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CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Ladies and gentlemen, I am J. H. Graham. I am the mayor of Crossville. And I'd like to take this opportunity to welcome you to this public hearing at the L&C Building, here on the 17th floor, at 10:30 a.m., on July the 24th, 2007.

I am the acting Chair of the Municipal Solid Waste Advisory Committee. And I'd like to take this opportunity to have all of the members of this Advisory Board introduce themselves and who they represent.

Ken, would you start?

MR. PURSER: My name is Ken Purser. I work for the Tennessee Farm Bureau serving 16 counties in Southeast Tennessee. I live in Dayton.

MS. BROOKS: Penny Brooks. I live in Ashland City. And I represent a variety of statewide environmental boards.

MR. BARKENBUS: I'm Jack Barkenbus. I'm with the Vanderbilt Environmental Management Center.

MS. DUNLAP: Joyce Dunlap. Division of Solid Waste Management.

MR. APPLE: Mike Apple. Director of Solid Waste Management.

MR. ADAMS: Chuck Adams. I'm with the Department of Environment and Conservation.

MR. LIESERSON: I'm Alan Lieserson. I'm
the attorney with the Department of Environment and Conservation.

MR. BUMPUS: Lewis Bumpus. I'm representing the Tennessee Environmental Council.

MR. HYMAN: Don Hyman. Tire industry.

MR. WADDLE: I'm John Waddle. I'm from Greenville, Tennessee. And I represent our local county commission.

MR. WHETSEL: I'm Bob Whetsel, with the City of Knoxville.

MS. SCHER: Diane Scher. I'm with Firestone. I live here in Nashville. And I represent business interest.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Well, thank you-all for attending today.

As a point of interest for you-all in the audience, we have microphones throughout this room. And all of the conversations in this room, if you do not want them to be taped and recorded for posterity, you may pay attention to this meeting.

Secondly, we'd like to ask you to turn your cell phones off, or put them on vibrate, so you would not interrupt those that wish to speak.

Let me take this opportunity to acknowledge some of the elected officials -- or their
representatives -- that are here today.

We have Representative Donna Rowland.

Thank you for coming.

(Appause)

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: And we have Tom Steidley with Representative John Hood's office.

(Appause)

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Let me briefly describe the context of this meeting and the process that we'll be following -- this Solid Waste Advisory Committee -- in regard to developing recommendations regarding the subject that we're here to discuss today. The purpose of this meeting is to provide an opportunity for the public to make comments to this committee regarding the disposal of Bulk Survey for Release -- BSFR -- waste material at Class I landfills in Tennessee, specifically in Rutherford County.

This meeting is limited just to that topic, because that's the job that the Legislature has given this committee. Please do not use your time on other subjects that you may feel that are just as important. Because we are limited in time and scope on what we may be doing today.

The Tennessee General Assembly passed Public Chapter 584 last month. Today we are only concerned about one aspect of that new law, namely, what it does in regard to BSFR Waste. It directs the Solid Waste Advisory
Committee to make recommendations concerning this BSFR waste, by September the 3rd, and it imposes a moratorium on the disposal of BSFR waste at the Middle Point Landfill in Rutherford County, pending our recommendations.

At our meeting, on July the 5th, the Advisory Committee began the process of working toward those recommendations. We approved the schedule of meetings over the next 60 days and heard a presentation from the Department on what BSFR material is and how this material is regulated. If any of you are interested, there is a video of those presentations, and copies of the documents presented, on the Department's website.

On July the 17th, a public meeting was held in Murfreesboro to inform people about the program and to take comments from the public. The meeting today is the next step of the process this Advisory Committee is following. We will hear from anyone who wishes to address the Committee today.

We are also receiving written comments until the close of business on August the 1st.

The next event on the schedule is a meeting of the Advisory Committee -- this committee -- on August the 16th. At that meeting the Department will present to us a transcript of the comments, as well as a summary of the comments. The Department will also present to the
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Committee its position on the issues that have been raised during this process.

The Committee will begin its deliberations at that time, and they have scheduled a meeting on August the 20th to continue those deliberations. All of the meetings of the Committee are open to the public.

Now let me explain the process that we will follow today. As you-all came in, there were cards at the table for everyone to use to sign in and indicate whether you wanted to make an oral comment.

Is there anyone else who has not filled out a card, who wishes to make a comment?

(Pause)

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Ms. Joyce, how many cards do I have right now?

MS. DUNLAP: Ten.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: We have ten cards from the people who wish to speak at this time. It's now 10:40. And we want everyone who has come today to be able to speak.

At this time we will allow each speaker six minutes to speak. Each speaker -- we have ten -- each one will get six minutes. If there's time available, after everyone has spoken, we will allow anyone who was not able to finish their remarks in six minutes to have some additional time. We're not going to allow people to seat other people
As you come to the microphone to speak, be sure you state your name clearly for the record, as we are having the minutes of this meeting publicly recorded. Remember to keep your comments to the subject of this meeting, which is the Bulk Survey for Release material going into the landfill. And we really do appreciate you following these rules.

And, Ms. Joyce Dunlap, would you present the first speaker?

MS. DUNLAP: Kathleen Ferris; John McAdden; Sammy Jones.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: If you-all will take a seat in those three chairs there (indicating).

The first speaker, if you will, please step forward and state your name.

MS. FERRIS: Hello. My name is Kathleen Ferris, and I am one of the cofounders of Citizens to End Nuclear Dumping in Tennessee. I live a few miles from the Middle Point Landfill.

I would like to address my remarks today to the issue of measurement and how they relate to the BSFR program. We have all heard assurances from TDEC, and their scientists, that people living in Rutherford County -- even if they become farmers on the future deserted Middle Point
Landfill -- will never receive more than 1 millirem of radiation per year over their lifetime and that they have only a minuscule chance of being affected by it.

I want to point out, a millirem is a hypothetical number. It's not a real one. This is a calculated risk. It's not something that can be measured. There's no way you can measure my body and say, "You've got no more than 1 millirem." This is a calculated risk that is being imposed on us statistically. It's not a certain one or a certain measure.

The amount of radiation required to damage one person's health is different from another depending on many known factors, such as age; heredity; the state of a person's immune system. There are other unknown factors that enter in as well. But we do know that a pregnant woman's unborn child is especially vulnerable to even the smallest amount of radiation.

