APPENDIX E

CENSUS BUREAU DATA AS USED IN ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE ANALYSES

This appendix displays the data obtained from the U.S. Department of Commerce, Census Bureau, on populations near the proposed site of the spent nuclear fuel storage facility in Skull Valley, Utah.

The staff examined the geographic distribution of minority and low income populations within 80 km (50 miles) of the proposed facility, based on 1990 Census data. The sidebar box below discusses the types of data available from the Census Bureau. The block group data for the region of study around Skull Valley are shown in Table E.1.

Census blocks are the smallest geographic areas recognized by the U.S. Census Bureau that are bounded on all sides by visible features. A geographic **Block Group** is a cluster of blocks having the same first digit of their three-digit identifying numbers within a census tract or block numbering area. Block groups generally contain between 250 and 550 housing units, with the ideal size being 400 housing units. With some exceptions, block groups have the distinction of being the smallest geographic unit for which the U.S. Census Bureau tabulates long form (sample) data on items such as income, occupation, or education.

A block group is a statistical subdivision of a census tract. Geographic block groups never cross census tracts but may cross the boundaries of county subdivisions, places, urbanized areas, voting districts, and so forth. Tabulation block groups may be split to present data for every unique combination of county subdivision, place, and the like.

A hierarchical geographic presentation shows the geographic entities in a superior/subordinate structure in census products. Graphically, this is shown as:

```
United States
  └Region
      └Division
          └State
              └County
                  └County subdivision
                      └Place (or part)
                          └Census tract/block numbering area (or part)
                              └Block group (or part)
                                  └Block
```

Table E.1. Minority and Low Income Block Groups Within 80 km (50 mi) of the Preferred Site on the Reservation of the Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians.

Table notes: Boldface values are 20 percentage points more than the state average. Italicized values are 10 percentage points more than the state average

County and tract	Block group	Number of persons	Below poverty level (percent)	Total whites (percent)	Black (percent)	Native American (percent)	Asian and Pacific Islander (percent)	Other (percent)	Hispanic (all races) (percent)	Minorities (Racial minorities plus white hispanics) (percent)
State of Utah		1,722,850	11.4	93.9	0.6	1.4	1.9	2.1	**4.8**	**8.7**
Weber										
2104	1	1,019	4.4	98.3	0.0	0.8	0.8	0.1	2.5	5.9
Utah										
0001	1	1,224	1.1	97.7	0.0	0.2	1.4	0.7	2.0	2.8
0001	2	1,714	4.3	97.1	0.1	0.6	1.4	0.8	3.0	4.1
0001	3	586	3.3	99.7	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	1.7	2.1
0001	4	782	7.7	97.7	0.0	0.6	0.6	1.0	1.3	2.3
0001	5	1,330	8.4	98.7	0.1	0.8	0.0	0.5	0.9	3.3
0001	6	1,622	3.4	97.2	0.0	0.4	1.5	0.9	1.6	2.8
0001	7	1,148	16.4	97.6	0.3	0.4	0.9	0.8	2.5	3.9
0022	1	1,789	17.9	95.9	0.4	0.6	1.0	2.1	3.7	5.6
0101	1	1,040	2.7	99.5	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.1	1.7	1.1
0101	2	1,452	7.3	96.9	0.0	0.1	1.0	2.0	2.7	3.5
010298	2	5,417	5.3	99.0	0.1	0.2	0.5	0.3	0.7	1.5
0106	1	1,151	19.0	85.8	0.0	1.7	0.3	*12.3*	*16.2*	16.7
Tooele										
1306	1	338	15.0	72.8	0.0	**23.1**	1.8	2.4	6.2	*28.2*
1306	9	1,766	5.9	86.9	7.9	0.5	1.9	2.9	6.3	16.2
1307	1	1,099	4.7	95.8	0.8	2.0	0.1	1.3	3.7	5.1
1307	2	485	20.2	95.3	1.0	2.5	0.0	1.2	5.6	5.7
1307	3	1,057	1.8	94.7	1.2	0.9	1.7	1.5	4.0	8.2
1307	4	1,072	2.7	96.4	0.4	0.4	0.2	2.7	4.9	6.6
1307	5	381	14.5	99.5	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	10.5	14.5
1307	6	101	0.0	99.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
1307	7	457	10.0	97.2	0.0	2.8	0.0	0.0	8.3	15.0
1307	8	690	2.5	95.4	0.0	0.4	0.4	3.8	5.5	6.7
1308	1	1,460	10.9	96.0	0.1	2.6	0.1	1.2	3.6	7.7
1308	2	922	17.5	94.4	0.3	0.7	0.4	4.2	6.2	9.4
1308	3	1,490	12.7	97.3	0.0	0.5	0.8	1.4	4.6	9.1
1309	1	972	12.9	92.8	0.2	2.1	0.6	4.3	9.4	11.0
1309	2	1,175	19.4	90.2	0.2	0.9	0.9	7.8	13.9	12.8
1310	1	1,390	8.1	94.8	0.4	1.4	0.4	2.9	13.8	*20.0*
1310	2	541	15.9	94.5	1.3	0.7	1.1	2.4	10.5	10.0
1310	3	797	16.8	89.6	0.8	1.1	1.9	6.6	*16.4*	*20.5*
1310	4	898	*24.7*	86.5	0.3	1.4	0.4	11.2	*16.4*	18.3
1310	5	687	13.8	90.8	0.3	1.0	1.0	6.8	9.8	14.0
1311	1	1,194	16.7	94.4	0.8	2.1	1.1	1.7	11.1	14.7
1311	2	463	20.3	96.3	0.0	0.0	0.9	2.8	6.9	3.7
1311	3	1,124	4.1	95.3	0.0	0.5	1.5	2.7	4.5	6.6
1311	4	1,448	10.0	94.5	0.3	1.5	0.5	3.2	12.7	16.0
1312	1	518	12.7	93.4	0.2	1.4	0.2	4.8	6.9	12.8
1312	2	1,404	4.8	95.6	0.0	0.9	0.6	3.0	13.6	15.7
1312	3	1,184	2.3	96.7	0.6	0.0	1.3	1.4	7.5	7.0

Salt Lake										
100302	1	141	0.0	95.7	2.8	0.7	0.0	0.7	14.2	9.6
100303	1	178	20.2	99.4	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.0	2.2	0.6
1028	4	2,715	16.7	71.1	4.6	1.7	*13.6*	9.0	*17.0*	**37.7**
1115	1	1,356	20.4	89.3	0.7	1.4	3.7	4.9	9.4	15.9
1116	4	715	12.8	90.2	2.0	2.2	3.6	2.0	7.8	11.6
1116	5	674	14.3	87.5	2.2	1.6	3.0	5.6	9.6	15.9
1116	6	1,200	**35.5**	91.3	0.8	1.3	3.3	3.2	7.3	10.8
1121	1	784	*24.7*	94.9	0.3	2.4	1.3	1.1	9.2	*21.3*
1121	2	754	19.7	95.0	1.1	0.9	1.9	1.2	5.7	6.5
1121	3	1,119	8.3	94.4	1.4	0.2	2.6	1.4	4.2	5.6
1121	4	968	14.1	93.4	2.6	0.4	2.2	1.4	4.2	10.2
1121	5	1,888	0.4	96.8	0.9	0.2	1.0	1.1	3.5	6.5
1121	6	1,775	2.2	95.5	0.3	0.2	2.5	1.5	2.9	4.5
112201	1	2,315	9.7	95.6	0.6	0.9	0.6	2.3	5.6	8.2
112201	2	1,748	0.5	95.7	0.2	0.2	1.8	2.1	5.0	7.0
112201	3	602	0.0	96.5	0.2	0.2	0.2	3.0	6.1	5.8
112202	1	1,517	13.5	96.0	0.2	0.5	2.3	1.0	2.8	8.0
112202	2	985	8.2	94.6	0.3	1.6	1.3	2.1	4.7	7.5
112202	3	898	1.8	95.8	0.6	0.6	2.2	0.9	2.8	5.0
112301	3	1,463	1.6	96.2	0.3	0.5	2.5	0.4	2.7	5.9
112302	2	902	5.6	97.0	0.7	0.6	0.7	1.1	3.0	8.1
112302	3	1,981	0.5	97.8	0.3	0.1	1.0	0.9	3.2	2.6
112401	1	1,622	12.8	91.7	0.4	1.2	2.7	4.1	7.0	9.7
112401	2	1,620	14.8	90.4	0.4	0.6	1.3	7.3	12.0	12.8
112401	3	613	13.8	68.2	0.3	2.6	2.9	**25.9**	**37.4**	**50.2**
112401	4	1,657	**36.3**	82.6	0.7	3.2	2.3	11.2	**26.0**	**29.0**
112401	5	995	**52.0**	70.8	1.0	2.9	9.2	*16.1*	**31.9**	**51.6**
112402	1	1,179	7.9	92.8	0.1	0.6	1.3	5.3	12.8	11.1
112402	2	1,016	19.9	93.7	0.0	0.0	4.0	2.3	5.0	6.8
112402	3	2,218	15.8	87.4	0.1	0.2	7.8	4.5	10.1	*18.9*
112402	4	1,065	*25.1*	91.5	0.1	2.3	3.8	2.2	6.4	10.5
112501	2	1,492	1.6	97.5	0.2	0.1	1.4	0.9	3.5	5.9
112501	3	1,360	2.3	95.7	0.1	0.4	2.1	1.7	5.1	5.7
112503	1	978	8.8	94.7	0.7	0.2	0.8	3.6	8.9	9.5
112503	2	1,077	9.7	93.5	0.1	1.3	3.2	1.9	5.7	13.4
112503	3	968	16.2	95.5	0.3	1.3	1.0	1.9	5.1	8.7
112503	4	648	4.8	96.8	0.0	0.0	0.5	2.8	9.0	14.0
112604	1	1,493	10.0	97.3	0.3	0.3	1.6	0.5	3.2	4.1
112604	2	1,649	7.1	97.8	0.2	0.4	0.2	1.3	4.8	7.9
112604	3	1,054	0.9	98.3	0.0	0.0	0.6	1.1	3.0	2.8
112604	4	1,079	7.3	94.1	0.2	1.1	2.2	2.4	4.0	6.4
112605	1	1,563	0.3	96.7	0.2	0.6	2.0	0.5	3.6	5.1
112605	2	931	2.4	95.8	0.0	0.8	1.4	2.0	3.5	4.2
112605	3	1,074	13.0	93.1	0.2	0.3	5.5	0.9	2.8	10.3
112605	4	1,020	20.9	91.1	0.0	1.9	3.8	3.2	7.4	11.9
112610	1	1,122	6.7	95.5	0.4	0.4	2.9	0.8	6.0	10.0
112610	2	1,004	5.7	98.1	0.0	0.3	0.9	0.7	3.7	3.1
112610	3	1,349	7.2	93.7	0.4	0.7	3.3	1.9	4.6	7.7
112611	2	2,327	6.2	96.9	0.3	0.3	1.2	1.2	2.6	5.8
112612	1	1,896	3.0	96.7	0.3	0.3	1.7	0.9	2.2	5.5
112612	2	1,519	4.0	97.0	0.3	0.0	1.6	1.1	3.3	5.5
1127	1	717	1.4	95.8	0.3	0.1	2.6	1.1	5.3	6.3
1127	2	1,015	9.0	97.7	0.2	0.2	0.4	1.5	4.1	3.2
1127	3	1,403	20.9	91.6	0.1	0.6	3.2	4.4	7.5	9.4
1127	4	1,077	11.3	96.9	0.0	0.2	1.1	1.8	4.4	4.5
1127	5	690	5.9	96.8	0.0	0.0	2.0	1.2	4.3	4.8
112801	1	1,294	12.5	95.1	0.1	0.2	4.1	0.5	2.3	5.5
112801	2	1,962	4.7	98.0	0.1	0.3	1.1	0.6	1.1	2.7

112801	3	1,471	10.0	97.6	0.3	0.8	0.5	0.8	2.6	2.4
112801	4	3,311	0.5	82.5	6.6	2.4	1.5	7.0	*14.8*	*25.7*
112801	5	2,042	12.2	99.4	0.0	0.4	0.1	0.0	1.2	1.7
112802	1	1,295	6.1	95.7	0.7	0.0	2.2	1.4	4.1	8.0
112802	2	1,895	11.1	96.7	0.3	0.0	1.3	1.7	3.5	5.9
112802	3	2,609	3.0	94.6	0.0	0.8	3.4	1.2	2.8	8.2
112802	4	1,855	1.8	97.8	0.0	0.0	1.7	0.5	2.0	3.2
112804	1	2,894	2.2	98.2	0.3	0.1	0.7	0.6	2.9	5.1
112804	2	2,835	3.0	97.8	0.3	0.3	1.1	0.5	2.0	2.9
112805	1	2,601	2.6	97.8	0.3	0.2	1.1	0.6	3.0	5.2
112805	2	979	0.0	98.0	0.1	0.4	0.2	1.3	3.2	4.6
112806	6	2,213	0.7	97.8	0.2	0.0	1.9	0.1	2.3	2.6
112904	1	1,199	0.0	93.1	1.7	0.1	2.4	2.8	5.7	8.8
112904	2	1,830	2.6	94.6	0.2	0.3	1.7	3.2	5.4	10.0
112904	3	2,445	5.5	92.3	0.6	0.3	2.3	4.5	9.0	10.6
112905	1	2,132	0.5	95.6	0.7	0.9	1.3	1.5	3.8	7.0
112905	2	1,399	3.8	98.1	0.4	0.1	0.9	0.5	3.1	4.8
112905	3	1,099	6.6	95.3	0.0	1.9	1.6	1.2	2.6	6.7
112906	1	2,770	0.8	95.9	0.2	0.4	0.7	2.8	5.2	4.1
112906	2	2,374	5.2	95.2	0.1	0.1	0.9	3.6	6.2	7.9
112906	3	2,821	4.9	95.0	0.5	0.2	1.7	2.6	6.3	11.2
112907	1	986	3.3	94.7	0.0	0.5	2.5	2.2	5.0	8.5
112907	2	817	0.7	97.1	0.0	0.0	1.2	1.7	6.5	10.6
112907	3	1,390	13.2	89.3	0.0	1.8	3.9	5.0	7.4	11.2
112907	4	1,941	8.5	89.9	0.2	0.9	3.5	5.6	9.2	16.3
112908	1	1,215	2.7	96.2	0.2	0.7	2.0	0.8	3.0	3.8
112908	2	1,991	13.9	92.9	0.3	1.1	2.2	3.5	7.2	9.4
112908	3	560	1.2	95.9	0.0	0.9	0.4	2.9	5.2	12.9
112908	4	1,219	**31.8**	91.4	0.4	0.5	4.4	3.3	9.8	11.8
112908	5	828	8.6	91.8	0.0	0.2	2.9	5.1	11.7	19.4
112909	1	1,081	7.4	91.8	0.2	0.6	0.6	6.9	9.5	8.9
112909	2	2,210	1.7	93.4	0.6	0.5	2.4	3.1	6.3	10.1
112909	3	2,519	11.4	90.1	0.7	1.0	2.1	6.2	10.8	14.2
112910	1	1,127	5.3	95.1	0.5	0.4	2.7	1.2	2.3	5.6
112910	2	1,566	12.0	91.6	0.1	0.8	2.4	5.2	6.6	11.7
112910	3	1,371	4.9	96.4	0.5	0.1	0.4	2.6	6.1	5.3
112911	1	911	3.1	94.1	0.1	0.4	3.3	2.1	6.1	10.6
112911	2	1,477	3.8	98.7	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.7	3.0	1.8
112911	3	1,413	3.1	97.8	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.7	4.0	6.7
113003	1	1,128	2.5	98.1	0.0	0.0	0.6	1.2	2.8	4.9
113003	2	2,552	1.6	96.3	0.1	0.2	1.4	2.0	3.6	4.1
113003	3	959	1.2	99.5	0.0	0.4	0.1	0.0	0.7	0.5
113004	1	1,905	6.3	98.3	0.1	0.1	0.7	0.9	1.9	3.5
113004	2	1,807	3.3	98.1	0.0	0.2	1.4	0.3	1.5	6.2
113004	3	1,752	3.6	97.8	0.1	0.4	0.7	1.0	1.9	2.8
113004	4	1,612	1.1	99.4	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.7	0.6
113005	1	1,897	0.3	97.8	0.1	0.3	0.7	1.2	4.0	5.4
113005	2	1,463	5.5	97.3	0.0	0.0	1.1	1.6	3.1	3.2
113005	3	1,247	7.2	98.6	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.9	3.7	1.4
113005	4	570	0.9	98.9	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.7	2.3	3.5
113006	1	893	12.7	99.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.9	1.5	3.0
113006	2	1,101	3.2	96.4	0.0	0.0	1.0	2.6	3.8	3.6
113006	3	1,565	7.5	99.2	0.0	0.4	0.1	0.3	1.0	0.8
113006	4	1,423	0.9	97.3	0.2	0.2	1.3	1.0	2.2	3.0
113006	5	1,313	3.7	99.5	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.5	2.7	3.8
1131	1	2,465	11.1	93.3	0.1	1.5	2.8	2.3	7.4	9.8
1131	2	1,693	2.5	96.5	0.5	0.3	2.0	0.7	2.5	5.0
1131	3	2,150	8.7	94.3	0.0	1.3	1.8	2.6	5.6	11.5
1131	4	631	5.6	97.0	0.0	0.2	1.6	1.3	7.1	7.1

