

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

NORTH AUGUSTA, SOUTH CAROLINA

Thursday, August 23, 2007

Banquet Rooms A1 and A2
North Augusta Community Center
495 Brookside Avenue
North Augusta, South Carolina

The above-entitled meeting was conducted at

6:00 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
Office of Disposal Operations (EM-12)
Department of Energy

JAMIE JOYCE, GTCC EIS Document Manager
Department of Energy

GEORGE DIXON, Senior Technical Advisor
GTCC EIS
Department of Energy

Joel Kristal
Office of Disposal Operations
Department of Energy

SHERON SMITH
Department of Energy
Citizens Advisory Board
Federal Technical Coordinator
Savannah River Operations Office

I N D E X

1		
2	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
3	Joe Whetstone	30
4	Bobbie Paul	31
5	Lee Poe	37
6	Ernie Chaput	38
7	Peter Evans	39
8	Dr. Rose O. Hayes	42
9	Joe Ortaldo	45
10	Rick Geddes	46
11		
12		
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: Good evening. Welcome to this
3 public scoping meeting on the proposed environmental
4 impact statement for the disposal of greater-than-class C
5 waste. The development of an environmental impact
6 statement for this project by the Department of Energy's
7 Office of Disposal Operations is required by the National
8 Environmental Policy Act.

9 My name is Holmes Brown; I will serve as the
10 facilitator for tonight's meeting. My role is to ensure
11 that the meeting runs on schedule and that everybody has
12 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 participant's packet, which contains some
17 important information on the program to follow. If you
18 don't have one, please raise your hand, and staff can
19 bring you a copy.

20 Okay. We have one. Anyone else?

21 (Pause.)

22 MR. BROWN: Okay. It's a convenient place to
23 take notes during the briefing that will follow.

24 There are three purposes for tonight's meeting,
25 first, to provide information on the content of the

1 proposed environmental impact statement, or EIS, and on
2 the National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA, which governs
3 the process. Our second purpose is to answer your
4 questions on the proposed EIS and on NEPA, and third is to
5 receive and record your formal comments on the scope of
6 the proposed EIS. The agenda for tonight's meeting
7 reflects these purposes.

8 We will begin with a presentation by Ms.
9 Christine Gelles regarding the proposed environmental
10 impact statement. She is the director of DOE's Office of
11 Disposal Operations, which was responsible for the
12 preparation of the EIS.

13 Project staff are available throughout the
14 evening to answer your questions about the materials on
15 the posters, about the printed materials in the
16 participant's packet and, also, on the presentation that
17 will follow soon. They can discuss the proposed EIS and
18 the NEPA process.

19 Following Ms. Gelles' presentation, we will
20 recess so that the public can follow up with any questions
21 that may arise from the presentation or any remaining
22 questions on the posters. Once we reconvene, the court
23 reporter will be available to receive and record your
24 comments and suggestions regarding the scope of the
25 proposed EIS for greater-than-class C waste. All of your

1 comments will be made part of the permanent record.

2 We'll begin with a presentation by Ms.
3 Christine Gelles, Director of DOE's Office of Disposal
4 Operations. She will discuss the background of the
5 project and the purpose and basic elements of the proposed
6 EIS.

7 MS. GELLES: Good evening, ladies and
8 gentlemen, and welcome to the public scoping meeting on
9 the greater-than-class C low-level radioactive waste
10 environmental impact statement, which I will refer to
11 throughout my presentation as the GTCC EIS. I am
12 Christine Gelles; I'm the director of the Office of
13 Disposal Operations, which is within the Office of
14 Environmental Management at the Department of Energy
15 headquarters in Washington, D. C.

16 The Department has been charged by Congress to
17 develop a disposal capability for greater-than-class C
18 low-level waste and to take actions related to it,
19 including the preparation of the environmental impact
20 statement. I'm very pleased to be here, and I'm delighted
21 to see you here tonight to join us in discussing the GTCC
22 EIS.

23 This meeting is your opportunity to present
24 your comments, concerns, suggestions and issues regarding
25 the scope of the GTCC EIS. This presentation will provide

1 you with some background on what greater-than-class C low-
2 level waste is and provide, we hope, some good, detailed
3 information on the proposed scope of the EIS.

4 Your involvement and your input here tonight is
5 very important to us, and we'll be taking careful note of
6 what you say throughout the evening. All comments
7 received during the scoping process will be carefully
8 considered as we work toward analyzing and developing a
9 disposal capability for GTCC low-level waste.

10 The National Environmental Policy Act, referred
11 to as NEPA, requires an environmental impact statement to
12 be prepared for any major federal action that could impact
13 the quality of the environment. The Department has
14 determined that the development of a disposal capability
15 for GTCC low-level waste is a major federal action and it
16 is appropriate that it be analyzed in an EIS.

17 We are in the beginning stages of the NEPA
18 process, with the primary focus at this time being the
19 identification of the scope of the EIS, including proposed
20 disposal locations and methods. The comments received
21 here tonight and throughout the public scoping process,
22 which began when we published the Notice of Intent last
23 month -- we're about halfway through the public scoping
24 period now -- will be considered as we develop a draft
25 environmental impact statement, which will then be

1 published for public comment. And comments received on
2 the draft EIS will be considered as we work toward
3 developing the final EIS.

4 As I will discuss later in the presentation,
5 before the Department can take any action as a result of
6 this environmental impact statement, we must provide
7 Congress a detailed report on all of the alternatives that
8 are evaluated and await their action before implementing
9 the preferred alternatives. So you can see that we are
10 just at the very beginning of this process. And we have
11 several years ahead of us, and a lot of hard work, before
12 we will get to the point of implementing the preferred
13 alternatives.

14 Before I get started with the slide
15 presentation, I thought it would be helpful if I gave you
16 just a general description of what greater-than-class C
17 low-level waste is. It is generated from commercial
18 activities such as the production of electricity from
19 nuclear reactors, as well as discarded radioactive sealed
20 sources which are used in every-day medical treatments.

21 The volume of greater-than-class C low-level
22 waste is quite small when compared to the other classes of
23 commercial low-level waste, Class A, B and C, as regulated
24 by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. But greater-than-
25 class C low-level waste has a much higher concentration of

1 radioactivity and therefore requires special disposal
2 considerations.

