



# STATE OF NEVADA

Department of Conservation & Natural Resources

DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Brian Sandoval, Governor

Leo M. Drozdoff, P.E., Director

Colleen Cripps, Ph.D., Administrator

## Jungo Landfill Site Permit - Public Hearing [Public Comment Transcription]

**Winnemucca Convention Center, Winnemucca Nevada  
Thursday 12/1/11, 6:00 to 9:00 p.m.**

### NEVADA DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION [NDEP] staff in attendance:

- ❖ Dave Emme, Deputy Administrator.
- ❖ Eric Noack, Bureau of Waste Management Chief;
- ❖ Vince Guthreau, NDEP-PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER
- ❖ Art Gravenstein PE, Solid Waste & Recycling Branch Supervisor;
- ❖ Jon Taylor PE CEM, Solid Waste Permit Writer;
- ❖ Jasmine Vittori, Northern Nevada Recycling Coordinator

### *NDEP PIO Vince Guthreau opened public comment period at 7:30p.m*

7:30 **Jean Williams:** Part of my comment has to do with the very top line, no construction without a valid Conditional Use Permit. When the CUP was initially given to Recology it was not valid at that time because our county law did not permit such a thing to happen and I do believe the State of Nevada owes us that, and you know, our public kind of, caught this late, and we acted on it with our initiative, and that initiative was 70% not in favor of the dump. And I think NDEP should also take that into consideration. Thank you.

7:31 **Norm Sweeney:** I'm a, at a minimum, citizen of Winnemucca for 40 years, I'm a relative new-comer here, and a Nevada State licensed Contractor for over 30 years. Was employed as the Public Works Director for the City of Winnemucca from 1985- 1992, I worked with mining and under NDEP regulations for most of the time I've been in Winnemucca I worked under NDEP permits in 3 areas: assumed [Inaudible] mining (all the same?), Sweeney [Inaudible] construction, and [Inaudible]. I'll just leave copies of this available up here, [Inaudible] if they can't [Inaudible] not understand it, I'd like for me to redo it.

I've never experienced as highly a designed mining system as I see for the Jungo Road Landfill which is approximately 7 feet in thickness, including a bentonite liner and two pressure tested polyethylene liners with daily coverage requirements, as I have seen in most mines in Elko, Lander, and Pershing counties [Inaudible] etc., etc., which would be signs indicating cyanide and heavy metals, waste, etc. Many of these mines use only a bentonite liner, or at most a single polyethylene liner with bentonite liner.

---

At least four [Inaudible]... human waste disposal facilities, which are our local landfill ~5 miles from Winnemucca, two private facilities on Jungo Road approximately two miles from Winnemucca and the Humboldt River, and our Winnemucca City waste disposal plant which occasionally discharges raw sewage directly into the Humboldt River, or discharges directly onto land above our water aquifer with no consideration for airborne infiltration or confinement.

I hold mining claims on private property within sight of the proposed landfill, and look forward to it coming to fruition. It should provide 20 plus well-paying jobs to Humboldt County and a substantial stipend of approximately \$1 million which our reasonable County Commissioners are meeting to negotiated with the landfill operators. It will also bring substantial start-up and on-going construction monies to Winnemucca and Humboldt County. I urge your support for this NDEP permit that I'm sure leaves no stone unturned, and even if it does, overlooks some minor detail, I'm sure it will be quickly remedied. Thank you.

7:35 **Diana Drake:** I'm Diana Drake, and I live in a [Inaudible]. Thank you, NDEP, for giving us a chance to raise our concerns about the desert valley soils.

The soils of the desert valley are not suitable for construction of a landfill. This is because the soils consist of a very fine silt, clay and sand. The Natural Resources Conservation Service website confirms this information. How can you issue a permit to build something that will ultimately fail? In previous proposed plans for construction, it was stated that, "An alternative daily cover may be used to augment the native soils." Now, there is not a specific source cited for this cover material, nor is there a description of the make up or composition of this cover. Where will this material come from? All the soils locally for miles around on the valley floor are the same type.

If the alternative cover is to be imported along with the garbage, are its characteristics going to be suitable for construction? If an alternative daily cover (ADC) is available, we're back to the original question. How can these soils be used if they're inadequate for the purpose? We think this is a very real problem, and these concerns need to be addressed. I am one of the overwhelming majority of Humboldt County residents who recognize that this proposed project will damage our environment, endanger public health, and potentially hinder our economic growth.