1131	5	1,233	*24.3*	98.3	0.4	0.5	0.1	0.7	2.6	3.5
113304	1	1,154	7.1	92.8	0.8	0.3	2.0	4.2	8.7	12.3
113304	2	882	**32.0**	87.9	1.2	1.7	2.3	6.9	12.2	14.1
113304	3	835	10.0	96.5	0.4	0.6	1.4	1.1	5.7	3.9
113304	4	1,328	7.9	92.2	0.3	0.2	3.0	4.2	6.9	12.9
113304	5	1,778	**31.5**	84.1	1.3	2.5	7.5	4.6	8.5	*21.1*
113304	6	1,345	7.4	91.7	1.5	1.3	3.7	1.9	4.3	10.3
113305	1	1,397	*23.1*	83.7	3.3	2.3	4.9	5.8	13.1	*21.8*
113305	2	839	13.4	89.6	0.5	5.5	2.6	1.8	5.1	13.9
113305	3	1,174	**53.7**	57.4	0.8	10.7	**26.0**	5.1	7.8	**46.5**
113305	4	1,193	10.8	88.9	1.7	1.7	3.7	4.1	9.6	18.3
113306	1	1,855	*23.0*	85.3	3.3	1.2	5.0	5.2	9.6	*20.6*
113306	2	2,713	9.6	88.8	1.4	0.7	4.7	4.4	6.9	13.4
113307	1	740	15.6	88.4	1.9	2.0	2.6	5.1	7.6	17.0
113307	2	1,469	*21.9*	84.9	0.9	1.6	7.6	5.0	8.2	17.8
113307	3	1,055	9.2	88.7	0.6	0.7	7.8	2.3	7.1	14.8
113307	4	673	7.8	88.3	2.2	0.4	4.6	4.5	9.2	12.8
113308	1	974	*23.6*	83.8	1.4	4.0	3.6	7.2	11.9	*20.9*
113308	2	1,558	20.8	95.5	0.7	0.9	2.3	0.6	5.7	10.0
113308	3	1,263	*25.5*	87.6	0.9	3.4	6.1	2.0	9.5	18.2
113402	1	1,948	1.4	95.5	1.1	0.1	2.1	1.2	4.7	10.6
113402	2	1,315	13.7	91.1	0.4	0.2	4.3	4.0	8.2	10.4
113402	3	1,415	5.8	89.3	0.5	0.6	6.5	3.2	5.2	12.6
113402	4	967	10.1	91.5	0.6	0.9	3.5	3.4	6.7	11.3
113402	5	1,299	1.7	92.1	0.5	0.6	2.3	4.5	6.1	9.2
113403	1	1,102	8.2	86.9	0.2	0.2	10.4	2.3	6.3	14.5
113403	2	1,291	8.6	93.3	1.2	0.2	3.0	2.3	4.8	10.7
113403	3	2,122	2.3	93.9	0.7	0.1	2.7	2.6	6.7	10.1
113403	4	1,406	9.0	95.8	0.4	0.4	1.3	2.1	4.3	5.2
113405	1	2,763	4.7	81.0	1.0	0.8	*13.0*	4.2	7.5	*22.8*
113406	1	1,983	12.8	90.2	1.0	2.0	2.6	4.2	7.4	11.0
113406	2	1,926	21.2	84.5	0.9	1.8	7.9	4.8	8.7	*21.0*
113406	3	1,614	11.0	89.0	0.7	0.6	7.0	2.7	6.9	13.1
113407	1	997	3.5	96.0	0.1	0.3	2.0	1.6	5.6	4.7
113407	2	699	19.6	90.4	0.3	1.0	1.9	6.4	12.4	*23.9*
113408	1	2,173	5.7	95.5	0.1	0.6	1.5	2.3	6.4	7.5
113408	2	2,156	9.4	93.6	0.3	0.5	2.2	3.4	7.4	12.0
113408	3	1,670	16.2	94.6	0.4	0.0	1.9	3.1	5.3	6.3
113409	1	1,552	7.7	97.7	0.5	0.3	0.6	0.9	3.3	3.5
113409	2	1,812	6.0	96.2	0.4	0.9	1.3	1.2	6.0	5.4
113409	3	1,594	6.4	93.9	0.5	0.9	1.8	2.9	6.7	9.4
113505	1	1,213	5.6	94.9	0.2	0.1	2.1	2.7	4.4	5.6
113505	2	1,762	19.2	90.1	0.7	1.3	3.4	4.4	10.3	16.4
113505	3	1,914	5.7	93.8	0.1	0.3	2.4	3.4	5.7	7.0
113505	4	1,412	15.4	93.6	1.6	0.5	2.0	2.4	7.8	13.2
113509	1	1,437	14.8	92.7	1.1	4.4	0.7	1.1	6.1	11.1
113509	2	1,105	17.1	88.3	1.2	1.8	4.9	3.8	8.1	16.0
113510	1	1,448	16.4	93.5	0.2	1.4	3.5	1.4	6.3	12.2
113510	2	1,027	11.1	93.9	0.1	0.7	2.9	2.4	4.7	6.1
113510	3	664	21.3	88.6	2.3	4.5	2.0	2.7	5.3	16.3
113511	1	2,293	8.0	91.1	1.3	0.7	4.9	2.0	6.2	13.2
113511	2	1,600	8.5	92.1	0.4	0.4	6.1	1.0	4.9	8.9
113512	1	2,492	8.2	90.1	1.6	0.9	5.3	2.2	6.8	15.6
113513	1	1,288	5.5	95.7	0.3	0.3	2.3	1.4	5.3	11.4
113513	2	1,039	4.2	93.5	0.3	0.8	4.2	1.3	4.4	9.8
113513	3	1,080	11.6	90.6	0.8	0.8	3.7	4.0	9.6	14.2
113513	4	1,850	8.1	95.0	0.8	0.4	1.5	2.3	4.4	5.4
113514	1	959	4.3	96.5	0.7	0.4	1.0	1.4	7.3	5.2
113514	2	3,032	8.4	93.2	1.0	1.3	1.4	3.1	5.7	9.2

113515	1	1,335	5.3	98.3	0.1	0.2	1.0	0.4	1.9	3.3
113515	2	1,350	8.4	96.4	0.4	0.2	1.5	1.6	4.2	10.3
113515	3	1,168	7.0	93.8	1.1	1.2	1.7	2.2	8.1	14.8
113516	1	2,093	1.6	94.0	0.5	0.3	2.4	2.9	5.9	8.5
113516	2	3,319	6.0	94.8	0.5	0.8	1.6	2.3	5.7	8.7
113517	1	1,390	6.5	94.2	0.4	1.2	3.5	0.8	6.0	8.4
113517	2	1,525	4.6	94.2	0.3	0.5	2.3	2.8	7.7	11.5
113517	3	2,298	8.4	93.3	0.2	0.7	1.9	3.9	8.2	12.7
113517	4	1,964	5.0	93.7	0.3	0.8	2.2	3.0	6.6	8.5
113518	1	1,036	0.0	96.8	0.1	0.0	2.8	0.3	2.6	4.0
113518	2	2,355	5.5	94.8	0.3	1.6	1.4	2.0	7.1	6.9
113518	3	2,317	8.3	95.3	0.0	0.0	0.9	3.7	6.1	8.8
113518	4	2,921	9.3	94.5	0.4	0.3	2.0	2.8	5.6	10.6
113519	1	1,834	5.4	93.7	0.2	0.5	3.7	1.9	4.9	7.2
113519	2	1,990	7.4	95.0	1.2	0.2	2.4	1.3	6.4	12.2
113519	3	1,960	11.5	90.7	0.7	0.7	2.6	5.4	9.5	12.2
113519	4	1,552	*23.3*	91.3	1.5	1.0	1.3	4.8	10.4	14.2
113520	1	584	8.3	92.3	1.5	0.3	1.9	3.9	6.7	7.7
113520	2	2,074	3.2	94.2	0.6	0.3	3.7	1.3	3.7	7.9
113520	3	1,438	6.0	90.5	1.8	1.2	3.4	3.1	8.7	18.0
113521	1	2,016	6.6	92.1	0.6	0.5	2.6	4.1	8.4	9.3
113521	2	1,586	3.3	91.9	1.1	0.3	5.0	1.6	5.2	11.0
113521	3	2,555	4.7	93.0	0.8	0.6	2.4	3.2	7.2	13.2
113522	1	1,216	0.3	90.0	0.8	0.5	4.3	4.4	6.8	12.7
113522	2	2,030	1.6	95.4	0.3	0.3	1.9	2.1	4.4	7.1
113523	1	2,472	5.5	91.2	1.0	0.2	5.6	2.0	6.2	12.1
113523	2	3,886	9.1	93.8	0.3	0.7	2.4	2.9	6.7	9.1
113524	1	962	5.0	97.0	0.4	0.0	0.2	2.4	4.4	5.4
113524	2	1,253	4.5	97.0	0.2	0.5	1.6	0.8	4.0	9.5
113524	3	1,114	9.6	96.1	0.3	0.4	1.3	1.9	3.5	5.9
113524	4	1,832	4.4	94.4	0.3	0.2	2.4	2.7	5.2	8.2
113524	5	2,274	1.1	92.5	0.4	0.6	3.9	2.6	5.3	7.7
1136	1	1,269	8.1	95.5	0.2	1.7	2.0	0.6	7.9	10.9
1136	2	917	4.3	96.0	0.0	1.6	1.6	0.8	9.4	15.5
1136	3	1,278	12.4	94.2	0.8	1.3	2.0	1.7	8.0	12.9
1136	4	1,181	18.8	95.7	0.5	0.8	0.1	3.0	9.7	10.3
1137	1	1,024	15.4	93.2	0.0	1.1	2.6	3.1	7.7	7.7
1137	2	1,655	7.7	93.7	0.1	0.1	4.0	2.0	7.1	17.5
1137	3	1,454	18.4	97.0	0.8	0.8	0.3	1.2	9.6	9.9
1137	4	2,537	9.4	96.5	0.4	0.5	1.8	0.9	6.4	8.3
113801	1	2,266	9.3	92.9	0.4	0.7	4.6	1.3	6.2	10.4
113801	2	1,589	14.3	92.2	0.4	0.6	4.8	2.0	5.9	14.7
113801	3	1,037	10.4	94.0	0.6	0.7	3.6	1.2	6.6	8.8
113801	4	1,154	11.8	93.7	0.5	1.0	1.9	2.9	8.3	12.2
113802	1	1,328	16.6	94.7	1.0	1.5	0.5	2.4	10.2	12.9
113802	2	1,476	17.6	93.4	0.8	0.3	2.0	3.5	13.1	19.7
113802	3	635	18.5	96.9	1.1	0.6	0.5	0.9	7.2	4.1
113803	1	2,266	13.7	93.9	0.2	0.8	3.9	1.3	6.1	9.5
113803	2	2,090	5.1	94.1	0.0	1.1	3.5	1.3	6.2	10.7
113901	1	798	10.7	91.6	0.0	5.1	0.8	2.5	10.0	10.3
113901	2	872	8.3	92.5	1.1	0.6	1.9	3.8	7.7	7.5
113901	3	1,636	**31.7**	90.6	0.9	0.4	2.8	5.3	*15.6*	*23.4*
113901	4	1,657	9.6	95.7	0.4	0.4	0.3	3.2	9.3	12.6
113903	1	1,526	5.8	96.3	0.5	0.4	1.3	1.5	5.6	9.7
113903	2	1,556	19.8	93.0	0.5	1.7	1.8	3.0	10.9	11.8
113904	1	1,240	4.1	96.6	0.2	0.3	1.0	1.9	7.4	8.3
113904	2	819	2.6	95.0	0.1	0.4	1.1	3.4	7.9	11.5
113904	3	1,265	9.9	93.0	0.9	0.5	1.0	4.5	7.7	8.9
113904	4	1,267	4.8	95.8	0.0	0.6	0.9	2.7	6.2	7.7

113905	1	1,653	13.1	95.9	0.4	0.3	0.5	2.8	7.0	9.6
113905	2	1,473	3.6	93.6	0.5	0.2	1.8	3.8	7.0	10.2
113905	3	923	3.4	95.6	0.0	1.6	2.0	0.9	4.8	8.3
113905	4	1,156	15.3	92.6	0.6	0.8	3.2	2.8	7.1	8.7
Juab										
9732	1	600	14.0	99.5	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.8
9732	2	191	20.7	73.8	0.0	*18.8*	0.0	7.3	7.9	*26.2*
Davis										
125401	2	959	5.3	97.8	0.0	0.3	1.7	0.2	2.2	5.8
125402	3	869	0.0	96.8	0.5	0.5	1.2	1.2	4.5	3.2
Box Elder										
9601	2	1,083	11.6	95.6	0.0	0.4	0.8	3.2	6.1	7.9
9601	3	405	11.2	98.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	1.7	2.5	2.0

APPENDIX F

SITE SELECTION/EVALUATION FORMS

This appendix displays copies of the evaluation forms used by Private Fuel Storage, L.L.C., (PFS) in the process of identifying a site for the proposed spent nuclear fuel storage facility. Thirty-six sites (as shown in Table F.1) were subjected to initial screening. The characteristics of these sites are shown in Exhibits F.1 through F.38.

Exhibits F.39 to F.41 show the responses to a survey developed by PFS and sent to representatives of the three final candidate sites. PFS's site selection process identified the Reservation of the Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians (i.e., site number 3 in Table F.1) as the preferred site for the proposed project.

Table F.1. Potential host sites considered for the proposed PFSF

No.	Potential host site	No.	Potential host site
01	Mescalero Reservation (Lower Three Rivers Site); New Mexico	20	Northern Arapaho; Wyoming
02	Mescalero Reservation (Ranch House Site); New Mexico	21	Ponca Tribe; Oklahoma
03	Goshute Tribe; Skull Valley, Utah	22	Prairie Island Sioux; Minnesota
04	Santee Sioux; Knox County, Nebraska	23	Sac & Fox Nation; Oklahoma
05	Absentee Shawnee; Oklahoma	24	San Juan County; Utah
06	Akhoik Kaguyak Tribe; Alaska	25	Tetlin Indian Reservation; Tetlin, Alaska
07	Alabama-Quassarte Tribe (Creek); Oklahoma	26	Tonkawa Tribe; Oklahoma
08	Apache County; Arizona	27	Ute Mountain Ute Tribe; Colorado
09	Apache Development Authority; Oklahoma	28	Yakama Indian Nation; Washington
10	NEW Corporation; Fremont County, Wyoming	29	City of Caliente & Lincoln County; Nevada
11	United Nuclear Corporation; New Mexico	30	U.S. Fuel and Security Service Group, Pacific Atoll (Palmyra Island); U.S. Protectorate
12	Caddo Tribe; Oklahoma	31	Barnwell; South Carolina
13	Chickasaw Nation; Oklahoma	32	Hanford; Richland, Washington
14	Eastern Shawnee; Oklahoma	33	Fort Wingate Army Depot; Gallup, New Mexico
15	Fifield Development Corp.; Fifield, Wisconsin	34	Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, Whiteshell Laboratories; Manitoba, Canada
16	Fort McDermitt Paiute Shoshone Tribe; Nevada	35	TGM, Inc.; White Sands, New Mexico
17	Grant County; North Dakota	36	Area 25, Nuclear Test Site; Nevada
18	Lower Brule Sioux; South Dakota	37	LADO Ranch; Texas
19	Miami Tribe; Oklahoma	38	Andrews County; Texas

Source: Table 8.1-1, PFS/ER 2001

Exhibit F.1

FUEL STORAGE SITE PROPOSAL INITIAL SCREENING
MESCALERO RESERVATION LOWER THREE RIVERS SITE
SITE # 001
New Mexico

TRANSPORTATION
Within 25 miles of mainline railroad ? Yes

Railroad on site ? No

Site access to one or more highways ? Yes

SEISMIC
At least two miles from capable fault ? No

At least five miles from capable fault, no faults on-site ? No

Ground accelerations within envelope of existing running plant ? Yes

Ground accelerations .5g or less and within existing vendor design criteria ? No

FLOODING
Above 100 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Yes

Above 300 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Yes

HOST
Has sovereign immunity ? Yes

Does not require Federal Land transfer ? Yes

Is a Tribe or community of less than 4000 population ? Yes

Is a Tribe or community of less than 500 population ? No

Is providing a site for lease or at a reasonable cost within jurisdiction ? No

Is providing a site with at least two 150 acre locations within a 5000 acre area ? No

Is providing a site with population density below 25/square mile within 2 miles of the site ? Yes

Is providing a site free of known historical sites, major recreational areas and endangered species ? Yes

PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE
Is an area free of a history of pro-active antinuclear referenda ? Yes

Has a vote of host population on record in support of the facility ? Yes

Has a resolution of the governing body on record in favor of the facility ? Yes

ANY UNIQUE FINDINGS Two votes, second passed. DOE Round 2 grant used.