Furthermore, if radiation gets into the groundwater and into the Stones River and then ingested, the damage that will be done to our bodies is far greater than the exterior radiation from the landfill. TDEC has not told us about these measurements.

We have been assured by TDEC that all radioactivity going into the Middle Point Landfill is carefully monitored. I would like to ask, who does the
monitoring? Does TDEC have anybody present watching the processors -- who are really from private corporations bent on making money -- as these people separate out what is safe for us and what is not? Who monitors the processors and how?

The second step that we were assured that guarantees our safety from radiation is the monitor at the gate of the landfill. I would ask whether it is a TDEC employee that mans that device, or is it somebody employed by BFI. Who calibrates that monitor and how often? Is all this done by BFR? A corporation with the reputation of being one of the worst polluters in the country.

There are many ways to fool that monitoring device. We've been able to think of some.

The load of radioactive material is hauled in a truck with a metal body. That metal would block some of the radiation from accurate measurement, especially if it happened to be lined with led.

How the material is placed in the truck -- nearer or farther from the monitor -- would affect how accurate the reading is.

The speed of the truck, as it goes through the monitoring area, would affect the reading.

Other measurements we are curious about are the leachate test and the sludge test. Who is taking the samples? Are independent laboratories ever used to evaluate
those samples? How often have these tests been performed over the years?
Pardon my distrust, but the people of Rutherford County have been lied to, and deceived, repeatedly. So my trust in TDEC is not especially high right now.
One of the tests for Murfreesboro's drinking water has shown a high level -- or an elevated level of Tritium -- H-3 -- which is a chemical known to increase the risk of cancer, birth defects, miscarriages, and genetic abnormalities.
According to the EPA website, it's -- Tritium -- most significant use is the component in the triggering mechanism in thermonuclear or fusion weapons. Very large quantities of Tritium are required for the maintenance of our nation -- and this is all a quotation from EPA. Very large quantities of Tritium are required for the maintenance of our nation's nuclear weapons capabilities, end quote.
The letter from TDEC's laboratory, to the Murfreesboro water company, states that these levels of elevated Tritium in our drinking water are probably attributable to exit signs. The kinds that light up over the doors -- or at least some of them. I don't know if all of them are.
And the manufacturer stated these signs have to be specially disposed of. They can't just be thrown
in a landfill.

And furthermore, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's rules say they should not go into a landfill.

That's a violation of their rules.

We want to know how many exit signs are disposed of in Middle Point Landfill. And if that is the source of the Tritium in our drinking water, why are these signs disposed of illegally? If that is not the source, are we getting debris from the nation -- the nuclear army production?

I have reports that I got in very recently from two environmentalists, who are experts in the field. One of them is Dan Hirsch who has -- he is the president of the Committee to Bridge the Gap, a Los Angeles based public policy organization focused on nuclear questions.

He is the director of the Stevenson Program of Nuclear Policy, at the University of California, Santa Cruz, where he will be elected in the fall teaching introduction to nuclear policy. The views he presents here he states are his own and don't necessarily represent his institution.

He has studied the results of the leachate tests, and we have asked him to comment on those. He says the data is interesting. Leachate from the Middle Point Landfill -- one of those participating in the BSFR disposal
program -- measured 3,395 picocurie -- I hope I am pronouncing
that correct -- of gross beta radioactivity per liter of
leachate with an aero margin of -- very large -- 286, plus or
minus 286. The standard maximum concentration limit -- MCL --
in drinking water is 50 picocurie per liter.

By contrast, with 50 landfills sampled in
California, several, several years ago, none had gross beta
levels in leachate anywhere approaching those levels. 42 of
the 50 landfills tested in California had gross beta levels
below the MCL. The highest value found for any of the 50
landfills, in California, was 450 -- now, remember, ours is
3,395 -- 450 picocurie per liter.

That's seven and a half times lower than
the Middle Point Landfill leachate. That's one measurement we
are very interested in.

Another comes from Diane D'Arrigo, whose
report on this -- if it weren't for her report on the presence
of radioactivity being dumped into our landfill, nobody would
have known. You-all still would not have told us. She has
e-mailed -- which I have given each of you a copy of -- a
rebuttal and addenda to her initial report. And she has some
interesting figures, too, about radioactivity.

This is something else. We have had the
cute little demonstration measuring all the naturally
occurring radioactivity in the atmosphere. Now I know -- I
have read the summary of the National Academy of Sciences, the
BEIR Report Number VII -- their latest one -- on low-level
radiation. And they support what she says here.

Naturally occurring radioactive materials
can pose health risks, thus releasing manmade radioactivity at
equal or portions of those levels -- I'm sorry. Naturally
occurring radioactive materials can pose health risks, thus
releasing manmade radioactive materials at equal or portions
of those levels are not justified, it only compounds the truly
unavoidable risk from natural occurring radioactivity.

According to the risk numbers of the
National Academy of Sciences, and the U.S. EPA, 1 in 50 of us
will get cancer due to the existing background radiation over
our lifetime. That's without anything being added to our
drinking water. Just what we get from all these naturally
occurring places are dangerous, and the more we get, the
greater the risk. That's what the National Academy of
Sciences says.

So why add to the 100 or 300 or 360
millirem the Government agencies calculate we receive
annually? If the addition is as TDEC reported to you at a
previous meeting, lost in the fluctuation or natural
background levels, how can they be so sure it is really as low
as they are claiming?

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: You have one minute.
MS. FERRIS: All right. I have one other point to make from Daniel Hirsch, from California. He says there are reasons why radioactive waste ought not to be dumped in municipal landfills.

One, the safety disposal of radioactive materials is strongly influenced by the capacity of soil to retard migration of specific radionuclides. Municipal garbage contains large amounts of organic complexing compounds that can dramatically increase the migration rate for radionuclides.

Licensed radioactive disposal sites are required to conduct fairly extensive monitoring for radioactivity. Municipal landfills are not required to do that monitoring.

And so for these reasons, we do believe that you are putting the risk of a quarter of a million people's health at risk -- a quarter of a million people in Rutherford County.