The NDEP has the power, obligation and duty as defined in its mission and purpose to deny this permit application. Again, thank you.

7:37 **Lewis Trout:** I'm a resident of Winnemucca. I understand that tires have been included in the material to be shipped to our state.

I think the best opportunity for Jasmine Vittori of your office to develop a recycling program that would divert those tires from the waste stream before they ever get to Winnemucca. Specifically, Nevada Cement in Fernley, and Nevada Energy's coal fired power plants would be able to make use of these tires in their furnaces and their kilns to

---

be able to generate electric power with reduced emissions on the [Inaudible] magnitude of 20% [Inaudible] use. This has been demonstrated at plants in other areas including downtown Seattle, so I would like to suggest that your office, as part of your corollary duties, develop such a program in cooperation both with Recology if you approve the permit, and with Nevada Cement and with Nevada Energy to divert those tires from the waste stream. Thank you.

7:39 **Laurie Bento:** I'm a member of the [Inaudible] given the obvious problems with the soils and drainage; I find it hard to believe a viable landfill can be constructed at this site.

The design as shown in drawing and calculations does not properly match the physical characteristics of the site itself. No amount of mitigation measures will properly solve the deficiencies inherent with the site's locality. A reasonable observer of the whole process would have to conclude that a different location would make more sense without even taking into consideration the ultimate reality of a poisoned aquifer as a result of building on a high desert valley floor. With all the negative consequences taken into account, NDEP should reject the application as potentially damaging to the environment. Thank you.

7:40 **Tom Brissenden:** I have been a resident of Humboldt County for 30 years, and in those 30 years, I have been involved in mining, the design, air quality and construction of geotechnical earthworks projects.

Specifically my comments are about discrepancies in the permit, correspondence, permit application, and agreement of trust materials on the name of the company we are being asked to do business with, or who will hold the NDEP operating permit, and what are the ramifications of those discrepancies. Here are the discrepancies I am concerned with.

- The original Conditional Use Permit is between Don Gamblin, dba Jungo Land & Investments, CUP# acceptance form 42307.
- The NDEP Draft permit issued 10/26/2011 specifies the Nevada Land & Resource, LLC, as the Owner and Recology as the Operator. I understand Nevada Administrative Code Statutes for applying for a waste permit defines Owner as the person who owns the disposal site, or any part of that site, and the Operator as the person responsible for the overall operation of the disposal site, or any part of that site. Yet, the header of this same draft permit for a solid waste disposal site permit Class I keeps referring to Nevada Land & Resources Jungo Landfill on every page.
- The NDEP Public Notice published a 10/26/11 states they have requested to issue a permit from the following applicant for a solid waste landfill disposal permit Class I this applicant is shown as Nevada Land & Resources, LLC, Jungo Landfill.

- 
- The NDEP Fact Sheet published on 10/26/11, states Nevada Land & Resources, Inc., Jungo Landfill, is the Permittee and states that Nevada Land & Resource, Inc., have requested to construct a Class I landfill in Humboldt County, Nevada.
  - The application for a Permit to Construct and Operate a Class I Facility is dated April 2011, and available in the latest document on NDEP site for this project, says that Jungo Land & Investments, Inc., is the landfill Owner and Operator and that is submitting the following Plan of Operations.
  - The Trust Agreement is filed between Jungo Land & Investments, not Nevada Land & Resources, Inc., or LLC, yet the permit appears to be issued to either Nevada Land & Resources, Inc., or LLC.
  - It appears all correspondence made between NDEP is with Recology who owns Jungo Land & Investments as a subsidiary.
  - The lawsuit revolving around a valid Conditional Use Permit is between Jungo Land & Investments and Humboldt County. The NDEP has required a valid CUP be in place before construction begins.

In summary, which company will be the Owner, the Operator, and Permittee of a solid waste disposal site Class I? Is it Nevada Land & Resources, LLC, Nevada Land & Resources, Inc., Jungo Land & Investments, Inc., Recology, or another name I found still being used and denied by their COO George McGrath, in the last couple of years that they were meeting here, is still being used and he says it's a misprint, it is Jungo Land & Resources, another name that is still being used by this consortium.