REASON FOR REJECTION **Capable seismic fault on site.**

Exhibit F.2

FUEL STORAGE SITE PROPOSAL INITIAL SCREENING
MESCALERO RESERVATION RANCH HOUSE SITE
SITE # 002
New Mexico

TRANSPORTATION
Within 25 miles of mainline railroad ? Yes

Railroad on site ? No

Site access to one or more highways ? Yes

SEISMIC
At least two miles from capable fault? Yes

At least five miles from capable fault, no faults on-site ? No

Ground accelerations within envelope of existing running plant ? Yes

Ground accelerations .5g or less and within existing vendor design criteria ? Yes

FLOODING
Above 100 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Yes

Above 300 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Yes

HOST
Has sovereign immunity ? Yes

Does not require Federal Land transfer ? Yes

Is a Tribe or community of less than 4000 population ? Yes

Is a Tribe or community of less than 500 population ? No

Is providing a site for lease or at a reasonable cost within jurisdiction ? No

Is providing a site with at least two 150 acre locations within a 5000 acre area ? No

Is providing a site with population density below 25/square mile within 2 miles of the site ? Yes

Is providing a site free of known historical sites, major recreational areas and endangered species ? Yes

PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE
Is an area free of a history of pro-active antinuclear referenda ? Yes

Has a vote of host population on record in support of the facility ? Yes

Has a resolution of the governing body on record in favor of the facility ? Yes

ANY UNIQUE FINDINGS Two votes, second passed. DOE Round 2 grant used.

REASON FOR REJECTION **Unable to negotiate contract with Tribe.**

Exhibit F.3

FUEL STORAGE SITE PROPOSAL INITIAL SCREENING
GOSHUTE RESERVATION
SITE # 003
Utah

TRANSPORTATION
Within 25 miles of mainline railroad ? Yes

Railroad on site ? No

Site access to one or more highways ? Yes

SEISMIC
At least two miles from capable fault ? Yes - USGS

At least five miles from capable fault, no faults on-site ? Yes - USGS

Ground accelerations within envelope of existing running plant ? Yes - DOE

Ground accelerations .5g or less and within existing vendor design criteria ? Yes - DOE

FLOODING
Above 100 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Yes - DOE

Above 300 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

HOST
Has sovereign immunity ? Yes

Does not require Federal Land transfer ? Yes

Is a Tribe or community of less than 4000 population ? Yes

Is a Tribe or community of less than 500 population ? Yes

Is providing a site for lease or at a reasonable cost within jurisdiction ? Yes

Is providing a site with at least two 150 acre locations within a 5000 acre area ? Yes

Is providing a site with population density below 25/square mile within 2 miles of the site ? Yes

Is providing a site free of known historical sites, major recreational areas and endangered species ? Yes - DOE

PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE
Is an area free of a history of pro-active antinuclear referenda ? Yes

Has a vote of host population on record in support of the facility ? Yes

Has a resolution of the governing body on record in favor of the facility ? Yes

ANY UNIQUE FINDINGS Low haul on County Road used for hazardous materials best approach. County favors project due to closing of nearby military base. DOE Phase IIB Applied for 8/93.

REASON FOR REJECTION NA

Exhibit F.4

FUEL STORAGE SITE PROPOSAL INITIAL SCREENING
SANTEE SIOUX
SITE # 004
Nebraska

TRANSPORTATION
Within 25 miles of mainline railroad ? Yes

Railroad on site ? No

Site access to one or more highways ? Unknown

SEISMIC
At least two miles from capable fault ? Unknown

At least five miles from capable fault, no faults on-site ? Unknown

Ground accelerations within envelope of existing running plant ? Unknwon

Ground accelerations .5g or less and within existing vendor design criteria ? Unknown

FLOODING
Above 100 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Yes

Above 300 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Yes

HOST
Has sovereign immunity ? Yes

Does not require Federal Land transfer ? Yes

Is a Tribe or community of less than 4000 population ? Yes

Is a Tribe or community of less than 500 population ? Yes

Is providing a site for lease or at a reasonable cost within jurisdiction ? Yes

Is providing a site with at least two 150 acre locations within a 5000 acre area ? Unknown

Is providing a site with population density below 25/square mile within 2 miles of the site ? Yes

Is providing a site free of known historical sites, major recreational areas and endangered species ? Unknown

PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE
Is an area free of a history of pro-active antinuclear referenda ? Yes

Has a vote of host population on record in support of the facility ? Unknown

Has a resolution of the governing body on record in favor of the facility ? No

ANY UNIQUE FINDINGS

REASON FOR REJECTION

Exhibit F.5

FUEL STORAGE SITE PROPOSAL INITIAL SCREENING
ABSENTEE SHAWNEE
SITE # 005
Oklahoma

TRANSPORTATION
Within 25 miles of mainline railroad ? Unknown

Railroad on site ? Unknown

Site access to one or more highways ? Unknown

SEISMIC
At least two miles from capable fault ? Unknown

At least five miles from capable fault, no faults on-site ? Unknown

Ground accelerations within envelope of existing running plant ? Unknown

Ground accelerations .5g or less and within existing vendor design criteria ? Unknown

FLOODING
Above 100 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

Above 300 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

HOST
Has sovereign immunity ? Unknown

Does not require Federal Land transfer ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 4000 population ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 500 population ? Unknown

Is providing a site for lease or at a reasonable cost within jurisdiction ? Unknown

Is providing a site with at least two 150 acre locations within a 5000 acre area ? Unknown

Is providing a site with population density below 25/square mile within 2 miles of the site ? Unknown

Is providing a site free of known historical sites, major recreational areas and endangered species ? Unknown

PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE
Is an area free of a history of pro-active antinuclear referenda ? Unknown

Has a vote of host population on record in support of the facility ? Unknown

Has a resolution of the governing body on record in favor of the facility ? Unknown

ANY UNIQUE FINDINGS

REASON FOR REJECTION **DOE Applied Phase I 3/31/92, withdrew 6/9/92.**

Exhibit F.6

FUEL STORAGE SITE PROPOSAL INITIAL SCREENING
AKHIOK KAGUYAK TRIBE
SITE # 006
Arkansas

TRANSPORTATION
Within 25 miles of mainline railroad ? Unknown

Railroad on site ? Unknown

Site access to one or more highways ? Unknown

SEISMIC
At least two miles from capable fault ? Unknown

At least five miles from capable fault, no faults on-site ? Unknown

Ground accelerations within envelope of existing running plant ? Unknown

Ground accelerations .5g or less and within existing vendor design criteria ? Unknown

FLOODING
Above 100 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

Above 300 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

HOST
Has sovereign immunity ? Unknown

Does not require Federal Land transfer ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 4000 population ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 500 population ? Unknown

Is providing a site for lease or at a reasonable cost within jurisdiction ? Unknown

Is providing a site with at least two 150 acre locations within a 5000 acre area ? Unknown

Is providing a site with population density below 25/square mile within 2 miles of the site ? Unknown

Is providing a site free of known historical sites, major recreational areas and endangered species ? Unknown

PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE
Is an area free of a history of pro-active antinuclear referenda ? Unknown

Has a vote of host population on record in support of the facility ? Unknown

Has a resolution of the governing body on record in favor of the facility ? Unknown

ANY UNIQUE FINDINGS

REASON FOR REJECTION **DOE Applied Phase I 3/31/92, denied 6/92.**

Exhibit F.7

FUEL STORAGE SITE PROPOSAL INITIAL SCREENING
ALABAMA QUASSARTE TRIBE (CREEK)
SITE # 007
Oklahoma

TRANSPORTATION
Within 25 miles of mainline railroad ? Unknown

Railroad on site ? Unknown

Site access to one or more highways ? Unknown

SEISMIC
At least two miles from capable fault ? Unknown

At least five miles from capable fault, no faults on-site ? Unknown

Ground accelerations within envelope of existing running plant ? Unknown

Ground accelerations .5g or less and within existing vendor design criteria ? Unknown

FLOODING
Above 100 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

Above 300 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

HOST
Has sovereign immunity ? Unknown

Does not require Federal Land transfer ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 4000 population ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 500 population ? Unknown

Is providing a site for lease or at a reasonable cost within jurisdiction ? Unknown

Is providing a site with at least two 150 acre locations within a 5000 acre area ? Unknown

Is providing a site with population density below 25/square mile within 2 miles of the site ? Unknown

Is providing a site free of known historical sites, major recreational areas and endangered species ? Unknown

PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE
Is an area free of a history of pro-active antinuclear referenda ? Unknown

Has a vote of host population on record in support of the facility ? Unknown

Has a resolution of the governing body on record in favor of the facility ? Unknown

ANY UNIQUE FINDINGS

REASON FOR REJECTION **DOE Applied Phase I 3/28/92, withdrawn 2/24/93.**

Exhibit F.8

FUEL STORAGE SITE PROPOSAL INITIAL SCREENING
APACHE COUNTY
SITE # 008
Arizona

TRANSPORTATION
Within 25 miles of mainline railroad ? Unknown

Railroad on site ? Unknown

Site access to one or more highways ? Unknown

SEISMIC
At least two miles from capable fault ? Unknown

At least five miles from capable fault, no faults on-site ? Unknown

Ground accelerations within envelope of existing running plant ? Unknown

Ground accelerations .5g or less and within existing vendor design criteria ? Unknown

FLOODING
Above 100 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

Above 300 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

HOST
Has sovereign immunity ? Unknown

Does not require Federal Land transfer ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 4000 population ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 500 population ? Unknown

Is providing a site for lease or at a reasonable cost within jurisdiction ? Unknown

Is providing a site with at least two 150 acre locations within a 5000 acre area ? Unknown

Is providing a site with population density below 25/square mile within 2 miles of the site ? Unknown

Is providing a site free of known historical sites, major recreational areas and endangered species ? Unknown

PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE
Is an area free of a history of pro-active antinuclear referenda ? Unknown

Has a vote of host population on record in support of the facility ? Unknown

Has a resolution of the governing body on record in favor of the facility ? Unknown

ANY UNIQUE FINDINGS

REASON FOR REJECTION **DOE Applied Phase I 3/18/92, denied 10/28/92.**

Exhibit F.9

FUEL STORAGE SITE PROPOSAL INITIAL SCREENING
APACHE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
SITE # 009
Oklahoma

TRANSPORTATION
Within 25 miles of mainline railroad ? Unknown

Railroad on site ? Unknown

Site access to one or more highways ? Unknown

SEISMIC
At least two miles from capable fault ? Unknown

At least five miles from capable fault, no faults on-site ? Unknown

Ground accelerations within envelope of existing running plant ? Unknown

Ground accelerations .5g or less and within existing vendor design criteria ? Unknown

FLOODING
Above 100 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

Above 300 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

HOST
Has sovereign immunity ? Unknown

Does not require Federal Land transfer ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 4000 population ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 500 population ? Unknown

Is providing a site for lease or at a reasonable cost within jurisdiction ? Unknown

Is providing a site with at least two 150 acre locations within a 5000 acre area ? Unknown

Is providing a site with population density below 25/square mile within 2 miles of the site ? Unknown

Is providing a site free of known historical sites, major recreational areas and endangered species ? Unknown

PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE
Is an area free of a history of pro-active antinuclear referenda ? Unknown

Has a vote of host population on record in support of the facility ? Unknown

Has a resolution of the governing body on record in favor of the facility ? Unknown

ANY UNIQUE FINDINGS

REASON FOR REJECTION **DOE Applied Phase I 3/31/92, Inactive.**

Exhibit F.10

FUEL STORAGE SITE PROPOSAL INITIAL SCREENING
NEW CORPORATION (FREMONT COUNTY)
SITE # 010
Wyoming

TRANSPORTATION
Within 25 miles of mainline railroad ? Yes

Railroad on site ? Yes

Site access to one or more highways ? Yes

SEISMIC
At least two miles from capable fault? Unknown

At least five miles from capable fault, no faults on-site ? Unknown

Ground accelerations within envelope of existing running plant ? Unknown

Ground accelerations .5g or less and within existing vendor design criteria ? Unknown

FLOODING
Above 100 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

Above 300 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

HOST
Has sovereign immunity ? No

Does not require Federal Land transfer ? Yes

Is a Tribe or community of less than 4000 population ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 500 population ? Unknown

Is providing a site for lease or at a reasonable cost within jurisdiction ? Unknown

Is providing a site with at least two 150 acre locations within a 5000 acre area ? Unknown

Is providing a site with population density below 25/square mile within 2 miles of the site ? Unknown

Is providing a site free of known historical sites, major recreational areas and endangered species ? Unknown

PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE
Is an area free of a history of pro-active antinuclear referenda ? Yes

Has a vote of host population on record in support of the facility ? No

Has a resolution of the governing body on record in favor of the facility ? No

ANY UNIQUE FINDINGS The proposal is for a corporation running the facility and the utilities as customers, it lists costs as high as $160+ /MTU, staff of 500 people and earliest startup scenario of 2010. These issues would need to be resolved. The current state requires state approval at two benchmarks and a positive EIS for Yucca Mountain. No resolution from Shoshone Tribe which abuts property. DOE Phase I awarded 1/23/92.
REASON FOR REJECTION NA

Exhibit F.11

FUEL STORAGE SITE PROPOSAL INITIAL SCREENING
UNITED NUCLEAR CORPORATION
SITE # 011
New Mexico

TRANSPORTATION
Within 25 miles of mainline railroad ? Yes

Railroad on site ? Yes

Site access to one or more highways ? Yes

SEISMIC
At least two miles from capable fault ? Unknown

At least five miles from capable fault, no faults on-site ? Unknown

Ground accelerations within envelope of existing running plant ? Unknown

Ground accelerations .5g or less and within existing vendor design criteria ? Unknown

FLOODING
Above 100 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

Above 300 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

HOST
Has sovereign immunity ? No

Does not require Federal Land transfer ? Yes

Is a Tribe or community of less than 4000 population ? Yes

Is a Tribe or community of less than 500 population ? Unknown

Is providing a site for lease or at a reasonable cost within jurisdiction ? Unknown

Is providing a site with at least two 150 acre locations within a 5000 acre area ? Unknown

Is providing a site with population density below 25/square mile within 2 miles of the site ? Unknown

Is providing a site free of known historical sites, major recreational areas and endangered species ? Unknown

PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE
Is an area free of a history of pro-active antinuclear referenda ? Yes

Has a vote of host population on record in support of the facility ? No

Has a resolution of the governing body on record in favor of the facility ? No

ANY UNIQUE FINDINGS A cleanup site for uranium mill tailings. EPA report could answer many of the questions. No resolution on record in support by the Navaho Tribe which abut the project.

