

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

+ + + + +

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING
FOR THE GREATER-THAN-CLASS C
LOW-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

LOS ALAMOS, NEW MEXICO

Tuesday, August 14, 2007

Hilltop House Best Western

400 Trinity Drive

Los Alamos, New Mexico

The above-entitled meeting was conducted at

6:40 p.m.

BEFORE:

HOLMES BROWN, Facilitator

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

ALSO PRESENT:

CHRISTINE GELLES, Director
Department of Energy
Office of Disposal Operations (EM-12)

JAMIE JOYCE, GTCC EIS Document Manager
Department of Energy

GEORGE DIXON, Senior Technical Advisor
GTCC EIS
Department of Energy

I N D E X

1		
2	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
3	James Bearzi	31
4	John Tauxe	39
5	Scott Kovac	43
6	Joni Arends	46
7	Trish Williams-Mello	52
8	Astrid Webster	55
9	Mike Dempsey	59
10	Roger Snodgrass	64
11	Sylvia Vergara	64
12	Marian Naranjo	68
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2 MR. BROWN: Let me welcome you to this public
3 scoping meeting on the proposed environmental impact
4 statement on the disposal of greater-than-class C low-
5 level radioactive waste. The development of an
6 environmental impact statement for this project by the
7 Department of Energy's Office of Disposal Operations is
8 required by the National Environmental Policy Act.

9 My name is Holmes Brown. I will serve as the
10 facilitator for this evening's meeting. My role is to
11 ensure that the meeting runs on time and that everybody
12 has an opportunity to speak. I'm not an employee of the
13 Department of Energy, nor an advocate for any party or
14 position.

15 At the registration table, you should have
16 received a green folder, a participant's packet. If not,
17 please raise your hand, and staff will be glad to -- okay,
18 we'll get one for you. The packet contains important
19 information on the presentation, and is a convenient place
20 to take notes during the briefing that will follow in a
21 few minutes.

22 There are three purposes for tonight's meeting.
23 First, to provide information on the proposed
24 environmental impact statement, the acronym being the
25 PEIS. And also on the National Environmental Policy Act,

1 or NEPA, which governs the process. Second, to answer any
2 of your questions on the PEIS or NEPA. And third, to
3 receive and record your formal comments on the proposed
4 EIS.

5 The agenda for tonight's meeting reflects these
6 purposes. We will begin with a presentation by Ms.
7 Christine Gelles regarding the proposed environmental
8 impact statement for the disposal of greater-than-class C
9 waste. Ms. Gelles is the director of the Office of
10 Disposal Operations, which is the DOE office charged with
11 preparing the EIS.

12 To answer your questions, project staff will be
13 available throughout the evening at the posters in the
14 back. They can discuss the proposed EIS and the NEPA
15 process, the contents of the printed materials on display,
16 and the contents of the slide show.

17 Following Ms. Gelles' presentation, we will
18 recess so that the public can pursue any questions that
19 may arise from the slide presentation or anything
20 remaining about the poster displays.

21 Once we reconvene, the court reporter will be
22 available to receive your comments and suggestions
23 regarding the scope of the proposed EIS for the greater-
24 than-class C waste. All of your comments will be
25 transcribed and made a permanent part of the record.

1 We'll begin with a slide presentation by Ms.
2 Christine Gelles. She will discuss the background of the
3 project and the purpose and basic elements of the proposed
4 EIS.

5 Yes, did you have a question?

6 FEMALE VOICE: Yes, so we're not going to hear
7 each other's comments on the scope?

8 MR. BROWN: Yes, but that's after the slide
9 presentation. We'll set the court reporter up and you
10 will be speaking from here. So, yes, everybody will be
11 heard.

12 MS. GELLES: Good evening. Welcome to the
13 greater-than-class C low-level radioactive waste
14 environmental impact statement public scoping meeting. I
15 will refer to the EIS throughout my presentation as the
16 GTCC EIS. And I apologize in advance for that long
17 acronym.

18 I am Christine Gelles. I'm the director of the
19 Office of Disposal Operations. That is within the Office
20 of Environmental Management at the Department of Energy
21 headquarters in Washington, D.C.

22 It is my office that's charged with the
23 responsibility by Congress to prepare this environmental
24 impact statement, and we take very seriously public
25 comments through this NEPA process, and I'm very happy

1 that you guys have all shown up this evening, taking your
2 important personal time to participate with us.

3 I am pleased to be here. This is your
4 opportunity to present comments, concerns, issues, and
5 suggestions on the scope of the EIS, and the slides that
6 will follow are intended to provide some background on
7 what greater-than-class C waste is, provide some
8 additional information on the inventory estimates, and
9 then talk in some detail about the scope elements that we
10 propose to include in this EIS.

11 Any comment received throughout this scoping
12 process, which continues through September 21, will be
13 very carefully considered as we work through the process
14 of analyzing and developing a disposal capability for GTCC
15 low-level waste.

16 The National Environmental Policy Act, referred
17 to as NEPA, requires that an environmental impact
18 statement be prepared for any major federal action that
19 could impact the quality of the environment. The
20 Department of Energy is determined that the development of
21 a greater-than-class C disposal capability, given the wide
22 range of generator sites and the long time period, is a
23 major federal action and is appropriate for an EIS.

24 We are just in the beginning stages of the NEPA
25 process, with the primary focus at this time being the

1 identification of the scope of the EIS, including proposed
2 disposal locations, possible disposal methods, and
3 candidate sites.

4 The comments we receive here tonight, and
5 throughout the public scoping process, will be considered
6 in developing a draft EIS. That draft EIS will be made
7 available to the public for comment, and those comments
8 will be considered in preparing a final EIS and a record
9 of decision. So you see, there'll be multiple
10 opportunities for your input.

11 As I will discuss later in my presentation, and
12 it's a pretty significant point because this is an unusual
13 circumstance, before making a decision on the disposal
14 alternative, or taking any action as a result of this EIS,
15 the DOE must first submit a report to Congress, which
16 describes all of the alternatives that we evaluate in this
17 document, and await action by Congress.

18 We are just at the start of this process and we
19 expect it will take us several years of work before we're
20 ready to implement any action as a result of this EIS. We
21 do hope that you will continue to stay involved throughout
22 the process as we collectively work towards a sound
23 disposal decision on greater-than-class C low-level waste.

24 Before I get into the slides, I thought it
25 might be helpful just to provide a very brief overview of

1 what greater-than-class C low-level radioactive waste is.
2 It's generated from commercial activities throughout the
3 nation, such as the production of electricity from
4 reactors. It also involves discarded radioactive sealed
5 sources, which are used in the diagnosis and treatment of
6 cancer, as well as in other industrial uses.

7 The volume of greater-than-class C low-level
8 waste is small compared to the other classes of commercial
9 low-level waste that are regulated by the Nuclear
10 Regulatory Commission. Those classes are class A, B and
11 C. But greater-than-class C has a higher radioactivity
12 and therefore requires special disposal considerations
13 under the NRC regulations.

14 And one of the poster boards in the back does
15 talk about, and there's a little bit more information in
16 these slides, as well as in the briefing materials that
17 are in your green folder.

18 Again, I hope you have a copy of the
19 presentation that was available at the registration table.
20 There is a website there in one of the later pages, the
21 next to the last slide, and I encourage you to go there
22 because there's a wealth of historical information and
23 other additional background information on the scope.

24 The Notice of Intent was published in the
25 *Federal Register* on July 23, 2007. On July 31 we

1 published a correction to the inventory table, and that
2 necessary because a printing error occurred a the *Federal*
3 *Register*. A copy of both of these documents is, again, in
4 the green folder.

5 The publication of the Notice of Intent serves
6 several purposes for us. It announced the Department's
7 decision to development an environmental impact statement
8 for both greater-than-class C low-level waste, which is a
9 commercial waste stream, as well as DOE greater-than-class
10 C-like waste, which is a waste stream that I will describe
11 in more detail. I realize that terminology can be a
12 little bit confusing, and we'll talk through that.

13 The Notice of Intent officially initiates this
14 EIS process, it requests your comments on the proposed
15 scope of the EIS, and it announced the public scoping
16 meetings that will take place over the next three weeks.

17 It provides information on the greater-than-
18 class C low-level waste and DOE greater-than-class C-like
19 waste inventories, which is estimated to be about 5600
20 cubic meters, and that includes both the currently stored
21 and the projected generation through the year 2062. That
22 is a relatively small number.

23 I realize radioactive waste management is a
24 very significant issue, but to put that in perspective,
25 5600 cubic meters, over six decades, is less than the

1 transuranic waste that has been received at the Waste
2 Isolation Pilot Plant this year alone. We're over 7,000
3 cubic meters this year alone.

4 The Notice of Intent identifies the purpose and
5 need for an action. It also identifies the Department's
6 proposed action, and, again, we'll describe that in some
7 detail because it is that point that we're really inviting
8 your comments on tonight.

9 It identifies the proposed disposal
10 alternatives, including possible locations, it responds to
11 public comments that we received on an advance Notice of
12 Intent that we published in May of 2005 that was the first
13 public announcement of our intent to develop an EIS.

14 That followed soon after the passage of the
15 Energy Policy Act, or the development of the draft Energy
16 Policy Act, because we knew Congress was going to direct
17 us to move forward on our statutory responsibilities.

18 The Notice of Intent also announces that the
19 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency will participate as a
20 cooperating agency, and the Nuclear Regulatory Agency as a
21 commenting agency.