If the Permittee of this solid waste disposal site for the Jungo Landfill is Nevada Land & Resources, LLC, it is important to note that they have a Notice of Non-responsibility with Jungo Land & Investments, Inc. This notice specifies they are not responsible for any claims arising from any work of improvement in, upon over said [Inaudible] property, not limited to mineral exploration, development, processing, construction, alteration, addition, repair, demolition, or removal of any building or structure, or seeding, sodding or planting for landscape purposes, building [Inaudible] grading [Inaudible] of said property. This Notice of Non-responsibility is on file [Inaudible] #2507. Also it applies to all other protections of land Jungo Land & Investments has an option on. Should the Permittee for the landfill be the Nevada Land & Resources, LLC, then they have no accountability for a clean-up on this landfill.

A search for Nevada Land & Resources, LLC, and Nevada Land & Resources, Inc., results only in information on Nevada Land and Resources, Inc., on the Nevada Secretary of State's Business Services site. Should this be a clerical error by the NDEP, it concerns around the rest of the intent to issue permit, including monetary, intent to issue the permit, recommended [Inaudible] for environmental impact, all remain highly suspect in terms of accuracy.

---

I remain greatly concerned and offer no solutions except to ask the NDEP for clarification on who is getting the Permit, why are these discrepancies prevalent in the project material, clearly it is of concern in terms of who is responsibility for having the valid CUP, and in terms of being accountable for clean-up of the land, either during the life of the landfill or after it. Is this duplicitous name game being done to defraud the County and to leave us holding the trash bag? Thank you.

7:47 **Massey Mayo:** I'm a resident of Winnemucca, Humboldt County. Three questions in regard to post-closure and monitoring of the landfill.

My first question relates to the proposed post-closure maintenance costs as reported in the [Inaudible], I would like to know if these costs are certified by a third party as reasonable and/or accurate. Where do these costs derive from, and how can any third person know that those costs are not just from the corporation itself? Has any documentation been provided to NDEP, as the language implies, that supports the notion that there will be adequate funding for the Trust Fund for the 1<sup>st</sup> section [Inadubile]. If so, has that been made public?

Secondly, regards monitoring in the post-closure phase. It states that it will be done in the first five years two-times a year, for both leachate and the ground water; however, I would like to know what NDEP plans on doing if leachate is not dissipating as projected, or if the ground water is not [Inadubile]. Who directs more frequent monitoring or what policies or implementations can be made to correct the issues? Although the technical presentation somewhat addressed this, who exactly who will be doing the monitoring at the post-closure phase?

The third question concerns the 30-years being the period for post-closure monitoring. The technical presentation did address that it can go beyond 30 years if, "something is going on." What is "something," and why is that not made specific in the conditions of the Permit? NDEP, please address what exactly would be "something" that would require 30-years plus monitoring.

7:50 **Bob Dolan:** Good evening ladies and gentlemen. I appreciate the sincerity of Mr. Taylor, I was impressed by your presentation, [I was] not too impressed with you (indicating NDEP PIO), but I was impressed with you.

The fact of the matter is, there's nothing we can say here folks that's going to stop NDEP, whether in written form, with the eloquence of Shakespeare, Mr. Taylor's going to issue the Permit. (I am a betting man. I will take bets). Now, what we hope he does is deny it, and let whoever the Permittee is go through the legal process to appeal his decision and say he's being arbitrary and capricious. Because I'm going to do that once he issues the Permit. Everything about this is arbitrary and capricious, not based upon sound science; it's based upon mathematical equations that are guesswork at best, formulae from laboratories.

Let me tell you something, I was once challenged by an elected official in the State of Oregon who said to me, "You know, we do all this stuff in the mines, and we do all this

---

stuff here.” I said, “Well, first of all, why do we, as human beings build museums? For beauty.” I’ll tell you what, there’s beauty out there in that valley and in that land, what you are all are going to allow to be destroyed by a corporate organization, who has good council and this one [Inaudible], indicating Mr. Frankovich in the back of the room. But man does not live by bread alone, and we’ve shown our metal when we as citizens voted to try to stop this landfill.