We get our water from the Stones River. We get it from wells -- some people only have wells -- and it goes into the groundwater. Our land is -- that land around the landfill is honeycombed with streams and caves leading to the river.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thank you very much, ma'am. We really appreciate you coming today.
MS. FERRIS: Thank you.

MR. McADDEN: My name is John McAdden. I am the executive director for the Tennessee Environmental Council. And I appreciate the opportunity to address the Advisory Board today.

And I want to start off, just really quickly, by saying that TEC is trying to get itself grounded in science. That includes the natural resources of sciences; the social sciences; economic sciences. Whatever sciences we need to help us promote and develop a sustainable community, a sustainable Tennessee.

And so with that said, what I would like to do is, I'd like to lead you through my process of conclusion relative to the recommendation that we think that you should make to the Legislature. And it starts off with the concept of sustainability and what is sustainability.

I believe it was 1987, the World Commission on Environment and Development came up and defined sustainability for us. It simply says that it allows us to meet our needs -- primarily our biological needs, things like food, water, shelter, and space -- things that the farmers have been providing for us for a long time -- and allows future generations to meet those same needs.

So we meet our needs, and future generations are able to meet their needs as well. That's the...
McAdden definition, if you will, of sustainability.

It includes three components: an environmental component, a social component, and an economic component. And I want to touch on each one of those relative to these two industries that are really at stake here. One is the nuclear power industry and waste streams that they're generating, as well as the landfill industries.

With regards to the nuclear power industry and economics, the TVA is carrying about a $25 billion debt. That -- by the way, I'm happy to report -- is down -- based on some of the comments that they made at their strategic planning meetings -- by about 4 billion, since 1990, when I more or less got in this conservation business. They're carrying a $25 billion debt associated primarily with their nuclear power program.

The Government is heavily involved in subsidizing that industry. And if you don't believe me, just look at what we're doing out at Yucca Mountain -- that is the Government's doing -- to try to deal with the waste stream that the nuclear power industry creates. Which, really, the nuclear waste -- I think -- has a high level of waste with a half-life of about 100,000 years.

I don't think there's anybody in the room that would want to have a facility in their community to deal with that waste -- long-term disposal, in essence, of that waste.
waste. That's why the Government is involved in dealing with it and trying to find a long-term storage facility -- or disposal facility for it.

So the economics of that industry are off. They don't, in my opinion, meet the criteria of sustained economics within the concept or framework of sustainability.

The social component -- whether or not the low-level radioactive waste that's being disposed of in the BFI Middle Point Landfill, down in Murfreesboro, has human health consequences, or is going to get out of the facility, or -- I think actually as the special waste streams go, there's about another 150 waste streams that may actually have a much greater risk associated with them as compared to the low-level waste.

But what we see when we look at that framework on sustainability, we see that there is this social response. People are not at all comfortable with radioactive waste, whether it's high-level waste or whether it's low-level waste. People just aren't comfortable with it. And, you know, there's lots of different theories as to why that is.

One of them that I heard somebody from the nuclear industry talk about -- one time when I was doing a HAZMAT training course -- was that the industry itself was conceived in secrecy and revealed in horror. And that's the Manhattan Project and Hiroshima and Nagasaki. And that was
one of the industry folks that told us that as a reason for 
that social response.

But based on those things, in our opinion, 
it doesn't meet that category, or the characteristics, of the 
social peace within that framework of sustainability.

And third, there's the waste stream that's 
generated as related to the environment. Even if the 
high-level or low-level radioactive waste enters into the 
environment, which I think over time -- because we're talking 
about -- I don't really like to predict what's going to happen 
in the future -- but over time, because we're talking about 
sustainability, and we really are talking about the future 
generations -- our children's children and grandchildren's 
ability to maintain their own life support system -- because 
we're talking about that -- it's prudent, I think, for us to 
talk about the future. But if these waste enter the 
environment -- can I have one minute?

Ms. Dunlap: One minute.

Mr. McAdden: One minute. Okay.

If they enter the environment, then there 
is a potential for there to be some serious human health 
consequences associated with that.

Landfills, if we just look -- landfills 
are engineered systems. We know that. Just like the road 
system, just like the sidewalks -- our buildings. And what we
know about engineering systems is primarily because of some of
the stuff that came out of thermodynamics -- the second law in
particular. And that law says that organization tends towards
chaos, unless you are constantly putting energy into it.

So if there is no plan for a landfill --
long-term plan -- forever plan for a landfill to have
energy put into it, in the maintenance of those engineering
systems -- the liner, the leachate collection system -- over
time we can expect it to leak. Which would expose those
materials to the environment and then to impact future
generation's abilities to support themselves.

So for those reasons, we encourage and
recommend that this Advisory Board recommend to the
Legislature to keep the moratorium in place.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. John.

Speaker number 3.

MS. DUNLAP: Could we have Mr. David Hall, Patricia Sanders, and John Safer come to the chairs please?

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: You may begin.

MR. JONES: Good morning. My name is Sammy Jones. I work for Impact Services, one of the
processors that is responsible for processing Bulk Survey for
Release material for the Middle Point Landfill. It goes in
there along with other landfills across the state.
We're located in Oak Ridge, Tennessee.

Our businesses include several processes for working with radioactive material, not just the BSFR process. We do packaging; waste production; waste mineralization activities on other material. We take a lot of pride in the fact that we've operated within the confines of the regulations and the laws governing the BSFR processing.

I spoke at the meeting the other day, and I think our comments are on the record for that. So I am not going to reiterate the same comments.

We had several questions as we listened to some 30 to 40 speakers that evening. They came up over and over. And we wanted to address those -- because it was not a question-and-answer quorum.

One of the first issues -- and it makes very reasonable sense as to why we requested this -- why are people transporting BSFR type material a long distance to come to these landfills?

Generators who have this candidate material, basically, find it attractive because it's faster than a federal petition, which is the other option they have. They can petition the Federal Government under 10 CFR 20, Standards for Protection Against Radiation, and dispose of this material in a sanitary and industrial landfill. That petition process is very bureaucratic. It takes up to about a
year and several thousand man hours to complete.

The other interesting thing about that petition process, in that 10 CFR 20 regulation that governs it, is that the regulation states that the dose basis for that disposal is a few millirem. And that's verbatim out of the regulation.