3 A copy of the presentation which we're about to
4 go through is in the package that you received at the
5 table, and there is a wealth of information on the web at
6 our greater-than-class C EIS website, which is also listed
7 in the slides that are in your package.

8 Okay. The publication of the Notice of Intent
9 occurred on July 23, 2007, and a correction to the
10 inventory table that appears within the NOI appeared in
11 the Federal Register on July 31. A copy of both of these
12 documents is in the folder.

13 The publication of the Notice of Intent served
14 several purposes for us. It did announce the Department
15 of Energy's intent to develop an environmental impact
16 statement for the commercial greater-than-class C waste,
17 as well as an inventory of waste that is generated by DOE
18 activities which we term DOE greater-than-class C-like
19 waste.

20 The Notice of Intent formally initiates the EIS
21 process. It requests public comment on the proposed scope
22 and announces these public meetings. This is our fourth
23 of the scheduled public scoping meetings. It provides
24 information on the greater-than-class C low-level waste
25 inventories, which, together with the DOE greater-than-

1 class C, is estimated to be over the life cycle of
2 generations through 2062 to be just 5,600 cubic meters.

3 And to put that into perspective, that is less
4 waste than we have sent to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant
5 in New Mexico this year alone. We have shipped over 7,700
6 cubic meters of defense transuranic waste in fiscal year
7 2007. We are talking about 5,600 cubic meters, which will
8 be generated over the course of the next six decades.

9 The Notice of Intent also identifies the
10 purpose and need for action. It identifies the proposed
11 action. And again, we'll talk about all of these elements
12 in greater detail in the slides to come. It identifies
13 the proposed disposal alternatives, including locations
14 and methods, response to the comments that we received on
15 the advance Notice of Intent which was published in May of
16 2005, and it identifies that the United States
17 Environmental Protection Agency will be participating in
18 this EIS as cooperating agency and that the Nuclear
19 Regulatory Commission will be participating as a
20 commenting agency.

21 Let's get into these elements in more detail.
22 The purpose and need for action results from the NRC and
23 Agreement State licensees generating low-level waste that
24 meets the definition of greater-than-class C for which
25 there currently is no permitted disposal capability.

1 DOE has a statutory responsibility to provide
2 that disposal capability, and we also own or generate some
3 low-level waste and transuranic waste that have
4 characteristics very similar to commercial greater-than-
5 class C but which today do not have a disposal path. And
6 we refer to these, again, as greater-than-class C-like
7 waste. I will discuss the statutory and regulatory
8 drivers for this EIS in some more detail here in the next
9 couple of slides.

10 There are three primary legislative drivers.
11 The first is the Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Act
12 amendments of 1985. It is that statute that gave the
13 federal government the responsibility for developing the
14 greater-than-class C low-level waste disposal solution.

15 The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969
16 is the statute that requires federal agencies to consider
17 environmental impacts of our proposed actions and
18 decisions; it also establishes the frame work for public
19 input in these evaluations.

20 And more recently, the Energy Policy Act of
21 2005 really gave us the impetus to move forward with this
22 project; it required the Department of Energy to provide a
23 report on the cost and schedule of developing the
24 environmental impact statement, which we did in July of
25 2006. A copy of that report is available on our greater-

1 than-class C EIS web page.

2 It also requires the Department again to submit
3 a report after we complete the EIS that describes in great
4 detail all of the alternatives that are considered, as
5 well as a number of other details related to
6 implementation of the preferred alternative. And we will
7 submit that report to Congress after we've developed the
8 EIS, and we will await Congress' action before
9 implementing the preferred alternative.

10 So let's talk about what greater-than-class C
11 low-level waste really is. And there are on the poster
12 boards a lot of very interesting factoids, and there are
13 some other fact sheets in the folders that I would refer
14 you to, as well. But if you have some questions following
15 this presentation, we'll be happy to answer them before
16 the formal period of providing comments.

17 Before you can understand what greater-than-
18 class C low-level waste is, we have to talk about what
19 generally low-level radioactive waste is. Unfortunately,
20 the statutory and regulatory definition is rather
21 complicated, and it defines low-level waste by what it is
22 not. It is not high-level waste. It is not spent nuclear
23 fuel. It is not byproduct material. Anything else that
24 has sufficient concentrations of radioactivity that it be
25 managed as a radioactive waste stream falls into the

1 category of low-level waste.

2 NRC regulations classify commercially generated
3 low-level waste into Class A, B, C or greater-than-class
4 C. Low-level waste comes in many forms. It comes in the
5 form of clothing, equipment, tools and discarded household
6 items such as watches, smoke detectors; it also comes in
7 the form of soil and water treatment residues. Anything
8 that has become contaminated with radioactivity may be
9 managed as low-level waste.

10 As I mentioned the NRC classifications in 10 C.
11 F. R. 61 define low-level waste into four classes based on
12 the concentration of specific short-lived and long-lived
13 radionuclides. A, B and C can safely be disposed of in
14 near-surface burial facilities. And this community is
15 probably very familiar with the Barnwell facility, which
16 can accept low-level waste up to Class C levels.

17 Greater-than-class C waste has higher
18 concentrations of radioactivity and is assumed as not
19 appropriate for near-surface burial; it is assumed that
20 geologic disposal would be required to isolate these waste
21 streams from the environment. However, NRC regs do
22 provide that there may be alternative disposal methods
23 that can be deemed appropriate if proposed and approved by
24 the NRC.

25 Greater-than-class C low-level waste is

1 generated, again, by NRC and Agreement State licensee
2 activities. It's generally grouped into three waste
3 forms: Activated metals, sealed sources and a catch-all
4 "Other waste" category that we will talk about.

5 Activated metals are primarily generated in
6 nuclear reactors during facility decommissioning
7 activities. They consist of components such as the
8 thermal shields and other reactor parts, basically pieces
9 of equipment, that have become radioactive through neutron
10 absorption that occurred during the operation of the
11 reactor.

12 The photo here on the right shows a radiation
13 survey occurring on an activated metal component during
14 the decommissioning of a small research reactor. Much of
15 the activated metals may require being managed as remote-
16 handled waste because of the significant activity.

17 Sealed sources are typically small, highly
18 radioactive materials that are encapsulated in closed
19 metal containers which provide shielding. They can be
20 larger, as well, but many of them are very small. They're
21 used in common applications and are found widely
22 throughout the United States. They're used for
23 sterilizing medical products and assisting in the
24 diagnoses and treatment of illnesses.

