

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

DRAFT LONG-TERM MANAGEMENT AND STORAGE OF  
ELEMENTAL MERCURY  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

PUBLIC HEARING

MARCH 2, 2010

5:30 p.m.

COURTYARD MARRIOTT  
500 EAST 105th STREET  
KANSAS CITY, MO 64131

Linda Robinson, Facilitator

PANEL MEMBER:

David Levenstein, U.S. Department of Energy

REPORTED BY: Sheila R. Vogt

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

LONG-TERM MANAGEMENT AND STORAGE OF ELEMENTAL MERCURY  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

FORMAL COMMENT SESSION	PAGE:	LINE:
CATHY JOLLY	4	24
JOHN SHARP	7	16
MAURICE SMITH	11	19
MAURICE COPELAND	13	21
DENNIS MURPHEY	16	8
ARNOLD MCMANN	17	9
SHARON DUNCAN	17	17
TERRENCE NASH	20	22
BRIAN DREIER	21	8
LAURIE HINES	22	18
BILL BRANT	24	1

1 MS. ROBINSON: Now, it is your opportunity  
2 to begin to give comments on the Draft Environmental  
3 Impact Statement. The court reporter is Sheila Vogt,  
4 over here (indicating). She's starting to run her  
5 fingers. Her objective is produce a complete and  
6 accurate transcript of your comments. Know that you  
7 do not get responses at this point. This is not a  
8 Q&A, but you will be answered in the final  
9 Environmental Impact Statement. Everybody's  
10 questions -- comments will be responded to.

11 I'm going to call the speakers in the order  
12 that they registered. We're going to start with the  
13 representatives of the city council, then I will name  
14 each speaker who signed up. I'm also going to  
15 name the subsequent speakers in advance so you'll know  
16 that it's time for you to be coming, so you can get  
17 ready to get up.

18 When it's your turn, you may give your full  
19 name and any organization that you represent. And if  
20 you think your name or your organization might be a  
21 challenge in spelling to the court reporter, we invite  
22 you to spell it. She wants to get it right, and I've  
23 given her the authority to interrupt if she needs to,  
24 if she can't hear, so please speak up. I think we're  
25 in a small enough room that she'll pretty well hear.

1           Once all the people who have registered to  
2 speak have spoken, I will open it up to anybody else  
3 in the room who is inspired to also speak. If you  
4 have a written comment of what you're going to say  
5 tonight, we would welcome you turning it in, either to  
6 the court reporter or the desk; and if you have  
7 extremely long comments, I ask that you summarize them  
8 here and turn them in in their many-page entirety for  
9 the record.

10           The many-paged one will be the one that  
11 counts on the record. Both of them will count, but  
12 that's the one that will be responded to in full. All  
13 oral and written comments will be considered equally.  
14 No one is given any more weight than the other. All  
15 right. Let us begin.

16           Let's start with Cathy Jolly from the city  
17 council. You may -- actually, come right here,  
18 please. Do you mind?

19           MS. JOLLY: Right here?

20           MS. ROBINSON: Right where the microphone  
21 is.

22           MS. JOLLY: Sure.

23           MS. ROBINSON: Thank you.

24           MS. JOLLY: Good evening, I'm Cathy Jolly,  
25 C-A-T-H-Y, J-O-L-L-Y, City Councilwoman, 6th District

1 at large. On behalf of the many residents of Kansas  
2 City who live in proximity to Bannister Road Kansas  
3 City Plant, I appreciate the opportunity to provide  
4 input to the DOE regarding the Draft Environmental  
5 Impact Statement for its proposed long-term storage  
6 facility for mercury.

7 In July of 2009, the mayor and the City  
8 Council of Kansas City, Missouri, unanimously  
9 expressed our strong opposition regarding the DOE's  
10 consideration of the Bannister Road Kansas City Plant  
11 as the possible long-term storage site for mercury.

12 The facility's location near residential  
13 neighborhoods and the city's plan for economic  
14 redevelopment at the site of the DOE's move of its  
15 existing operations to another location were two of  
16 the many reasons why the Bannister Road Plant was a  
17 poor site for consideration by the DOE. I am pleased  
18 that the recently published DEIS identified a facility  
19 other than the Bannister Road Kansas City Plant as a  
20 preferred alternative for the mercury storage  
21 facility.