If you go to the NRC guidance documents, they define a few as five. So we come to Tennessee's program -- and Tennessee adopted a program that is basically more streamline. But the tradeoff for that more streamline program is, they're allowed to dispose at only 1 millirem expected exposure. So it's five times restricted, but just due to the bureaucratic nature.

And I think most of us here have dealt with the Government. We understand what that involves. Especially the Federal Government. So that's why people transport this material.

Many times the amount of material from a specific generator -- and it's such a small volume that it doesn't make any economic sense to go through the long process. Even though we are much more restricted here in Tennessee.

Is this dangerous radioactive waste -- was another question. We don't think so. All waste going to the landfill is radioactive to some degree. In fact, the levels
of this material are less than the naturally occurring radioactivity in Middle Tennessee. So if you took this material -- the dirt out of that landfill -- and replace it with this material, the population of the people that are exposed are actually going to get more radioactivity from that dirt.

Why are these standards appropriate for Middle Point? That's one of the questions we heard. Every landfill is different -- the geological conditions there. We understand that. The modeling that takes place for this material for the landfill is landfill specific.

As I mentioned before, we dispose in landfills other than Middle Point. Every one of the landfills that are used across the state are independently analyzed and modeled for this material. It's not a cut-and-dry approach. This amount gives you 1 millirem. It takes into account the geology; the construction; the operation of that plant.

Along the same lines is -- we hear the liner, the liner -- we must have heard "the liner" 50 times the other night. And I understand why they bring it up. Because I, too, don't know that a polyethylene liner is not going to last 1,000 years.

The modeling takes no credit for the liner. It assumes that the liner is not there. It assumes the radioactivity will become mobile and will go into your
drinking water and it will go into the river. And that's the dose basis. So it takes that into account, and it ensures the 1 millirem maximum exposure.

The last thing I will talk about is the sensitive populations. The dose calculations are based on a resident farmer. And basically that means that, after the landfill has closed, or if somebody moves there and he farms that land, he is going to be the maximum exposed individual. So the people off that area, or the general members of the public, are not going to receive that.

The other thing that you have to account for in 1 millirem for Middle Point, that is based on 5 percent of the material that went into that landfill. Every day of its operation was BSFR material. To date, the number is much, much less than one-tenth of 1 percent. The material that's gone into that landfill is that material.

I thank you for your time.

These questions, along with some additional information -- and we update it regularly -- are on our website, which is factsaboutBSFR.com -- www.factsaboutBSFR.com. And we're also going to have a comment section. So if you have questions, we will be glad to address other things on that website.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Jones. I
1 appreciate it.
2 Will the next speaker step forward please
3 and state your name into the microphone?
4 MR. HALL: Good morning. My name is
5 David Hall. I'm a certified public accountant and a resident
6 of Murfreesboro.
7 I would just like to know -- like to see a
8 show of hands how many of you folks have ever actually visited
9 the Middle Point Landfill.
10 (Pause)
11 MR. HALL: Well, I would like to pass
12 around some pictures of it so that you can see, in color, just
13 what is there and how close it is to the Stones River. Which
14 is our water supply.
15 (Documents tendered to the Committee.)
16 MR. HALL: TDEC has allowed BFI to locate
17 this landfill in a very bad place to start with, as far as a
18 geological situation. And it's right by our water supply.
19 Rutherford County gets 17 percent of
20 Tennessee's trash, and we only have 4 percent of the people.
21 So I think we're being dumped on a little excessively.
22 According to press reports, TDEC has
23 collected upwards of a million dollars in fees for allowing
24 this stuff to be put in our landfill. I'd like to know just
25 exactly how much has been collected, and I'd like to point out
that this looks like a conflict of interest. If you're
getting fees -- collecting money for putting trash in our
landfill now, you have a vested interest in it. I think
there's a conflict.

And we could argue a lot about whether
1 millirem, or whatever, is harmful. But, you know, there's
an easy solution to this: Let's just stop putting it in
there. Then we don't have anything to argue about.

Why should Murfreesboro get the world's
trash? Why should Murfreesboro get nuclear plant waste that
comes from way out of state -- California; Washington;
Michigan? Why pick on us?

The reason is, somebody is making money
off of hauling it here. If it's worth paying -- or getting
rid of to other people, maybe we don't want it.

That landfill is going to leak, and it's
right by our water supply. What is happening is that we are
being stuck with a problem down the road that we're not going
to get any help with. When that landfill is full, where is
our trash going to go? What's it going to cost? What's going
to happen to our water supply? Who's going to pay for that?

We in Rutherford County are going to get
stuck with a problem that shouldn't be ours. So quit hauling
stuff in from other places and leave us in peace.

We need these answers now. We need to be
planning ahead. And we need to know where -- how and where
we're going to dispose of trash when that thing is full.

You can see from the pictures where this
is a huge operation. You can see from the pictures that it's
right close to our water plant. So let's just quit bringing
stuff in from out of state, regardless of what it is. There's
plenty of hazardous waste in there that's going to be a
problem for us already, without adding anymore to it.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Hall.

MS. SANDERS: My name is Pat -- for
Patricia -- Pelot -- spelled P-E-L-O-T -- Sanders. I grew up
in Crossville. And I went to the wedding of J. H. Graham's --
the third -- parents.

I wanted to say that only five of your
committee members -- I'm from Murfreesboro, by the way. I've
lived there almost 44 years.

I wanted to say only five of your
committee members came. I remember seeing the lady from
Carthage and this gentleman here (indicating). And I know she
came (indicating), because she really didn't like our signs,
which I was told.

And that (indicating) stands for End
Nuclear Dumping in Tennessee. And that's our group. When I
say "we," this is who we is. We is ENDIT.
I was disappointed that you didn't come, so today is a repeat performance. How many came last Tuesday to Murfreesboro, to the Fleming Center?

(Pause)

MS. SANDERS: You and you (indicating).

One, two, three -- no. You're not a SWAC member, though.

You're TDEC, I thought.

And you (indicating) came, didn't you?

We appreciate those that did come. It was a difficult place to park. We had hoped for other locations.