25 Not all sealed sources are greater-than-class

1 C. Some can safely be managed as Class A, B and C waste
2 and are disposed of today in those existing near-surface
3 disposal facilities. The Energy Policy Act that gave us
4 those report requirements on greater-than-class C waste
5 also required the establishment of an inter-agency task
6 force to look at the safety and security of disused
7 radioactive sources. Our office participated in that
8 inter-agency task force.

9 The reason that task force was established was
10 because there is a widely held belief that disused sealed
11 sources pose a proliferation risk because they could fall
12 into the hands of malevolent forces and be used to make
13 dirty bombs. And for that reason, it is very important
14 that we move forward with providing disposal capabilities
15 so that in the future disused sources can go directly to
16 the disposal sites.

17 And the third waste form within the greater-
18 than-class C waste stream is this "other waste" category.
19 Other greater-than-class C waste is anything that meets
20 the definition of greater-than-class C waste that is not a
21 sealed source and is not activated metal. Its form could
22 be equipment, debris and trash, scrap metal and any
23 decommissioning or decontamination waste streams that are
24 generated from industrial activities such as laboratory
25 research.

1 The photo here shows contaminated glove boxes,
2 which, again, would be an example of a waste form that
3 falls into this category of "other" GTCC waste. We expect
4 that only a few commercial licensees have generated or
5 will in the future generate this type of waste stream;
6 however, most of the commercial greater-than-class C low-
7 level waste will fall into the categories of activated
8 metals or disused sealed sources. That is not the case,
9 however, with this category of waste, DOE greater-than-
10 class C-like waste.

11 We do acknowledge that this terminology can be
12 somewhat confusing. It is a descriptive term only. Use
13 of this term does not have the intent or effect of
14 creating a new waste classification.

15 The reason I mentioned that is that the NRC
16 regulations are applied to commercially generated waste
17 and DOE has different terminology that we use for waste
18 streams that are generated by DOE activities. We do not
19 classify a waste as Class A, B, C and greater-than-class
20 C. That is why we use this term, greater-than-class C-
21 like waste, for our streams of waste that have similar
22 characteristics to the commercial greater-than-class C
23 waste.

24 That was a lot of acronyms. I'm sorry about
25 that. And if you have any questions about that, please

1 don't hesitate to ask us during the recess.

2 DOE greater-than-class C-like waste is low-
3 level waste and transuranic waste that has characteristics
4 similar to the commercial stream but that today we do not
5 believe has a disposal pathway. It is owned by DOE. It
6 is generated by DOE activities even if those activities
7 occur at a commercial site.

8 Waste forms are similar to the waste forms that
9 are in the commercial GTCC stream; however, most of ours
10 is transuranic waste that today does not qualify for
11 disposal at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in Carlsbad,
12 New Mexico. The reason it's not acceptable today is it is
13 not clear that that waste streams -- that these waste
14 streams have a lineage to defense-related activities.
15 They do not meet the definition of defense transuranic
16 waste.

17 Let's compare the two waste streams. And
18 again, the poster board over here provides a little bit
19 more detail than this slide does.

20 But just to recap, both the currently stored
21 and the future projection of both the commercial greater-
22 than-class C waste stream and the DOE greater-than-class
23 C-like waste stream total approximately 5,600 cubic
24 meters. While that's a small volume, it contains a very
25 large amount of radioactivity. It contains as much as

1 approximately 140 million curies of radioactivity.

2 More than half of the volume is associated with
3 the DOE greater-than-class C-like waste stream, but the
4 majority of the curies is associated with the commercial
5 greater-than-class C low-level waste. Most of the
6 activated metals that comprise the commercial stream will
7 not be generated until 2035 and beyond, because of the
8 extension in the reactor licensees that has been occurring
9 over the last several years. And this is expected to
10 continue in the next couple decades.

11 Most of the DOE greater-than-class C-like
12 waste, again, is transuranic waste that today is not
13 considered defense transuranic waste and may not even be
14 generated in the future is associated with a project
15 called the Radioisotope Power Systems, which is a project
16 that's going through a project-specific NEPA analysis
17 right now. The draft EIS has been provided for public
18 comment.

19 If that project is ultimately approved and
20 implemented, it is possible that the waste resulting from
21 those activities would contribute to this DOE greater-
22 than-class C-like waste stream. And that's why we've
23 included it in our inventory estimate.

24 Another important point. The total volume of
25 greater-than-class C and greater-than-class C-like waste

1 is less than one-tenth of a percent of the total estimated
2 commercial low-level waste that meets the definitions of
3 Class A through C that would be generated over the same
4 time frame.

5 Let me say that again. It's less than one-
6 tenth of one percent of the commercial low-level waste
7 that would be generated during the next six decades, but,
8 again, to put it in perspective, there is seven times more
9 radioactivity in that much larger volume of commercial
10 low-level waste than meets the definitions of Class A
11 through C.

12 We collected this information through data
13 calls, through interviews, by researching historical
14 databases and reports, and we have a very detailed
15 inventory report that is available, again, on our greater-
16 than-class C web site that was developed by many of the
17 folks who are here in this room. It's a very detailed
18 methodology for these estimates. It provides some detail
19 on the generation sites and the sorts of projects that
20 generate the individual waste streams that comprise this
21 inventory estimate.

22 This is the proposed action of the
23 environmental impact statement. I'm going to read it to
24 you verbatim: "To construct and operate a new facility or
25 facilities or use an existing facility for the disposal of

1 greater-than-class C low-level waste and DOE greater-than-
2 class C-like waste."

3 I say that because this is the scope of the
4 EIS. This is the very subject matter that we're inviting
5 your comment on tonight.

6 These are the proposed disposal alternatives
7 that can be analyzed in the environmental impact
8 statement. And we're very interested in what you have to
9 say about these alternatives. If you have some other
10 ideas that you think should be considered, we invite you
11 to identify those tonight.

12 These alternatives range from no action, which
13 means that current and future greater-than-class C low-
14 level waste, both commercial and DOE waste, will be stored
15 at designated locations and consistent with ongoing
16 practices, no change in regulation. The second is
17 disposal in a geological repository at the Waste Isolation
18 Pilot Plant.

19 Disposal in a geologic repository at Yucca
20 Mountain, which is proposed in Nevada.

21 Disposal at a new enhanced near-surface
22 disposal facility at one of the sites that we'll talk
23 about on the next slide. One of the proposed sites is the
24 Savannah River site.