22 The purpose and need for action. The NRC and
23 agreement state licensees have generated, and will
24 continue to generate, greater-than-class C low-level waste
25 for which there is no permitted disposal facility today.

1 We, the Department, have a statutory responsibility for
2 developing the disposal capability for this waste. This
3 statutory requirement is largely found in the Low-Level
4 Waste Policy Act amendments of 1985, as I'll explain in
5 just a few moments.

6 However, DOE owns and generates certain low-
7 level waste and transuranic, or TRU waste streams which
8 have characteristics very similar to commercial greater-
9 than-class C-like waste, and which may also not have a
10 disposal path today. We refer to that as DOE greater-
11 than-class C-like waste.

12 And, again, that terminology is somewhat
13 confusing. GTCC-like is intended to communicate that it
14 is very comparable to the commercial greater-than-class C
15 definition. However, DOE's waste streams are not managed
16 under NRC regulations, so the terminology GTCC does not
17 officially apply to us, and that's why the GTCC-like
18 phrase is used.

19 There are three primary legislative drivers for
20 the environmental impact statement. The Low-Level
21 Radioactive Waste Policy Act Amendments of 1985, as I
22 mentioned, which is the document that assigned the federal
23 government the responsibility for providing a disposal
24 capability for greater-than-class C low-level waste.

25 The National Environmental Policy Act, which

1 requires federal agencies to consider environmental
2 impacts of proposed actions. Our proposed action, again,
3 here being the establishment of a disposal capability for
4 commercial greater-than-class C waste. NEPA also
5 establishes the framework for public input throughout the
6 evaluation of alternatives.

7 And very significantly, the Energy Policy Act
8 of 2005, specifically Section 631, required the Department
9 of Energy to produce a report that summarized the cost and
10 schedule to develop this EIS.

11 It also, however, includes a requirement for us
12 to develop a report and submit to them a comprehensive
13 report with many data requirements, but primarily focused
14 on describing all of the alternatives that we evaluate
15 through this EIS, and it specifically says we will await
16 their action before making -- taking any other steps to
17 implement a record of decision.

18 What this means for us is that we will be
19 unable to ultimately solve the disposal problem for
20 greater-than-class C low-level waste without Congress's
21 support and involvement.

22 I believe the genesis of Section 631 was in
23 response to heightened concerns about proliferation risks
24 that we may face because of disused sealed sources not
25 being managed and not having a permanent disposal

1 facility. I'm sure this community is pretty familiar with
2 the Los Alamos National Labs offsite source recovery
3 program, which does recover disused sealed sources from
4 commercial industry and safely stores them.

5 The establishment of that program also is
6 derived indirectly from the Low-Level Waste Policy Act
7 responsibilities that the Department has to manage
8 greater-than-class C commercial waste. However, we
9 recognize that without a disposal solution we needed a
10 stop gap measure and that's why the offsite source
11 recovery program was established.

12 The 1987 report to Congress, as well as the
13 2006 report to Congress are available on the greater-than-
14 class C EIS website. And, again, that web link is
15 included in these slides.

16 So let's talk about what greater-than-class C
17 low-level waste really is. And to do that we have to
18 first start talking about exactly what low-level
19 radioactive waste is in NRC terminology.

20 Unfortunately the statutory and regulatory
21 definition is rather complicated, and it defines low-level
22 waste by what it is not. It's not high-level waste, it's
23 not spent nuclear fuel, and it's not byproduct material
24 such a uranium mill tailings, the tailings of waste that
25 are generated from mining uranium.

1 It is included in -- it includes items that
2 have been contaminated with radioactive material, or that
3 have become radioactive through exposure to radiation. It
4 comes in many forms, clothing, equipment, tools, soils,
5 water treatment residues, building debris when radioactive
6 facilities are demolished and cleaned up.

7 It's generated from a variety of commercial and
8 government activities, including the production of
9 electricity, medical research, medical treatment. It also
10 is produced when common objects like luminous watches,
11 exit signs and smoke detectors are ultimately disposed.

12 The NRC classifies low-level waste into four
13 classes, class A, B, C and greater-than-class C, or GTCC.
14 And those classes are based on the concentration of
15 specific short-lived and long-lived radionuclides, with
16 greater-than-class C having the highest radionuclide
17 concentrations.

18 Classes A, B and C low-level waste can be
19 disposed of in near surface facilities. It is the
20 responsibility of states and regional disposal compacts to
21 provide for disposal of class A, B and C low-level waste
22 generated in the commercial industry, and there are
23 several operating commercial disposal facilities today,
24 and a few others planned.

25 However, the NRC requires that greater-than-

1 class C waste, because of the higher concentrations of
2 radioactivity, be disposed of in a geologic repository
3 licensed by the NRC, unless an alternative method of
4 disposal is evaluated, identified to be protective,
5 proposed to the NRC, and ultimately licensed. And that's
6 what this EIS is undertaking.

7 So greater-than-class C waste. Greater-than-
8 class C waste exceeds -- is waste that exceeds the
9 concentration limits as defined by the NRC for class C
10 waste. Again, it's generated throughout the United States
11 by NRC and agreement state licensees. It can typically be
12 grouped into three major waste types, activated metal,
13 sealed sources, and other waste.

14 We'll talk about each of these in some detail.
15 Activated metals, which makes up the majority of the
16 volume of greater-than-class C wastes that we are
17 analyzing in this EIS, is primarily generated in nuclear
18 reactors during facility decommissioning. It consists of
19 reactor components such as thermal shields, internal to
20 the reactor, that have become radioactive from neutron
21 absorption during reactor operations.

22 This picture here shows a radiation survey of
23 an activated metal component from the decommissioning of a
24 small research reactor. Currently there are 104 operating
25 nuclear reactors today, and 18 decommissioned reactors,

1 some of which are currently storing greater-than-class C
2 that was generated when they decommission their
3 facilities. Much of the activated metal has sufficient
4 radiation that it may require remote handling.

5 Sealed sources, these are very small, typically
6 very small radioactive materials that are encapsulated in
7 closed metal containers to provide shielding. They're
8 used in common applications in everyday use, sterilizing
9 medical products, for diagnosis and treatment of illnesses
10 to avoid invasive surgery, and a number of other
11 industrial purposes.

12 Not all sealed sources are greater-than-class
13 C. Some can be managed as class A, B or C waste, and
14 commercially disposed in existing commercial disposal
15 facilities.

16 As I mentioned before, one of the primary
17 reasons why I believe Congress gave us the mandate to move
18 forward with this EIS in a timely fashion is because of
19 the proliferation concerns associated with disused sealed
20 sources.

21 The third waste stream, or waste type, is
22 really a catch all. We call it other waste. It basically
23 includes any greater-than-class C low-level waste that is
24 not activated metal and is not a sealed source. It
25 consists of contaminated equipment, debris, trash, scrap

1 metal, decontamination and decommissioning waste from
2 industrial activities such as laboratory research.

3 Only a few commercial licensees generate this
4 other types of GTCC. Most commercial greater-than-class C
5 waste is activated metals and sealed sources as described
6 in previous slides, in the posters, and in the handout
7 material.

8 So let's get into what DOE greater-than-class
9 C-like waste is. Again, I'm acknowledging that that
10 terminology can be confusing, so when we break, if you
11 have any questions about that, please see me, or any of
12 the other project staff that are present here.

13 DOE low-level waste and transuranic waste that
14 have characteristics similar to commercial greater-than-
15 class C, and may not have an identified path of disposal,
16 comprise this inventory of greater-than-class C-like
17 waste. It's owned by DOE, generated by DOE activities,
18 even if those DOE activities occur at a commercial
19 facility.

20 The waste forms are similar to the waste forms
21 in greater-than-class C low-level waste, activated metal,
22 sealed sources, and the other waste category. Most of the
23 DOE GTCC inventory is comprised of transuranic waste that
24 may not qualify for disposal at the Waste Isolation Pilot
25 Plant near Carlsbad under the current legislation, in

1 large part because it has not yet been determined, and may
2 not be determined, to have been derived from defense
3 related activities.

4 I think many of you are familiar that the
5 current legislation enabling of the Waste Isolation Pilot
6 Plant requires that all transuranic waste received there
7 be defense related.

8 The use of this term, GTCC-like, does not have
9 the intent or effect of creating a new classification of
10 radioactive waste. And I'll remind you that the NRC waste
11 classifications do not technically apply to DOE's waste
12 streams because we manage our waste under our Atomic
13 Energy Act authorities and pursuant to our DOE orders.

14 Here's a summary of our waste inventories. The
15 total estimated and projected greater-than-class C low-
16 level waste and DOE greater-than-class C-like waste,
17 again, is approximately 5600 cubic meters. That would
18 contain approximately 140 million curies, and that's if
19 all of that were, in fact, generated.

20 A total volume of 2600 cubic meters is the
21 greater-than-class C, the actual commercial generation.
22 That contains a total of 110 million curies. While the
23 DOE greater-than-class C-like volume is slightly larger
24 when you include the total maximum projection that could
25 be generated of 3,000 cubic meters, but we have

1 substantially less curies, just 31 million curies.

2 Put this in perspective with the class A, B and
3 C low-level waste that would be generated commercially and
4 disposed in the same time frame, again, through 2062.
5 This inventory of 5600 cubic meters that is the scope of
6 this EIS, is less than one tenth of a percent of the total
7 estimated volume of class A, B and C commercial low-level
8 waste that would be generated and disposed.

9 However, the activity of this very small, less
10 than one tenth of a percent, is seven times greater than
11 that total volume of waste that would be generated and
12 commercially disposed.