The first speech I gave over at the Martin where I am no longer allowed to go in, but the first speech I gave on this issue I said to the people at the Martin, NDEP will grant this permit, it’s up to you to look at the negatives to stop it locally. They can [Inaudible] if they want to. That’s why, after you issue the Permit, which you will issue, and after I go to the State Environmental Commission, and into the District Court, and into the Nevada Supreme Court, and then they’ll come back and they’ll say something else, we will have the opportunity as citizens to vote for a monitoring system. We will ring that landfill at public expense, to monitor the particulate matter.

I must tell you, I went to the SEC hearing to discuss their Air Quality Permit, and I paid for an expert out of my own pocket, to discuss the fact that certain data that was part of the NDEP website was really not accurate, in fact, it is in my opinion fraudulent, and in my expert witnesses opinion was fraudulent, and guess what? The NDEP person who issued the Permit was asked by one of the Commissioners, “Did you look at that data before you issued that Permit?” [and they answered], “Nope, we didn’t.” So they ruled that testimony of my expert for not even being in order.

With respect to the soil samples, I looked at this report from the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Services; it basically says that this location for this landfill is not a good place for it. Because it’s not a good place for it, move it somewhere else. Plus we don’t want it. Now, I don’t think it’s been adequately taken into account with respect to all of the Nevada mathematical formulae that you know we can rely upon the that is still conjecture, cause you look at the Xs and Ys and the subdivisions, it’s hocus-pocus junk science and it’s only reinforced by junk scientists who have a little part of the world where they can be an expert in, nobody can understand a word that they say because it means nothing.

So, in the final analysis, just know that I appreciate [Inaudible] all the great things you have done for this community and John Siegfried also. There comes a time, we can’t reconcile all of the inconsistencies in life. We could find out all sorts of reasons, we could open up a bombing range 10-miles out of town like they’ve done in Vegas, but you stop at some point, for me it’s this landfill, my wife and I found it and camp out there, I’ve kicked the soccer ball, and hunted, and look at the stars, so it’s a jewel and it’s a shame that this is coming to our community. The 20 jobs the (project will generate?), the mines for the next 15 years are going to generate hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of jobs, and they’re subjected to more rigorous oversight than is presented here today.

I wish you all a good night and Merry Christmas.

7:56

**Paul Schlehr [sp]:** My name is Paul Schlehr [sp], some of you know me through Toastmasters or other organizations in town. You also know I live down in Pershing County, so I am not a Humboldt County resident. I didn't have the opportunity to vote against this program.

It's been mentioned the soil is not suitable in the area. In many areas of this county, Humboldt, and Pershing County, if you disturb the top plants that have been there for years, you have, what is commonly referred to as bug dust. It's an environmental hazard, it floats, it will completely destroy the visibility of anyone traveling in, around or through it. [Inaudible]

The other problem that I see is this: even with the supervision and testing and the other things that the program talks about, what happens if it doesn't meet the requirements? Who's responsible? Any company could basically declare bankruptcy and walk away. We'd be stuck with one heck of a mess, and that is tempered words.

The top cover, 6", over a plastic membrane, basically will forbid any plant in the desert that I know of from ever growing there, so you're going to have a totally open uncovered soil mound, no matter how deep because of it, the average desert plant has a deep root so it can grow. If you've got a narrow cover over an impervious membrane, it ain't gonna grow. That's my point.

I don't think we should have it. I don't want it. And I certainly don't want any leachate run-off or anything else getting down into Rye Patch Reservoir which is in Pershing County because of it.

7:58

**Marlene Brissenden:** I am a Humboldt County resident. I will briefly discuss my concerns regarding the liner permeability, but first I'd like to thank NDEP for allowing the citizens of Humboldt County an opportunity to express their concerns regarding the Jungo Landfill.

All liners leak: not if, just when. As stated by the EPA in the Federal Register, 53 Federal Register 333 14-33422, August 30, 1988, the NDEP a letter to NorCal Waste Systems, dated March 4, 2009, also stated that the NDEP will not assume no leakage through the liner. Therefore, we must assume that ground water pollution which is illegal, will occur. It's not a question of if, just when.