But I am interested to see who is on your committee. There is no biologist -- that I know of. They're environmentalists. There's no molecular biologists -- that I've heard from -- except from ENDIT.

My husband was a pediatrician. And I want to say right off, he went with Public Health in 1966. He had 25 years with the State Department of Public Health.

And I'm regretting the fact that the Department of Public Health was made into two departments. And Mike Apple knows when that happened. He was here because he's been here 38 years. And he has certainly earned his dues.

But my husband was with just Public Health. And I think this is a health matter. It's a biological matter when you start talking about biology and the
body. And these wonderful health physicists -- one of them
was rather vicious in his column, if you read the paper last
week -- Bob Applebaum, the masters from Georgia Tech. And all
that's fine, but I want some physicians on your committee. I
want some biologists on your committee.

And that little demonstration that was
given over here (indicating) by Mr. Finner -- all the sunshine
coming in on his little counter. We don't drink those little
things on the watches. We don't drink the glow-in-the-dark
toys. We're talking about what the future -- could be in the
future happening to our water supply in Murfreesboro and
Rutherford County.

I want to say, too, the only threat that
my husband ever had on his life was over garbage -- over that
landfill. He was given a court order to find a location. He
went to see a sanitary landfill with the road commissioner --
Bill Wilson -- this is just for posterity to know -- in
Northern Alabama and came back with photographs. All of these
wonderful liners and all that.

Sure, my husband was given the orders
to do it. He lost friends over it. One of those friends that
objected even started leasing his land. Mr. Morgan Green --
whose wife is Ann Green -- gave my husband a lot of grief
over this. They started leasing their land out there at
Walter Hill.
But the letter that came to my husband that was a threat on his life, we gave it to the FBI. It said, "If you want to live and do good -- Dr. Sanders, if you want to live and do good, stay out of the Matthews Landfill thing." This is where it got started.

And the commissioners -- county commissioners thought it was going to be closed down in ten year's time. It was just household garbage. We didn't know it was anything but household garbage, until May of this year when they announced the D'Arrigo's -- Diane D'Arrigo's watchdog group announced it.

But we realized that BFI had a handle on this. And they owned it. And people sold land to them. And we've been getting -- when Bordeaux closed down, here in Metro, we started getting everybody's garbage. So every Kleenex you're throwing out is coming to us.

We were concerned about your independent consultant being paid 5,000 or 10,000. I don't know. But the fact that that consultant used to work for TDEC was a little bit -- it's concerning.

When we asked Mike Apple, on July 5th, why is it coming here -- why is it cheaper to come here, he said, "It's cheaper to take this stuff from California to Tennessee, Michigan to Tennessee, than to process it there."

And this gentleman (indicating) that
objected to the use of the liner -- by the way, I hear millirem used a lot more than the word liner.

But I want to say, California is fining the company that's bringing it -- or companies. I don't know if any of them are in this room or not. I don't know if BFI is in this room. But they're breaking a California law by taking it out of state.

The molecular biologist will tell you, unlike the health physicist, that radiation accumulates. Just because it's out there in these exit signs, that doesn't mean it's safe. And in molecular biology, you're going to have radiation that accumulates in your body, and it goes after your chromosomes -- your DNA. It alters the DNA. Then you get mutations. Then you get tumors. And then you get death, maybe. Some do; some don't.

My husband got a lymphoma. I don't know how much he accumulated in his medical years training.

But anyway, it accumulates. And we're not all like Winston Churchill. He drank gin every day, he smoked cigars, and he lived to be in his 90s. It's different for different people and different sizes of people -- and especially the children.

And I really did resent the simple demonstration. Not the word alpha or gamma or beta -- the word accumulation was not mentioned by Mr. Finner.
CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: You have one minute.

MS. SANDERS: Okay. Thank you.

We just feel like your main concern is looking after the nuclear industry. The DOE is behind this. I worked on the Super Collider, fighting that.

And a guy named Phil Bredesen came down, and he realized -- this is 1988 -- that it might have an affect on our groundwater to have that Super Collider in Tennessee and the Tritium going into the water. And we thanked him very much for coming.

My husband was told to hush because he worked for the Department of Health, because he was talking about the environmental concerns.

So, anyway, think about talking to some molecular biologists and read the BEIR Report. Because there is no safe level of radiation, despite what Mr. Applebaum tells you.

The BEIR Report stands for Biological Effects of Ionizing Radiation and what it does to the body.

So if you're going to just believe Eddie Nannie, who didn't speak up loud enough for me to hear him over here on July 5th, in spite of him having the microphones -- and I appreciate Paul Sloan being with this. I know he has said that you're supposed to -- you're charged with reporting the recommendations back to the
General Assembly by September 3rd. I hope you will look at
the video from last week's meeting that you didn't attend. I
hope you will read the comments.

I hope you will find out about Barnwell,
South Carolina. They're stopping it next year, except for
Connecticut and Pennsylvania. They're not going to bring
radioactive waste into South Carolina after next year.

And also read what Dan Hirsch's comments
are about his testing. That's the guy from Santa Cruz --
University of California, Santa Cruz. You might find that
very interesting.

Thank you for listening.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thank you, Ms. Sanders.

MS. DUNLAP: Mr. Safer, let me call the
next three speakers, please.

MR. SAFER: Sure.

MS. DUNLAP: Mr. Scharber, would you like
to speak today?

Mary Wright and Michelle Smith.

MR. SAFER: Hi. My name is Don Safer.

I'm the Chairman of the Board of Tennessee Environmental
Counsel. And I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you'all
today on this topic.

Nuclear power is not the answer to global
warming. Let me repeat that. Nuclear power is not the answer
to global warming. Now, I understand that we're supposed to
stay on topic, and to me this is extremely on topic.

If we expand the nuclear industry -- as
those are trying to want to -- we're going to have more of
these types of problems all over the state and the country.
And these types of issues are not going to go away. The magic
bullet will come back to bite us and bite us in a bad way.

And the simple reality is that, the
relationship between life and radiation has been worked out
over eons. And disrupting that balance by creating more
radiation in the environment is going to change life.
Radiation causes mutations, and it will make things different.

When you talk about 1 millirem, that
doesn't sound like a lot. The question really becomes, where
are the controls that make sure it's just 1 millirem per
person?

