



Department of Comprehensive Planning Nuclear Waste Division

500 S Grand Central Pky • Ste 3012 • PO Box 551751 • Las Vegas NV 89155-1751
(702) 455-5175 • Fax (702) 455-5190

John L. Schlegel, Director • Dennis Bechtel, Planning Manager



65 FR 11613
March 3, 2000

7

RECEIVED
200 APR 11 AM 9:19
RULES & DIR. BRANCH
U.S. NRC

April 6, 2000

Mr. David L. Meyer, Chief
Rules and Directives Branch,
Mail Stop T6D59
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Subject: NRC's Draft Strategic Plan for Fiscal Years 2000-2005

Dear Mr. Meyer:

Attached are Clark County's comments on the draft strategic plan for the U.S.N.R.C. We appreciate the opportunity to be able to submit our comments on this important document.

Sincerely,

Dennis Bechtel
Manager

bmc0132evt
Enc.

~~FILE # 133-10116~~
Template Adm 013

E-RIDS=ADM03
Add Daryl Kade (DWK)

**Comments
By
Clark County, Nevada
on the
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Strategic Plan**

The following are Clark County's comments on the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Strategic Plan, which was issued, in the Federal Register, for public comment on March 3, 2000.

Under "Nuclear Waste Safety" the draft plan states that "--consultations with the Department of Energy (DOE) to resolve issues most important--"

Clark County believes that the pre-licensing consultation phase between the DOE and the NRC should comprise more than information sharing. Issues that will impact a license application cannot totally be resolved at the present time Clark County feels that *resolve* is too strong a word to use in this context.

Under the section of the use of measures to reduce unnecessary regulatory burden the statement is made "--to be protective at reasonable cost and undue conservatism."

Clark County is unable to determine exactly what this statement implies. The term "undue" is defined in Webster's dictionary as "exceeding or violating propriety or fitness." The term "*reasonable*" should not be at the expense of public health and safety. Clark County, however, believes that neither of these terms should be used in the regulatory environment because they are subjective and, therefore, open to varying interpretations. We, however, agree with the statement that the burden *should be commensurate with the risk of the regulated activity*. The disposition of high level waste is, given the waste being stored and the time frame considered, a very risky undertaking for a number of generations of potential future residents. NRC needs to ensure that the Strategic Plan reflects a regulatory burden on the applicant (in the case of the Yucca Mountain Program) is commensurate with the risk.

Under public involvement the statement is made that "--our efforts may not be successful and could negatively affect our overall goal of improving public confidence in the NRC as a regulator."

Clark County finds this statement somewhat disturbing as it sets the stage for the NRC to pull out of a public involvement program. Involving the public in Yucca Mountain Program activities is an important undertaking, one that takes resources and time. We would, therefore, urge the NRC to expend needed efforts to achieve comprehensive public involvement on nuclear waste program issues.