25 Or disposal in a new intermediate depth

1 borehole facility, again, at one of the proposed locations
2 we'll talk about here in the next slide.

3 As I'll mention later, it's very possible that
4 different combinations of these disposal alternatives may
5 be appropriate based on the different hazards of the
6 various waste streams that comprise the inventory. We
7 also recognize that there are some existing legislative
8 and regulatory constraints that affect some of these
9 alternatives; however, that alone is not a reason for
10 eliminating an alternative from consideration in this EIS.

11 NEPA guidance requires that the Department of
12 Energy consider a very reasonable range of alternatives,
13 and the sites that we'll identify here in a few moments
14 were identified because of mission compatibility and the
15 characteristics of those sites.

16 These are the three disposal methods that at
17 this time we propose to analyze in the environmental
18 impact statement: Deep geologic repository, intermediate-
19 depth borehole and enhanced near-surface. Again, if you
20 have other ideas for other disposal approaches, we ask you
21 to identify those tonight or during this public scoping
22 period.

23 Deep geologic repository involves the placing
24 of waste in mined cavities deep beneath the earth's
25 surface. It is the configuration used at the Waste

1 Isolation Pilot Plant in New Mexico.

2 This picture is a picture of contact handled
3 transuranic waste generated from one of our DOE sites and
4 being disposed of in one of the rooms mined out of the
5 salt mines in Carlsbad, New Mexico. It is also the
6 methodology planned for the repository at Yucca Mountain,
7 where high-level waste and spent nuclear fuel will,
8 hopefully, be disposed of one day.

9 Enhanced near-surface disposal is the placement
10 of waste in engineered trenches, vaults or other similar
11 structures within the upper 30 meters of the earth's
12 crust.

13 I'd like to mention again that the NRC
14 regulations, although it assumes that greater-than-class C
15 low-level waste requires geologic disposal, it does
16 provide for consideration of alternate disposal methods
17 that, if proposed to and approved by the NRC, would be
18 appropriate for greater-than-class C and low-level waste
19 disposal. That is why we are considering alternative
20 disposal methods in this EIS.

21 The photo here at the right is a concrete vault
22 used at one of our DOE sites. The photo here and the
23 conceptual drawings provided on the poster boards are
24 really just initial ideas about what this disposal
25 methodology might be; the exact design would be developed

1 through the development of the EIS.

2 Intermediate depth borehole disposal is the
3 placement of waste in an augered borehole deeper than 30
4 meters, and it may also involve additional barriers,
5 concrete or other engineered structures and then a
6 backfill once the waste is in place to, again, isolate the
7 waste from the environment.

8 This method has successfully been demonstrated
9 at a DOE site; it is also being analyzed in other
10 countries for waste streams that are termed intermediate-
11 level waste. That internationally is the waste category
12 that would be comparable to what we call here in the
13 United States greater-than-class C low-level waste.

14 These are the proposed locations that we intend
15 to analyze a range of these disposal alternatives at
16 throughout the development of the EIS. Again, the
17 inclusion of these identified DOE sites was based on
18 mission compatibility, because these sites are either an
19 existing geologic repository, which is the case of WIPP, a
20 proposed geologic repository, which is the case for Yucca
21 Mountain, or DOE sites where there are ongoing low-level
22 waste disposal operations.

23 What WIPP Vicinity entails would be either a
24 facility sited within the perimeter of the Department's
25 land withdrawal on which the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant

1 is or just outside, within the geographic vicinity of the
2 Waste Isolation Pilot Plant. We also intend to analyze
3 generic commercial facilities, and the reason is that this
4 would allow the Department to make a programmatic
5 determination that a commercial site may be appropriate.

6 And we did publish a request for expressions of
7 interest to industry soon after we published the advanced
8 Notice of Intent to see if any commercial companies wanted
9 to be part of this disposal solution, because greater-
10 than-class C low-level waste is a commercially-generated
11 waste stream. And we did have a number of respondents.
12 However, none of those companies had a proposal or a
13 specific site sufficiently developed that we could analyze
14 it specifically in this EIS.

15 So again, we're trying to provide bounding
16 analysis of sites, consider a commercial site within an
17 arid environment and a commercial site within a humid
18 environment.

19 We do intend to analyze each of the greater-
20 than-class C waste types individually and in combination
21 with each of these disposal alternatives taking into
22 consideration waste characteristics, waste volumes and the
23 rate at which they're generated. The EIS will describe
24 the statutory and regulatory requirements for each of the
25 alternatives and whether legislative or regulatory

1 modifications will be required for their implementation.

2 It is conceivable that the recommendation could
3 entail combinations of facilities and different solutions
4 for different subsets of the waste inventory.

5 And finally, this is a summation of the
6 greater-than-class C EIS process, just to recap. We
7 started it with an advanced Notice of Intent published in
8 May 2005. We started the formal EIS process with
9 publication of the Notice of Intent last month, in July.

10 What happened in the two years that transpired
11 between the ANOI and the NOI is that we really worked hard
12 to refine those inventory estimates and produce that
13 inventory report that's on the web page.

14 We also worked hard to reach the programmatic
15 decision that we would in fact include DOE greater-than-
16 class C-like waste, although our mandate from Congress was
17 to focus on commercial greater-than-class C low-level
18 waste. The reason we did this is that because there were
19 such physical and chemical similarities between the two
20 waste streams, we believe that there will be economies of
21 scale in providing one solution or a suite of solutions at
22 the same time for both populations of waste.

23 We are now in the public scoping period. We
24 began, again, with the publication of the Notice of
25 Intent; it closes on September 21. We're about halfway

1 through it.

2 After the public scoping period, we'll develop
3 a draft EIS; we will provide it for public comment. Based
4 on those comments, we will proceed with development of the
5 final EIS.

6 Soon after we publish the final EIS, we will
7 provide the report to Congress that summarizes the
8 alternatives considered and meets the other report
9 requirements, and then we will await their action before
10 implementing a record of decision. There are a number of
11 other important steps that have to occur between Congress'
12 action and formal implementation, including the possible
13 licensing by a third party, such as the NRC.