Science should trump politics: follow the law. By granting Jungo Land Investments, Inc., or Nevada Land & Resources an Operating Permit, the NDEP violates its own mandate to protect the environment and citizens of Nevada. NDEP's mission and purpose is to preserve and enhance the environment of the state, to protect public health, sustain healthy ecosystems, and contribute to a vibrant economy. The permitting of the proposed Jungo Landfill accomplishes none of these goals and violates NDEP's mission and purpose. The NDEP has the power, the duty, and the obligation, to reject this

---

application. It is your duty not to issue this permit for the citizens of Humboldt County, the State of Nevada, and for future generations. Thank you.

8:02

**David Von Seggeren:** I came up from Reno tonight. I'm a member of the Sierra Club. The Sierra Club has been heavily involved in Northern Nevada for decades trying to preserve the natural resources, the wildlife, the beauty of Northern Nevada, it's a special place that's not highly developed and we'd like to keep it that way. I'm submitting written comments, so I'll keep this short. I just want to say a couple things.

I'm alarmed by pictures I've seen of water on this site. I have two pictures, one is on your website, taken right off your website, the other is almost the same camera view taken by a local photographer. We don't know how long a periods these are referring during the year, whether they occur every year, I think the extreme event might be that the entire site is covered with water, lasts for days maybe even weeks, we don't have the documentation on that. But, that's a possibility. We haven't studied it.

I'm a scientist. The science of extreme events is very interesting. It comes on with earthquakes, flooding, and it would come up in a situation like this. The extreme event, where this site is covered by water for days or weeks, I think would seriously impede the operation of this site, and would carry pollutants off-site, and that would be in violation as you know of the Permit.

So, I think one thing, we don't have enough information on how this might interfere with the operation of the site, and I think that we probably can't get that information in 30 days to make a decision on this Permit. That in itself might be a reason to deny the Permit at this time.

You know we Nevadans are pretty respectful of other playas. In the spring months, we don't go driving on playas. Well maybe, [Inaudible] got stuck in a playa once. But anyway, tell me how do they would operate heavy equipment in a situation like this where it was covered with water? I have no idea. That's one point.

The other point I want to make is that, I'm dismayed, [Inaudible], I'm dismayed by the reaction of NDEP to this Permit application. We live in the state where the entire State was behind defeating Yucca Mountain and we apparently won that battle. We left no stone unturned to try to keep the nuclear waste out of Nevada. Now it seems we haven't turned over a single stone to try to keep this garbage out of Nevada. NDEP needs to realize that 70% of the people here in this town are against this, they need to work for us, the citizens of Nevada, and not accommodate an out-of-state contractor who desires to bring toxic waste here. Thank you.

8:05

**Richard Cook:** Many of you who are opposed the proposed Jungo Landfill are primarily concerned about the feasibility of Jungo Flat to that activity. [Inaudible] elevation, ground and surface water conditions, complex soils, potential seismic activity at the Jungo site does not appear to be suitable for a Class I landfill. The evaluations of Golder

---

Associates, hired by Recology, rather than ameliorating these concerns, have increased them.

Golder has previously called their own veracity into question on this matter which sets false claims describing the desert valley as a perched basin and claiming that the prevailing winds flow East to West. I've got a USDA website here that will straighten that out for you because it's wrong on your site, too. The graphic below indicate how Golder, throughout the permit application materials, manipulates the data. We asked to have an overhead here, but we were told they didn't see why we needed one. Do you recall that conversation?

Here's this little tiny graphic, on the left we have something that looks like a bunch of amoebas swimming around, and on the right we have like a really tightly stratified, neat layers of stuff. Berger, in its USGS [Inaudible] service report 954-19, who has been pretty much ignored I think by NDEP and certainly by Golder, states in general: the basic fill deposits within the study area consist of discontinuous units and heterogeneous mixtures of [Inaudible] sand, silt and clay and as such function as a single aquifer system as represented on the left graphic, the amoebas swimming around. By extrapolating the bore-hole data over thousands of feet horizontally, represented by the right graphic, the Owner presents a picture of a perfectly stratified sub-surface structure that Berger expressly refutes. By depicting a highly-structured soil stratigraphy, the Owner can claim sub-surface stability in construction, at the same time if there's any failure of structural integrity of the landfill, cells can also claim that the [Inaudible] (living and?) continuous natural barrier of clay layers to prevent aquifer contamination.