REASON FOR REJECTION NA

Exhibit F.12

FUEL STORAGE SITE PROPOSAL INITIAL SCREENING
CADDO TRIBE
SITE # 012
Oklahoma

TRANSPORTATION
Within 25 miles of mainline railroad ? Unknown

Railroad on site ? Unknown

Site access to one or more highways ? Unknown

SEISMIC
At least two miles from capable fault ? Unknown

At least five miles from capable fault, no faults on-site ? Unknown

Ground accelerations within envelope of existing running plant ? Unknown

Ground accelerations .5g or less and within existing vendor design criteria ? Unknown

FLOODING
Above 100 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

Above 300 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

HOST
Has sovereign immunity ? Unknown

Does not require Federal Land transfer ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 4000 population ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 500 population ? Unknown

Is providing a site for lease or at a reasonable cost within jurisdiction ? Unknown

Is providing a site with at least two 150 acre locations within a 5000 acre area ? Unknown

Is providing a site with population density below 25/square mile within 2 miles of the site ? Unknown

Is providing a site free of known historical sites, major recreational areas and endangered species ? Unknown

PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE
Is an area free of a history of pro-active antinuclear referenda ? Unknown

Has a vote of host population on record in support of the facility ? Unknown

Has a resolution of the governing body on record in favor of the facility ? Unknown

ANY UNIQUE FINDINGS

REASON FOR REJECTION **DOE Applied Phase I 4/17/92, withdrawn 7/16/92.**

Exhibit F.13

FUEL STORAGE SITE PROPOSAL INITIAL SCREENING
CHICKASAW INDIAN NATION
SITE # 013
Oklahoma

TRANSPORTATION
Within 25 miles of mainline railroad ? Unknown

Railroad on site ? Unknown

Site access to one or more highways ? Unknown

SEISMIC
At least two miles from capable fault ? Unknown

At least five miles from capable fault, no faults on-site ? Unknown

Ground accelerations within envelope of existing running plant ? Unknown

Ground accelerations .5g or less and within existing vendor design criteria ? Unknown

FLOODING
Above 100 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

Above 300 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

HOST
Has sovereign immunity ? Unknown

Does not require Federal Land transfer ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 4000 population ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 500 population ? Unknown

Is providing a site for lease or at a reasonable cost within jurisdiction ? Unknown

Is providing a site with at least two 150 acre locations within a 5000 acre area ? Unknown

Is providing a site with population density below 25/square mile within 2 miles of the site ? Unknown

Is providing a site free of known historical sites, major recreational areas and endangered species ? Unknown

PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE
Is an area free of a history of pro-active antinuclear referenda ? Unknown

Has a vote of host population on record in support of the facility ? Unknown

Has a resolution of the governing body on record in favor of the facility ? Unknown

ANY UNIQUE FINDINGS

REASON FOR REJECTION **DOE Applied Phase I 12/28/91, Awarded 02/14/92, Declined 3/31/92.**

Exhibit F.14

FUEL STORAGE SITE PROPOSAL INITIAL SCREENING
EASTERN SHAWNEE
SITE # 014
Oklahoma

TRANSPORTATION
Within 25 miles of mainline railroad ? Unknown

Railroad on site ? Unknown

Site access to one or more highways ? Unknown

SEISMIC
At least two miles from capable fault ? Unknown

At least five miles from capable fault, no faults on-site ? Unknown

Ground accelerations within envelope of existing running plant ? Unknown

Ground accelerations .5g or less and within existing vendor design criteria ? Unknown

FLOODING
Above 100 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

Above 300 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

HOST
Has sovereign immunity ? Unknown

Does not require Federal Land transfer ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 4000 population ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 500 population ? Unknown

Is providing a site for lease or at a reasonable cost within jurisdiction ? Unknown

Is providing a site with at least two 150 acre locations within a 5000 acre area ? Unknown

Is providing a site with population density below 25/square mile within 2 miles of the site ? Unknown

Is providing a site free of known historical sites, major recreational areas and endangered species ? Unknown

PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE
Is an area free of a history of pro-active antinuclear referenda ? Unknown

Has a vote of host population on record in support of the facility ? Unknown

Has a resolution of the governing body on record in favor of the facility ? Unknown

ANY UNIQUE FINDINGS

REASON FOR REJECTION **DOE Applied Phase I 3/30/92, Applied Phase IIA 3/31/93, Denied Phase IIA 8/93.**

Exhibit F.15

FUEL STORAGE SITE PROPOSAL INITIAL SCREENING
FIFIELD DEVELOPMENT CORP
SITE # 015
Wisconsin

TRANSPORTATION
Within 25 miles of mainline railroad ? Unknown

Railroad on site ? Unknown

Site access to one or more highways ? Unknown

SEISMIC
At least two miles from capable fault ? Unknown

At least five miles from capable fault. no faults on-site ? Unknown

Ground accelerations within envelope of existing running plant ? Unknown

Ground accelerations .5g or less and within existing vendor design criteria ? Unknown

FLOODING
Above 100 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

Above 300 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

HOST
Has sovereign immunity ? No

Does not require Federal Land transfer ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 4000 population ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 500 population ? Unknown

Is providing a site for lease or at a reasonable cost within jurisdiction ? Unknown

Is providing a site with at least two 150 acre locations within a 5000 acre area ? Unknown

Is providing a site with population density below 25/square mile within 2 miles of the site ? Unknown

Is providing a site free of known historical sites, major recreational areas and endangered species ? Unknown

PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE
Is an area free of a history of pro-active antinuclear referenda ? Unknown

Has a vote of host population on record in support of the facility ? Unknown

Has a resolution of the governing body on record in favor of the facility ? Unknown

ANY UNIQUE FINDINGS

REASON FOR REJECTION **DOE Applied Phase I 3/92, Denied.**

Exhibit F.16

FUEL STORAGE SITE PROPOSAL INITIAL SCREENING
FORT McDERMITT PAIUTE SHOSHONE TRIBE
SITE # 016
Oregon

TRANSPORTATION
Within 25 miles of mainline railroad ? Unknown

Railroad on site ? Unknown

Site access to one or more highways ? Unknown

SEISMIC
At least two miles from capable fault ? Unknown

At least five miles from capable fault, no faults on-site ? Unknown

Ground accelerations within envelope of existing running plant ? Unknown

Ground accelerations .5g or less and within existing vendor design criteria ? Unknown

FLOODING
Above 100 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

Above 300 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

HOST
Has sovereign immunity ? Yes

Does not require Federal Land transfer ? Yes

Is a Tribe or community of less than 4000 population ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 500 population ? Unknown

Is providing a site for lease or at a reasonable cost within jurisdiction ? Unknown

Is providing a site with at least two 150 acre locations within a 5000 acre area ? Unknown

Is providing a site with population density below 25/square mile within 2 miles of the site ? Unknown

Is providing a site free of known historical sites, major recreational areas and endangered species ? Unknown

PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE
Is an area free of a history of pro-active antinuclear referenda ? Unknown

Has a vote of host population on record in support of the facility ? Unknown

Has a resolution of the governing body on record in favor of the facility ? Unknown

ANY UNIQUE FINDINGS **DOE Applied Phase I 5/27/92, Applied Phase IIA 2/18/93, Awarded Phase IIA 6/1/93.**

REASON FOR REJECTION **NA**

Exhibit F.17

FUEL STORAGE SITE PROPOSAL INITIAL SCREENING
GRANT COUNTY
SITE # 017
North Dakota

TRANSPORTATION
Within 25 miles of mainline railroad ? Unknown

Railroad on site ? Unknown

Site access to one or more highways ? Unknown

SEISMIC
At least two miles from capable fault ? Unknown

At least five miles from capable fault, no faults on-site ? Unknown

Ground accelerations within envelope of existing running plant ? Unknown

Ground accelerations .5g or less and within existing vendor design criteria ? Unknown

FLOODING
Above 100 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

Above 300 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

HOST
Has sovereign immunity ? No

Does not require Federal Land transfer ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 4000 population ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 500 population ? Unknown

Is providing a site for lease or at a reasonable cost within jurisdiction ? Unknown

Is providing a site with at least two 150 acre locations within a 5000 acre area ? Unknown

Is providing a site with population density below 25/square mile within 2 miles of the site ? Unknown

Is providing a site free of known historical sites, major recreational areas and endangered species ? Unknown

PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE
Is an area free of a history of pro-active antinuclear referenda ? No

Has a vote of host population on record in support of the facility ? Unknown

Has a resolution of the governing body on record in favor of the facility ? Unknown

ANY UNIQUE FINDINGS **DOE Applied Phase I 11/19/91, Awarded 11/25/91.**

REASON FOR REJECTION ***County Board Recalled ?***

Exhibit F.18

FUEL STORAGE SITE PROPOSAL INITIAL SCREENING
LOWER BRULE SIOUX
SITE # 018
South Dakota

TRANSPORTATION
Within 25 miles of mainline railroad ? Unknown

Railroad on site ? Unknown

Site access to one or more highways ? Unknown

SEISMIC
At least two miles from capable fault ? Unknown

At least five miles from capable fault, no faults on-site ? Unknown

Ground accelerations within envelope of existing running plant ? Unknown

Ground accelerations .5g or less and within existing vendor design criteria ? Unknown

FLOODING
Above 100 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

Above 300 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

HOST
Has sovereign immunity ? Unknown

Does not require Federal Land transfer ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 4000 population ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 500 population ? Unknown

Is providing a site for lease or at a reasonable cost within jurisdiction ? Unknown

Is providing a site with at least two 150 acre locations within a 5000 acre area ? Unknown

Is providing a site with population density below 25/square mile within 2 miles of the site ? Unknown

Is providing a site free of known historical sites, major recreational areas and endangered species ? Unknown

PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE
Is an area free of a history of pro-active antinuclear referenda ? Unknown

Has a vote of host population on record in support of the facility ? Unknown

Has a resolution of the governing body on record in favor of the facility ? Unknown

ANY UNIQUE FINDINGS

REASON FOR REJECTION **DOE Applied Phase I 3/31/92, Inactive.**

Exhibit F.19

FUEL STORAGE SITE PROPOSAL INITIAL SCREENING
MIAMI TRIBE
SITE # 019
Oklahoma

TRANSPORTATION
Within 25 miles of mainline railroad ? Unknown

Railroad on site ? Unknown

Site access to one or more highways ? Unknown

SEISMIC
At least two miles from capable fault ? Unknown

At least five miles from capable fault, no faults on-site ? Unknown

Ground accelerations within envelope of existing running plant ? Unknown

Ground accelerations .5g or less and within existing vendor design criteria ? Unknown

FLOODING
Above 100 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

Above 300 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

HOST
Has sovereign immunity ? Unknown

Does not require Federal Land transfer ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 4000 population ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 500 population ? Unknown

Is providing a site for lease or at a reasonable cost within jurisdiction ? Unknown

Is providing a site with at least two 150 acre locations within a 5000 acre area ? Unknown

Is providing a site with population density below 25/square mile within 2 miles of the site ? Unknown

Is providing a site free of known historical sites, major recreational areas and endangered species ? Unknown

PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE
Is an area free of a history of pro-active antinuclear referenda ? Unknown

Has a vote of host population on record in support of the facility ? Unknown

Has a resolution of the governing body on record in favor of the facility ? Unknown

ANY UNIQUE FINDINGS

REASON FOR REJECTION **DOE Applied Phase I IA 3/31/93, Withdrawn 6/93.**

Exhibit F.20

FUEL STORAGE SITE PROPOSAL INITIAL SCREENING
NORTHERN ARAPAHO
SITE # 020
Wyoming

TRANSPORTATION
Within 25 miles of mainline railroad ? Unknown

Railroad on site ? Unknown

Site access to one or more highways ? Unknown

SEISMIC
At least two miles from capable fault ? Unknown

At least five miles from capable fault, no faults on-site ? Unknown

Ground accelerations within envelope of existing running plant ? Unknown

Ground accelerations .5g or less and within existing vendor design criteria ? Unknown

FLOODING
Above 100 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

Above 300 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

HOST
Has sovereign immunity ? Unknown

Does not require Federal Land transfer ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 4000 population ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 500 population ? Unknown

Is providing a site for lease or at a reasonable cost within jurisdiction ? Unknown

Is providing a site with at least two 150 acre locations within a 5000 acre area ? Unknown

Is providing a site with population density below 25/square mile within 2 miles of the site ? Unknown

Is providing a site free of known historical sites, major recreational areas and endangered species ? Unknown

PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE
Is an area free of a history of pro-active antinuclear referenda ? Unknown

Has a vote of host population on record in support of the facility ? Unknown

Has a resolution of the governing body on record in favor of the facility ? Unknown

ANY UNIQUE FINDINGS Same site as Fremont County & New Corp ??

REASON FOR REJECTION **DOE Applied Phase I IA 3/31/93, Denied 97/7/93.**

Exhibit F.21

FUEL STORAGE SITE PROPOSAL INITIAL SCREENING
PONCA TRIBE
SITE # 021
Oklahoma

TRANSPORTATION
Within 25 miles of mainline railroad ? Unknown

Railroad on site ? Unknown

Site access to one or more highways ? Unknown

SEISMIC
At least two miles from capable fault ? Unknown

At least five miles from capable fault, no faults on-site ? Unknown

Ground accelerations within envelope of existing running plant ? Unknown

Ground accelerations .5g or less and within existing vendor design criteria ? Unknown

FLOODING
Above 100 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

Above 300 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

HOST
Has sovereign immunity ? Unknown

Does not require Federal Land transfer ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 4000 population ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 500 population ? Unknown

Is providing a site for lease or at a reasonable cost within jurisdiction ? Unknown

Is providing a site with at least two 150 acre locations within a 5000 acre area ? Unknown

Is providing a site with population density below 25/square mile within 2 miles of the site ? Unknown

Is providing a site free of known historical sites, major recreational areas and endangered species ? Unknown

PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE
Is an area free of a history of pro-active antinuclear referenda ? Unknown

Has a vote of host population on record in support of the facility ? Unknown

Has a resolution of the governing body on record in favor of the facility ? Unknown

ANY UNIQUE FINDINGS **DOE Applied Phase I 3/31/92, Awarded 9/4/92.**

REASON FOR REJECTION **NA**

Exhibit F.22

FUEL STORAGE SITE PROPOSAL INITIAL SCREENING
PRAIRIE ISLAND SIOUX
SITE # 022
Minnesota

TRANSPORTATION
Within 25 miles of mainline railroad ? Yes

Railroad on site ? Yes

Site access to one or more highways ? yes

SEISMIC
At least two miles from capable fault ? Yes

At least five miles from capable fault, no faults on-site ? Yes

Ground accelerations within envelope of existing running plant ? Yes

Ground accelerations .5g or less and within existing vendor design criteria ? Yes

FLOODING
Above 100 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Yes

Above 300 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

HOST
Has sovereign immunity ? Yes

Does not require Federal Land transfer ? Yes

Is a Tribe or community of less than 4000 population ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 500 population ? Unknown

Is providing a site for lease or at a reasonable cost within jurisdiction ? Unknown

Is providing a site with at least two 150 acre locations within a 5000 acre area ? Unknown

Is providing a site with population density below 25/square mile within 2 miles of the site ? Unknown

Is providing a site free of known historical sites, major recreational areas and endangered species ? Unknown

PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE
Is an area free of a history of pro-active antinuclear referenda ? Yes

Has a vote of host population on record in support of the facility ? Unknown

Has a resolution of the governing body on record in favor of the facility ? Unknown

ANY UNIQUE FINDINGS Intervenor against Prairie Island site of NSP

REASON FOR REJECTION **DOE Applied Phase I 12/20/91, Applied Phase IIA 3/31/93, Denied 5/10/93.**

Exhibit F.23

FUEL STORAGE SITE PROPOSAL INITIAL SCREENING
SAC & FOX NATION
SITE # 023
Oklahoma

TRANSPORTATION
Within 25 miles of mainline railroad ? Unknown

Railroad on site ? Unknown

Site access to one or more highways ? Unknown

SEISMIC
At least two miles from capable fault? Unknown

At least five miles from capable fault, no faults on-site ? Unknown

Ground accelerations within envelope of existing running plant ? Unknown

Ground accelerations .5g or less and within existing vendor design criteria ? Unknown

FLOODING
Above 100 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

Above 300 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

HOST
Has sovereign immunity ? Unknown

Does not require Federal Land transfer ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 4000 population ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 500 population ? Unknown

Is providing a site for lease or at a reasonable cost within jurisdiction ? Unknown

Is providing a site with at least two 150 acre locations within a 5000 acre area ? Unknown

Is providing a site with population density below 25/square mile within 2 miles of the site ? Unknown

Is providing a site free of known historical sites, major recreational areas and endangered species ? Unknown

PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE
Is an area free of a history of pro-active antinuclear referenda ? Unknown

Has a vote of host population on record in support of the facility ? Unknown

Has a resolution of the governing body on record in favor of the facility ? Unknown

ANY UNIQUE FINDINGS **DOE Applied Phase I 12/30/91, Awarded 2/18/92.**

REASON FOR REJECTION **Grace Thorp a tribal member stopped further participation.**

Exhibit F.24

FUEL STORAGE SITE PROPOSAL INITIAL SCREENING
SAN JUAN COUNTY
SITE # 024
Utah

TRANSPORTATION
Within 25 miles of mainline railroad ? Unknown

Railroad on site ? Unknown

Site access to one or more highways ? Unknown

SEISMIC
At least two miles from capable fault ? Unknown

At least five miles from capable fault, no faults on-site ? Unknown

Ground accelerations within envelope of existing running plant ? Unknown

Ground accelerations .5g or less and within existing vendor design criteria ? Unknown

FLOODING
Above 100 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

Above 300 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

HOST
Has sovereign immunity ? Unknown

Does not require Federal Land transfer ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 4000 population ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 500 population ? Unknown

Is providing a site for lease or at a reasonable cost within jurisdiction ? Unknown

Is providing a site with at least two 150 acre locations within a 5000 acre area ? Unknown

Is providing a site with population density below 25/square mile within 2 miles of the site ? Unknown

Is providing a site free of known historical sites, major recreational areas and endangered species ? Unknown

PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE
Is an area free of a history of pro-active antinuclear referenda ? Unknown

Has a vote of host population on record in support of the facility ? Unknown

Has a resolution of the governing body on record in favor of the facility ? Unknown

ANY UNIQUE FINDINGS **DOE Applied Phase I 3/27/92, Awarded 5/4/92.**

REASON FOR REJECTION **NA**

Exhibit F.25

FUEL STORAGE SITE PROPOSAL INITIAL SCREENING
TETLIN VILLAGE
SITE # 025
Arkansas

TRANSPORTATION
Within 25 miles of mainline railroad ? Unknown

Railroad on site ? Unknown

Site access to one or more highways ? Unknown

SEISMIC
At least two miles from capable fault ? Unknown

At least five miles from capable fault, no faults on-site ? Unknown

Ground accelerations within envelope of existing running plant ? Unknown

Ground accelerations .5g or less and within existing vendor design criteria ? Unknown

FLOODING
Above 100 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

Above 300 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

HOST
Has sovereign immunity ? Unknown

Does not require Federal Land transfer ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 4000 population ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 500 population ? Unknown

Is providing a site for lease or at a reasonable cost within jurisdiction ? Unknown

Is providing a site with at least two 150 acre locations within a 5000 acre area ? Unknown

Is providing a site with population density below 25/square mile within 2 miles of the site ? Unknown