13 We developed these inventory estimates through
14 data calls, interviews, and other sources of information.
15 We relied on available databases, historical reports, for
16 example. This inventory is supported and is well
17 documented in the inventory report that is available on
18 the GTCC EIS website.

19 It has a very long title, Greater-than-class C
20 Low-Level Radioactive Waste and DOE Greater-than-class C-
21 Like Inventory Estimates. It's a pretty detailed and
22 scientific explanation of the methodology, and I encourage
23 you to take a look at it.

24 Now that I've provided you with the background
25 of the waste types and the legislative drivers for this

1 EIS, what I'd like to discuss in the following slides are
2 the proposed action and the associated disposal
3 alternatives. Together they comprise the proposed scope
4 of this EIS and they are the topics that, in particular,
5 we are most interested in receiving your comments tonight.

6 The Department's proposed action is to
7 construct and operate a new facility, or facilities, or
8 using existing facilities for the disposal of greater-
9 than-class C low-level waste and DOE greater-than-class C-
10 like waste. Again, this proposed action stems from the
11 legislative requirement that DOE develop a disposal
12 capability for this waste stream that today has no
13 disposal outlet.

14 We do intend to include the DOE greater-than-
15 class C-like waste because we have the responsibility for
16 it as well as the commercial greater-than-class C-like
17 waste because of the similarities in those two waste
18 streams, and because we consider that this would be a cost
19 effective solution, given the relatively small volume of
20 waste that exists today.

21 These are the five primary disposal
22 alternatives we propose to analyze in the EIS. The first
23 is no action where current and future generations of both
24 commercial greater-than-class C-like waste and DOE
25 greater-than-class C-like waste are stored at the

1 designated locations, at the generator sites in large
2 part, consistent with ongoing practices. It's a no change
3 scenario.

4 The second alternative is disposal in geologic
5 repository at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant. The third
6 is disposal in the geologic repository plant at Yucca
7 Mountain in Nevada.

8 The fourth is disposal at a new enhanced near
9 surface disposal facility at one of the candidate sites
10 that we'll talk about in just a few moments, or the fifth
11 is a different disposal method, it's disposal at a new
12 intermediate depth bore hole facility at, again, one of
13 the candidate sites that we will discuss in just a few
14 moments.

15 We are very interested in what you think of
16 these alternatives, as well as the locations that I'll
17 list in a moment. And, as I'll mention also in a few
18 moments, it's possible that different combinations of
19 disposal alternatives may be appropriate based on the
20 different waste streams within the greater-than-class C
21 inventory, both current and projected, as well as other
22 considerations.

23 And we do recognize that for some of these
24 alternatives, there may -- it may be required that
25 existing legislation or regulatory requirements be

1 changed. However, this alone is not a reason for
2 eliminating a site or an alternative from the EIS
3 analysis. Our NEPA guidance and NEPA regulation require
4 that we evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives,
5 notwithstanding the statutory and regulatory constraints
6 that may exist.

7 But in this EIS analysis through the
8 development of the draft EIS we will describe any
9 statutory or regulatory limitations on each of these
10 disposal alternatives. And, again, I would like to remind
11 you, and I will point out again, that we must await
12 Congress's action before we implement any action as a
13 result of this EIS.

14 These are the three disposal methods we propose
15 to analyze today, deep geologic, intermediate bore hole,
16 and enhanced near surface. And I'll quickly walk through
17 each of those. And, again, we have some conceptual
18 drawings of what the designs might be like as we move
19 through the EIS development process on the poster boards
20 in the back of the room.

21 If you have other ideas or approaches you'd
22 like us to consider, please provide a comment on those
23 tonight.

24 Deep geologic repository, the placement of
25 waste in mined cavities deep beneath the earth's surface.

1 This is the method used for disposal of defense related
2 transuranic waste at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant. It
3 is the methodology planned for the geologic repository at
4 Yucca Mountain for spent nuclear fuel and for high-level
5 waste. This photo here on the right is a snapshot of
6 contact handled transuranic waste that's been disposed of
7 at WIPP.

8 Enhanced near surface is the placement of waste
9 in engineered trenches, vaults, or other similar
10 structures within the upper 30 meters of the earth's
11 crust. The photo here shows a concrete vault that is used
12 for disposal of some higher activity low-level waste that
13 DOE generated at a DOE site.

14 Again, the poster provides you a conceptual
15 drawing of what the design might look like that we will
16 analyze in the EIS. We do invite your comments on that
17 conceptual idea.

18 Intermediate depth bore hole disposal. There's
19 a lot of international interest and activity on this
20 disposal methodology. It involves the placement of waste
21 in augered bore holes deeper than 30 meters beneath the
22 earth's surface. So this is sort of an in between
23 alternative.

24 Additional barrier such as drilling deflectors
25 could protect from -- could provide increased protection

1 against future inadvertent human intrusion. There is
2 still robust packaging involved here, shield plugs, et
3 cetera. This method has successfully been demonstrated in
4 the U.S. at a DOE site, as well as in other countries.
5 And, again, I mention that the international community is
6 increasingly looking at this for the disposal of sealed
7 sources.

8 These are the proposed disposal locations we
9 intend to analyze in the EIS. Inclusion of the identified
10 DOE sites was based on mission compatibility, where these
11 sites have ongoing waste disposal operations and we
12 project that these sites will be in existence for a number
13 of decades into the future.

14 It also considers the physical characteristics
15 of the site. The inclusion of WIPP and Yucca Mountain are
16 because there's already a geologic operating -- an
17 operating and planned geologic repositories. Hopefully
18 it's obvious to you because, again, that is the disposal
19 methodology that the NRC assumes is required for greater-
20 than-class C waste.

21 The term WIPP vicinity that would involve
22 either land within the Land Withdrawal area that is
23 currently under the jurisdiction of DOE, or on government
24 property within the vicinity of WIPP.

25 We also intend to analyze generic commercial

1 alternatives. This provides us some opportunity to make a
2 programmatic determination on the use of such a facility
3 in the future. At this time though there are no
4 commercial companies that were willing to, or interested
5 or able to provide us with a specific site or a specific
6 design. So we're trying to cover our bases in the EIS by
7 analyzing a generic humid/generic arid location.

8 The EIS, again, will describe the statutory and
9 regulatory requirements for each alternative, and whether
10 legislative or regulatory modifications would be needed to
11 implement the alternative under consideration. That will
12 be a key component of that report to Congress that is
13 required after we complete the EIS.

14 It's conceivable that the recommendations could
15 entail combinations of facilities based on different waste
16 types and other considerations.

17 And this slide provides really a summary of the
18 NEPA process. We published the advance Notice of Intent
19 in May of 2005, the Notice of Intent just last month, July
20 2007. During the two years that passed between the
21 publication of the advance Notice of Intent and the
22 publication of the actual Notice of Intent, we were
23 working to refine the inventory estimates, and, again,
24 working to come up with the departmental decision to
25 include the DOE greater-than-class C-like waste.

1 We are now in the public scoping process. It
2 began with the publication of the Notice of Intent, and
3 will continue through September 21. Following
4 consideration of those public comments, we'll proceed with
5 the development of the EIS, receive public comment on that
6 EIS, and proceed to a final EIS. Once that is complete
7 we'll use much of that information to provide that report
8 to Congress and then we'll await Congress's action before
9 implementing a record of decision.

10 The July 2006 report to Congress that estimated
11 the cost and schedule for the EIS, again, it's available
12 on our project website. It did identify an actual
13 schedule with the goal of us developing an EIS, a draft
14 EIS in 2008, writing a report to Congress in late calendar
15 year 2008.

16 After we receive these public comments and
17 determine exactly what our schedule will be moving
18 forward, we plan to update the schedule and provide that
19 information again the DOE greater-than-class C EIS
20 website.

21 Public participation is a very critical
22 component of the NEPA process, and it's a very important
23 step for us. And, again, I thank you for taking your time
24 to be here today to participate in the process. There
25 will be multiple opportunities throughout the development

1 of the EIS.

2 And tonight you can provide your comments
3 orally or written during this meeting. And, again, it
4 will be on the record, our court reporter -- they will be
5 transcribed and it will be part of the official record for
6 this EIS.

7 However, written comments can also be provided
8 by mail, via the website, or by fax through the public
9 scoping period, which, again, ends on September 21. There
10 is a written comment form in the folder if you want to
11 work on that tonight and leave it with the reporter, or
12 if you want to provide it after the fact.

13 I do encourage you also to visit that greater-
14 than-class C EIS website. We've put a good amount of
15 effort into providing a lot of supporting information,
16 linking you to historical reports. And, again, the
17 inventory report is there.

18 We will continue to maintain it because it will
19 be the primary tool for us to give information to you as
20 we move forward on this project.

21 And this is some contact information for me and
22 my staff, and I'll ask Jamie Joyce to raise his hand. He
23 will be your primary contact. He is the -- both the team
24 lead for the greater-than-class C organization at
25 headquarters, but he's also the document manager. George

1 Dixon is his senior technical advisor, who's also here
2 with us.

3 We are supported by Argonne National
4 Laboratory. Mary, you want to raise your hand, and, Joe,
5 you're hand? Okay.

6 MALE VOICE: And Sandia.

7 MS. GELLES: Oh, I'm sorry. And Sandia
8 National Laboratories, who are providing -- they're
9 providing technical documents that we'll use in the EIS
10 analysis. And, let's see, where's John? John, in the
11 back, back here. Okay. So if you have any questions on
12 the material in the back, please find one of us.