Golder, an engineering firm paid by the outcome to get'er done, used only amateur-level geologists of little or no experience to evaluate the site. Their findings conflict with Berger's, a highly respected experienced USGS hydrologist. Berger's was a thorough unbiased scientific effort to determine the facts, while Golder was using putting lipstick on a pig.

8:08

**John Siegfried:** I have a simple comment to make. A lot of people in the audience don't have any faith in the NDEP, I do. I'm the guy that built the CYANCO plant, I've dealt with NDEP for many years. I have a lot of faith in you folks. I also have faith in Recology. I think if you decide this Permit with the caveats that were given tonight taken into consideration, I think you can come up with a proper permit. And if you issue a proper Permit, I have faith that Recology can comply with that permit. And that is what this is all about, isn't it? You guys design the permit, they comply with the permit, or else they don't. I have faith in the NDEP and I think that the audience does, also, in spite of the fact that they're a little bit callous about it tonight. I'd also like to suggest that, if you took the time to leave your homes and families and came up here to hear these comments, that I appreciate that and the audience does also.

Please take the comments into consideration when you design your Permit. Thank you.

---

8:10 **Jean McCoy:** As someone who is familiar with [the site]. I know that there are times during the winter months when the site it inundated with standing water. It is my feeling that the site design is not adequate to accommodate these seasonal events contrary to Jungo Landfill Investments' assurances and that these are not infrequent occurrences and will adversely affect the landfill cells and covered materials. According to NRS 444.560 which states the qualifications for acceptable landfill sites, there must be a 1000' distance from surface water. With the proposed construction of 6' berms, this qualification is not met. How can this problem be realistically solved even with design change? It can't. Don't issue.

8:11 **Roberta Rockwell:** I am a resident of Humboldt County. First, I thank NAG, Nevadans Against Garbage, for causing me to get involved for encouraging me to attend meetings and to find out the facts for myself. I thank the Planning Commission for the multiple meetings you had on this issue where you first brought up the concerns of environment and the safety of allowing the landfill to be built in our area. The minutes of each of your meetings showed that you would not give your approval until Recology produced a plan that satisfied those requirements. Although most folks believe this was all done behind closed doors, the public was invited, but there was no in attendance that was concerned.

I thank the Humboldt Sun for writing the first article, back in early 2006, which cause me to write a letter to the editor about two weeks after that and it was put in the Humboldt Sun. That was even before I moved to this area, so I knew of this before you folks all seem to think you did.

I thank Recology for having the open door policy, where those of us willing to have an open mind were kept up to date. You've answered questions and concerns, completely and honestly, and gave us a first-hand, hands on view of the operation.

I would again like to thank NAG. The heart of the concerns invitatives you raised helped form the plan that is before us now.

I thank Recology for addressing those issues. Environmental concerns are the backbone of your company and you realized these issues were legitimate. You found ways to address the worries of the community and [Inadubile] complaints.

Most of all, I thank NDEP for addressing each issue and writing these concerns into the requirements for the Permit. If I am not mistaken, these guidelines will be the rules for any future landfills, and I hope any mining ponds and other industrial waste areas, causing the entire state of Nevada to have a safer and cleaner environment.

I believe that this exercise has shown how, when many sides of opposing views become involved, the entire community wins. Just as the liners of this landfill are super-welded together, I hope that the cracks and chasms that have divided families and long-time friendships can be patched back together and be stronger than before. Let's look to the

---

future, move forward and build on the possibilities and opportunities this new business will create.

**Linda Trout:** My concerns have already been addressed.

8:14

**Phil Jacka:** I'm a native of Nevada for the last 66 years, and I'm totally opposed to this landfill. 10 years back of inspections every month in California of Wheatland and Pacheco Pass and all their violations, you will get that. I'm still concerned about the leachate, you haven't told us what you're doing with it, and that's the most important part of this whole thing.

In CA, they don't use the leachate there; they do have a little bit of a process on some of the locations. If they get the contamination down far enough, you can use it but it's only for dust control. They do that dust control only on the roads. All that is under liners. What they do is either tie it to a pipeline, pump it into the waste water treatment plants with nothing in between, no buildings homes or anything in between, just a straight shot right in to the plant, or they pump it into tanks in a containment area so it doesn't go anywhere, then they pump into trucks and take it to a sewer plant.