22 On February 11, 2010, the mayor and the  
23 City Council of Kansas City, Missouri, unanimously  
24 adopted Resolution No. 100107 in support of the DOE's  
25 preferred alternative. A copy of that resolution has

1 previously been provided as part of the official  
2 record of the site selection of its mercury storage  
3 facility.

4 As noted in the DEIS, there were several  
5 factors that made the preferred alternative location  
6 the Waste Control Specialists Facility near Andrews,  
7 Texas, the more appropriate site for long-term mercury  
8 storage rather than the Bannister Road facility here  
9 in Kansas City. Those include the capability of  
10 mercury storage with its current operation as a  
11 commercial hazardous waste management facility, a  
12 remote location with no residential population nearby,  
13 no surface water bodies nearby, and environmental  
14 impacts that are otherwise similar to the other  
15 candidates' sites.

16 The DEIS also noted that the Bannister Road  
17 Kansas City Plant was one of two candidate sites under  
18 consideration by the DOE where minority and/or low  
19 income populations are present within a two-mile  
20 radius and transportation accidents at or near the  
21 facility could disproportionately impact low income  
22 and/or minority individuals.

23 We had previously called this to the DOE's  
24 attention, and we believe that this factor alone makes  
25 the Bannister Road Kansas City Plant an inappropriate

1 location for consideration of a mercury storage  
2 facility.

3 In order to provide peace of mind to the  
4 residents of the neighborhoods nearby to Bannister  
5 Road who are concerned regarding the uncertainty of  
6 these plans, I urge you -- vehemently urge you -- to  
7 finalize the Environmental Impact Statement and issue  
8 the formal record of decision very, very soon, as soon  
9 as possible. And we hope that you affirm your  
10 preferred alternative of the mercury storage facility  
11 as identified in the Draft Environmental Impact  
12 Statement. Thank you.

13 MS. ROBINSON: Thank you, Ms. Jolly.

14 Now we will have John Sharp also of the  
15 city council.

16 MR. SHARP: Thank you very much. I'm  
17 John Sharp. I'm the city councilman from the 6th  
18 District. My district includes this site, and I live  
19 very close to it, as does Councilwoman Jolly.

20 I would like to enter four documents into  
21 the record, which you should have already received,  
22 but I think it would be appropriate to provide them  
23 here today. One is a letter to Mr. Levenstein from  
24 Councilwoman Jolly and myself and Mayor Funkhouser  
25 expressing our support for your preferred alternative

1 and, again, expressing our opposition to why this is  
2 an inappropriate site.

3 We do mention the city council resolution  
4 that was adopted unanimously last July opposing this  
5 site. We have also attached a copy of the resolution  
6 passed February 11 indicating our support for the  
7 preferred alternative and, again, urging that that be  
8 finalized. We also have included in this packet a  
9 letter to Mr. Levenstein from the city manager and  
10 from our chief environmental officer essentially  
11 saying many of the same things, and a letter from our  
12 environmental management commission. So I would like  
13 to enter those for the record. Who do I give them to?

14 MS. ROBINSON: You can give them to me.  
15 I'll get them to the right place. Thank you,  
16 Mr. Sharp.

17 MR. SHARP: Let me make just a few  
18 additional comments, if I could. We've heard about  
19 the flood gates, and those gates actually are not  
20 lowered. They're moved. Because they aren't up there  
21 waiting to be dropped, they have to be pulled across  
22 the entrances to seal the area. That is not a quick  
23 process. And this an area that if we ever have a  
24 microburst, you could have very quick flooding.

25 I know you could probably automate that

1 system, although it would be at a substantial cost.  
2 But to locate a hazardous material or toxic metal  
3 waste storage facility in a flood plain, in a  
4 residential area, in an urban area, doesn't make a  
5 whole lot of sense to any of us here in Kansas City.  
6 It just does have risks to the people living nearby.

7 Now, I understand that the study says the  
8 risks are low to negligible, and, of course, that's  
9 easy to say when you aren't the one living by it. But  
10 the fact of the matter is this is in a residential  
11 area. There is a possibility that there could be  
12 traffic accidents when transporting this material to  
13 this facility. Those traffic accidents could take  
14 place near a residential area. They would have a  
15 possibility of disproportionately affecting low and  
16 minority income populations.

17 And, you know, this country and units of  
18 government in this country have a pretty checkered  
19 past as far as locating facilities that are  
20 potentially hazardous in low income and minority  
21 populated areas, and that's the reason we have tried  
22 to get away from that and have required environmental  
23 justice to be considered when locating these sites.