The nuclear industry has consistently had
problems with disclosure, secrecy, and hiding its problems.

In Erwin, Tennessee, a year ago, there was
an accident in a nuclear processing plant that was this far
(indicating) from going critical and killing at least one
worker, they acknowledge. That was in 2006. When did we find
out about this? It was a year later, in 2007, before we even
found out about it, under the secrecy that the nuclear
industry operates.
That's the kind of thing that has caused -- plus what's happened in Murfreesboro to the people there, of not knowing that this was happening until the report from out of state -- that's why people distrust the nuclear industry and distrust the state government in its charge to protect the public and the public interest.

Tennessee -- why is Tennessee one of only, roughly, ten states to accept this type of waste in this type of landfill? I would ask, what do the other 40 states know that we're not factoring in? That's a preponderance of evidence that it's not right to let this type of radiation into landfills.

EPA has a strict assurance -- I mean, there is no technology that doesn't fail. There is no technology that guidelines aren't met and things have to slide through in the heat of the moment, whether it's fraud in the sense of masking the radiation coming in or just carelessness. But, you know, we read about accidents every day in every industry of every type. And there is just no control over -- you know, things that can go wrong will go wrong.

There is no margin for error when it comes to radiation, and the risks are quite high. That's why people are suspicious and overly alarmed at any indication of radiation in their communities. They know instinctively that this stuff is, basically, incompatible with life. And it's a
deal that we shouldn't make for future generations.

This low-level waste -- so called low-level waste is the tip of the iceberg, and it needs to be monitored. And that waste that exists needs to be sequestered from the other waste that we have to landfill. So I urge the Committee to recommend that the moratorium also continue.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Please step forward and state your name, sir.

Thank you.

MR. SCHARBER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Mayor Graham. I appreciate the number of you-all attending today.

I am Wayne Scharber, vice president for Environmental Affairs, Tennessee Chamber of Commerce and Industry, here in Nashville.

I also want to say this before I start my remarks, I appreciate the efforts taken by the Department to educate and address questions and concerns prior to the meeting last Tuesday night in Murfreesboro. I think they put forth an effort there to help people better understand the issue and the magnitude for rightful concern.

The Chamber is a traded organization; established in 1912; representing manufacturers, industries, and businesses in this state. My experience includes 36 years
of employment with the environmental regulatory departments of public health, health and environment, and the Department of Environment and Conservation.

When I retired, in 1999, from Government, I had, for the prior 12 years, been either the deputy or the assistant commissioner for Environment and over the divisions of Solid Waste Management and the Division of Radiological Health, as well as others. The responsibility of these divisions was to enforce and assure compliance with scientifically sound and adopted standards to protect public health and the environment for Tennesseans, as well as the millions of visitors traveling through or to the state annually.

The Chamber renews its statements and position presented at that public hearing in Murfreesboro, on July 17th, 2007.

You have a number of comments offered by several persons regarding the location and operation of the landfill. We understand the Advisory Committee to be focused on the issue of the moratorium of disposal at the Middle Point Landfill, the Bulk Survey for Release program materials. That's what was in the law that was passed -- the bill that was passed and signed into law by the Government.

The State of Tennessee -- for -- those of you here today need to understand -- and, I think, properly
appreciate -- the State of Tennessee has shown its ability to
enforce adopted safe standards for materials as may be
disposed in a permitted sanitary Class I landfill. This is
the kind of landfill that's being addressed here.

While state laws are the first levels of
state regulatory programs, these programs are subject to the
review and the level of oversight by federal agencies to
assure that the federally established, scientifically based
standards are implemented and complied with, to assure the
protection of the public's health and the environment.

And it's been noted by some other
speakers, the level of material going into this landfill is
even at a more conservative level than that proposed by those
federal official agencies. The materials with this regulated
level of activity can safely be accepted in Class I landfills,
and it is not necessary to be disposed of in low-level
radioactive waste landfills or hazardous landfills.

Citizens should not be misdirected and
alarmed with factual errors and misrepresentations about
materials containing radioactivity. Citizens should be fully
informed with available information from their responsible
regulatory agencies and elected officials.

The state program regulators should
continue their effective monitoring enforcement of the
scientifically based standards to assure the protection of the
public's health and safety.

Business and industry, processing, transporting, or managing for the disposal of radioactive materials in the state should be held fully accountable to meet the standards and the responsibilities imposed by the regulatory programs of this department.

Businesses, industry, and waste management companies can, and will, comply with the responsible standards and understandable practices. Tennessee Chamber of Commerce and Industry -- on behalf of many of these industries -- supports the existing standards, practices, and policies of the state regulators to protect our environment and the public's health and safety.

We appreciate this opportunity, once again, to present some of these remarks and add to this body as you make your recommendations to the Commissioner, pursuant to Section 2(c) of Public Chapter 584.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Scharber.

May we have our next speaker, please?

Make sure you state your name clearly for the record.

MS. SMITH: Good morning. My name is Michelle Smith. I reside on the Compton side of the landfill.

First, thank you to everyone who's taken
off work and traveled this far to see that this landfill does
not accept anymore radioactive waste. Thank you for coming.

I understand that radiation is in
everything. I hear those of you who say that the level is so
low that it cannot possibly affect our community. But why
should we, as residents of Rutherford County, have to have
more than the typical area? It almost feels like we, the
people of Rutherford County, are, in a sense, guinea pigs as
to the amount of radiation a person can be subjected to.

I am certain that with all the professors
and scholars, everyone already knows that radiation cannot be
removed from water. The liner and all the other precautions
taken to ensure that this landfill will not leak have failed.
It has. We, as a continually growing community, will not
stand for this.

The landfill came to be by someone who was
told the trash would be used -- the landfill would be used for
regular trash. Our community was nowhere near as large as it
is now when this come into place.

I regret with my whole heart that I did
not investigate this area before purchasing a home. I'm not
from Tennessee. But at the time I was very young, I had
never had an experience with a landfill, so it didn't cross
my mind.

I don't know how many mothers that live
near this landfill, or in this county, that would not be opposed to an amplified amount of radiation in our water. But I'm thinking it would be zero.