13 Thank you. That concludes my information.

14 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Thanks very much.

15 At this time we'll take a very brief recess to
16 allow you to pose any questions that you may have on the
17 slide presentation, or if there are any remaining
18 questions on the posters at the back. And we'll start
19 very soon with the public comment period.

20 So we'll take maybe a five minute break or so
21 and then get started. Thanks.

22 (Off the record.)

23 (On the record.)

24 MR. BROWN: -- take their seats, we'll get
25 started on the public comment period. Okay. Thanks.

1 It's now time to receive your formal comments
2 on the scope of the proposed EIS. This is your
3 opportunity to let DOE know what you would like to see
4 addressed in the draft document. The court reporter will
5 transcribe your statement.

6 Let me review a few brief ground rules for the
7 formal comments. Please step up to the podium over there
8 when your name is called, introduce yourself, providing an
9 organizational affiliation where appropriate.

10 If you have a written version of your
11 statement, please provide a copy to the court reporter
12 after you've completed your remarks. And also please give
13 the court reporter any additional documents that you would
14 like included in the formal record. Each will be labeled
15 and submitted for inclusion.

16 I will call two names at a time. The first of
17 the speaker and the second of the person to follow. In
18 view of the number of people who have indicated an
19 interest in speaking this evening, I'll ask each person to
20 confine their -- at least their initial statement to five
21 minutes. I will let you know when you have a minute
22 remaining.

23 Ms. Gelles will be serving as the hearing
24 officer for the Department of Energy during the formal
25 comment period, but she will not be responding to any

1 questions or comments during this session.

2 So that, by way of introduction, let me ask our
3 first speaker to come forward.

4 James Bearzi is here with the State of New
5 Mexico. I'd ask him to make opening comments. And,
6 please, come on up. And he will be followed -- I'm afraid
7 I'm going to fail my second test, it's John, and it looks
8 like maybe Tauxe or something like that. Anyway, you
9 probably know who you are, and you can correct me when you
10 get up here.

11 But, again, we'll begin with James Bearzi.
12 Welcome.

13 MR. BEARZI: Thank you. My name is James
14 Bearzi. I'm chief of the Environment Department's
15 Hazardous Waste Bureau with the State of New Mexico.

16 My bureau regulates Los Alamos and the WIPP
17 facility under the Federal Resource Conservation Recovery
18 Act, and so both the Department of Energy and the co-
19 operators of these facilities have sought permits from us
20 and we've issued them. So the State of New Mexico feels
21 like it has a very strong stake in what's being discussed
22 today.

23 There are quite a few microphones up here, so
24 that's --

25 MR. BROWN: Right.

1 MR. BEARZI: -- that's a good thing. I guess
2 I'll be heard.

3 MR. BROWN: Yes. Especially in Washington.
4 Right?

5 MR. BEARZI: Yes. Yes. Right.

6 MR. BROWN: Good.

7 MR. BEARZI: Except I do have recollections of
8 things that happened --

9 MR. BROWN: Okay.

10 MR. BEARZI: -- yesterday. So I guess I must
11 not be in Washington.

12 MR. BROWN: Okay.

13 MR. BEARZI: The -- I want to organize my
14 comments in three forms. I want to make a brief statement
15 about the WIPP facility, and then I want to talk a little
16 bit secondly about Los Alamos in general and some of the
17 concerns that we have about this project with Los Alamos,
18 and then thirdly I'd actually like to do what you've asked
19 us to do, which is to make some recommendations for some
20 factors that the Department of Energy should consider as
21 they go through the NEPA process.

22 Last night there was a meeting down at WIPP,
23 and the Governor's office has made some statements about
24 how they view this, and I kind of want to reiterate those.
25 The state didn't get its comments on the record, but we're

1 here to do that now.

2 Governor Richardson and the State of New Mexico
3 has been steadfast in its commitment to making sure that
4 WIPP remains focused on its core mission and is operated
5 in a manner that protects New Mexicans. We've opposed
6 attempts in the past to broaden the types of waste
7 accepted by WIPP, thinking particularly of tank wastes.

8 And we're opposed to this proposal for WIPP.
9 The DOE has made promises to the State of New Mexico and
10 its citizens that WIPP will solely remain focused on
11 defense related transuranic waste, and we expect the
12 Department of Energy to, frankly, keep that promise in
13 this and in subsequent administrations.

14 We weren't able to do that last night, but we
15 wanted to get that on the record here.

16 Generally speaking, we think that the idea of
17 disposing of these types of materials at Los Alamos,
18 whether in near surface or in intermediate depth bore
19 holes, is a horrible idea. In fact, you can think of it
20 at a place like Los Alamos as clean up in reverse.

21 Los Alamos National Laboratory is operating on
22 a consent order to clean up the entire site, fence to
23 fence, that they've negotiated with the state
24 painstakingly. The Department of Energy has consented to
25 the provisions of the consent order, as has the operators.

1 And a large part of this consent order involves
2 moving waste, transuranic and other defense related waste,
3 from Area G and other areas off the hill and to places
4 like WIPP. And they're, in fact, after the Cerro Grande
5 fire in 2000, there was a large push to get some of what's
6 known as the higher wattage transuranic waste out of Area
7 G and down to WIPP. And this was a project known as Quick
8 to WIPP.

9 We get the to WIPP part, but the quick part
10 hasn't really come to fruition. But we're expecting that
11 it is going to happen someday.

12 So just on a common sense level, it's
13 counterintuitive to think that we're going to spend all of
14 this energy and money to get these wastes off of the hill
15 down to WIPP, and spend a lot of money and a lot of effort
16 to do that, while at the same taking other wastes that are
17 also high activity wastes, and put them back up on the
18 hill.

19 And if you look at the activities that we're
20 talking about with greater-than-class C versus the quick
21 to WIPP, they're comparable. So we're actually not really
22 doing anything except wasting a tremendous amount of
23 taxpayer money and putting a lot of people at risk by
24 moving this stuff around.

25 We think that getting the waste off the hill to

1 WIPP is a good idea. We think that replacing it with
2 other waste is a bad idea, and is counterproductive.

3 It was mentioned in the presentation that the
4 consideration of the sites included physical conditions of
5 the sites as well as ongoing disposal operations. As far
6 as the physical conditions of the sites, Los Alamos
7 National Laboratory, and the hydrogeology particularly, is
8 very poorly understood, and poorly characterized.

9 In fact, the state would be very supportive of
10 these intermediate depth bore holes, for characterization
11 purposes. We don't think they should put waste in them.
12 But, frankly, Los Alamos doesn't understand what's
13 happening in the intermediate zone, much less what's
14 happening in the vadose zone 1,000 feet below.

15 The performance assessment at Area G relies on
16 this very thick vadose zone on the order of 1,000 feet,
17 but we already have contamination in the regional aquifer
18 from waste operations -- disposal operations, we're not
19 sure. It could be from liquid discharges in the canyons.
20 I think the relevant point is that we don't know where
21 it's coming from.

22 So the site is poorly characterized, and one of
23 the reasons that it's poorly characterized is that Los
24 Alamos National Laboratory frankly has struggled with its
25 environmental mission over the years, and continues to

1 struggle to this day.

2 We think that the ongoing disposal operations
3 may be good from the Department of Energy's standpoint,
4 but from the State of New Mexico's standpoint, we have
5 many ongoing -- we have many former disposal operations
6 that may have caused contamination to the aquifer.

7 We know that at the current disposal site that
8 they're using at Area G, there have been releases from the
9 disposal areas to the subsurface. We don't know how big
10 they are, we don't know if they've affected ground water
11 or not. That's one of the points of the consent order is
12 to figure that out.

13 So there are a lot of unknowns with Los Alamos.
14 We think that it would be exceedingly expensive to plug
15 those data gaps for purposes of greater-than -- disposing
16 of greater-than-class C waste.

17 But enough ranting about Los Alamos. We're
18 here to give the Department of Energy some advice about
19 what they -- some factors to consider through the NEPA
20 process. One is for every site that you're considering,
21 the Department of Energy needs to do an evaluation of the
22 volume of activity and activity of waste at existing
23 sites.

24 And a mass calculation of non-radioactive
25 components at sites. For example, solvents and chemical

1 contamination, to put more colloquially, how much
2 pollution is already at the sites, both in the form of
3 releases from waste as well as waste volumes that we
4 already know about. This is mandatory.

5 Only after that evaluation has been done can
6 the Department of Energy make an honest public evaluation
7 if we're going to dispose of this permanently in a
8 pristine site, or, we're going to basically declare one of
9 these sites a kill zone and we're going to put this stuff
10 in forever.

11 Secondly, characterization of the geology, and
12 particularly the hydrogeology at all of the sites has to
13 be detailed, and it has to be comprehensive, and it has to
14 be complete. And then, the data gaps have to be
15 identified, and these data gaps can be evaluated fairly
16 easily by looking at the existing reports and what we
17 know.

18 And then you have to decide how much does the
19 Department of Energy want to invest in evaluating the
20 subsurface geology at a site where the site managers,
21 frankly, haven't done a very good job. That might now be
22 a very good use of taxpayer money.

23 Next, the Department of Energy should consider,
24 through this NEPA process, the relative volumes of mixed
25 versus non-mixed waste. And that's important, for

1 example, to the State of New Mexico, because we regulate
2 mixed waste. We regulate it at Los Alamos National
3 Laboratory, from a record standpoint, and we regulate the
4 disposal of mixed waste at the Waste Isolation Pilot
5 Plant.