Is providing a site free of known historical sites, major recreational areas and endangered species ? Unknown

PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE
Is an area free of a history of pro-active antinuclear referenda ? Unknown

Has a vote of host population on record in support of the facility ? Unknown

Has a resolution of the governing body on record in favor of the facility ? Unknown

ANY UNIQUE FINDINGS

REASON FOR REJECTION **DOE Applied Phase I 3/30/92 Denied 8/92.**

Exhibit F.26

FUEL STORAGE SITE PROPOSAL INITIAL SCREENING
TONKAWA TRIBE
SITE # 026
Oklahoma

TRANSPORTATION
Within 25 miles of mainline railroad ? Unknown

Railroad on site ? Unknown

Site access to one or more highways ? Unknown

SEISMIC
At least two miles from capable fault ? Unknown

At least five miles from capable fault, no faults on-site ? Unknown

Ground accelerations within envelope of existing running plant ? Unknown

Ground accelerations .5g or less and within existing vendor design criteria ? Unknown

FLOODING
Above 100 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

Above 300 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

HOST
Has sovereign immunity ? Yes

Does not require Federal Land transfer ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 4000 population ? Yes

Is a Tribe or community of less than 500 population ? Yes

Is providing a site for lease or at a reasonable cost within jurisdiction ? Unknown

Is providing a site with at least two 150 acre locations within a 5000 acre area ? No

Is providing a site with population density below 25/square mile within 2 miles of the site ? Unknown

Is providing a site free of known historical sites, major recreational areas and endangered species ? Unknown

PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE
Is an area free of a history of pro-active antinuclear referenda ? No

Has a vote of host population on record in support of the facility ? No

Has a resolution of the governing body on record in favor of the facility ? Yes

ANY UNIQUE FINDINGS **DOE Applied Phase I IA 3/31/93, Awarded 9/30/93.**

REASON FOR REJECTION **Tribe voted against facility Fall, 1994.**

Exhibit F.27

FUEL STORAGE SITE PROPOSAL INITIAL SCREENING
UTE TRIBE
SITE # 027
Colorado

TRANSPORTATION
Within 25 miles of mainline railroad ? Unknown

Railroad on site ? Unknown

Site access to one or more highways ? Unknown

SEISMIC
At least two miles from capable fault ? Unknown

At least five miles from capable fault, no faults on-site ? Unknown

Ground accelerations within envelope of existing running plant ? Unknown

Ground accelerations .5g or less and within existing vendor design criteria ? Unknown

FLOODING
Above 100 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

Above 300 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

HOST
Has sovereign immunity ? Unknown

Does not require Federal Land transfer ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 4000 population ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 500 population ? Unknown

Is providing a site for lease or at a reasonable cost within jurisdiction ? Unknown

Is providing a site with at least two 150 acre locations within a 5000 acre area ? Unknown

Is providing a site with population density below 25/square mile within 2 miles of the site ? Unknown

Is providing a site free of known historical sites, major recreational areas and endangered species ? Unknown

PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE
Is an area free of a history of pro-active antinuclear referenda ? Unknown

Has a vote of host population on record in support of the facility ? Unknown

Has a resolution of the governing body on record in favor of the facility ? Unknown

ANY UNIQUE FINDINGS

REASON FOR REJECTION **DOE Applied Phase IIA 3/31/93, Withdrawn 8/9/93.**

Exhibit F.28

FUEL STORAGE SITE PROPOSAL INITIAL SCREENING
YAKIMA INDIAN NATION
SITE # 028
Washington

TRANSPORTATION
Within 25 miles of mainline railroad ? Unknown

Railroad on site ? Unknown

Site access to one or more highways ? Unknown

SEISMIC
At least two miles from capable fault ? Unknown

At least five miles from capable fault, no faults on-site ? Unknown

Ground accelerations within envelope of existing running plant ? Unknown

Ground accelerations .5g or less and within existing vendor design criteria ? Unknown

FLOODING
Above 100 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

Above 300 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

HOST
Has sovereign immunity ? Unknown

Does not require Federal Land transfer ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 4000 population ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 500 population ? Unknown

Is providing a site for lease or at a reasonable cost within jurisdiction ? Unknown

Is providing a site with at least two 150 acre locations within a 5000 acre area ? Unknown

Is providing a site with population density below 25/square mile within 2 miles of the site ? Unknown

Is providing a site free of known historical sites, major recreational areas and endangered species ? Unknown

PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE
Is an area free of a history of pro-active antinuclear referenda ? Unknown

Has a vote of host population on record in support of the facility ? Unknown

Has a resolution of the governing body on record in favor of the facility ? Unknown

ANY UNIQUE FINDINGS **DOE Applied Phase I 12/20/91, Awarded 318/92.**

REASON FOR REJECTION **NA**

Exhibit F.29

FUEL STORAGE SITE PROPOSAL INITIAL SCREENING
CITY OF CALIENTE & LINCOLN COUNTY
SITE # 029
Nevada

TRANSPORTATION
Within 25 miles of mainline railroad ? Yes

Railroad on site ? Yes

Site access to one or more highways ? Yes

SEISMIC
At least two miles from capable fault ? Unknown

At least five miles from capable fault, no faults on-site ? Unknown

Ground accelerations within envelope of existing running plant ? Unknown

Ground accelerations .5g or less and within existing vendor design criteria ? Unknown

FLOODING
Above 100 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

Above 300 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

HOST
Has sovereign immunity ? No

Does not require Federal Land transfer ? Yes

Is a Tribe or community of less than 4000 population ? Yes

Is a Tribe or community of less than 500 population ? No

Is providing a site for lease or at a reasonable cost within jurisdiction ? Unknown

Is providing a site with at least two 150 acre locations within a 5000 acre area ? Unknown

Is providing a site with population density below 25/square mile within 2 miles of the site ? Unknown

Is providing a site free of known historical sites, major recreational areas and endangered species ? Unknown

PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE
Is an area free of a history of pro-active antinuclear referenda ? Unknown

Has a vote of host population on record in support of the facility ? Unknown

Has a resolution of the governing body on record in favor of the facility ? Yes

ANY UNIQUE FINDINGS

REASON FOR REJECTION **NA**

Exhibit F.30

FUEL STORAGE SITE PROPOSAL INITIAL SCREENING
PACIFIC ATOLL
SITE # 030
Protectorate

TRANSPORTATION
Within 25 miles of mainline railroad ? No

Railroad on site ? No

Site access to one or more highways ? No

SEISMIC
At least two miles from capable fault ? Unknown

At least five miles from capable fault, no faults on-site ? Unknown

Ground accelerations within envelope of existing running plant ? Unknown

Ground accelerations .5g or less and within existing vendor design criteria ? Unknown

FLOODING
Above 100 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

Above 300 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

HOST
Has sovereign immunity ? Unknown

Does not require Federal Land transfer ? No

Is a Tribe or community of less than 4000 population ? Yes

Is a Tribe or community of less than 500 population ? Unknown

Is providing a site for lease or at a reasonable cost within jurisdiction ? Unknown

Is providing a site with at least two 150 acre locations within a 5000 acre area ? Unknown

Is providing a site with population density below 25/square mile within 2 miles of the site ? Unknown

Is providing a site free of known historical sites, major recreational areas and endangered species ? Unknown

PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE
Is an area free of a history of pro-active antinuclear referenda ? Unknown

Has a vote of host population on record in support of the facility ? Unknown

Has a resolution of the governing body on record in favor of the facility ? Unknown

ANY UNIQUE FINDINGS ***US Fuel & Security Service Group***

REASON FOR REJECTION **High cost, would require ocean shipping in International waters.**

Exhibit F.31

FUEL STORAGE SITE PROPOSAL INITIAL SCREENING
BARNWELL
SITE # 031
South Carolina

TRANSPORTATION
Within 25 miles of mainline railroad ? Unknown

Railroad on site ? Unknown

Site access to one or more highways ? Yes

SEISMIC
At least two miles from capable fault ? Unknown

At least five miles from capable fault, no faults on-site ? Unknown

Ground accelerations within envelope of existing running plant ? Unknown

Ground accelerations .5g or less and within existing vendor design criteria ? Unknown

FLOODING
Above 100 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

Above 300 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

HOST
Has sovereign immunity ? No

Does not require Federal Land transfer ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 4000 population ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 500 population ? Unknown

Is providing a site for lease or at a reasonable cost within jurisdiction ? Unknown

Is providing a site with at least two 150 acre locations within a 5000 acre area ? Unknown

Is providing a site with population density below 25/square mile within 2 miles of the site ? Unknown

Is providing a site free of known historical sites, major recreational areas and endangered species ? Unknown

PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE
Is an area free of a history of pro-active antinuclear referenda ? Unknown

Has a vote of host population on record in support of the facility ? Unknown

Has a resolution of the governing body on record in favor of the facility ? Unknown

ANY UNIQUE FINDINGS ***Long transportation routes to Yucca Mountain.***

REASON FOR REJECTION

Exhibit F.32

FUEL STORAGE SITE PROPOSAL INITIAL SCREENING
HANFORD
SITE # 032
Washington

TRANSPORTATION
Within 25 miles of mainline railroad ? Yes

Railroad on site ? Unknown

Site access to one or more highways ? Yes

SEISMIC
At least two miles from capable fault ? Unknown

At least five miles from capable fault, no faults on-site ? Unknown

Ground accelerations within envelope of existing running plant ? Unknown

Ground accelerations .5g or less and within existing vendor design criteria ? Unknown

FLOODING
Above 100 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

Above 300 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

HOST
Has sovereign immunity ? Unknown

Does not require Federal Land transfer ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 4000 population ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 500 population ? Unknown

Is providing a site for lease or at a reasonable cost within jurisdiction ? Unknown

Is providing a site with at least two 150 acre locations within a 5000 acre area ? Unknown

Is providing a site with population density below 25/square mile within 2 miles of the site ? Unknown

Is providing a site free of known historical sites, major recreational areas and endangered species ? Unknown

PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE
Is an area free of a history of pro-active antinuclear referenda ? Unknown

Has a vote of host population on record in support of the facility ? Unknown

Has a resolution of the governing body on record in favor of the facility ? Unknown

ANY UNIQUE FINDINGS

REASON FOR REJECTION

Exhibit F.33

FUEL STORAGE SITE PROPOSAL INITIAL SCREENING
FORT WINGATE ARMY DEPOT
SITE # 033
New Mexico

TRANSPORTATION
Within 25 miles of mainline railroad ? Yes

Railroad on site ? No

Site access to one or more highways ? Yes

SEISMIC
At least two miles from capable fault ? Unknown

At least five miles from capable fault, no faults on-site ? Unknown

Ground accelerations within envelope of existing running plant ? Unknown

Ground accelerations .5g or less and within existing vendor design criteria ? Unknown

FLOODING
Above 100 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Yes

Above 300 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Yes

HOST
Has sovereign immunity ? No

Does not require Federal Land transfer ? No

Is a Tribe or community of less than 4000 population ? No

Is a Tribe or community of less than 500 population ? No

Is providing a site for lease or at a reasonable cost within jurisdiction ? Unknown

Is providing a site with at least two 150 acre locations within a 5000 acre area ? Yes

Is providing a site with population density below 25/square mile within 2 miles of the site ? Unknown

Is providing a site free of known historical sites, major recreational areas and endangered species ? Yes

PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE
Is an area free of a history of pro-active antinuclear referenda ? Yes

Has a vote of host population on record in support of the facility ? No

Has a resolution of the governing body on record in favor of the facility ? No

ANY UNIQUE FINDINGS

REASON FOR REJECTION

Exhibit F.34

FUEL STORAGE SITE PROPOSAL INITIAL SCREENING
AECL WHITESHELL LABORATORIES
SITE # 034
Canada

TRANSPORTATION
Within 25 miles of mainline railroad ? Yes

Railroad on site ? No

Site access to one or more highways ? Yes

SEISMIC
At least two miles from capable fault? Yes

At least five miles from capable fault, no faults on-site ? Yes

Ground accelerations within envelope of existing running plant ? Yes

Ground accelerations .5g or less and within existing vendor design criteria ? Yes

FLOODING
Above 100 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Yes

Above 300 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Yes

HOST
Has sovereign immunity ? Unknown

Does not require Federal Land transfer ? Yes

Is a Tribe or community of less than 4000 population ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 500 population ? Unknown

Is providing a site for lease or at a reasonable cost within jurisdiction ? Unknown

Is providing a site with at least two 150 acre locations within a 5000 acre area ? Yes

Is providing a site with population density below 25/square mile within 2 miles of the site ? Yes

Is providing a site free of known historical sites, major recreational areas and endangered species ? Yes

PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE
Is an area free of a history of pro-active antinuclear referenda ? Yes

Has a vote of host population on record in support of the facility ? Unknown

Has a resolution of the governing body on record in favor of the facility ? Unknown

ANY UNIQUE FINDINGS

REASON FOR REJECTION

Exhibit F.35

FUEL STORAGE SITE PROPOSAL INITIAL SCREENING
TGM, WHITE SANDS
SITE # 035
New Mexico

TRANSPORTATION
Within 25 miles of mainline railroad ? Yes

Railroad on site ? No

Site access to one or more highways ? No

SEISMIC
At least two miles from capable fault? Unknown

At least five miles from capable fault, no faults on-site ? Unknown

Ground accelerations within envelope of existing running plant ? Unknown

Ground accelerations .5g or less and within existing vendor design criteria ? Unknown

FLOODING
Above 100 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Yes

Above 300 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Yes

HOST
Has sovereign immunity ? No

Does not require Federal Land transfer ? No

Is a Tribe or community of less than 4000 population ? Yes

Is a Tribe or community of less than 500 population ? Yes

Is providing a site for lease or at a reasonable cost within jurisdiction ? Unknown

Is providing a site with at least two 150 acre locations within a 5000 acre area ? Yes

Is providing a site with population density below 25/square mile within 2 miles of the site ? Yes

Is providing a site free of known historical sites, major recreational areas and endangered species ? Yes

PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE
Is an area free of a history of pro-active antinuclear referenda ? Yes

Has a vote of host population on record in support of the facility ? No

Has a resolution of the governing body on record in favor of the facility ? No

ANY UNIQUE FINDINGS

REASON FOR REJECTION

Exhibit F.36

FUEL STORAGE SITE PROPOSAL INITIAL SCREENING
AREA 25 NUCLEAR TEST SITE
SITE # 036
Nevada

TRANSPORTATION
Within 25 miles of mainline railroad ? No

Railroad on site ? No

Site access to one or more highways ? Yes

SEISMIC
At least two miles from capable fault ? Unknown

At least five miles from capable fault, no faults on-site ? Unknown

Ground accelerations within envelope of existing running plant ? Unknown

Ground accelerations .5g or less and within existing vendor design criteria ? Unknown

FLOODING
Above 100 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Yes

Above 300 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Yes

HOST
Has sovereign immunity ? Yes

Does not require Federal Land transfer ? No

Is a Tribe or community of less than 4000 population ? No

Is a Tribe or community of less than 500 population ? No

Is providing a site for lease or at a reasonable cost within jurisdiction ? Unknown

Is providing a site with at least two 150 acre locations within a 5000 acre area ? Yes

Is providing a site with population density below 25/square mile within 2 miles of the site ? Yes

Is providing a site free of known historical sites, major recreational areas and endangered species ? Yes

PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE
Is an area free of a history of pro-active antinuclear referenda ? No

Has a vote of host population on record in support of the facility ? No

Has a resolution of the governing body on record in favor of the facility ? No

ANY UNIQUE FINDINGS

REASON FOR REJECTION

Exhibit F.37

FUEL STORAGE SITE PROPOSAL INITIAL SCREENING
LADO RANCH
SITE # 037
Texas

TRANSPORTATION
Within 25 miles of mainline railroad ? Yes

Railroad on site ? Yes

Site access to one or more highways ? Yes

SEISMIC
At least two miles from capable fault? Yes

At least five miles from capable fault, no faults on-site ? Yes

Ground accelerations within envelope of existing running plant ? Yes

Ground accelerations .5g or less and within existing vendor design criteria ? Yes

FLOODING
Above 100 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Yes

Above 300 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Yes

HOST
Has sovereign immunity ? No

Does not require Federal Land transfer ? Yes

Is a Tribe or community of less than 4000 population ? Yes

Is a Tribe or community of less than 500 population ? Yes

Is providing a site for lease or at a reasonable cost within jurisdiction ? Yes

Is providing a site with at least two 150 acre locations within a 5000 acre area ? Yes

Is providing a site with population density below 25/square mile within 2 miles of the site ? Yes

Is providing a site free of known historical sites, major recreational areas and endangered species ? Yes

PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE
Is an area free of a history of pro-active antinuclear referenda ? Unknown

Has a vote of host population on record in support of the facility ? No

Has a resolution of the governing body on record in favor of the facility ? No

ANY UNIQUE FINDINGS

REASON FOR REJECTION

Exhibit F.38

FUEL STORAGE SITE PROPOSAL INITIAL SCREENING
ANDREWS COUNTY
SITE # 038
Texas

TRANSPORTATION
Within 25 miles of mainline railroad ? Unknown

Railroad on site ? Unknown

Site access to one or more highways ? Unknown

SEISMIC
At least two miles from capable fault? Unknown

At least five miles from capable fault, no faults on-site ? Unknown

Ground accelerations within envelope of existing running plant ? Unknown

Ground accelerations .5g or less and within existing vendor design criteria ? Unknown

FLOODING
Above 100 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

Above 300 year return frequency flood per USGS ? Unknown

HOST
Has sovereign immunity ? Unknown

Does not require Federal Land transfer ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 4000 population ? Unknown

Is a Tribe or community of less than 500 population ? Unknown

Is providing a site for lease or at a reasonable cost within jurisdiction ? Unknown

Is providing a site with at least two 150 acre locations within a 5000 acre area ? Unknown

Is providing a site with population density below 25/square mile within 2 miles of the site ? Unknown

Is providing a site free of known historical sites, major recreational areas and endangered species ? Unknown

PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE
Is an area free of a history of pro-active antinuclear referenda ? Unknown

Has a vote of host population on record in support of the facility ? Unknown

Has a resolution of the governing body on record in favor of the facility ? Unknown

ANY UNIQUE FINDINGS

REASON FOR REJECTION

Exhibit F.39

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Skull Valley Band of Goshutes, (Tribe), have been pursuing a Interim Spent Fuel Storage Installation (ISFSI) on the Skull Valley Goshute Reservation in Tooele County, Utah. Given the extensive proven experience of the Tribe's consultants in siting nuclear facilities and with the commitment from PFS, the Tribe believes a ISFSI could be licensed for construction within 24 months. The only caveat is the assumption that there will be no significant changes in the present Federal regulations that now control the process. With the surrounding presence of both NRC and State licensed nuclear waste facilities; two hazardous waste incinerators; the Dugway Proving Ground, and the Tooele Army Depot's nerve gas incinerator, which is about to begin continuous operation with the blessing of the State, the only credible opposition mounted to an ISFSI located on the Skull Valley Reservation will be on philosophical grounds. In addition, because of the extensive effort to characterize and remediate chemical warfare material (CFM) sites placed on the Skull Valley Reservation by the Department of Defense (DOD) in 1968, there could be substantial savings made, both in time and money, in the simultaneous siting of an ISFSF. This program, which is expected to begin within the next few weekswould allow for mimimizing early political exposure to the ISFSI siting process.