24 I would certainly hope that we would do it  
25 right as the law requires and not put a site like this

1 in an area where it could have this kind of impact on  
2 working-class folks and minority individuals.

3 The Andrews site is the type of site that I  
4 would envision for a facility like this. It is in a  
5 very sparsely-populated area. It's not in a flood  
6 plain. It does have all the facilities you need to  
7 transport the material to the site. And from what I  
8 understand, that waste management facility is equipped  
9 and ready to handle things like this.

10 Just as an aside, my son has been playing  
11 baseball out in Yuma, Arizona, and his season is over.  
12 He played in an Arizona winter league and was driving  
13 to Dallas, and I asked him this last weekend, I said,  
14 "Could you go by Andrews, Texas, and just take a look  
15 at what this site is like?" I don't think he wanted  
16 to do it particularly anyway, but he said he couldn't  
17 find it on the map.

18 Now, I don't know how hard he looked, but  
19 that's the kind of facility where this should be. It  
20 should be in a sparsely-populated area where in case  
21 you would have some type of accident it wouldn't  
22 impact people's health. It wouldn't impact their  
23 lives.

24 For us to locate a facility like this at  
25 the Bannister site, it would only take a small portion

1 of that site, and yet if you had a hazardous waste  
2 disposal facility there or toxic metal storage  
3 facility there, it would cripple any of our efforts to  
4 redevelop the rest of that site because no one else is  
5 going to want to locate near a facility like that.

6 So we have a 300-and-something acre site  
7 and only seven to 10 acres of it being used, and the  
8 rest would be just sitting there blighting our area  
9 and hurting our efforts to redevelop the area and  
10 stimulate our economy. So we do hope that you  
11 finalize this decision as soon as possible in the fall  
12 so the people who live out here and the people who are  
13 interested in economic development out here will have  
14 this cloud lifted from over our heads. Thank you very  
15 much.

16 MS. ROBINSON: Thank you, Mr. Sharp.

17 Next will be Maurice Smith followed by  
18 Maurice Copeland.

19 MR. SMITH: My name is Maurice Smith,  
20 M-A-U-R-I-C-E, last name S-M-I-T-H. I live in the  
21 area, this district, and I would like to, first of  
22 all, second the comments that both of our council  
23 people have made. Because of the unusual  
24 circumstances of my life, I was born and raised --  
25 actually moved as a boy out to my home, which is just

1 east of that facility, and I actually watched the  
2 Pratt and Whitney plant being built in 1942. During  
3 World War II it was called the Pratt and Whitney  
4 Plant. They made airplane engines there.

5 I can tell you, because of my family, my  
6 parents lived there many years, we actually observed  
7 and I saw -- even though I was not working at the  
8 plant myself at the time -- we observed the flood that  
9 permeated the area -- that inundated that area.

10 I must tell you that because of the fact  
11 that there is a railroad track that goes immediately  
12 to the east of the facility, they are not able to  
13 build a flood wall around that. And I can remember  
14 standing looking down on that hill at the flood, and  
15 the flood covered the entire valley.

16 And so not only would the -- would it be  
17 necessary to add automatic closers to the gates that  
18 are there, but I can tell you -- any hydrologist will  
19 tell you that you would have to extend the current  
20 flood wall completely around the facility. And it's  
21 just along Bannister Road now essentially. It's more  
22 like a facade.

23 Having said that, then, I can tell you that  
24 I also have been studying your comments and I noticed  
25 that the waste control specialist site in Andrews,

1 Texas, is something like five times the site's area.  
2 It's about 1,300 acres instead of 300 -- four times.  
3 And I must concur that common prudence suggests the  
4 old saying, "If something can go wrong, it will."

5 And being an engineer myself, I can tell  
6 you, you cannot and will never engineer perfection.  
7 And so any environmental impact statement that adopts  
8 as a premise the assumption or hope that one could so  
9 cleverly design and engineer protections around that  
10 facility to prevent all of these risks is a pipe  
11 dream. Thank you.

12 MS. ROBINSON: Thank you, Mr. Smith.

13 Now we will have Maurice Copeland.

14 By the way, since those of you have signed  
15 in, we have your spellings. The only ones who really  
16 need to spell their names are the people I call on  
17 after the signups, but if the organization you belong  
18 to might not be understood, you can spell that. So  
19 Maurice Copeland will be followed by Dennis Murphey.