6 So not just understanding the volumes, relative
7 volumes of mixed and non-mixed waste, but the regulatory
8 requirements, there needs to be a very rigorous evaluation
9 of that.

10 Finally, the Department of Energy needs to
11 consider, in a comprehensive way, the record of
12 environmental clean up and what DOE calls stewardship at
13 each of the sites, and not entrust this very important
14 responsibility of the final, Final with a capital F,
15 forever disposition of greater-than-class C waste to sites
16 that have a poor record of environmental clean up. And we
17 would recommend that those sites with poor records should
18 be downgraded as you evaluate the relative factors.

19 The state appreciates the opportunity to come
20 up here and make some comments on the record. We hope the
21 Department of Energy considers our comments because we've
22 put a considerable amount of thought in them. Thank you.

23 MR. BROWN: Thanks very much.

24 John, and if you will spell your name for the
25 court reporter, and I guess for my benefit as well. Also,

1 you may have noticed that my watch is running a little
2 slow tonight. That's because we do have adequate time and
3 people are making very substantive comments. So please --

4 MR. TAUXE: Okay. Based on --

5 MR. BROWN: -- carry on.

6 MR. TAUXE: -- a sample of one there, but.

7 MR. BROWN: That's -- well, you're going to
8 carry on --

9 MR. TAUXE: Oh, yes, I will --

10 MR. BROWN: -- the great tradition.

11 MR. TAUXE: -- carry on. Sorry. No offense.

12 My name is John Tauxe. Tauxe, T-A-U-X-E.

13 MR. BROWN: Okay.

14 MR. TAUXE: All right. That's a tough one both
15 ways. I know.

16 I'm here as a resident of Los Alamos. I also
17 am an environmental engineer up here, and do a lot of work
18 with radioactive waste. I am well versed in low-level
19 waste performance assessment, as well as transuranic and
20 other sorts of DOE waste. I have a lot of experience in
21 it.

22 Now I'm not an advocate for any particular
23 site, and I'm not going to argue in favor or against any
24 particular site, or technology. What I'm an advocate for
25 is making sure that decisions like this are based on

1 science, and based on sound risk assessment. And that --
2 if those -- if the analyses that inform these decisions
3 are based on science, then that will direct you, I
4 believe, to the, you know, the best sort of site.

5 If you're most interested in keeping risks as
6 low as reasonably achievable, ALARA is the mantra of
7 radioactive management. Then you do a risk assessment to
8 determine what is the best place to put it to keep risks
9 low.

10 And although it's not reasonable for me to
11 expect, it would be nice if politics were kept out of the
12 decision. I don't think that's possible, especially now
13 with Congress getting involved in it. It is ultimately
14 there are political aspects to it.

15 But I'm an advocate for making science based
16 decisions. And I think that the risks, as they're
17 assessed, should be done with a very long time frame in
18 mind. DOE manages its own low-level waste with a 1,000
19 year time frame. It used to be 10,000 years. They've
20 reduced it to one.

21 And the NRC typically uses a 10,000 year time
22 frame, but recently they got in trouble with that because
23 the National Academies of Sciences suggests that one make
24 estimates out to peak dose, which could be as long as a
25 million years out, or something like that.

1 It's not reasonable for a model to expect to
2 actually be able to predict that sort of dose, but it's
3 still useful in separating one site from another. It's
4 long term behavior, see which one would produce a lower
5 risk than another.

6 Another very important aspect in risk
7 assessment, in my view, is the question of institutional
8 control. Often assumptions are made that a site will be
9 under institutional control, meaning that potential future
10 receptors will be kept off, residents will never be
11 allowed to live on it, and no one would be allowed to
12 drill through it.

13 I think institutional controls may be
14 reasonable to expect to be in place over 100 years, or
15 maybe a few hundred years at the outside. But there's
16 really no technical basis as to why they should be
17 effective for longer than that. Certainly not for 1,000
18 years.

19 And it's -- another aspect that's very
20 important, as James Bearzi pointed out, is to include the
21 risks from other sources that are already there. And DOE
22 has already recognized the need for this, with a little
23 help from the Defense Nuclear Facility Safety Board, and
24 their recommendation of '94 too that suggested DOE
25 evaluate other wastes in the area and the total risk

1 involved from not only, in this case the greater-than-
2 class C waste put in, but other things that are in the
3 area.

4 And that's called a composite analysis under
5 DOE Order 435.1, which is the radioactive waste management
6 order for DOE. So DOE already recognizes the need for
7 that, and I would encourage them to continue to do so.

8 And in general, an excellent bit of guidance
9 for making these sorts of decisions, basing them on risk
10 assessment and on science, it comes from the National
11 Academies in a publication that I think they did in 2005,
12 or some date near that, called Risks in Decisions, which I
13 would highly recommend as required reading for anyone
14 involved in this field.

15 And the idea is, in a way it doesn't matter
16 what the classification of the waste is, or where it came
17 from, or how long it's been there. The important
18 decisions to be made are based on what sort of risk it
19 poses to people in the future, and as is typically ignored
20 in these things, to the environment in the future, and
21 ecological risk assessment could be a part of this as
22 well.

23 So anyway, that's -- what I would like to have
24 this all focused on, I know that politics may overtake the
25 thing in the long run, but, you know, if one can interject

1 the science, then it's clear where the science leaves off
2 and the politics take over. And let the politicians die
3 on their swords.

4 And let's keep the technical aspects of this
5 honest and forthright and based in science. And then
6 hopefully that will lead to the right decision with enough
7 persuasive argument. Okay.

8 MR. BROWN: Thanks a lot.

9 MR. TAUXE: Thanks.

10 MS. GELLES: Thank you.

11 MR. BROWN: Okay. Scott Kovac is next, and he
12 will be followed by Joni Arends.

13 Sorry, I didn't give you much warning. I fell
14 down on the job. So I'm sure --

15 MR. KOVAC: That's okay.

16 MR. BROWN: -- you're ready though.

17 MR. KOVAC: That's okay. My name is Scott
18 Kovac with Nuclear Watch New Mexico.

19 We have another idea, another alternative that
20 we'd like DOE to consider, please. We'd like DOE to
21 consider hardened on site storage. Hardened on --
22 greater-than-class C radioactive waste must be safely
23 stored as close to the site of generation as possible.
24 Waste must be safeguarded in hardened on site storage, or
25 HOSS, facilities.

1 Impacts of building HOSS facilities must be
2 analyzed in order to ensure that these wastes are not
3 subject to risks posed by wildfire or -- natural or
4 manmade disasters. HOSS facilities must not be regarded
5 as permanent waste solutions and thus should not be
6 constructed deep underground. The waste must be
7 retrievable and real time radiation and heat monitoring at
8 the HOSS facility must be implemented for early detection
9 of radiation releases.

10 An overall objective of HOSS should be that the
11 amount of releases projected, even in severe attacks,
12 should be low enough that the storage system would be an
13 unattractive terrorist target.

14 Also considering HOSS, DOE should dedicate
15 funding to local and state governments for independent
16 monitoring of the HOSS facilities. The affected public
17 must have the right to fully participate.

18 Periodic review of HOSS facilities should be
19 required. An annual report reviewing the safety of each
20 HOSS facility should be prepared with meaningful public
21 participation from stakeholders, regulators and utility
22 managers at each site. The report must be made publically
23 available and may include recommendation for actions to be
24 taken.

25 On other notes, we think that DOE should

1 analyze possible greater-than-class C waste treatment
2 alternatives, such as vitrification and compaction.
3 Pretreatment of class C -- greater-than-class C waste
4 could possibly lessen the disposal volumes.

5 We also request that DOE analyze the
6 transportation impacts. DOE should specify each site that
7 has greater-than-class C, and the transportation impacts
8 of shipping waste from site -- from each site to the
9 alternative disposal locations, specify how many shipments
10 would occur by truck, train or barge, specify how many
11 shipping containers would be needed, their cost, and
12 whether they already exist or whether new containers would
13 have to be developed.

14 Do not bury greater-than-class C waste, or
15 sealed sources, at Los Alamos National Laboratory. LANL
16 has collected 15,000 sealed sources from across the
17 country that are currently being stored above-ground at
18 the lab's radioactive waste dump, Area G.

19 The final disposition of Area G, in operation
20 since 1957, but now facing closure, has yet to be
21 determined. Hopefully, the existing buried hazardous
22 waste and radioactive waste will be excavated. Please
23 analyze the location at LANL for a HOSS facility.

24 Do not bring greater-than-class C waste to the
25 Waste Isolation Pilot Plant. This will require a change

1 in existing law of over what WIPP can accept. This would
2 require changing the Land Withdrawal Act, and opens up the
3 site to commercial waste, which should -- which is and
4 should remain prohibited. WIPP cannot even accommodate
5 all of the waste that DOE has planned for it, let alone
6 new waste.

7 Thank you.

8 MR. BROWN: Thank you. And a printed copy of
9 your recommendations are available --

10 MR. KOVAC: Yes. Yes.

11 MR. BROWN: -- on the table. Right?

12 MR. KOVAC: Yes.

13 MR. BROWN: Okay. And could -- I guess we'll
14 get one for the court reporter.

15 MR. KOVAC: Who's the court reporter?

16 MR. BROWN: Oh, right here.

17 MR. KOVAC: Okay.

18 MR. BROWN: Okay. Thanks very much.

19 Okay. Joni Arends is next, and Trish Williams-
20 Mello will follow Joni.

21 MS. ARENDS: Good evening. My name is Joni
22 Arends, and I'm with Concerned Citizens for Nuclear
23 Safety. And I thank everybody for coming out tonight.