In addition to the many favorable site attributes of an ISFSI located on the Skull Valley Reservation, there are also some possible logistic advantages as well. The Tribe has previously determined that there is a complete capability locally to build all the necessary storage and shipping containers that would be required over the life of the project. Implicitly, this option would provide significant cost savings. Manufacturing the shipping casks locally, transporting the casks to the reactors and then returning them when loaded to the ISFSF would preclude the need for any "dead head" transport. Because the manufacture of the storage and shipping containers could also provide significant local employment, public acceptance of the ISFSI would probably be much greater than it would be otherwise.

A summary of some of the significant attributes that favor the siting an ISFSI on the Skull Valley Goshute reservation are:

* An extensive Environmental Impact Analysis prepared in 1987 by the State of Utah for their Supercondicting Super Collider proposal, includes a major portion of the Skull Valley north of the proposed ISFSI site on the Goshute Reservation. (See Attachment A). In effect, the State of Utah has made a de facto determination that the Skull alley is suitable for locating engineered facilities that are far more complex and would have had a much higher Environmental impact than ISFSI. With the exception of the socio-economic analysis and a limited amount of site specific data, most all of the data in the SSC Siting Proposal could be used directly to satisfy Federal and State regulatory requirements.

Exhibit F.39 (continued)

* A Final Environmental Impact Statement for Envirocare of Utah's Section 11e. (2) radioactive waste storage site near Clive, Utah site was issued by the NRC in August, 1993 (NURB-1476), for the Clive, Utah site located in the middle of the proposed SSC site and just west of the north end of the Skull Valley. With the exception of depth to ground water (greater at ISFSI) and the ground water quality (poorer at Clive), site conditions at the proposed ISFSI site and the Clive site are essentially the same. The SSC Siting Proposal data were updated and used by Envirocare and the NRC as the principal source for preparing the EIS. The State of Utah concurred in all of the findings.

* Envirocare has also been, and is currently, licensed by the State of Utah (an agreement state) to dispose of Naturally-Occurring Radioactive Material (NORM) waste and low activity, low level radioactive waste (LLW) at the Clive site. In addition, Envirocare has a license from the State of Utah to dispose of mixed radioactive waste material, as regulated under RCRA. The NRC concurred in all of the findings.

* The Nuclear Regulatory Commission issued a Final Safety Evaluation Report (NUREG-1486) in January, 1994, on Envirocare's Clive site. The site was licensed under Appendix A to 10 CFR Part 40. Appendix A to CFR Part 40 requires effective control for up to 1000 years, to the extent achievable, and in any case for at least 200 years. Since the lifetime of the proposed ISFSI will be considerably shorter than 200 years, there should be no difficulty in meeting the less stringent regulatory requirements imposed by 10 CFR Part 72 and Appendix A to 10 CFR Part 100.

* The DOD has built and tested a nerve gas incinerator at the Tooele Army Depot South in the Rush Valley, immediately to the east and south of the Skull Valley Goshute Reservation. With full support from the State of Utah and Tooele County, the facility is expected to begin continuous operation within the next few months. Complete emergency procedure and evacuation plans are in place and operable. These procedures and evacuation plans are far in excess of any possible requirements that would ever by necessary to license and operate an ISFSI. Because the State of Utah and the Federal government are willing to accept the risk of this operation to those citizens living nearby in the Skull Valley and the rest of Tooele County and the Wasatch front, it seems reasonable to expect that risk from operating a much less hazardous ISFSI would also be acceptable.

* The Dugway Proving Ground starts a few miles south and west of the Skull Valley Goshute Reservation. The Dugway Proving Ground has been operation since the mid 1940's and is the principal area used to test Chemical and Biological Warfare Materials. Test of the nerve gas VX in 1968 were considered to be the cause of thousands of sheep dying in the Skull Valley and the adjacent Rush Valley where the nerve gas incinerator is located. Approximately half of the containated sheep were buried on the Skull Valley Goshute Reservation. The remainder of the contaminated sheep were buried immediately to the west of the Goshute Reservation at the south end of Skull Valley. Although operations at Dugway Proving Ground have been reduced somewhat, with the encouragement of the State of Utah, the facility is expected to continue operating for

Exhibit F.39 (continued)

sometime to come regardless of the attendant risk to those living in the Skull Valley. Because the State of Utah and the Federal government are willing to accept the risk of future operations at Dugway impacting the citizens of Skull Valley and the rest of Tooele County, it seems reasonable to expect that the risk from operating a much less hazardous ISFSF would also be acceptable.

I. LOCATION:

The location of this proposed site is T5S, R8W on the Skull Valley Goshute Reservation, Skull Valley, Utah. This site will comprise approximately one section of land on the Skull Valley Goshute Reservation. The enclosed maps show the Reservation and the proposed site. Interstate 80 is approximately 26 miles directly north of the Skull Valley Reservation. Tooele County Skull Valley road travels north to south through the Reservation.

II. HOST JURISDICTION ACCEPTANCE

There will be no change in jurisdiction prior to or after licensing. The Skull Valley Goshutes are a "treaty tribe". Their separate political sovereignty is recognized by the United States government pursuant to federal law. The Skull Valley Goshutes went through the entire federal process under the Office of Nuclear Waste Negotiator and signed an agreement to enter into formal negotiations with the United States government to site, license and build a interim storage facility for spent nuclear fuel. The Tribe was successful in becoming the voluntary candidate site for the United States under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 as amended in 1987. Once the Tribe completed the federal process, the entire federal program was canceled.

The Tribe has spent a considerable amount of resources, (both monetary and time), in studying this issue. Tribal members were given a tour of the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory. The Tribal Chairman has consulted with scientists in Japan, France, Great Britain, Sweden and numerous experts in the United States. The Tribal government has comprehensively studied this problem of safe transportation and storage of spent nuclear fuel. They produced a full report and video on this subject both of which have previously been made available to you. Enclosed is another copy of the Phase II video.

The Tribe has the permission of the Tribal members to build this facility on the Reservation. A General Council Resolution was passed which authorizes the Skull Valley Goshute Tribal government to build this project.

The surrounding community has a good working relationship with the Tribe. During the federal process, the Tribe was able to obtain a $13,000 federal grant for Tooele County to properly study the social and economic impact of the proposed MRS.

4

Exhibit F.39 (continued)

This County has substantial experience with major waste issues. Tooele County has licensed a hazardous waste corridor. There are two hazardous waste incinerators, one major hazardous waste landfill and a low level radioactive waste dump in this corridor. The County is also the site of a nerve gas incinerator and a biological and chemical weapons laboratory with Dugway Proving Grounds. This top secret laboratory is located immediately next to the Reservation.

The people in Tooele County have extensive experience in working with major national weapons programs and difficult waste industries. They are not readily swayed with rhetorical arguments. This skilled labor force will welcome this project *if* the entities involved are honest and build this facility to world class standards of safety.

There are no jurisdictional restrictions which would prohibit or significantly restrict construction or operation of an ISFSI. The reason is, state law does not apply on this Reservation. What federal restrictions are imposed at a later date cannot be commented upon at this time. The neighboring communities do not have jurisdiction over the Tribe. They are separate political sovereigns. Although the people in Tooele County support this facility, even if they opposed it, they do not have the legal authority to stop this project.

The print media has been relatively even handed in accurately reporting this issue. The Tribe made it a point to maintain diplomatic media contacts. Most reporters in Salt Lake have at one time or another interviewed the Tribal Chairman and/or their attorney. The Tribe has issued press releases and been very careful not to make enemies with the media. The Tribe has co-sponsored charitable events and maintained a socially responsible position on important issues which affect members and others in the surrounding community. Most of the television and print media followed the MRS project. With regards to Yucca mountain, not all of the Utah media has been actively following this issue. The Tribe understands the importance of good media relations.

III. SITE OWNERSHIP

The Skull Valley Goshute Tribe holds title to the proposed site. The railroad transportation corridor, depending on where the railroad is located, is owned by the Bureau of Land Management See enclosed map. The railroad which runs immediately adjacent to Interstate 80 is owned by Union Pacific. This company previously owned a hazardous waste landfill at Grassy Mountain and a hazardous waste incinerator. Both of these hazardous waste projects are located on the Tooele County Hazardous Waste Corridor. The title to the site will always remain with the Skull Valley Goshute Tribe.

IV. TRANSPORTATION ACCESS

The proposed site is 26 miles from a Union Pacific railroad. See enclosed maps of Tooele County, Utah. A offload facility could be built at the Timpie junction, where Union Pacific currently unloads hazardous waste containers. The casks carrying the spent

5

Exhibit F.39 (continued)

fuel could then be loaded on a trucks and hauled to the proposed site. The offload facility can save the costs and expense of building a railroad to the site. Transporting the casks from Timpie to the Reservation along the Tooele County Skull Valley road can be accomplished is a very short time frame.

A railspur could certainly be built over time. However, the Tribe would recommend first building an off load facility at Timple and transporting the casks to the Reservation on certified truck haulers licensed by the Department of Transportation for Type A transports. This will allow the project to proceed without the delays of obtaining permission from the Bureau of Land Management for a rail spur. It will also save money. Under current federal law and the Interstate Commerce Clause of the US Constitution, other jurisdictions cannot stop the shipments of spent fuel to the Reservation.

The Interstate highway nearest to the proposed site is Interstate 80 which traverses east to west between Utah and Nevada. See Enclosed Map. This highway is 26 miles from the site. The road is capable of heavy hauls. Currently, the Skull Valley Road is used by Dugway Proving Grounds for hauling of heavy military equipment, i.e. howitzers, major battle tanks, etc. The Tribe also uses this highway to haul heavy rocket motors for testing on the Tekoi Rocket Test Facility on the Reservation.

The Skull Valley Road provides truck access to the site. The road should be upgraded with or without this project. Monies for upgrading this road might be available from the Department of Transportation, the Department of Energy, the Department of Defense and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. One of the considerations for approaching the federal government for funding for upgrading the road or for building a rail spur and other money which will be needed is an unsolicited proposal. This proposal will be for storage of spent nuclear fuel at this site in exchange for federal funding assistance with this project.

IX. DEMOGRAPHY

The permanent polulation within 10 miles of the proposed site is the Skull Valley Goshute Tribal Village and the town of Dugway, Utah. The Village has approximately 40 permenant residents. The town of Dugway, Utah has a population of approximately 2,000 when occupied full time. This town has lost some of it's population due to the cutback in defense spending and transfers of missions from this military base to other parts of the country. The enclosed data on Tooele County specifically details this information. The labor for construction can be housed at English Village located approximately nine miles south of the site. This residential village was built for the military at Dugway. Presently, comfortable housing is available for a construction force to build this facility. Permanent housing can also be made available at English Village.

Exhibit F.39 (continued)

XIII. SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS

The availability of and proximity of a potential labor force is within 50 miles of the proposed site. Nine miles south of the Reservation is English Village, a residential complex for the labor and military for Dugway Proving Grounds. The town of Dugway has a public school system, including a high school and a small medical center for on base personnel and contractors. The Tribe has an excellent relationship with Dugway. Many Tribal school children attend public school at Dugway. Tribal members use the clinic and shop at the base. Due to cutbacks in the defense sector of the economy, Dugway Proving Grounds has lost some personnel and scaled back their mission. This project will be welcome by people in Dugway who work with chemical and biological weapons which are far more dangerous than spent nuclear fuel. The following data from Tooele County fully explains the physical, human and economic resources available for this project. Also included is a brochure on "The Tooele Chemical Agent Disposal Facility"

Exhibit F.40

RESPONSE TO SITE SELECTION QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INDEPENDENT SPENT FUEL STORAGE INSTALLATION

I. LOCATION

1. Specify location of proposed site.
   a. State, County, or other political jurisdiction

Response: Shoshoni, Fremont County, Wyoming.

   b. Tribal reservation.

Response: n/a

2. Specify size and site configuration.

Response: 2700 total acres. For configuration, please see Map No. 1.

3. Provide maps of site and area showing location, size, configuration and transportation corridor(s), together with jurisdictional boundaries.

Response: Please see Map No. 2.

II. HOST JURISDICTION ACCEPTANCE

1. Identify the jurisdiction or jurisdictions in which the site is located.

Response: The site is located in the State of Wyoming, in Fremont County, near Shoshoni.

2. Would there be any change in jurisdiction prior to licensing, construction or operation of the ISFSI? If so, identify other jurisdiction involved, and describe how and when such change would be accomplished.

Response: There would be no change in political jurisdiction over the site.

3. Describe basis for concluding that applicable jurisdiction (state/local; tribal) is a willing host.

Exhibit F.40 (continued)

Response:

In 1991 the Fremont County Commissioners requested from the Federal Government under the Nuclear Waste Fund Site Selection Program a $100,000 grant to begin initial studies. That money was received and spent in a very public and open Countywide evaluation process. The County Commissioners then authorized requesting the Phase 2B money (Three million dollars second phase money for statewide education).

At that point Governor Sullivan wrote an objection letter based upon the facility being owned and operated by the Department of Energy. That stopped that particular process. Four of the five County Commissioner who voted in favor of those actions are still on the Commission. Two of them have faced re-election and have won large margin victories. Ongoing contact has been made with the County Commission as to NEW Corp's program and there has been continued support from those particular Commissioners.

State Senator Bob Peck, the man in Wyoming most closely identified with this process since day one, has stood for election since the County Commissioner's project and has had a resounding re-election.

Attached is a copy of Goals 2000 Report which is a Riverton Chamber of Commerce/City of Riverton ongoing evaluation in what areas our community wants to proceed. Please note that the "MRS" (now NEW Corp/ISFSI continues to received high community support.

PLEASE NOTE IN THIS PARTICULAR CASE the Host would be NEW Corp and not one of the political subdivisions. It is NEW Corp's realistic belief, however, that the above mentioned ongoing evidence of support will not be eroded in the future and that NEW Corp continues to present a project which is favored by a strong nucleus of the communities within Fremont County. Senator Bob Peck indicates that in his traveling the State and in his attending various legislative interim sub-committee meetings, that there continues to be strong interest by citizens and legislators from outside of Fremont County.

4. Provide information on any surveys or opinion polls on views of residents in vicinity of proposed site to ISFSI.

Response: Please see above for election results.

5. Identify (and provide copes of) any jurisdictional restrictions, including applicable stale, local or tribal laws or regulations, which could prohibit or significantly restrict construction or operation of an ISFSI.

2

Exhibit F.40 (continued)

Response: I have already provided Mr. Northard and Mr. Parkyn with these.

6. Describe positions taken by local, regional and state-wide media on location of an ISFSI at proposed site or other locations.

Response: The Casper Star Tribune is the largest paper in the State located in Casper, Wyoming. It is a Scripps-Howard chain newspaper. It tends to be more "sensational" with its reporting of events. It has historically shown a editorial negative aspect (largely based on the prior MRS concept of government ownership).