I cringe when my children drink a glass of water. I purchase it by the gallons every week. I make my coffee in the morning with it. And I ask my boys to use it as well, but unfortunately, as kids, they don't understand. They use the tap anyway. I am scared for them and their future and my own home. With my four-digit mortgage payment that I make every month, I'm scared of our water.

I think about it when we sit outside: How much are we breathing in? What about the animals that have their feet in the landfill that come and land in my backyard? We swim in it. We shower in it. We're in it every single day.

We have fought the embarrassment of the cringing smell of the sludge -- otherwise known as the human waste -- from various places dumped in our area. And it helps some, but not always. How many other fights are we going to have about this landfill -- this eyesore mountain of crap?

When will someone with power get a heart and help us stop this before people get sick; have health issues; have abnormal babies. This is not a money issue, this is an ethical one -- a moral one.

As mentioned previously, this landfill was
originally implemented for household trash in Rutherford County, only, back when Rutherford had just a handful of people compared to the number that resides there now.

I plead with you to please end this landfill. Make the contract null and void based on the Committee and the public being misinformed and end these battles and any request to accept any waste in this community, especially from outside our county. We, as the people, are smart enough to figure out another way to dispose of our waste.

Come on. You guys are smart enough. We can figure out something else, without putting the people at risk. And we can probably wind up making energy doing it and saving people money.

Thank you.

MS. DUNLAP: Ms. Wright, before you start, let me call the next people, please.

Bruce Woods; Sharon Force; Harold Bell.

MS. WRIGHT: My name is Mary Wright. I am here in support of ENDIT. I received an e-mail from a couple other members that wanted me to continue to support them. And I am in strong support of them.

As I said, my name is Mary Wright. I am the cofounder -- one of the cofounders of the Tennessee Coalition of Environmental Justice.
I can understand everything ENDIT is going through. Because, as everyone knows, Dickson County is going through a lot of problems too. But I am here to support them. And I'd like to know -- and helped them with this. Will you really listen and hear their interest and not protect what you know is very wrong?

There is a solution, as one of the residents of that area said: close it. Find a proper and safer place for dangerous chemicals and nuclear waste. By solving this issue, maybe we can protect this earth and its people. We are appealing to you.

And I think you have a hard job. I know. But something is wrong when you can't meet with the people. Something is wrong. And we know you have feelings, and we know you care. But bureaucracy should not stop you from doing your job. They need help, and this country -- this country needs help with the landfills. We need to find safer places to put these landfills and let the people know what is going on when you do.

So for the sake of this earth and the people on this earth, do your job.

Thank you so much.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thank you, Ms. Wright.

(Documents tendered to the Board.)

MR. WOOD: Thanks very much.
My name is Bruce Wood, and I -- I messed up the mic.

I'm here as the elected president of BURNT, a 20-year-old environmental group, here in Nashville, a volunteer citizens effort. And we specialize in solid waste. And the -- actually, one of the bills that we supported this year was amended -- and we appreciate that very much -- to create this process. So we are delighted to be here to participate.

We did a -- this is two sided (indicating). One side is an outline of testimony; and on the other side, it's a letter that we submitted to the Department requesting information on this. And we were told that information isn't available.

I think it's very questionable to be at this process -- at this point, and for the Department not to make readily available what are the names and installations and landfills all over in every state and how much of this material is being accepted.

We were told three weeks ago that this is a very routine process in many states. Well, let's produce those states. Let's say what the landfills are. Let's say how much of this material goes there. If you can't make that available at this part of the process, I think that that's very noteworthy.
We strongly urge to continue the moratorium at Middle Point. There is absolutely no reason to reopen this landfill with more of this material at Middle Point. And then, really, make the moratorium permanent in Tennessee.

How are we helping our state by accepting this type of material? We don't think that it should be allowed in the state of Tennessee.

I think I would testify this is not a transparent decision-making process for the people on this panel, or employed by the State of Tennessee in this Department. How likely are they to overturn the existing policy?

One of those four wrote an impassioned commentary to the congressman in Murfreesboro instilling this policy. Well, to me this makes everybody a very -- actually, the four people that work in the Department should recuse themselves -- should not participate in this process.

I mean, it's been ongoing for years. The Solid Waste Assistance Group was chaired by a lobbyist from county government. That means he was a gatekeeper for solid waste legislation in the state of Tennessee. That was very, very difficult. But you have a very informed and capable Chair, now.

I would like to say, how does TDEC justify
landfilling this waste when the gross alpha radiation comes in
five times larger than the EPA allows in drinking water?
Sixty-six times on the gross beta radiation. 66 times what
the EPA is allowed. That is seemingly unacceptable.

I think earlier there was a comment on
modeling. What's a model? I've heard about models all my
life. Then, finally, we got somebody that'll look at
somebody's model. And he said, "That's not what's really
there." Let's get an expert that knows something about solid
waste and looks at this model in a critical way and doesn't
accept the rubber stamp, which is usually the way it is.

And again, on test results,
Middle Point -- and then they tested Crossville. My
understanding -- I asked for those test results today, and
I don't see them. They tested Crossville, which has not
accepted this waste, and they did not exceed the EPA. They
did not measure Crossville --

MS. SANDERS: Clarksville.
MR. WOOD: Clarksville. I'm sorry. Thank
you very much.

And Clarksville did not have that type of
radiation. So does that mean that they're very scrupulous
about exit signs in Clarksville? I doubt that.

And then methane gas is burned or
otherwise processed at Middle Point. One of the implications
for radioactivity for there is that disbursing it --
propelling it out into the -- the woman just talked about
sitting in her backyard. Are they breathing that? Certainly
nothing burned in a landfill is destroying nuclear waste.

We need third-party testing of all landfills in Tennessee that accept this waste. Actually, we
need no dumping of nuclear waste in any of these landfills.

I think it's just patently evident to anyone -- it should be -- is that the expansion of
Middle Point should be reopened. I remember when that happened. We weren't paying too much attention to it. It just seemed like it was an open and shut case. The opening shot was to keep it open. But now that we have this information, we should do it.

And I do want to address one comment. As an expert, $5,000 -- what are you going to get for $5,000? You're not going to get anything, except a form letter.

People on this board know what you get for $5,000.