14 Our July 2006 report to Congress, which was
15 required by the Energy Policy Act, is on the web page, as
16 well as the 1987 report to Congress, which had the earlier
17 inventory estimates and talks about some of the
18 legislative and technical considerations. That report was
19 required by the 1985 Low-Level Waste Policy Act
20 amendments.

21 Public participation is very important to the
22 NEPA process. And you will have, as I just mentioned,
23 several opportunities to give input to this document
24 development.

25 You can participate tonight by providing oral

1 or written comments on the scope of the EIS; you can also
2 provide written comments by mail or via the web page or by
3 fax, again, through September 21, which is when the public
4 scoping period closes, and you can stay informed on this
5 project throughout the process by visiting this website.
6 This is the greater-than-class C project website.

7 We have included a written comment form in your
8 package, and if you wish to provide a written comment,
9 just submit it to our court reporter. You may also wish
10 to provide some written comments in conjunction with an
11 oral comment you make, and we just ask that you also
12 provide that to our court reporter. And we do encourage
13 you to visit the website; there is a wealth of historical
14 information and supplementary information there.

15 This is our contact information. Again, I'm
16 Christine. James Joyce is our team lead back at
17 headquarters on greater-than-class C and is the document
18 manager. We have a number of other team members here.
19 John Cochran from Sandia National Labs. Let me see.
20 George Dixon.

21 George Dixon, where are you?

22 George Dixon is one of our federal staff.

23 Joel Kristal is back here in the back. Mary
24 Picel, way in the back. And Bruce is back here. These --
25 Mary and Bruce are both from Argonne National Laboratory.

1 Okay. That concludes my comments here tonight.
2 I look forward to answering any questions you may have
3 when we take a recess. Thank you.

4 MR. BROWN: Thanks very much.

5 We're going to take a brief recess at this
6 point to allow you an opportunity to pose questions about
7 the slide presentation, to review the posters further if
8 you'd like and, also, to pose any additional questions you
9 may have with DOE staff.

10 I will make an announcement when we're ready to
11 resume the formal portion of the meeting and to begin
12 taking oral comments. If you would like to speak and are
13 not yet signed up, please see the desk where you came in,
14 and you can sign up at this time.

15 So we'll just take a brief recess at this
16 point. And when we resume, we'll take your formal
17 comments. Thanks very much.

18 (Whereupon, a short recess was taken.)

19 MR. BROWN: Thanks very much. It's now time to
20 receive your formal comments on the scope of the proposed
21 EIS. This is your opportunity to let DOE know what you
22 would like to see addressed in the draft document. The
23 court reporter will transcribe all of your statements.

24 Let me review a few of the ground rules for the
25 formal comment period. Please step up to the microphone

1 over there, introduce yourself and provide an
2 organizational affiliation where appropriate.

3 If you have a written version of your
4 statement, please provide a copy to the court report after
5 you've completed your remarks. Also, please give the
6 court reporter any additional material that you would like
7 to see included in the formal record. It will be labeled
8 and will be included in the preparation of the document.

9 I'll call two names at a time; the first is the
10 speaker, and the second will be the person to follow. And
11 in view of the number of people who've signed up to speak,
12 I'll ask that, if you can, confine your initial statement
13 to five minutes. I will let you know when you've reached
14 the five-minute mark, and then you can I guess gracefully
15 conclude your remarks.

16 If you find that you really have a lot more to
17 say above and beyond five minutes, after we've completed
18 calling the entire list, just let me know, and I can ask
19 you to come up and complete your statement. I will remind
20 you, however, that whether your statements are made
21 verbally or whether they're submitted in writing by e-mail
22 or whatever, they all carry equal weight when they're
23 being considered in the preparation of the draft
24 environmental impact statement.

25 So with that, by way of introduction, let me

1 first call Joe Whetstone.

2 Welcome back. It's nice to see you again.

3 MR. WHETSTONE: Good evening. My name is Joe
4 Whetstone, and I live in Buford County, South Carolina.
5 And I would just like to say that we have enough tritium
6 from this facility reaching the Savannah River already,
7 and we certainly should not risk adding any additional
8 nuclear waste to this facility, since I think our first
9 order of business should be to clean up the mess that has
10 already been created here.

11 When it comes to what to do with the bulk of
12 this material, I think hardened on-site storage should be
13 seriously considered. And then with what was referred to
14 as the sealed sources, the WIPP facility seems to be the
15 most logical spot for this material, too.

16 Again, I emphasize we have received over 500
17 picocuries per liter on a regular basis here in Buford
18 County in our drinking water. And as you know, the state
19 of California has implemented their public health goal of
20 400 picocuries per liter based on EPA Report Number 13.
21 So I don't think 500 curies is anything to snicker at. So
22 thank you for your time.

23 MR. BROWN: Okay. Thanks very much.

24 Sonny Goldston is next, and Bobbie Paul will
25 follow. Sonny is --

1 Is Sonny here?

2 MR. GOLDSTON: I think I signed up by accident.
3 I didn't mean to do that.

4 MR. BROWN: All right. Well, that's fine.
5 We'll make sure that your name is on the list to get a
6 copy of the draft.

7 Okay. Bobbie Paul is next.

8 Hi, Bobbie. I thought you were always ready to
9 speak.

10 MS. PAUL: No. I'm never ready.

11 MR. BROWN: And Lee Poe will follow Bobbie.

12 MS. PAUL: Hey. Do I have to do anything
13 official, or can I just start?

14 MR. BROWN: Just tell us your name.

15 MS. PAUL: Okay. Bobbie Paul.

16 MR. BROWN: All right. Go ahead.

17 MS. PAUL: Thanks. And I also work with a
18 women's group called WAND, Women's Action for New
19 Directions.

20 Thank you for the presentation. I'm not sure I
21 understand a lot of it. So some of my comments will be in
22 the form of questions that I think probably should be
23 addressed.

24 Specifically for locations like Savannah River
25 Site and Plant Vogtle, I would like to know how will the

1 disposal techniques ensure that the groundwater is
2 protected from contamination. What standards would you
3 employ to define contamination? And what remediation -- I
4 mean, like to what applicable standards would occur if
5 those standards are met? So how would you do that?

6 I'm still not sure exactly how much GTCC and
7 GTCC-like waste there is currently or exactly where it
8 exists. And is there any of this kind of waste that was
9 not listed in the Notice of Intent? And could you provide
10 the total amount of the GTCC and the GTCC-like or DOE -- I
11 guess, could the GTCC-like be considered DOE?