It has now undergone a change in the position of publisher and although nothing dealing with NEW Corp has been public since then, it appears that the anti-mining, anti-oil and gas approach is being modified. The source of this understanding comes from John Atkins, public relations officer of Pathfinder/Cogema. Mr. Atkins and his office are in Cheyenne, Wyoming.

The State Capital is in Cheyenne and the Cheyenne Tribune editorialized during the Legislature two years when the existing State law was passed that it was in favor of allowing the facility.

The local community newspapers generally tend to be neutral in their editorialism.

There are no regional papers (The Billings Gazette and the Denver Post) which have seemed to take any substantial stand.

III. SITE OWNERSHIP.

1. Identify the individual or entity that currently holds title to the proposed site, and to the railroad transportation corridor.

Response: The proposed site consists of an overall area of approximate 2700 acres which is owned by a family corporation. NEW Corp has negotiated an Option to Purchase of the entire 2700 acres with the corporation. Within the option agreement, it is <u>clearly pointed out</u> the intended use of the property. It was NEW Corp's belief that full disclosure at all times and at all places was appropriate.

The proposed site wraps around both Burlington Northern Mainline and the Bad Water Line Spur line so that no property owned by other persons needs to be crossed by the Spur line or the mainline of the railroad.

3

Exhibit F.40 (continued)

The dirt road/county road which is shown in orange on Map No. 3 running parallel to the Spur line is a county road and its exit point comes off of State Highway 20/26.

2. Would title be transferred to another entity in connection with development of the ISFSI If so, identify the other entity and describe when and how title would be transferred.

Response: Title would not be transferred to any other entity. Perhaps the non-consumed land in the overall option total acres may be transferred to a different entity but the land actually used (assuming 200 consumed) is not intended to be transferred to any other entity.

3. If you do not currently own the site, provide the estimated cost to acquire it.

Response: The current option price for the entire 2700 acres is $1,000,000.00. That is a price which is a multiple of many times its value as agricultural grazing land. ($50.00 to $75.00 per acre).

No attempt has been made to this date to negotiate that number down in that within the entirety of Fremont County, this is the <u>only site</u> that has the confluence of major railroad, a functional and currently working spur line, sufficient land on either side of the spur line to handle the 200 acre facility, and no other entity owing any land which must be crossed in order to get to the facility site.

IV. TRANSPORTATION ACCESS

1. Describe the accessibility of the proposed site by railroad.

(a) Identify the railroad mainline(s) and their distance from the proposed site.

Response: On Map No. 2, the Burlington Northern mainline is shown as highlighted by the pink color. It is NEW Corp's belief that a substantial majority of the power plants to be served by this facility lie within the overall Burlington Northern rail system.

4

Exhibit F.40 (continued)

It is also to be recognized that the Burlington Northern line has now merged with another line so that there are hundreds of miles of additional track made part of the Burlington system.

The violet colored line on Map No. 1 is labeled Chicago and Northwestern. It no longer is owned by Chicago and Northwestern and is owned by a group of three gentlemen in Riverton, Wyoming who operate the line under the name of The Bad Water Line. These gentlemen are in the trona (soda ash) transportation business and operate approximately 100 tanker trucks that haul trona from Rock Springs/Green River, Wyoming to Bonneville to put it on the Burlington Northern to serve eastern United States manufacturers.

These gentlemen are progressive businessmen who have upgraded the line a 100 pound track.

(b) Does a rail spur exist to the proposed site or close thereto? If so, identify and describe. Is it capable of handling spent fuel shipments?

Response: Please see response to (a) above.

(c) If no rail spur exists to the proposed site, describe the terrain between the mainline(s) and the site, identify the jurisdiction through which such a rail spur to the site, including cost, ownership and availability of right-of-way, environmental impacts of construction and operation, etc.

Response: Please see response to (a) above.

(d) Provide other information relevant to the accessibility of the proposed site by railroad.

Response: Please see response to (a) above.

2. Describe the accessibility of the proposed site by highway.

(a) Identify the interstate highways and major thoroughfares closest to the proposed site and their distances from the site.

Response: On Map No. 2 in light blue, running east and west is the highlighted State Highway 20-26. It is wide double lane highway of good and substantial construction and width. On the west (right side of the map as

5

Exhibit F.40 (continued)

indicated) that Interstate 25 at Casper, Wyoming is approximately 80 miles away from the site. Interstate 25 runs north from Interstate 80 at Cheyenne, Wyoming to Casper and then north to Billings, Montana.

Also it is noted in light green that the Highway 20-26 which travels north through Shoshoni goes north to Boysen Lake and Boysen Dam which are 15 miles north of Shoshoni, north to Thermopolis which is 30 miles north of Shoshoni and north to Billings, Montana which is 225 miles away and where Interstate 90 intersects from I-25 coming from Casper.

Interstate 80 is due south of Shoshoni approximately 200 miles.

The "local area map" which is Map No. 1 and the State of Wyoming which is Map No. 2 should be reviewed in common to see how these State roadways and rail lines intersect. The closest roadway, of course, is State Highway 20-26 from which the Fremont County road exits on to the site property. State Highway 20-26 is approximately one-half mile from the beginning of the total optioned area and one mile from the proposed site area.

(b) Identify and describe existing roads suitable for major truck traffic from the proposed site to the interstate highways and major thoroughfares identified above.

Response: State Highway 20-26 (east/west Riverton to Casper highway) and State Highway 20 (the State highway north from Shoshoni to Thermopolis and Billings) are both capable of major truck traffic. Highway 20-26 is a better highway both as to its geographic layout, its width and maintenance and to its closer access to the Interstate system in Casper.

(c) To the extent that suitable roads for major truck traffic do not currently exist, describe the terrain over which such a road to be proposed site would need to be constructed, identify the jurisdictions through which such a road would pass, and provide other information relevant to constructing such a road, including cost, ownership and availability of right-of-way, environmental impacts of construction and operation, etc.

Response: Please see responses to (a) and (b) above.

(d) Provide other information relevant to the accessibility of the proposed site by highway.

Response: Please see responses to (a) and (b) above.

6

Exhibit F.40 (continued)

V. SEISMOLOGY

1. Provide copies of available seismic analysis of the site vicinity and surrounding region.

Response: Please see Exhibits A and B and Maps 4 and 5.

2. Are any known faults or geologic evidence of fault offsets located on or within 5 miles of the site?

(a) Describe and provide available information on the location and size of such faults or geologic evidence of fault offsets.

(b) Describe and provide available information on earthquakes associated with such faults or potentially associated with such faults or geologic evidence of fault evidence.

(c) Describe and provide any other currently available information concerning such faults or geologic evidence of fault offsets.

Response: Please see Exhibits A and B and Maps 4 and 5.

3. Are any known faults located within 200 miles of the site? If so, provide the information request in V. 2(a)-(c) above with respect to such faults.

Response: Please see Exhibits A and B.

4. Have earthquake tremors or ground acceleration been experienced or recorded in the site vicinity or surrounding areas? If so, describe and provide available information concerning such historical earthquakes, including the epicenters and ground accelerations associated with the earthquakes.

Response: Robert Anderson, President of NEW Corp has lived in Riverton for 47 years. If there have been any earthquakes tremors or ground accelerations they are unknown to him.

In the late 1950's or early 1960's an earthquake took place in Yellowstone Park.

7

Exhibit F.40 (continued)

There have been other earthquakes, but very small in significance in areas greater than 150 miles distant. As to this specific Site Area, no personally known seismic activity has taken place.

Please refer to the response to 2. (a) and (b) above for further information.

5. Based on the available information, does the proposed site lie "within the range of strong near-field ground motion from historical earthquakes on large capable faults?" See 20 C.R.R. Section 72.102(b).

Response: Please see the response to 2. (a) and (b) above.

VI. GEOLOGY/SOILS

1. Provide copies of available geologic analyses of the site, site vicinity (including transportation corridor(s) and, region.

Response: Please see the enclosed Exhibits A and B.

2. Describe soils and bedrock types at the site and (if not yet constructed) rail and highway access.

Response: Please Exhibits C & D. These are drilling logs from people within several hundred yards of the proposed site. The drilled water wells from domestic consumption. The logs are self-expressive as to what the surface and subsurface terrain is like.

3. Describe and provide available information on other geologic characteristics of the proposed site, not described above, in particular any geologic characteristics that may be considered unstable.

Response: Please see VI. l. above and V 2. (a) and (b) above.

4. Describe and provide available information concerning the topography of the proposed site.

Response: Please see the enclosed photographs which show general surface conditions of the area. Attached to Map No. 1.

8

Exhibit F.40 (continued)

VII. HYDROLOGY

1. Provide copies of available ground and surface water analyses for the site and site vicinity.

Response: By way of historical anecdote, the area is classified as high desert and receives an annual average of 6 to 10 inches of combined rain or snow based on total water accumulation.

The sandy soils absorb the water rather quickly.

Snow accumulations in the area in the winter time are seldom more than 3 or 4 inches for a couple of days.

Included with this at Exhibit D are water well bore hole logs which will show volume of water at specific depths and the types of subsurface stratification involved.

2. If a Probable Maximum Flood has been determined for the site, provide the analysis and show whether any part of the site of transportation corridor

Response: If a Probable Maximum flood has been calculated, no one in this area has been able to determine that.

There are no streams, lakes or retention basins above the elevation of this site.

3. Does any part of the site or transportation corridor(s) lie within a flood plan? If so, provide available information.

Response: No.

4. Is any part of the site or transportation corridor(s) considered to be wetlands?

Response: No.

5. Is the site or any portion of the site subject to flooding? Describe the frequency and severity of any flooding and provide any studies or evaluations that have been performed on the potential for flooding in the site vicinity and surrounding areas.

Response: Historically, none has happened.

9

Exhibit F.40 (continued)

6. Identify the distance to groundwater at the site.

Response: See Map as referred to in 1.

VIII. ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS

1. Provide copies of available environmental analyses for the site, transportation corridor(s) and site vicinity.

Response: Any environmental analyses of the site and its vicinity are done by the Nature Conservancy and their reports are attached at Exhibit E.

2. Identify any endangered or threatened plant or animal species that have been found in the site, transportation corridor(s), site vicinity and region.

Response: Please see Nature Conservancy report which fails to show any endangered or threatened species.

3. Describe any historical sites on or in the region surrounding the proposed ISFSI site or in the areas surround the proposed railroad or highway access to the site.

Response: There are no known or designated historical site. There are no known non-designated historical sites within several miles of the area.

4. Describe any archeological or cultural sites on or in the region surrounding the proposed ISFSI site or in the areas surrounding the proposed railroad or highway access to the site.

Response: There are no known archeological or cultural sites in the area.

5. Identify and describe recreational areas and facilities within ten miles of the proposed site and transportation corridor(s).

Response: Boysen Lake is popular Central Wyoming fishery year around and beach and boating enthusiast destination therein four to five summer months.

Exhibit F.40 (continued)

Most of the popular areas are more than 10 miles away although "as the crow flies" the eastern boundary of the Lake is within 10 miles of the site.

6. Describe the current land use of the site, transportation corridor(s) and site vicinity.

Response: Currently the land is used for livestock grazing approximately five months of the year.

7. Provide any available information on project future land use in the vicinity of the site and the transportation corridor(s).

Response: It is hard to determine future use of any of the land in the area. The company that owns spur line appears to be actively attempting to market their services, but they have been doing so for a couple of years without much success.

Bulk storage of various types of alfalfa hay for shipment both to the Orient and to East Coast race track owners has been discussed.

There is a very small discussion of using some land in the area for an unload/load zone for taconite which would come from a now abandoned iron ore mine 60 miles to the south.

A representative of a chemical company has been here to look the area as one of 6 or 8 potential areas for a fertilizer plant. I am uncertain as to whether that will ever take place as their water consumption is a bit high for what the availability of water is in the area.

IT MUST BE REMEMBERED that NEW Corp property is 2700 acres which would provide for substantial buffer zones, location of related businesses nearby, and for protection from any other type of industry.

8. Describe current air quality of the site, site vicinity and region.

Response: Air quality is virtually pristine. See Exhibit F.

9. Describe current water quality of any rivers, streams or other bodies of water in the vicinity of the site and the transportation corridor(s).

11

Exhibit F.40 (continued)

Response: Water quality is virtually pristine. Boysen Dam is all snow melt and rainwater accumulation with only the waste water effluent off some fields as a contaminate. Bad Water Creek that runs along side the Burlington Northern Mainline runs only four months of the year and is a dry sand bed the balance of the year. (There is no short term method by which NEW Corp can obtain any background radiation statistics.) See Exhibit G.

10. Provide information on background radiation for site and site vicinity.

Response: Gas Hills is a historic uranium mining and milling area located 70 miles south by southeast, as the crow flies. The tailings, mills and other areas have been subject to clean and restoration and radiation control.

IX. DEMOGRAPHY

1. What is the permanent and transient population within 10 miles of the proposed site? If available, provide population by 22-1/2 degree sectors at distances 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 10 miles from site.

Response: The area open terrain Wyoming high desert with very little population. The town of Shoshoni has 500 (plus or minus) people and that would be constant, year and year out. It is one mile from the proposed site.

Within ten miles of the proposed site, the only other population would be farmers and ranchers and that would total approximately 1000 people, including Shoshoni.

Riverton is 24 miles from the site and would be the first center of any substantial greater population.

2. Identify all towns and cities within 10 miles of the site.

Response: Please see 1 above.

3. Provide any available information on the population projections for future years for the 10 mile radius around the site and for all towns and cities within 20 miles of the site.

Response: Population projections for Shoshoni in the 10 miles radius are not in existence. I would assume that since Shoshoni has been the same size for the

12

Exhibit F.40 (continued)

last 20 years and there is nothing other than this project on the horizon for the area, this project would the dominate population shift.

Most people, however, would live in Riverton and commute the 24 miles.

Riverton is 24 miles away and is a town of 13,500 people. (The entire County is 40,000 people). Riverton probably shows a projected growth of 3% per year at best.

4. What is the permanent and transient population within 10 miles of the transportation corridor(s)(to the extent that this is outside the area described in IX 1. above.)

Response: The population growth along the transportation corridor(s) is not expected to be substantial. i. e. One or two houses per year at best.

X. METEOROLOGICAL/CLIMATOLOGICAL CONDITIONS

1. Provide information on the frequency and severity of any severe weather conditions (e.g. tornadoes, lightning, sever winds) that may be experience at the site which could potentially damage or affect the safe operation of the ISFSI facility.

Response: The site is approximately 10 miles as the crow flies from the Owl Creek Mountain Range. Some wind storms due occur against the Range with some lightening. It is not serious or substantial as to its frequency. Although once or twice a year a lightening storm may take place within 10 miles site. Tornadoes are not unheard of but this writer has lived here for 47 years and has never seen one nor heard of one in that area.

Severe winds for that area would be gusts of 30 or 40 miles an hour, perhaps three times a year in the springtime.

2. Provide information on weather conditions (e.g. winter storms/snow falls) that could significantly impede site access and operations during substantial portions of the year.

Response: The Burlington Northern train runs year around and therefore access to the site from the Burlington Northern and the spur line would not be impeded by any winter storms or at least historically they have not affected Burlington Northern activity.

13

Exhibit F.40 (continued)

The State Highway (20-26) and the County road off the highway to the site are open year around and would not impede access to the site.

XI. NATURAL/MAN-MADE HAZARDS

1. Provide information (e.g. type, severity, location, frequency,) on any natural hazards, not describe above, that could affect the site and potentially damage or affect the safe operation of the ISFSI facility.

Response: None known

2. Provide information (e.g., type, severity, location, frequency) on any man-made hazards that could affect the site and potentially damage or affect the safe operation of the ISFSI facility.

Response: None known

XII. SITE DEVELOPMENT COSTS

1. Provide information on the amount and difficulty of clearing and grading the proposed site for construction of the proposed ISFSI, including the likely need for rock blasting and import of fill from off site.

Response: All of the land has a gentle slope to it (1 to 3 degrees) Land leveling would be a necessity for a perfectly flat location. <u>However,</u> the soil is a sandy soil and amenable to easy modification by regular earth moving equipment.

It is probably recommended that an earthen berm around the facility be raised to serve as eye-sight shield only. No rock blasting would be needed and there is certainly plenty of dirt available both within the anticipated 200 acres and directly adjacent and off site to fill any potential needs.

2. Provide information on any dwellings, businesses, road and any other structures or infrastructures that may need to be relocated from the proposed site or the proposed rail and highway corridors to the site.

Response: There is only at best three residence which would need to be relocated. They are all at a distance outside of a 200 acre buffer area. However, if it became advisable, there are three locations, none of which are

Exhibit F.40 (continued)

extraordinarily expensive to rebuild, which may bear review for purchase and relocations. There are no businesses that would need such consideration.

3. Provide information concerning any significant environmental mitigation features (wetlands restoration, surface water diversion and runoff collection, cleanup of contaminants from prior land use) that may be necessary for construction of an ISFSI at the proposed site or of the proposed rail and highway access to the site.