24 My comments are not necessarily very well
25 prepared, but I'm going to make the statements anyway.

1 First, to talk about the hearing last night, we're very
2 concerned about the fact -- about the number of DOE
3 employees who made comments last night.

4 While they have a First Amendment right to make
5 those comments, we're concerned about the fact that -- how
6 they'll be considered in terms of bias towards the WIPP
7 site. We're concerned specifically about statements made
8 by Cliff Stroud and by Roger Nelson.

9 We're concerned as -- you know, this state --
10 DOE has made promises, as James spoke, about the mission
11 of WIPP being for defense waste, and we're concerned about
12 this proposal for commercial waste being sent to WIPP,
13 this greater-than-class C waste. So we're very concerned
14 about those statements. And we've brought these issues up
15 in previous EISEs where the proposal is to expand the
16 mission of WIPP.

17 So CCNS supports the alternative that addresses
18 the hardened on site storage, the HOSS facility. And we
19 believe that those -- that should be considered by the
20 Department of Energy.

21 Another aspect is the storage of the sealed
22 sources currently at Los Alamos National Laboratory. We
23 went on a tour of Area G today, and we raise concerns
24 about whether -- currently the sealed sources are stored
25 in the fabric tents. And we asked a question about when

1 the last time the fire retardant was applied to those
2 tents. And given the amount of rain this year, there's a
3 higher potential for fall fires.

4 And we understood that the fire retardant
5 hasn't been put on, and basically many of these tents are
6 12 years old, and according to the manufacturer's
7 information, that needs to happen, that the fire retardant
8 needs to be put on that.

9 So DOE needs to consider the existing storage
10 of the greater-than-class C waste and how that's being --
11 are they in the most protective facilities currently,
12 because it may be a long period of time before a decision
13 is actually made on the greater-than-class C waste. So we
14 would like to see this waste put in the most protective
15 facility.

16 And we have a long history with, you know,
17 whether it's the quick to WIPP, or it's the greater-than-
18 class C waste, the sealed sources up here, because after
19 the dome fire in 1996 we asked for hardened on site
20 storage for the 40,000 drums of waste sitting in the tents
21 right now at Area G. And we were told, you know, that
22 waste will be off the hill by then. And that was in --
23 that fire was in 1996.

24 Following the Cerro Grande fire we were told,
25 Oh, no, don't worry, don't worry because by the time we

1 went through the construction permit process to build a
2 harden on site storage facility, we'll have all of that
3 waste down at WIPP. Well, in 2007, seven years after the
4 fire, that waste is still sitting in those tents.

5 So DOE needs to looks at the current storage of
6 those -- of this waste right now, and to make
7 improvements, and order DOE at LANL to do better.

8 Then I'd like to talk about why Los Alamos is
9 not the site for the greater-than-class C, for any of the
10 disposal options. And I'll refer the DOE to the National
11 Academies of Science report, which I will put into our
12 comments, the plans and practices for ground water
13 protection at Los Alamos National Laboratory, which was
14 released on June 8.

15 On the first couple of pages they made five
16 recommendations, and one to support what James said was
17 the mass balance, that we need to know what came up the
18 hill and what's going down the hill through surface and
19 ground water pathways. We don't have that information
20 right now.

21 Another important point that the NES made was
22 that DOE does not know the inventory of the Mesa Top
23 disposal sites, and we need to know that. And this all
24 goes to the cumulative effects argument, and why bring
25 more waste to WIPP -- or to LANL when we're already being

1 impacted. And the fact that a qualified detection of
2 plutonium 238 has been found in the Buckman Well Number 1,
3 which is the --

4 FEMALE VOICE: Excuse me. I can't hear you.

5 MS. ARENDS: Okay.

6 FEMALE VOICE: Could you turn the microphone
7 up? I can't hear your comments.

8 MS. ARENDS: There's been a qualified detection
9 of plutonium 238 in the Buckman Well Number 1, which is
10 part of 13 wells that the City of Santa Fe uses for its
11 drinking water supply. Forty percent of the water comes
12 from there. And a qualified detection means that the
13 plutonium 238 is there, it's a question of whether DOE
14 used the most sensitive methods to detect it.

15 Another issues with regard to any decision
16 making to be done for Area G is the fact that the
17 performance assessment composite analysis, risk
18 assessment, whatever you want to call it, hasn't been
19 available, hasn't been updated since 1997. A lot of
20 decisions, as James said, that they -- that PA realize on
21 a 1,000 foot thick vadose zone has not been available to
22 the public.

23 The fact that the DOE released a draft LANL
24 SWEIS last year, in August, the fact that the PA was
25 referred to in the draft LANL SWEIS, but the fact that it

1 isn't available to the public is of great concern for the
2 public, because we believe that we need to be able to see
3 that.

4 And, in fact, we've asked for a revision or a
5 supplement to the draft LANL SWEIS based on the fact that
6 we don't have the PA, and we keep asking for the PA, and
7 we understand that it keeps going through revisions. So
8 the fact that we don't have a current PA, performance
9 assessment, for Area G raises a lot of questions for us.
10 And DOE needs to see the PA before they make any
11 decisions. It needs to be included in this scope, so.

12 The other fact with regard to Area G is that
13 there is no ground water monitoring network as required by
14 DOE orders for Area G, and DOE needs to look into that.
15 And as an aside, DOE needs to order LANL to put together
16 the ground water monitoring network because it was
17 required under DOE orders by December 31, 2005. And the
18 fact that LANL hasn't done it is of great concern for the
19 citizens in the community surrounding this site.

20 With regard to WIPP, we're concerned about
21 reopening the Land Withdrawal bill for increasing the
22 volume and the types of waste for WIPP. And, again, as
23 James said, you know, DOE made a promise that it would
24 only be for the defense waste.

25 We're also concerned about the recent GAO

1 report that said that WIPP cannot hold any more waste. So
2 it would be opening the Land Withdrawal bill, not only for
3 the types of waste, but also the volume of waste.

4 Okay. Let's see if there's anything else here.
5 But -- okay. And, again, we support the HOSS and we refer
6 you to the Institute for Energy and Environmental
7 Research, the IEER, website and their work on the proposal
8 for hardened on site storage. And DOE really needs to
9 move in that direction.

10 You know, whether it's the commercial fuel or
11 the defense waste, it needs -- we need to talk about
12 hardened on site storage in a real way, and this is really
13 an opportunity to do that, and DOE's consideration is
14 greatly appreciated on that.

15 MR. BROWN: Fine. Thanks a lot.

16 MS. ARENDS: Thank you.

17 MR. BROWN: Okay. Trish Williams-Mello is
18 next, and she will be followed by Astrid Webster.

19 MS. WILLIAMS-MELLO: Good evening. Thank you
20 for --

21 MR. BROWN: Sure.

22 MS. WILLIAMS-MELLO: -- allowing us the
23 opportunity -- you might need to turn this down now for
24 me.

25 MR. BROWN: Yes. Okay.

1 MR. BROWN: Okay. If folks can't hear, just
2 raise your hand and -- there, that should do it.

3
4 MS. WILLIAMS-MELLO: Okay. Can you hear me?
5 Can't hear me? No, turn it up, I guess --

6 MR. BROWN: Okay.

7 MS. WILLIAMS-MELLO: -- I guess. I'll try not
8 to shuffle my papers and cause too much racket up here.

9 MR. BROWN: Okay. The court reporter will skip
10 that.

11 MS. WILLIAMS-MELLO: Okay. I'm Trish Williams-
12 Mello. I'm with the Los Alamos Study Group. We have
13 dealt with issues surrounding Area G for many, many years.
14 We have a history of gathering supporters against the
15 dumping at Area G. We have over 4,000 letters that were
16 given to Governor Johnson and Governor Richardson combined
17 that ask for closure of Area G.

18 Some of these petitions included information
19 from the Attorney General's office, from NMED, and these
20 stated that this dump has many, many problems, as James
21 Bearzi had stated earlier, and others have as well.

22 Over 27 organizations signed on to the letter
23 that went to DOE and to the Governor and to NMED asking
24 for the closure of Area G, and the discontinuation of any
25 dumping that would occur there.

1 Any comments that I would make on the GTCC
2 being stored up at Los Alamos would be pointless because
3 this really should never be considered at Los Alamos. Los
4 Alamos is not the place for this. It's preposterous to
5 think of bringing that type of waste up the hill and
6 adding it to the already nearly full Area G, or to the
7 expansion areas up on that mesa.

8 So it's really fruitless to spend our time here
9 even commenting on GTCC. If there were an option that
10 anyone would choose, it would be, in my opinion, the on
11 site hardened storage that the others have spoken for.
12 Why are we considering transporting this waste, and why is
13 not the DOE considering this options that have been on the
14 table for quite some time?

15 I have information here that I would like to
16 turn into the record that the study group has generated
17 considering the long history of disposal at Area G, and
18 the fact that this is an illegal, unpermitted and very
19 slipshod storage facility for nuclear waste.

20 I believe that the move now needs to be clean
21 up, as was spoken about. There has been successful clean
22 up at other sites in the country, and that's what we need
23 to focus on instead of adding to this as, again, James
24 Bearzi mentioned.

25 I appreciate that comment from James because it

1 speaks right to the point of what we've been discussing
2 for many, many years, this place needs to clean up and not
3 build up. Thank you.