20 Mr. Copeland.

21 MR. COPELAND: Maurice Copeland, 32-year  
22 employee of Honeywell. I want you to take into  
23 consideration the problems that DOE is having with the  
24 sick workers and the contamination at the plant as it  
25 is already. And the history so far, for my last 10

1 years, is DOE is not living up to its obligations to  
2 the sick workers.

3 And if we're going to store this mercury  
4 there, it really doesn't matter to me. I don't care  
5 what you do at the plant. What you do is live up to  
6 the obligations that you have to the workers that work  
7 in the industry, and you're not doing that. So what  
8 makes us think that everything is going to be good  
9 with the mercury at the plant?

10 We already have mercury at the plant --  
11 have had mercury at the plant for years. We used to  
12 roll mercury up and down the aisles at the plant in  
13 the '60s and the '70s. It wasn't accountable -- taken  
14 into account in any manner out there, for say, the  
15 loss of the mercury, the accountability of it.

16 How good are we going to be with that  
17 considering the past with the storage of the mercury  
18 at the plant? How good are we going to be with that  
19 storage of other elements at the plant, the beryllium  
20 that's freely stored and was stacked on any racks with  
21 any other material, handled in any type of way.

22 The workers were not protected. We wore  
23 the same clothes. The engineering controls were  
24 nonexistent. The DOE set out that the -- if we had a  
25 meeting with DOE, Department of Labor in March of 2006

1 where the workers gave you information, gave us -- the  
2 Department of Labor and DOE information that we were  
3 not protected.

4 The engineering controls were not there.  
5 We even had process engineers, the people responsible  
6 for the protection of the people, that stated in that  
7 meeting that's recorded that they did not -- because  
8 it wasn't a priority for protection. The priority was  
9 production. This was a cold war. Now, we won the cold  
10 war.

11 I'm a Vietnam veteran. I've been in a lot  
12 of wars. I've lost them all, and I won the cold war.  
13 And I'm losing the cold war with DOE for not living up  
14 to their responsibility to the sick workers with the  
15 cancers. I notice the symptoms that come from  
16 exposure to these chemicals.

17 I wonder how many exposures in the past  
18 that we had that we're not living up to of people with  
19 mercury poison that no doubt that could have been  
20 happening because we rolled it up and down the aisle.  
21 We played with it.

22 So I have a problem with even the site.  
23 You've got three points here for the preferred site,  
24 and we fail them all. You only have six points. Why  
25 even consider this? Why even waste this money to do

1 that? Write us off. But then, again, for Maurice  
2 Copeland's benefit, bring the mercury in because it'll  
3 show us how arrogant the DOE and the government is.

4 MS. ROBINSON: Thank you for your comments,  
5 Mr. Copeland.

6 Next will be Dennis Murphey, followed by  
7 Arnold McMann.

8 MR. MURPHEY: Thank you. My name is  
9 Dennis Murphey. I'm the chief environmental officer  
10 for the city of Kansas City, Missouri. I would like  
11 to affirm the remarks of Councilwoman Jolly and  
12 Councilman Sharp. I think they very clearly express  
13 the City's position regarding the DOE's consideration  
14 of the Kansas City plant for a mercury storage  
15 facility. We clearly expressed our opposition during  
16 the scoping process last summer, and we are clearly  
17 expressing our support now for the preferred  
18 alternative.

19 I think not only have you identified  
20 through the environmental impact statement -- Draft  
21 Environmental Impact Statement -- a compelling case  
22 for why the preferred alternative site is superior to  
23 the Kansas City plant, but I think you have also  
24 identified that because the Kansas City plant is one  
25 of two facilities that do represent a potential,

1       however small it may be, risk of disproportionate  
2       impact to low income and minority populations is  
3       sufficient basis in and of itself to disqualify Kansas  
4       City from consideration. So I appreciate your  
5       consideration of our comments.

6                   MS. ROBINSON: Thank you, sir.

7                   Arnold McMann and Sharon Duncan are the  
8       last two speakers.

9                   MR. MCMANN: I'm going to waive my  
10       comments. They're extensive. I'll submit them in  
11       writing. Councilman Sharp covered a lot of areas that  
12       I wanted to. So I will help everybody to move along  
13       and get home.

14                   MS. ROBINSON: Thank you.

15                   All right. The next one will be  
16       Sharon Duncan.

17                   MS. DUNCAN: This is my second opportunity  
18       to speak before you. I came to the first one, and  
19       there was a lot of information given to you at that  
20       time about the problems with the contamination that  
21       mercury would create. There are a lot of problems at  
22       the site now.