Response: There are no environmental mitigation features which are currently anticipated. If the LLC wished to build a retention pond to collect rain and runoff off the higher bluff to the east would be optional but certainly not anything that should be required.

There are no environmental spills of any kind in the area as it has never been used for industrial purposes.

4. Provide information on the availability of electrical services for the proposed site.

Response: Pacific Power and Light (PacifiCorp) has the franchise to serve electricity in the area and has the capacity to bring whatever necessary service either from the Town of Shoshoni or across the Bad Water and up to the site.

5. Provide information relevant to developing infrastructure on site for the provision of other services (e.g. water and sewage.)

Response: Sewage facilities for human waste would be most likely taken care through a septic system which given the soil conditions would work ideally.

Drinking water could be obtain through either extension of the water line from the Town of Shoshoni or the drilling a water well on the site.

Industrial use of water, depending on the volume, would most likely come from the Shoshoni water lines or an additional water well.

6. Provide information on any unique conditions or characteristics of the proposed site and the surrounding region, not described above, that could affect the licensing, construction or operation of an ISFSI at the site.

Response: The site is accessible directly from the Burlington Northern and the Bad Water railroad lines. The Bad Water line currently is a 100 pound

15

Exhibit F.40 (continued)

line. No state or federal lands needs to be crossed in order to get to the site either from the Highway or from the railroad tracks. Because of the very large overall acreage around the site, placement of the specific 200 acre facility could be done with substantial ease.

XIII. SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS.

1. Provide information on availability of, and proximity to, potential work force.
2. Provide information on distance to, and availability of, housing for work force.
3. Provide information on impact of work force on schools, public services, utilities, etc.

Response: Fremont County currently has a 7% unemployment rate. We have 1500 people who are "under employed" in all fields of work which would apply to this project. Housing is available in Shoshoni in rural settings and in Riverton sufficient to handle the needs of the work force. The school system in Shoshoni is excellent and should not need upgrading for this work force nor should the schools in Riverton.

No substantial impact on public services or utilities should be made by this project.

Exhibit F.41

RESPONSE TO THE SITE SELECTION QUESTIONNAIRE

FOR

AN INDEPENDENT SPENT FUEL STORAGE INSTALLATION

I. LOCATION

1. The UNC proposed site is located in Mc Kinley County, New Mexico.

2. The site is 878 acres. UNC operated a uranium mill on the site through 1982. The tailings area is a Superfund site and is within two years of complete remediation. The tailings area is graded nearly level and the NRC and EPA approved remediation plan will assure 1000 years stability. There are additional areas currently used for working buildings and machinery storage which are suitable for construction of a transfer facility.

3. Two site maps are attached and identified as Exhibit A. The Santa Fe Railroad runs a mainline parallel to Interstate 40 shown on the map. State highway 566 shown is direct to the proposed site. There are a number of other maps and charts of various types and for specific purposes of explanation included among other exhibits.

II. HOST JURISDICTION ACCEPTANCE

1. The proposed site is located in Mc Kinley County, New Mexico.

2. No change in jurisdiction is anticipated prior to licensing construction or operation of the ISFSI.

3. UNC has successfully remediated this property under the scrutiny of the local media, the local Native American Tribes, the NRC and the EPA. In addition to this site, UNC has a successful history of restoring nuclear sites to environmentally sound conditions and converting the sites to public use and planned private residential, recreational, and industrial use.

   UNC was a manufacturer of submarine nuclear reactors for over twenty years at a Connecticut plant. In 1990, UNC reached agreement with the Department of Energy to close the plant due to insufficient new submarine production. After closing in 1991, the site was reclaimed with proper remediation completed. The NRC terminated its license for the site in June of 1994. The Connecticut EPA cleared the site for "public" use in 1995. In 1993, UNC entered into a contract with the Mohegan Indian tribe for

Exhibit F.41 (continued)

the sale of the property. UNC was directly involved with the Bureau of Indian Affairs which eventually allowed the Department of Interior to take the property into "trust" for the Mohegan tribe. In addition, negotiations involved two successive governors of Connecticut, the first of whom favored, and the second of whom opposed the tribal operations. As a result of these negotiations, the sale was completed and a public gaming facility is under construction and will open in the near future.

UNC also operated a uranium reprocessing facility in Rhode Island. At the conclusion of operations, this land was restored to pristine conditions and is currently planned for development as a well balanced community, integrated with existing natural systems. The proposed development is described in Exhibit B. The associated NRC license was terminated in the fall of 1995.

Should this site be selected as the ISFSI, UNC will engage a New Mexico public relations firm to assist in a public education and awareness program, stressing the inherent safety of an ISFSI and the substantial economic benefits accruing to the local community when they host such a site. This program would be similar to efforts made in Connecticut and Rhode Island. UNC believes the Church Rock site meets all the technical criteria for an ISFSI and recognizes public and political support will be essential for the successful siting of an ISFSI at its location..

UNC will also, with the concurrence of the L.L.C. , form a citizens advisory committee comprised of New Mexico citizens of note. The members will have credibility with the populace and the media, will be scientifically oriented, and will have representatives from Native Americans, the environmentally concerned, academia, and prominent citizens. This committee will be provided with appropriate technical data, nuclear background information, and will be invited to visit successful spent fuel storage sites in foreign countries. They will be asked to adhere to a limited time schedule and prepare and release a report to the people of New Mexico on the net benefits of an ISFSI. The committee members will be volunteers, but their expenses related to this work will be paid.

A video tape will be prepared. This tape will explain the project to be undertaken, the safety measures which will be in place, and a general explanation of the benefits accruing to the locale in which the site is located. The tape will also serve as a primer in understanding nuclear energy so as to remove the element of fear of the unknown. Dramatic comparisons of the inherent safety and cleanliness of nuclear energy as compared to fossil fuel generated power, and even other industries such as transportation will be portrayed. For example, we may show the enormous benefits of air travel, including bringing families and friends together, supporting world commerce, providing emergency medical and health benefits and bringing prosperity

2

Exhibit F.41 (continued)

to involved communities. We can then show the air pollution and the noise pollution created by airplanes, the safety record of air travel as compared to nuclear energy and ask the question "should we ban all aircraft from the planet?". We can also show the benefits provided by fossil fuels and look at the pollution caused by them. A comparison of safety records of nuclear versus fossil fuel will favor nuclear energy. Again the question of banning fossil fuels can be asked. The major point made will be, once there is a basic understanding of nuclear energy, the safety measures to be taken, and the economic benefit associated with an ISFSI, it makes no more sense to oppose nuclear installations than it does to oppose other accepted industries. This tape will address the propaganda and misinformation disseminated by the extremist groups opposed to siting an ISFSI anywhere. The tape will be shown to local citizens groups in New Mexico, Native American groups, civic clubs, and will be available for showing on both commercial and public broadcasting television stations.

UNC will also exercise its working relationships with the key political figures in the local, state, and federal governments. Our strategy will be to seek positions of non-opposition and to avoid any possible embarrassment prior to the November elections. Our outside counsel in this matter is experienced in nuclear matters, general energy matters, and includes a former NRC Commissioner and a current advisor to the Secretary of Energy.

4. There are no residents within one and one half miles of the proposed site. The population density of Mc Kinley county is 11.2 people per square mile as compared to an average of 68.6 people per square mile throughout the United States. No polls have been conducted among the populace of Mc Kinley county, but UNC is prepared to conduct such polls upon selection of Church Rock as the ISFSI.

5. We have not found any regulatory impediments to construction and operation of an ISFSI at the UNC site, and will continue a current and comprehensive review of all germane regulations.

6. UNC has been subjected to intense scrutiny by the New Mexico media since the closing of our mine and milling operation in 1982. Strict adherence to NRC and EPA reclamation criteria and conscientious meeting and improvement upon agreed schedules has earned the respect of the local media for the efforts made. Utilization of a first rate New Mexico public relations firm and inclusion of the local media in our educational and awareness program will generate reasonable support once the safety of the operation and the economic benefits are known and understood. We are, of course, aware of and have copies of most of the media coverage generated by the Mescalero negotiations.

3

Exhibit F.41 (continued)

III. SITE OWNERSHIP

1. United Nuclear Corporation, a wholly owned subsidiary of UNC Incorporated, owns the site. The Santa Fe Railroad owns and operates the main railroad line within ten miles of the site. Should a spur be constructed to the site, the right of way alongside State Highway 566 would be the logical path and ownership of that land is spread among the Federal government, State government, and several private entities.

2. The title may be transferred to an entity as required by any agreement between Private Fuel Storage, L.L.C. and UNC Incorporated.

3. The site is owned by UNC.

IV. TRANSPORTATION ACCESS

1. (a) The Santa Fe main line runs east/west ten miles south of the site.

   (b) A rail spur does not exist currently.

   (c) The logical right of way for a rail spur would parallel State Highway 566 directly to the site. The route would pass through land owned by the Federal government, State government, and several private entities.

   (d) Should a rail spur be found more economic than use of State Highway 566, the grading and route would be straightforward.

2. (a) Interstate Highway 40 runs east/west ten miles south of the site. State Highway 566 runs from I-40 directly to the site.

   (b) The existing highways are suitable for heavy truck loading and have already been used for such.

   (c) Suitable highways do exist.

   (d) State Highway 566 is capable and has been used for heavy truck transport from both the Santa Fe railroad and I-40 for the ten miles direct to the site.

V. SEISMOLOGY

1. Exhibit C, section 2.5 includes copies of seismic analyses of the site vicinity and surrounding region.

Exhibit F.41 (continued)

2. (a), (b), & (c)

3. (a), (b), & (c)

4. Detailed information pertaining to questions 2,3 & 4 are found in Exhibit C, section 2.5 and D, section B4.3

5. The proposed site does not lie within the range of strong near-field ground motion from historical earthquakes on large capable faults.

VI. GEOLOGY/SOILS

1. See Exhibit E sections 1.0 and 2.0
2. See Exhibit E sections 1.0 and 2.0
3. See Exhibit E sections 1.0 and 2.0
4. See Exhibit E sections 1.0 and 2.0

VII. HYDROLOGY

1. Detailed data in response to ground water analysis can be found in Exhibits D, E, & F. There is no surface water at the site.

2. A Probable Maximum Flood (PMF) has been calculated for the site. Exhibit G shows the limits of the PMF. While a portion of the site is below the PMF elevation, sufficient acreage remains for construction of an ISFSI.

3. Additional study is required to respond to this question.

4. There are no wetlands in the area or in the transportation corridor.

5. The site is not subject to flooding. The site is transected by a natural ephemeral drainage known as pipeline arroyo. Under normal conditions this drainage way is dry and contains water only during precipitation.

6. See Exhibit E, section 3.0

VIII. ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS

Exhibit F.41 (continued)

1. Exhibit C provides the analyses requested.

2. There are no known endangered or threatened plant or animal species in the site, the transportation corridors, the site vicinity or the region.

3. See Exhibit C, section 2.3

4. See Exhibit C, section 2.3

5. There are no recreational facilities within ten miles of the facility or the adjacent transportation corridor.

6. The site is currently being reclaimed after use as a uranium milling facility ceased in 1982. The transportation corridor is a state highway. There is some grazing of cattle and sheep in immediate juxtaposition to the site.

7. The site has no future planned land use. It will remain as a remediated uranium tailings site. The surrounding land is sparsely populated and is used for some grazing. No change in this use is anticipated. The nearest residence is over 1.5 miles from the site.

8. The air quality of the site, the site vicinity and the region is excellent.

9. See Exhibit C, section 2.6

10. See Exhibit C, section 2.9

IX. DEMOGRAPHY

1. See Attachment H, section A.19

2. There are no towns or cities within ten miles of the proposed site.

3. There has been no significant change in the population within five miles of the site for the last 15 years. There is no reason to expect any significant change within the foreseeable future.

4. Attachment H covers half the transportation corridor, and the other half has a population density similar to that of the rest of Mc Kinley county.

X. METEOROLOGICAL/CLIMATOLOGICAL CONDITIONS

6

Exhibit F.41 (continued)

1. See Exhibit C, section 2.7

2. See Exhibit C, section 2.7

XI. NATURAL/MAN MADE HAZARDS

1. There are no natural hazards not described above that could affect the site and potentially damage or affect the safe operation of the ISFSI.

2. There are no man-made hazards that could affect the site and potentially damage or affect the safe operation of the ISFSI.

XII. SITE DEVELOPMENT COSTS

1. The site is already cleared and the grading for installation of the complete ISFSI would be minimal. Over three hundred acres of the land has been graded nearly level with drainage planned to withstand a thousand year flood. No blasting or importation of fill would be required.

2. There is no need for any relocation of dwellings, businesses, roads, or any other structures or infrastructures at the proposed site or along any transportation corridors to the site.

3. Comprehensive environmental studies of the site prior to mining and milling and after shutdown had not revealed any wetlands restoration, surface water diversion and runoff collection which would preclude ISFSI operations. The site is a Superfund site and total reclamation is being accomplished in full accord with all NRC and EPA requirements. UNC does not anticipate any ISFSI owner/operator liabilities being attached. Reclamation efforts will be complete in less than two years and, in any event, UNC would be willing to indemnify such participant(s) against any such liability.

4. Electricity to the site is in place and provided by Public Service of New Mexico.

5. Water is provided by private wells and sewerage is treated in septic tanks. The septic tanks would require enlargement for an ISFSI operation.

6. UNC is not aware of any unique conditions or characteristics of the proposed site and surrounding region, not described above, that could affect the licensing, construction,

7

Exhibit F.41 (continued)

or operation of an ISFSI at the site.

XIII. SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS

1. UNC currently employs eleven people at its Church Rock site. During peak operations in 1980, approximately 1500 persons of varied skills were employed by UNC at the site. There has been little change in the area population since that time.

2. The city of Gallup (population 20,000) is seventeen miles from Church Rock.
   The city of Grants (population 20,000) is sixty miles from Church Rock.
   The city of Albuquerque (population 500,000) is one hundred and forty miles from Church Rock.

3. There should be no impact on area schools, public services, utilities, etc. from the operation of an ISFSI at Church Rock.

8

NRC FORM 335
(2-89)
NRCM 1102,
3201, 3202

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET

(See instructions on the reverse)

1. REPORT NUMBER
(Assigned by NRC, Add Vol., Supp., Rev., and Addendum Numbers, if any.)

NUREG 1714
VOLUME 1

2. TITLE AND SUBTITLE

Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Construction and Operation of an I ndependent Spent Fuel Storage Installation on the Reservation of the Skull Valley Band of Goshute indians and the Related Transportation Facility in Tooele County, Utah

3. DATE REPORT PUBLISHED

MONTH	YEAR
December	2001

4. FIN OR GRANT NUMBER

5. AUTHOR(S)

See Chapter 11-List of Preparers

6. TYPE OF REPORT

Final to Support NRC ROD

7. PERIOD COVERED *(Inclusive Dates)*

8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION - NAME AND ADDRESS *(If NRC, provide Division, Office or Region, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and mailing address; if contractor, provide name and mailing address.)*

Spent Fuel Project Office
Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001

9. SPONSORING ORGANIZATION - NAME AND ADDRESS *(If NRC, type "Same as above"; if contractor, provide NRC Division, Office or Region, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and mailing address.)*

Same as above

10. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

U.S. Bureau of land Management, U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, and U.S. Surface Transportation Board are cooperating agencies

11. ABSTRACT *(200 words or less)*

Private Fuel Storage, L.L.C. (PFS), proposes to construct and operate an indepe ndent spent fuel storage installation on the Reservation of the Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians. The Reservation is lo cated geographically within Tooele County, Utah. Spent nuclear fuel (SNF) would be transported by rail from existing U.S. commercial reactor sites to Skull Valley. To transport the SNF from the existing rail line to the proposed facility, PFS pro posed to construct and operate a rail siding and a 51 im (32mile) rail line from the rail line near Low, Utah to the reservation.
This final environmental impact statement evaluates the potential environmental impacts of the PFS proposal. The document discusses the purpose and need for the PFS proposed facility, describes the pro posed action and its reasonable alternatives, describes the environment potentially affected by the proposal, presents and co mpares the potential environmental impacts resulting from the proposed action and its alternatives, and identifies mitigat ion measures that could eliminate or lessen the potential environmental impacts.
The PFS proposal requires approval from four federal agencies: the U. S. Nuclea r Regulatory Commission, the U.S. Department of Interior's Bureau of Indian Affairs and Bureau of Land Management, and the U.S. Surface Transportation Board. The actions required of these agencies are administrative. The environmental issues that each of these agencies must evaluate pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) are i nterrelated; therefore; the agencies have cooperated in the preparation of this final environmental impact statement, and this document serves to satisfy each agency's statutory responsibilities under NEPA.

12. KEY WORDS/DESCRIPTORS *(List words or phrases that will assist researchers in locating the report.)*

Private Fuel Storage, PFS, Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians, ISFSI, Skull V alley, Utah, independent spent fuel sotrage installation, FEIS

13. AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

unlimited

14. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION

(This Page)
unclassified

(This Report)
unclassified

15. NUMBER OF PAGES

16. PRICE

This form was electronically produced by Elite Federal Forms, Inc.