4 MR. BROWN: Okay. Thank you.

5 Astrid Webster is next, and Mike Dempsey will
6 follow Astrid.

7 MS. WEBSTER: Good evening. Thank you for this
8 opportunity to speak. And I'm not really going to talk to
9 you all. I'm going to talk to the person who reads, or
10 the people who read this in preparation for a report to
11 Congress, because I think this is where this information
12 really needs to go.

13 I think Los Alamos talks about being based on
14 science, but I think, more than anything, using James
15 Bearzi's words, he thinks of this endeavor as clean up in
16 reverse. I think of what happens here in Los Alamos as
17 learning from history in reverse.

18 Just a real failure to understand the
19 consequences of what happens here, beginning with a nice
20 green glass that was brought home for adornment from the
21 Trinity site nine months before I was born. It was used
22 for play for children and for bookends and bookcases until
23 they figured out how really radioactive it is.

24 And truly I think we are in our infancy in
25 learning about this. And to consider expanding the waste

1 disposal here at Los Alamos versus cleaning it up and
2 closing it down, which is what really should be happening.
3 I think building plutonium pits up here, I think doing
4 radioactive research up here is foolhardy to the utmost
5 extent.

6 I mean, if you drove up here with your eyes
7 open, it was a winding road that you could drive off very
8 easily. This past winter, speaking of science and doing
9 things well here, there was a -- there was something that
10 was put on the road to supposedly make it safe from the
11 snow that had fallen, and at the temperatures that were
12 occurring, this material became more slick, rather than
13 less slick. And a woman, who was a business owner up here
14 in Los Alamos died on that road.

15 This year, based on science, folks. This is
16 one of the nation's top labs here and she's dead. And
17 somebody told them, this is material not to use, that
18 it's --

19 MR. DEMPSEY: It's the state.

20 MS. WEBSTER: -- I'm sorry?

21 MR. DEMPSEY: It's the state.

22 MR. BROWN: Well, don't -- don't -- let people
23 speak, and if you have --

24 MR. DEMPSEY: I'm sorry.

25 MR. BROWN: -- a comment, you can --

1 MS. WEBSTER: You can write --

2 MR. BROWN: -- ask me to --

3 MS. WEBSTER: -- them down.

4 MR. BROWN: -- speak later.

5 Sorry you were interrupted. Please.

6 MS. WEBSTER: Okay. I happened to be at Jemez
7 Falls one weekend morning and noticed a plume of smoke and
8 reported it to the forest ranger. And he said, Oh, not to
9 worry, we've noticed it, and it's nothing to worry about.
10 That turned out to be Cerro Grande fire. And if you
11 travel around Los Alamos very much, you know how close it
12 got.

13 I mean, really, if you have your eyes open and
14 you want to learn anything, you look around and the drop
15 off from any point in Los Alamos to off the mesa, down the
16 hill, into the run-off and everything else, is not very
17 far. A lot of people can kick a soccer ball that far.

18 I think to consider this for either buried or
19 unburied waste disposal is to ignore that the seismic
20 information about Los Alamos is not quite as complete as
21 people thought it was. This is not as safe as people
22 thought it was.

23 And to talk about protecting the environment
24 and humanity 100 years, or 1,000 years into the future
25 barely skims the surface, barely touches it. These are

1 things that should not be happening. If you learn from
2 history, creating this stuff shouldn't be happening.

3 The first one of these hearings I went to three
4 or four years ago, a Los Alamos employee said, We must not
5 make any more nuclear weapons up here, we don't have any
6 place to bury the waste now, we don't have any place to
7 put this stuff. These activities should stop. And this
8 was a very courageous person, because he was employed by
9 LANL. I don't know what happened to him. I'd be real
10 curious to know.

11 But I think it's time we really added things
12 up. If these are scientific laboratories, use your math
13 and add up what's happening here.

14 And for the Congress that's going to consider
15 this a year or two down the road, shipping this waste
16 around like a shell game is ridiculous. Especially if you
17 bring it up the road to Los Alamos, for pete's sake. It
18 shouldn't be here.

19 And I hear the words loud and clear that WIPP
20 has already too full of defense waste. Adding commercial
21 waste to it is ridiculous. I think if we want to be well-
22 based in science, we need to explore alternatives to any
23 of the nuclear industry, because as far as I'm concerned,
24 it is an enormous waste of tax money.

25 It creates dirt that never goes away. I mean,

1 the aluminum can we throw out on the -- from a Coke, does
2 never go away either. All we do by burying it is put it
3 out of sight out of mind. And if we are scientists and we
4 are humans, and have an interest in the future, we have to
5 change course very seriously. Thank you.

6 MR. BROWN: Thanks very much.

7 Okay. Mike Dempsey --

8 MR. DEMPSEY: Sorry for interrupting you.

9 MR. BROWN: Okay. Mike, you're next.

10 Roger Snodgrass will follow Mike.

11 MR. DEMPSEY: Hi, I'm Mike Dempsey. I'm sorry
12 I interrupted that lady.

13 I already sent my prepared comments via e-mail
14 to D.C. I work for the lab, proud of it. I came here to
15 lobby to have the dump in Los Alamos County because we're
16 part of the problem -- and maybe we're causing the
17 problem. We're part of the situation, we should be part
18 of the solution.

19 I live in White Rock. I can see the domes of
20 the Area 50G WIPP storage area from my street. If I stand
21 in the middle of the street I can see the domes.

22 I stayed through the Cerro Grande fire, did not
23 leave. My family evacuated to Carlsbad -- I used to work
24 at WIPP also. I wasn't afraid. I know how the material's
25 contained, I help package it. I wasn't concerned that it

1 would be released in a fire, you know, a forest fire.

2 Like I said, I came to lobby for here, and
3 actually I'm flabbergasted -- and then when I heard the
4 presentation, I'm flabbergasted that the state objects to
5 stashing it at WIPP. I worked at WIPP for two years, I
6 was an underground miner for 10, I was a truck driver for
7 four, and then I was a radiological control technician at
8 Los Alamos and at WIPP for 14. That's the guy that tells
9 you whether the radiation level's safe. And now I do non-
10 destructive assay, and also second line of defense.

11 I've worked on the second off site source
12 recovery trip from Los Alamos. If you saw how the sources
13 are stored out in the world, you'd be donating money to
14 have the waste moved here. We go to the first site to
15 open up, the guy's got it in his backyard down in a pipe
16 thing, and he cracks the cap, 100 daddy long legs pour out
17 of the pipe and they're living on 5 rem an hour neutrons
18 down in his front yard.

19 So if you saw how the waste was stored in the
20 real world, how the orphan sources are stored, and all
21 those sources, they got you the oil that you use to drive
22 your car here in, here in your car. That's where -- what
23 those sources are used for. You saw how they're stored
24 there, you'd be clamoring for them to be stored properly.

25 I have no fear of any materials stored at Los

1 Alamos. After I heard the presentation, and having worked
2 at WIPP for two years, I truly believe they should be
3 stored there. It probably would be better there. I would
4 like -- I'm not afraid to take the material here, but it
5 would probably be better if they be stored at the WIPP.

6 The salt's been there for 245 million years.
7 The evidence that if there's no water is that it's still
8 salt there, for 245 million years. So it'll be there
9 another 100 million years probably.

10 The comments that there is no more room at the
11 WIPP are complete garbage. They could cut 10 new levels.
12 I was an underground miner for 10 years. They could cut
13 10 new levels at the WIPP. It's 2,000 foot thick, it's
14 placed 1,000 foot down, and there's 10 square miles. You
15 could cut many more drifts and tunnels and stash all the
16 nation's nuclear waste at the WIPP.

17 Another concern about storing it here at Los
18 Alamos is that when I heard the term a strong, tight
19 container -- well, that wasn't the term used, but extreme
20 barrier, whatever it was, well, that's going to cost a lot
21 of bucks to stash it in a bore hole where it can't be
22 reached in 1,000 years. That's going to cost a lot of
23 money. The WIPP's my number one choice now, I have to
24 say, having worked there.

25 The HOSS process, or storing it onsite in

1 the -- at the locations, it -- that addresses nothing.
2 Nothing at all. It's the same situation. You want that
3 stuff out of the world, and it does need -- pardon me --
4 it needs to be on federal land. It doesn't need to be on
5 any private land, on any commercial storage area, unless
6 that commercial storage area is on federal land.

7 And then it's going to have to revert to the
8 feds anyway, because it's going to have to be monitored
9 for a long time. Absolutely. So it needs to be on
10 federal land. That's one of the DOE sites, including the
11 WIPP.

12 Oh, yes, here's one plan I wanted to make. So
13 you're going to store medical waste there. My grandmother
14 was treated with radioactive material to cure her cancer.
15 She lived an additional five years. My son, was treated
16 with radioactive material to diagnose a condition he had
17 when he was eight weeks old. Knock on wood. And you say,
18 oh, I'll never have that done to me. Yeah, yeah, yeah.

19 You're going to need it -- everyone in this
20 room knows someone that's been treated with radioactive
21 medicine. You're going to need it, or one of your
22 friend's are going to need it someday, and you'll be
23 damned glad that you had it and that there was a place to
24 dump it, to get rid of the leftovers when it's done.

25 So right now, I don't know what happened to my

1 grandma's radium needles. My son's technetium 99
2 metastable got dumped down the sink at Presbyterian
3 Hospital and went into the Rio Grande. That's what
4 happens today with it also. It goes into a storage tank
5 and goes through several half lives and then is dumped
6 into the Rio Grande. But that's where it goes today. So
7 you'll be glad that they have a place to put this stuff
8 when your time comes.