23                   I live -- 95th Street is the east-west  
24       major artery. I live on 98th Terrace. I have been  
25       there since '68, and I have seen many, many floods in

1 that area.

2 We have helped correct some of the flooding  
3 problems because we have a new bridge that the city  
4 and the county cooperated in building over Indian  
5 Creek, but nevertheless that won't stop the flooding  
6 because more development from Kansas comes right down  
7 Indian Creek, right through my area, right where it  
8 floods into Blue River at a junction, which is the  
9 same river that goes around your plant in Kansas City.  
10 And that's what's causing the flooding, it is because we  
11 have too much construction in other areas, and all the  
12 water runs off and comes through that area.

13 I agree with everything Mr. Sharp and  
14 Ms. Jolly said with the Kansas City resolution,  
15 that this is a disproportionate problem that you would  
16 cause for the people living there. Having lived there  
17 for many years, I don't intend to really leave it  
18 until I am practically drug out.

19 I really love the area and I don't like to  
20 see it ruined by having contamination placed in an  
21 area where we already know there are PCBs, beryllium.  
22 There's some other contaminates, things that have been  
23 removed from the soil. There's contamination in the  
24 water under a couple of buildings. This was all  
25 outlined in The Star, the "Kansas City Star's" articles.

1 We've all known about it.

2 We have all been concerned -- that lived  
3 there -- you know, what would happen if something  
4 explodes in that building itself, what kind of  
5 materials would get out in the air. So you're adding  
6 more contamination problems for us to live with.

7 It is just the arteries that surround it,  
8 east, west, north, south. That's too close to that  
9 area of where trucks -- as Mr. Sharp had said,  
10 accidents can happen, and they always do when you're  
11 not looking for them.

12 I had a microburst two years ago at my  
13 house that took out huge limbs off of a tree and took  
14 the tree down in front of my house and the neighbor's.  
15 You know, it just happens. You never know when you're  
16 going to have that situation become out of control,  
17 and you can't prevent with a flood wall. You can't  
18 prevent with that flood wall because it cost 13  
19 million to put it there and it really is a thing of  
20 beauty.

21 That's about the only thing I can say about  
22 it. It hides some of the things behind the wall that  
23 you don't really have to look at now. You don't have  
24 any feeling of peace of mind that it will prevent  
25 anything from going inside that area.

1           So if you think it's going to help, it  
2 probably won't. There is nothing else we can say  
3 except that people live there that really should be  
4 looked at as their quality of life. And you shouldn't  
5 have a situation where you have to say, "Please don't  
6 put it in my area, but you could put it maybe one or  
7 two or three other areas, even Andrews. It sounds  
8 like is the best."

9           So the Government should be selecting it  
10 without having to go around to all these sites and  
11 make everyone come back and make comments two or three  
12 times, because you already know in your mind, I think,  
13 where it should be. So I hope it does. And we hope  
14 that we have given you these comments respectfully  
15 because we do respect the situation, but it's  
16 important that you hear us. Thank you.

17           MS. ROBINSON: Thank you, Ms. Duncan. That  
18 is all the people who have signed up, and I'll just  
19 make an invitation to others --

20           Sir, at this time you do need to give your  
21 name and maybe spell it.

22           MR. NASH: Okay. Terrence Nash,  
23 T-E-R-R-E-N-C-E; Nash, N-A-S-H. I just want to thank  
24 the Department of Energy for following procedures in  
25 the process and considering alternatives. And I

1 understand that you have to follow -- get a cross  
2 section of sites to make your decision and with  
3 thorough analysis, you'll come to the correct  
4 conclusion. And that's all I would like to do is say  
5 thank you for doing the process and the procedures.

6 MS. ROBINSON: Thank you, Mr. Nash.

7 Someone else over here?

8 MR. DREIER: My name is Brian Dreier. I  
9 spell my last name D-R-E-I-E-R. I was struck by the  
10 minimal impact statement considering the traffic  
11 around town and pulled up a timely -- kind of a timely  
12 article that was just released to the chief of police  
13 yesterday.

14 As all of us local here know, the immediate  
15 cross section roads are Bannister Road and 71 Highway.  
16 Directly near that or directly surrounding that are  
17 435, 71 Highway, pretty major arteries through our  
18 community. Anyway, the chief of police just released  
19 his list of the top traffic sites in the entire city.  
20 As you know, Kansas City is a huge metropolis,  
21 geographically.