12 MS. GELLES: Yes.

13 MS. PAUL: Right? Okay. -- by the state and
14 by the site so we know a little bit more? Particularly --
15 I understand that a lot of this waste is all over. And
16 that -- I appreciate all the comments tonight and having
17 the little conversations.

18 But it seems like, you know, it's all over, in
19 medical facilities and in research places, but NRC must
20 know, because they license this stuff, where it is, but --
21 especially the GTCC-like. Probably DOE knows where this
22 is. So we'd like to know that radioactivity and volume.

23 I am also interested in what we call HOSS,
24 Hardened On-Site Storage. And I don't know why -- I was
25 thinking as much as -- I live in Georgia and am very

1 concerned about possible expansion of Plant Vogtle right
2 across the river.

3 What about the possibility of a detailed
4 analysis of hardened on-site storage being done? Like
5 here you look at a conceptual facility and a real power
6 plant site. And although -- maybe Vogtle is it. But I
7 know that that is considered -- the disposal you say is
8 like permanent storage. I personally don't think anything
9 is permanent, but -- and that this would be temporary --
10 the HOSS would be temporary until a better solution could
11 be found.

12 But I think that money, which -- all of this is
13 going to cost enormous amounts of money -- should go into
14 a real serious study to give us some more information.
15 And as I understand, people around the country have also
16 said HOSS, or Hardened On-Site.

17 So what are the options available for hardened
18 on-site, above-ground, monitored retrievable storage of
19 GTCC and GTCC-like waste? And at those sites where on-
20 site storage is not possible, probably because they have
21 site-specific safety concerns, what are the conceptual
22 options available for nearby and centralized above-ground,
23 monitored retrievable storage of this waste, both kinds?

24 And along those lines, let's compare the
25 advantages and the disadvantages and the cost estimates of

1 above-ground storage versus underground storage? Okay?
2 And if Yucca Mountain's never licensed to receive spent
3 nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste, what are
4 the conceivable impacts upon this waste disposal plan if
5 that never comes? I mean I know you're looking at that as
6 one of the options, but if it never comes in, what
7 happens?

8 I'm trying to shorten all this. I have so many
9 questions. Okay. So what -- I know we have a gentleman
10 who is working on transportation. So what are the
11 transportation routes for your Two through Five -- not the
12 No alternative, but your Two through Five alternatives
13 from the Notice of Intent?

14 What are the costs projected for the
15 transportation of all this waste, both kinds, to the
16 proposed disposal sites? What are the estimated -- I'm
17 sure you'll do this -- number of accidents, radioactive
18 releases and public health and economic impacts from the
19 areas along the transportation routes?

20 And what shipping containers will be used to
21 transport this from production sites to the proposed
22 disposal sites? Do these containers already exist, or
23 would this be another new design, and, if so, how many
24 would we need to have? Would they have to be designed and
25 licensed? What are the costs of the containers? Have

1 they been tested in practice, or computer modeling? What
2 is that?

3 Okay. With all this newly generated waste that
4 we're going to have, why do the projections for the waste
5 only go to 2062? Especially here in the southeast, we
6 have all these new proposals for new nuclear reactors.
7 And if DOE is promoting the potential for new reactors
8 plus nuclear weapons and if they're projected to be built,
9 why is the disposal of all the waste that's going to
10 result from that not being considered in this analysis?

11 How will the DOE analyze the waste from future
12 programs? How much waste is actually expected beyond that
13 date if 50 or the number of new reactors that DOE
14 estimates will be built and operated for the length of
15 those licenses?

16 So all of that should detail volumes,
17 radioactivity, composition, and all of that. And how will
18 we receive them, and how will they be stored?

19 Oh. I had another question. What about the
20 waste items that are -- maybe there's an easy answer to
21 this -- currently sitting in the cooling ponds, fuel
22 assemblies and related material, not spent fuel, that may
23 cool down to GTCC levels of activity? What is the
24 disposal path that may become this kind of waste, either
25 through decay or activities that kind of blend together?

1 And since this waste doesn't seem to be that --
2 hardened is not a good word. GTCC and GTCC-like waste
3 have kind of loose definitions to me. So are there plans
4 to include other kinds of radioactive waste under this
5 classification, either through concentration or dilution,
6 so that it would be eligible for GTCC disposal? And what
7 are those things? What would that be? And will they be
8 treated this way?

9 MR. BROWN: Okay. You're a bit beyond the
10 five-minute mark. But if --

11 MS. PAUL: So I think that's a really good
12 place. As you can see, I have a lot of questions. And I
13 guess the overall thing that I would say is that the most
14 amazing thing is that we have an enormous waste problem in
15 this country on all levels. I mean military, industrial
16 and the commercial reactor. And the fact that we're
17 continuing to propose these new reactors and these new
18 missions without a proper disposal plan for the end
19 byproducts just boggles my mind. Thanks.

20 MR. BROWN: Okay. Thanks a lot.

21 MS. PAUL: Sure.

22 MR. BROWN: And, you know, if you have further
23 comments, just --

24 MS. PAUL: I'll write them down.

25 MR. BROWN: Okay.

1 MS. PAUL: I still have a lot of questions.

2 MR. BROWN: Okay. Great.

3 Okay. Lee Poe is next, and Ernie Chaput.

4 MR. POE: My name is Lee Poe, and I'm a citizen
5 of Aiken, South Carolina. I have a comment that I think
6 is different than most, because I think that risk ought to
7 be considered in this EIS, not consequence. You know,
8 your output ought to be risk, and it ought to be in a form
9 that is understood and acceptable from the public
10 participation.

11 You know, I think there needs to be some
12 significant effort spent on showing that the 500
13 picocuries per liter that Joe mentioned a minute ago is in
14 fact a dangerous thing. It doesn't apply to this
15 particular EIS, but, whatever the consequence of the
16 actions that you analyze on these storage modes, they
17 ought to be expressed in terms of risk, not consequence.

18 And I mentioned earlier the institutional
19 disruptive acts. I think you need to consider very
20 strongly what that means, because anybody -- that could be
21 any kind of an analysis. And I think that I guess the one
22 thing that kind of sits behind all of my comments is -- I
23 think we ought to try to conserve our federal funds as
24 much as possible and not spend money, to drive our risk
25 lower than it really needs to be. Thank you.