9 You can collect all kinds of studies for
10 anything about, Oh, the lab didn't do this, the lab didn't
11 that, the DOE didn't do this. It doesn't mean a damn
12 thing. You've got to address the problems sooner or
13 later. And you can study it to the nth degree, and, oh,
14 there's a chance of this and a chance of that.

15 Well, by the time -- it's too late. By the
16 time you're finished doing all that, it's still
17 accumulated more, you need to get rid of it, you need to
18 open a place, you need to take a step forward.

19 Nuclear energy in this country is on the way
20 up. Thank God. And that's good for the environment,
21 absolutely good for the environment because it doesn't
22 generate greenhouse gases like the coal that we're using
23 right now does, or the car that you drove up here in does.
24 Anybody here drive an electric car up here, up the hill?
25 Didn't think so. Neither did I.

1 That's about all I've got to say. Please find
2 a place. WIPP's the best, it really is. You probably
3 need to change the scope. It's going to be a killer to do
4 it with the state. I'm sorry.

5 Jim, help them out, man. Don't put Richardson
6 on the wrong track. Just put it in the WIPP. Cut a bunch
7 of new levels, dump it down in there; it'll be there for
8 another 245 million years. Thank you very much.

9 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

10 MR. DEMPSEY: And, once again, I'm sorry for
11 interrupting you, ma'am.

12 MR. BROWN: Okay. Roger Snodgrass is -- yes.

13 MR. SNODGRASS: I may have signed the wrong
14 sheet.

15 MR. BROWN: Okay.

16 (General laughter.)

17 MR. BROWN: We'll make --

18 MR. SNODGRASS: I could tell stories.

19 MR. BROWN: Well, we may have some extra time,
20 and this could be your big chance, but we'll make sure
21 your name gets transferred over to the list to receive the
22 draft environmental impact statement.

23 And let's see, Sylvia Vergara. Okay. You will
24 be next.

25 MS. VERGARA: Hello. My name is Sylvia

1 Vergara, and I don't belong to any particular group. I'm
2 actually here representing myself. And I'm not going to
3 speak scientifically because I'm not a scientist. I do
4 want to speak simply from my heart, as a human being. And
5 I want to say one thing that I think is very important.

6 There's something called psychic numbing. And
7 I remember seeing in Al Gore's movie about global warming.
8 This little frog in a glass and the -- of water, and the
9 water was very gradually heating up. And because it was
10 gradually heating up, the frog would not jump out of the
11 water. And I was so happy in the movie when I saw this
12 little hand go into that little container and pull that
13 frog out before it died.

14 And to me that is what psychic numbing is. And
15 I think psychic numbing happens to not only odd
16 populations, but it happens to scientists, it happens
17 to -- it can happen to anybody.

18 And that is, when you're surrounded by an
19 environment that is the same and the colleagues that are
20 the same, and you're working continuously on dangerous
21 materials, you can lose a sense of the sense of danger of
22 what it is, and you can lose the sense of what it is.

23 And so in that sense I feel that what we need
24 really is we need to have the other example of what would
25 help to awaken people from this psychic numbing. And how

1 they awaken from this is if you have a frog that hasn't
2 been in the hot water, and it's suddenly exposed to some
3 hot water, it suddenly jumps out. There's a natural
4 reaction.

5 And there's a way in which I think that our
6 decisions shouldn't necessarily be scientific. I think
7 what we need to have is a moral decision. And what does
8 that mean? It doesn't necessarily have to mean churches,
9 or a religion, per se. But would it mean that if we have
10 this waste, are we worth enough to spend all the money in
11 this nation, everybody's money, to blast it off and get it
12 off the planet entirely?

13 Do we have enough self-worth to consider the
14 possibility? And I invite you, scientists, I invite all
15 of you, to simply leave your jobs, to live something just
16 because you want to smell the flowers 10,000 years from
17 now, simply because you want to drink pure water from the
18 Rio Grande, simply because you want to imagine that that
19 could be a possibility.

20 We can't categorize human beings into politics,
21 into science. And I think that we have to look at our
22 arrogance. Should we be the ones to make the decision for
23 all those unborn people, this planet, thousands of years
24 ahead? Do you have the scientific knowledge? Do you
25 really? You do have the moral sense of what could

1 possibly be beautiful.

2 I can't speak of Los Alamos. Los Alamos means
3 the cotton woods. I can imagine beautiful cotton woods.
4 And when I think of the area now, this beautiful area, I
5 don't think of a town, but I think of these beautiful
6 Jemez Mountains, some of the most beautiful mountains that
7 we're graced with in this entire area. What a gift. What
8 grace.

9 And these mountains have only to render us its
10 beauty when we look at them. I have this wonderful
11 opportunity to see them when I drive by Alcalde. It's so
12 beautiful to look into those mountains. They are so
13 beautiful. And they have been here for thousands of
14 years. And I really hope that many thousands of years
15 from now, that people will still be able to admire their
16 beauty.

17 And the other thing that I wanted to say is I
18 want to wish you love. I love you. And I want and I hope
19 that we can feel that and that we can love enough to where
20 we can make these decisions from a place that's deeper
21 than science, deeper than politics. From the deepest
22 place where we're human beings, where we can say, this is
23 what we were meant to do. That's why we were born.

24 And that's all I have to say.

25 MR. BROWN: Thank you very much.

1 And, in fact, Sylvia is the last person who has
2 signed to speak. Let me ask if there's anybody else in
3 the audience who would like to add any comments at this
4 point, if you haven't signed up?

5 (No response.)

6 MR. BROWN: We are scheduled to remain
7 available for public comment now for another 45 minutes.
8 Customarily what we do, at this point we will take a
9 recess. If anybody would like to add further comments,
10 please see me. We will reconvene, the court reporter will
11 remain available.

12 And thanks very much for attending this
13 session, and for what I think are very excellent comments
14 throughout the evening. We're in recess.

15 (Whereupon, a short recess was taken.)

16 MR. BROWN: Okay. Our next -- are you ready?
17 Okay. Our court reporter is ready. Our next speaker is
18 Marian Naranjo. Welcome.

19 MS. NARANJO: Thank you. My names is Marian
20 Naranjo. I am from the Pueblo of Santa Clara. I'm the
21 founder and executive director of the newly formed
22 organization that is called Honor our Pueblo Existence,
23 HOPE.

24 I am happy and honored to be able to talk from
25 my heart also this evening. And what's on my mind is what

1 this place means to our people, the Pueblo people. This
2 whole Jemez Mountains is the ancestral homes of our past.
3 All of the teachings that have been passed down to us that
4 we continue in our cultural beliefs happened in this
5 place. It's very hurtful when we realistically look at
6 what has transpired in our ancestral homelands in the last
7 65 plus years.

8 Today I was privileged to go on the Area G
9 tour, and it has not been my first time going to the area.
10 As a young girl, one of our teachings is that whenever we
11 have the opportunity to visit our ancestral homes, which
12 we consider as sacred sites, we're to offer our cornmeal
13 offerings.

14 And so I've done that throughout my life
15 whenever I have the opportunity, and especially at that
16 particular area, which is a known sacred site, a
17 desecrated sacred site. Well, on this particular tour I
18 thought I was being gracious and respected -- respectable
19 to Los Alamos National Laboratory by asking permission to
20 do my cornmeal offering, and I was denied.

21 So it was a very big learning experience for me
22 today because I learned that this teaching has nothing to
23 do with the lab, it has nothing to do with the agreements
24 with the Pueblo leadership and the lab, but it has
25 everything to do with what I have been taught, and I don't

1 need to ask permission to do this.

2 It's very hurtful to come here and witness what
3 is happening in our sacred places, probing and dumping
4 and, you know, our -- we don't have anywhere else to go.
5 You know, others can come here and fly back east and
6 whatever whenever they choose, you know, but our people
7 have been here for a millennium and we're -- this is it,
8 you know, we don't have no place else to go.

9 So the environmental justice issues are very
10 important, you know, to the -- actually the past and our
11 future. And with saying that, I agree with a lot of what
12 our chief in the New Mexico Environment Department had to
13 say, and it's a very bad idea to bring more of this
14 radiation things, you know, to this area.

15 We're already seeing the health in babies that
16 we've never seen before, you know, leukemia, and all of
17 these things. Maybe the other culture has dealt with
18 this, you know, but we're just starting to see this.

19 And I know that this knowledge, you know,
20 has -- it started here and it needs to go full circle, and
21 it has, it's around the world now, and so it is up to us,
22 you know, what are you going to do now? And I believe
23 that we need to take all those good things that -- to
24 promote life and keep those things because we can deal
25 with that.

1 But all those things that are done that are
2 detrimental to life, you know, hurting others purposely
3 and -- or for defense, or whatever it is, we need to stop
4 doing that and put it back, bury it and call it sacred.
5 Thank you.

6 MR. BROWN: Thank you very much.

7 Is there anybody else who would like to add
8 comments at this time?

9 (No response.)

10 MR. BROWN: Okay. Again, we will recess.
11 Thank you.

12 (Whereupon, a short recess was taken.)

13 MR. BROWN: Okay. Okay. I'm reconvening the
14 scoping meeting on greater-than-class C low-level waste
15 draft environmental impact statement, and asking if any
16 member of the public wishes to make any further public
17 comment.

18 (No response.)

19 MR. BROWN: Noting that no member of the public
20 has expressed an interest and that we have reached the
21 time published in the *Federal Register* for concluding the
22 meeting, I'm officially adjourning the meeting. Thanks
23 very much.

24 (Whereupon, at 8:49 p.m., the meeting was
25 concluded).