22 If you don't mind, I would just like to  
23 read down them real quick. No. 4, the most traffic  
24 accidents was at 75th Street and 71 Highway. No. 6  
25 was at Gregory and 71 Highway. No. 8 was at 435 and

1 Holmes. No. 10 was at 55th Street and 71 Highway.  
2 No. 11 was at Bannister Road and 71 Highway. No. 2  
3 was I-435 and Wornall Road. No. 13 was at 71 Highway  
4 and Red Bridge Road. No. 14 -- I'm sorry, No. 15 was  
5 435 and 87th Street. No. 16 is at 470 and Blue Ridge  
6 Road. No. 17 was a little further down 71 Highway.  
7 No. 19 was 435 and 71 Highway, and No. 20 was I-435  
8 and Bannister Road.

9 So addressing the impact of traffic and the  
10 small impact it may have, I don't know -- I didn't add  
11 them up as I was going through these, but that's an  
12 awful lot of intersections that are immediately  
13 surrounding that site. So thank you again for your  
14 time and thank you, Councilman Sharp.

15 MS. ROBINSON: Thank you, Mr. Dreier.

16 Is there anyone else who would like to  
17 provide a comment?

18 MS. HINES: My name is Laurie Hines,  
19 L-A-U-R-I-E, H-I-N-E-S. I am a current employee of  
20 the Bannister complex, and I noticed from page 12 of  
21 your summary here where they showed the proposed  
22 location for the building, it's actually a parking lot  
23 and directly to the east is a childcare center.

24 Some friends of mine just had a little boy  
25 back in September, September 11th as a matter of fact.

1 He stays at that childcare facility. So I'm concerned  
2 about the proximity to the childcare center. Also,  
3 they live in Santa Fe Hills, which is a little bit to  
4 the northeast. I'm kind of concerned about that.

5 As everyone has mentioned here, the flood  
6 plain is directly to the east. So with those  
7 things -- all things considered there, I can't really  
8 understand why this would be a very good location.  
9 That's just addressing the building being on the  
10 outside of the existing building.

11 Now, I was glad to hear that you were  
12 planning to put that to the north in that parking lot  
13 because as other people have said, there are plenty of  
14 other mysterious chemicals in that facility -- in the  
15 existing facility as it is.

16 It was built with really good concrete, but  
17 they have a lot of problems in that building that  
18 probably the general public doesn't know all about.  
19 So I would be concerned with any additional toxic  
20 chemicals being located in close proximity there. I  
21 want to thank you for going through the process. I  
22 appreciate it. Thanks for letting me comment.

23 MS. ROBINSON: Thank you, Ms. Hines.

24 Is there anyone else that would like to  
25 make a comment? Sir?

1           MR. BRANT: I'll just make a short comment.  
2           My name is Bill Brant, B-R-A-N-T, and I walk my dog in  
3           the vicinity. After 9/11 the gates that access the  
4           public roads on the north side of the plant -- when we  
5           went to Code Orange or whatever the upper-level  
6           concerns were, they would lock the gate. So it just  
7           became -- the plant isolated different neighborhoods,  
8           so you couldn't get from one side to the other.

9           Putting in this facility will just kind of  
10          carry that over to where it's just a donut hole that  
11          separates everybody in all the different sides. You  
12          know, it may not be much there now, but putting more  
13          stuff there without the benefit of employing very many  
14          people is just going to be a donut hole that isolates  
15          us.

16          MS. ROBINSON: Thank you, Mr. Brant.  
17          Are there any other commentators in the  
18          room?

19          I would like to say -- and I'm not the  
20          official, but I do know this is a required meeting  
21          under the National Governmental Policy Act. So  
22          whoever said, "Why do you bother coming," they do want  
23          to hear your comments and they also are required to  
24          hear your comments. So this is a value to the  
25          Department of Energy.

1                   If there are no other comments, then I want  
2 to thank you for coming tonight and sharing your  
3 thoughts. This will help the Department of Energy in  
4 writing the final Environmental Impact Statement and  
5 in reaching a decision.

6                   Now final remarks from Mr. Levenstein.

7                   MR. LEVENSTEIN: I want to just thank  
8 everybody for coming out this evening. I appreciate  
9 your comments and appreciate your taking the  
10 opportunity to let us know what you think, and every  
11 comment will be considered. As you know, the  
12 preferred alternative is elsewhere, so hopefully you  
13 will maintain your current state of happiness. Thank  
14 you.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