1 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

2 Okay. Ernie's next.

3 Glad to see you again.

4 And Peter Evans will follow Ernie.

5 MR. CHAPUT: Thank you. I'm Ernie Chaput with
6 the Economic Development Partnership in Aiken, South
7 Carolina. And we're pleased to provide comments on DOE's
8 plans for the disposal options for greater-than-class C
9 waste. We congratulate DOE and the Congress for
10 addressing this issue, because it does need to be dealt
11 with, and sooner better than later.

12 As many of you know, EDP has supported new DOE
13 and commercial activities in our region, nuclear
14 activities, which can be performed in a safe and
15 environmentally acceptable manner and which are consistent
16 with the capabilities and infrastructures that exist in
17 our region.

18 With that as a backdrop, we have two comments
19 for your consideration. One, we believe there are DOE
20 sites other than Savannah River which are better suited
21 for disposal of these wastes. Savannah River should be
22 considered only if other sites are proven to be
23 unsatisfactory. You know, it's on a technical basis, as
24 well as the capabilities. We really believe the
25 capabilities for this type of an activity exists in

1 different locations.

2 Secondly, we believe that some greater-than-
3 class C wastes may be suitable for disposal at the
4 Barnwell low-level waste radioactive waste facility. And
5 we suggest that the EIS evaluation include those items as
6 may be appropriate. Thank you for the opportunity to
7 present these comments.

8 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

9 MR. CHAPUT: Do you want these?

10 MR. BROWN: Oh, the court reporter will take
11 them. Thanks.

12 Peter Evans. And Dr. Rose Hayes will follow
13 Peter Evans.

14 MR. EVANS: Hi. I'm just speaking as a
15 resident of Aiken, South Carolina. And I just have a lot
16 of concerns and qualms and questions about what is
17 happening here.

18 It really worries me to see any expansion here
19 in this area of such hazardous, hazardous, scary material
20 in such a major metropolitan area. This area is growing
21 by leaps and bounds. We've got people from all over the
22 country and the world who are wanting to move here. And I
23 don't understand why this is happening in this area.

24 We've been fortunate that there hasn't been a
25 major disaster here. We had a train that derailed in

1 Graniteville, and there was so much destruction done by
2 cars filled with chlorine. And people were horrified.
3 They said, we don't want trains coming through here with
4 such dangerous substances.

5 We had some mills here that were severely
6 affected. Actually, ultimately through the time of the
7 cleanup and so on, we went out of business. People were
8 killed. And that is not nearly as dangerous as all of
9 these materials.

10 We are near a major river. Many, many people
11 are dependent upon the water for drinking. We are --
12 supposedly there's an earthquake fault line that runs near
13 or through the SRS. And with some of these facilities for
14 storage, that alone is a little worrisome.

15 And then we have the problem of, what I've been
16 hearing on the news, leakage into the aquifer at the
17 Hanford, Washington, plant. And obviously, there must not
18 be sufficient rules yet for stopping such leakage. And
19 I'm just wondering why the emphasis isn't on getting
20 everything that is there out, as they did in Colorado. I
21 think it's Rocky Flats. And instead, what's happening is
22 that we -- just more is being brought in.

23 And I know how important it is to have good
24 jobs here. And yet, if there's a disaster, this plant
25 would have to be shut down, which could mean a huge loss

1 of employment. And at this point, also, a question -- and
2 in Barnwell, there was -- apparently there has been
3 leakage from a nuclear waste disposal site and it's
4 showing up now in people's drinking water wells.

5 And then if there should be something very
6 serious that would happen here, some terrible disaster,
7 who would pay for this? Is it this Washington group? I
8 don't know if anybody can answer me on that. Or is it
9 DOE? But if it's a company, how many billions of dollars
10 of insurance do they have to cover this, or is the DOE
11 prepared -- and the government -- to pay the cost of, you
12 know, what could happen to not only things physically, but
13 loss of employment, loss of value of land, and so on?

14 There is such an incredible brain trust here
15 with people at the SRS that it just seems like it would be
16 logical that the emphasis now would be on hydrogen
17 development. Get the stuff out of here completely, as
18 they've done in Rocky Flats, and let's start doing
19 something positive that would give worldwide acclaim to
20 Aiken and to the Washington group and to the SRS facility.

21 I noticed the very nice gentleman who has been
22 saying that all the Aiken residents are pro-expansion at
23 the SRS. I think this is incorrect, and I think that it's
24 way too early for anything additional to happen here,
25 anything more at this plant at this site, unless it's

1 hydrogen related. Then go for it. Thank you.

2 MR. BROWN: Thanks.

3 MS. GELLES: Thank you.

4 MR. BROWN: Okay. Dr. Rose Hayes, and then Joe
5 Ortaldo will follow.

6 DR. HAYES: I am now a resident of Aiken, and I
7 have first of all a comment to make regarding bias toward
8 nuclear energy. Alternative energy sources would be a
9 possible way to remove us from oil dependency, but I'm
10 wondering if we can find a way to neutralize the danger
11 that the waste products it produces pose to our community
12 and others.

13 Therefore, I feel that rather than focusing on
14 storing and disposing the waste, that the focus should be
15 on neutralizing it, finding processes that, while we
16 produce these byproducts of nuclear energy, are also
17 capable of neutralizing the hazards they present to public
18 health. And I think that is as critical an issue we face
19 today in terms of security.

20 Secondly, I just recently returned from
21 [electronic interference]. They have terrible pollution
22 problems there, and one of the worst, of course, is the
23 water; it's very polluted, and the drinking water and the
24 river. I mean, they're drilling wells to get to clean
25 water that go down 300 meters. That's the government

1 standard right now to try and find clean water.

2 Well, if we're drilling boreholes at only 30
3 feet, I don't think that that's a very large safety
4 margin. And I wonder how do you find out how deep you
5 have to go before this stuff is okay, before new public
6 safety hazards are present once we bore holes into the
7 earth and drop it down?

8 I was speaking to one of the scientists here at
9 our break. We found that in terms of the current existing
10 and projected nuclear waste that is harmful to humans in
11 any contact form, there is approximately 6,500 bathtubs
12 full now and into the year 2062. And that's a lot of
13 holes to be drilling in the earth to be dropping bathtubs
14 full of poison into.