I would like to address an earlier comment. Tennessee has shown the ability to enforce landfill laws. And that's just not true. Tennessee is the repository and waste station for companies from the North. They come to Tennessee, and then they end up in Guatemala or Taiwan, and then leave their filthy residue behind in Dickson County.

Now, let's stop that. And let's start
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with stopping the nuclear waste in Tennessee. These landfills aren't built for that.

We've got leaking in Dickson County.

Nothing illegal happened in Dickson County. That's what's so fascinating. And, yet, they can't dig a well --

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Your comments are very appreciated.

MR. WOOD: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Next speaker, please.

MS. FORCE: Good morning. Thank you for this opportunity to speak. I'm also a board member. I'm also a member of the Tennessee Coalition for Environmental Justice.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Your name, please? I didn't catch it.

MS. FORCE: Sherry Force.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Yes, ma'am. Excuse me.

MS. FORCE: I live here in Nashville, Tennessee. I also made comments before, and I won't be repeating those.

I would like to start by saying -- by quoting Rachel Carson: "If you contaminate water anywhere, you contaminate it everywhere." We are all down river, and that certainly includes Nashville.

And I am rather disappointed. I know there were more than 50 people that rose to speak in
Murfreesboro, and I'm disappointed that either the Nashville people are so ill-informed, or maybe it's at 10:00 in the morning, but it seems like there ought to be more people that are interested in this topic.

The reason I am speaking is because Mark Quarles -- a professional geologist -- was talking about -- at the last public comment hearing -- that if there is a hole the size of a dime in the liner, that allows 3300 gallons of leachate to escape on a daily basis.

And then, apparently, there is some kind of 8-inch hole they know about as of August 2005. And I'm thinking, oh, good, they know about the hole. And then I was alarmed by the end of the public comment hearing when Mark spoke again. I realized he's just talking about one hole.

When I first found out about the Middle Point Landfill -- being an environmental activist -- I've done this for 18 years now. And we're primarily involved in solid waste.

I have been up to visit to Middle Point. I went out there to the top to watch them covering garbage and whatnot. I got to talk to some of the people up there, and I asked a question to them. And this was several years prior to August 2005.

I asked them about the possibility of the
liner -- how it holds material and whether it would leak. And
one of them snickered and laughed and said -- apparently they
had been putting vents into this landfill, at some point in
time prior to my visit to Middle Point, where someone had
miscalculated the depth and they had punched several holes
into the liner.

Now, I just want to make sure that this is
on record somewhere and that it should be investigated
thoroughly. I'm sure -- I don't know the date. I can't tell
you. If I had to hazard a guess when my visit was there, I
would say it was approximately 2002. But I don't really know
when this would have happened. But certainly adding vents to
a landfill doesn't happen on a regular basis, and there ought
to be a way to pinpoint that timeframe. But, please, see that
that is investigated.

And I, too, ask that you continue the
moratorium against radiation and to end it. As one speaker
said -- I believe it was Bruce -- this does not benefit the
state of Tennessee. It does not benefit Tennesseans.

It's just outrageous that Governor
Bredesen has given the kind of raises he has to his people
when we should be using this money to start cleaning those
landfills up.

Thank you so much.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Next speaker.
MR. BELL: My name is Harold Bell, the elected president of the NAACP of the Dickson County Branch. We are here to support Rutherford County. And I support and understand everything that everybody has said before me but the moratorium.

We was told that in Dickson County, a few years ago, that it would be household garbage only. Since then we have found out that they have put in that landfill just about everything you can name. All kind of diseases have come from that. We have scientific proof that -- and autopsies -- that death has come from that landfill. And all kind of physical illness has come from that landfill.

And if you're there at the landfill on a good warm morning, you can see it, you can smell it, and you can feel it. It's completely out of order.

And we are here to say that we need to stop it -- end it now. We feel that garbage of that material can be recycled. Most of that stuff they put in that landfill can be recycled. We are asking the Committee, and our elected officials, to find a way to recycle this material because we realize and know that.

They told us that the liners would stop it. But we have found out later on that it has permeated three miles outside of the landfill. Now, you know, if it's done got three miles outside of the landfill, it's not going
to stop there. It's going to continue its journey. So we are asking the Committee to look into it and make sure that we get rid of that.

Not only that, the realtors said that the -- out there on Eno Road -- that the land value of that has dropped 50 to 60 percent. No one that knows anything about Eno Road, and the landfill, will not purchase any property out there. Yet, and still, the tax is of the -- the taxes there is of the additional community. Something is wrong with this picture. Something is wrong with this picture.

So we as -- the people there are asking me, as being president of the NAACP, is there anything that we can do about this situation? I said we can bring it to our officials and hope they -- that the officials will do the right thing.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thank you very much.

Ms. Dunlap, do you have any more speakers?

MS. DUNLAP: That's all the speakers.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: I will have one last call for any additional speakers that would like to address the Advisory Committee.

Are there any other individuals that would like to address the Advisory Committee? We have just about eight more minutes before we recess for lunch and then begin
another meeting.

Yes, ma'am?

MS. FERRIS: May I add one additional point?

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: You may. Please step forward.

MS. FERRIS: There's a point that I wish to make and I --

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Please state your name one more time.

MS. FERRIS: Kathleen Ferris, from Rutherford County.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Yes, ma'am.

MS. FERRIS: And one of the things that I have become aware of in studying this issue is that, we're told that things are safe within federal guidelines. But I know that both the EPA guidelines and the nuclear regulatory guidelines have changed in the last several years.

They -- back in the '70s, after Chernobyl and after the -- still up in New York -- there was an effort to have legislation that would meet strict regulation of nuclear materials because people were suddenly aware of how dangerous they were. And the Clean Water Act and the Clean Air Act were put into place. Those guidelines have been diluted over the years.
And so, when we are told "safe within federal standards," it was -- there was a time when all this low-level stuff had to go into a special low-level depository. And now we have so much of it, they can't put it into those special places, like foreign wells. So they're bringing it into municipal landfills.

And I just think that one factor to take into account is, what are those guidelines? And are they really strict enough? And how do they compare with what the original laws intended?

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thank you.

I hereby recess the Advisory Committee for lunch.

Thank you-all for your attendance.

(End of the proceedings.)
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