There are two experimental plants run by Waste Management at this time on the use of the leachate. They are bio-reactor landfills in California, one in (Tuvernment?) Hills in King County and at UC Davis, (Yellow Central?). Both are Waste Management landfills, and at this time are for research and study only. That's putting the leachate back on to or into it. In this case, they are pumping it into it, they drill wells down and pump it in and you need a few years to establish the landfill in order to do that. It's supposed to eat up the rest of it, but they haven't got any proof of it yet and they're still doing the research and study on it. So I need to know what you're going to with it 'cause you can't just spread it back all over the landfill out here.

You've already answered all of my other concerns. I'll be giving you a bunch of information.

March 4, 2009, Erin was written by NDEP, same print out that you have from tonight, the primary concern that NDEP has. One was unstable areas, they didn't like the idea. Earthquake area, the soils were a big concern, these soils wouldn't work, this is NDEP's saying this themselves, NDEP will not assume no leakage through the liners, and it goes on and on. 1000' away from any surface water, or 100' from the upper most aquifer (your goin with the double liner for that).

#1, all liners will leak sooner or later, and when they are installed they do have rips and holes in them. I can attest to that, at the mine out there at Phoenix Project, I did the piping on it, the collection piping pumping from up above, putting in the valves and everything else as well as the reclaim. When we got to the reclaim pond, the liner down there 60mm Battle Mountain Gold - they originally owned it -- put a leaching pad in there - this was 2005 - the pad had been put in in '86-87 - it was pulled all apart, full of holes, not even 25 years old. Also at the power plant, I worked on that, it's a copy of the

---

(Wydak [sp]) power plant in Wyoming, how many liners have they gone through since 1983? That's a question I'd like you to answer that as well.

How many of you went over to the Wheatland Project - the landfill over there? Some of you were bused over there by Recology, in June (2011), May? Inspections... They inspect landfills every month in California. I don't know why we can't do that over here with this larger landfill. (Inspection results from the Wheatland Landfill?)

January:	Stockpiling areas of concern
February:	Gas monitoring and control - violation
March:	Disposal site records - they didn't keep them up Grading and Fill services - failed to do that Gas Monitoring and Control, and it goes on and on
April:	Gas Monitoring and Litter Control Records
May:	Daily Cover Gas Monitoring
June:	Gas Monitoring and Control - violation
July:	Gas Monitoring and Control - violation

And you think that these people are going to this out here with all these violations at the other place? I don't see it.

That's another question: how often are they going to be out here to inspecting these guys? I don't want to hear once or twice a year, I want to know that you're going to be out here every month, inspecting their books and records. That needs to be done. That's enough from me.

8:24 **Mike Means:** I live in Winnemucca, 18 years. I have two quick questions.

The statewide and national budget cuts, regulations, reductions, etc., for example the Board of Regents have been considering closure of the fire academy out in Carlin, how can we be ensured a proper [Inadubile] being enforced at the Jungo Landfill site, say as a budget reductions within NDEP, will they have the manpower to properly staff the monitoring on a regular basis?

Second one, I haven't found any info on your website concerning the Railroad's plans concerning [Inaudible] sites, the routes, what kind to use, what kind cars, box cars or the double decker [Inaudible] cars. Permitting they will need to use, Federal money needed to use when derailment occurs and cleanup is needed [Inaudible], it's more of a Federal issue, [Inaudible], their spurs, their permitting [Inaudible].

8:26 **Jeannie Van Sholt:** I just want to make one statement. The only natural disaster not present at this site is a live volcano. That's all I need to say.

---

I also want to ask, you're an agency, we pay your salaries. Are we no longer a Constitutional Democracy? When you go against 73% of the voters of this County who said "No." You do not rule us, we pay your salary. You should be representing us, not Recology. Thank you.

8:27

**Benny Romo:** I've been a resident of Winnemucca for 15 years, homeowner for 8, single-parent of two. We just need to keep it simple: It isn't going work. The next 4 years, for the [Inaudible] of a that has 21 partners [Inaudible]. It's not going to work. You can have all the faith in all the people in the world, but if you don't have faith in God, it ain't gonna work.

***NDEP PIO Vince Guthreau closed the public comment period at 8:28 p.m***

###