15 We don't seem to have any current program that
16 has been tested to know that it's a safe way to store or
17 dispose of this material. And we have no alternative but
18 to try and find a way to neutralize it, and we shouldn't
19 be producing any more until we can neutralize it. And we
20 shouldn't be focusing all of our energies on how to store
21 it. That's not solving the problem; that's just shelving
22 it.

23 We need to find out how to process it and
24 neutralize it. That's the responsibility of our
25 government in the contracts they give to others to take

1 care of risks.

2 And finally, I think that there should be an
3 extensive risk assessment, until we can drill the hole, on
4 how this stuff can be kept until we find out how to
5 neutralize it. And I think that the results of this risk
6 assessment should be clearly shared with the public in
7 terms that the public can understand, and that it should
8 contain information on such risks as transporting it.

9 How will it get transported? What are the
10 risks involved in putting it on railroad trains or on
11 trucks or by other means of conveyance? And if there is
12 some sort of accident or malfunction -- a malfunction at
13 the site or in the course of transporting it -- what is
14 the exact risk to the public? How many die? How sick do
15 you get? How many people can be affected by how much of
16 the stuff?

17 These are things that need to be considered in
18 the environmental impact statement and shared with
19 everyone here in Aiken. And also, I think that if you're
20 going to put it in anybody's backyard -- and I'm
21 particularly concerned about Aiken -- then you should do a
22 survey to find out if people actually want it here.

23 There have been people here who -- an
24 organization who call themselves concerned citizens, who
25 went to Washington and said that everybody here is for it.

1 That wasn't true; it isn't true now. And I think that the
2 only way to find out just what the population of the area
3 really wants about this issue is to actually survey them.
4 Thank you.

5 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

6 Okay. Joe Ortaldo's next.

7 I'm not sure that I got your name quite right.

8 MR. ORTALDO: Close enough.

9 MR. BROWN: Okay. Well, we'll get it spelled
10 right for the court reporter. Thank you.

11 MR. ORTALDO: Well, my name's Joe Ortaldo, and
12 I'm a resident of Aiken; I'm also a member of the citizens
13 advisory board for the Savannah River Site. I'd like to
14 thank all of the representatives from headquarters that
15 came down and gave this presentation, and I'd also like to
16 thank the people who made their comments.

17 Many of the questions that were asked. I
18 think, you'll find as this process progresses, a lot of
19 those issues are going to be addressed in just the way
20 these EISs are prepared. I would encourage everybody to
21 get on the hoof as they head outside there to receive a
22 copy of the draft EIS.

23 And I would like to request that the Department
24 of Energy come back to the Aiken area at the appropriate
25 time and hold a similar public meeting such as this so

1 that we can get more comments from the people and we'll
2 have a document with information in it that people can
3 comment on and make appropriate comments.

4 Again, thank you for coming. And I would
5 request that a future meeting be scheduled at the
6 appropriate time when the draft EIS is completed. Thank
7 you.

8 MR. BROWN: Okay. Thank you.

9 Rick Geddes is next.

10 MR. GEDDES: Hello. My name is Rick Geddes.
11 And in contrast to all of these Aikenites you've been
12 hearing from, I'm from right here in North Augusta. So
13 I'd like to take this opportunity and I feel obligated to
14 tell you all that there seems to be a disconnect between
15 your program and another DOE action of which I'm aware.

16 In the next fiscal year, DOE has requested \$420
17 million for the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership, a
18 program which intends to close the fuel cycle by
19 establishing large-scale commercial fuel reprocessing. It
20 is likely that large-scale reprocessing will generate
21 large quantities of GTCC waste. In fact, there are
22 studies out there that show the quantities might be
23 greater than your 5,000 or so annually from large-scale
24 reprocessing.

25 So I think, particularly when you look out to

1 2060 and DOE is trying to establish many reprocessing
2 plants, you may need to be looking at much larger
3 quantities of GTCC waste. Thank you.

4 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

5 That concludes the number of folks who've
6 signed up to speak. But this is an opportunity if anybody
7 else would like to add a comment. Or if somebody else has
8 something to say, please let me know.

9 Joe, do you have something to add?

10 MR. ORTALDO: Yes. This is kind of off the
11 record for this, but I'd just like to invite anybody who's
12 interested in learning more about the Savannah River Site
13 in general to come to some of the citizens advisory board
14 meetings. If you want on the mailing list -- Sharon, are
15 you still here? Sharon is the DOE coordinator for the
16 board. And I think she -- if you see her, she'll get you
17 on the mailing list, and you're perfectly welcome to
18 attend the meetings.

19 We have -- the committee has a meeting usually
20 once a month, and they're usually in the Aiken area. And
21 every other month, there's a meeting that rotates around
22 the area. So if you're interested, see Sharon.

23 MR. BROWN: Okay. Thanks.

24 Anybody else have anything to add at this
25 point?

1 Yes. And if you can, step up to the mic,
2 because I think the court reporter finds it easier to hear
3 you there.

4 MR. POE: I will do that. My name is Lee Poe,
5 again. Again is not part of my name.

6 (General laughter.)

7 MR. POE: You didn't mention it, but I would
8 presume that for the alternatives that you talk about for
9 disposal, if one part of this alternative looks good for
10 that kind of waste, it will be used. And if not, that's -
11 - my comment is you ought to make the ability to make this
12 thing function so that you could use surface storage for
13 some kind and then geologic disposal for another kind of
14 waste. Thank you.

15 MS. GELLES: Thank you.

16 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

17 Anyone else?

18 (Pause.)

19 MR. BROWN: We're scheduled to continue to be
20 available to take comments through nine o'clock. And what
21 we do when nobody is currently wanting to make a comment
22 is -- we will recess, but we'll be available. The court
23 reporter and DOE will be available to receive your
24 comments through nine o'clock.

25 So we will recess, but if somebody decides

1 they'd like to add something, just see me, and we'll
2 reconvene. Thank you very much.

3 (Whereupon, a short recess was taken.)

4 MR. BROWN: Okay. I'm reconvening the scoping
5 meeting for the greater-than-class C low-level waste
6 environmental impact statement and asking if any other
7 member of the public wishes to make any additional
8 comments.

9 (Pause.)

10 MR. BROWN: I'm sorry. This is the official
11 closing here. Noting that no other member of the public
12 wishes to speak, we are officially adjourning this
13 meeting. Thank you very much.

14 (Whereupon, at 9:00 p.m., the meeting was
15 concluded).

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25