

April V. Gil
 U.S. Department of Energy
 Office of Civilian Radioactive
 Waste Management
 Yucca Mountain Site Characterization
 Office
 PO Box 98608
 Las Vegas, Nevada 89193-8608

April 17, 1997

SUBJECT: GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR THE RECOMMENDATION OF SITES FOR
 NUCLEAR WASTE REPOSITORIES — NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING
 (DOCKET NO. RW-RM-96-100)

Dear Ms. Gil:

On December 16, 1996, the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) published, in the *Federal Register*, for public comment, proposed amendments to its "General Siting Guidelines for the Recommendation of Sites for Nuclear Waste Repositories" found at 10 CFR Part 960 (see 61 FR 66158). The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission concurred on the 1984 original version of these guidelines, in accordance with the requirements of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (Public Law 97-425). In its *Federal Register* notice, DOE indicated that it would be submitting the proposed amendments to the Commission for concurrence (61 FR 66160).

Inasmuch as DOE has given the staff an opportunity to review the proposed amendments before DOE submits the proposed amendments to the Commission, the staff has some general comments for DOE's consideration (see enclosure). Because DOE plans to submit to the Commission for concurrence its currently proposed amendments, the enclosed comments should not be considered the final NRC position on this matter.

If you have any questions about these comments, please contact Michael P. Lee of my staff. He can be reached at 301-415-6677.

Sincerely,

(ORIGINAL SIGNED BY)

Carl J. Paperiello, Director
 Office of Nuclear Material Safety
 and Safeguards

*WM-11
 102.8
 NHTB
 97-10*

Enclosure: NRC Staff Comments on
 10 CFR Part 960 Amendments

Diskette files in C.F. diskette will be stored at archival facility 5/9/97 JPC

cc: See Next Page

DISTRIBUTION: Central File DWM r/f PSobel NMSS r/f CPoland PUBLIC LSS SWastler On-Site Reprs
 CNWRA KMcConnell KStablein KCyr PAHL r/f IG ACNW

DOCUMENT NAME: S: DWMPAHLIMPLdoetr.new * SEE PREVIOUS CONCURRENCE

OFC	PAHL		Tech Ed		PAHL		PAHL		ENGB
NAME	MLee*		EKraus*		JThoms*		JAustin*		MBell*
DATE	03/06/97		03/05/97		03/06/97		03/10/97		03/11/97
OFC	DWM		OGC		NMSS				
NAME	MFederline*		WReamer*		CPaperiello				
DATE	03/13/97		03/19/97		04/17/97				

NRC FILE CENTER COPY OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

9704220303 970417
 PDR WASTE
 WM-11 PDR

April V. Gil
 U.S. Department of Energy
 Office of Civilian Radioactive
 Waste Management
 Yucca Mountain Site Characterization
 Office
 PO Box 98608
 Las Vegas, Nevada 89193-8608

**SUBJECT: GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR THE RECOMMENDATION OF SITES FOR NUCLEAR
 WASTE REPOSITORIES – NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING (DOCKET
 NO. RW-RM-96-100)**

Dear Ms. Gil:

On December 16, 1996, the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) published, in the *Federal Register*, for public comment, proposed amendments to its "General Siting Guidelines for the Recommendation of Sites for Nuclear Waste Repositories" found at 40 CFR Part 191 (see 61 FR 66158). The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission concurred on the 1984 original version of these guidelines, in accordance with the requirements of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (Public Law 97-425). As a condition of NRC's 1984 concurrence, DOE committed to obtain Commission concurrence on future siting guideline revisions that related to NRC jurisdiction. In its *Federal Register* notice, DOE indicated that it would be submitting the proposed amendments to the Commission, and would again obtain its concurrence (61 FR 66160).

Before DOE submits the proposed amendments to the Commission, it has given the staff an opportunity to review them. The staff has some general comments for DOE's consideration (see enclosure). Because DOE will be requesting Commission concurrence on its currently proposed amendments, the enclosed comments should not be considered the final NRC position on this matter.

If you have any questions about these comments, please contact Michael P. Lee of my staff. He can be reached at 301-415-6677.

Sincerely,

Carl J. Paperiello, Director
 Office of Nuclear Material Safety
 and Safeguards

Enclosure: NRC Staff Comments on
 10 CFR Part 960 Amendments

cc: See Next Page

DISTRIBUTION: Central File DWM r/f PSobel NMSS r/f CPoland PUBLIC LSS SWastler On-Site Reps
 CNWRA KMcConnell KStablein KCyr PAHL r/f IG ACNW
 DOCUMENT NAME: S: DWM\PAHL\MPL\doetr.960 * SEE PREVIOUS CONCURRENCE

OFC	PAHL		Tech Ed *		PAHL	E	PAHL		ENGB
NAME	MLee <i>MPL</i>		EKraus <i>MPL</i>		JThoma <i>307</i>		JAustin		MBell
DATE	03/097		03/05/97		03/6/97	H	03/10/97		03/ /97
OFC	DWM		DWM		OGC		NMSS		
NAME	MFedarine		JGreeves		WReamer		CPaperiello		
DATE	03/ /97		03/ /97		03/ /97		03/ /97		

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

April V. Gil
 U.S. Department of Energy
 Office of Civilian Radioactive
 Waste Management
 Yucca Mountain Site Characterization
 Office
 PO Box 98608
 Las Vegas, Nevada 89193-8608

**SUBJECT: GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR THE RECOMMENDATION OF SITES FOR
 NUCLEAR WASTE REPOSITORIES – NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING
 (DOCKET NO. RW-RM-96-100)**

Dear Ms. Gil:

On December 16, 1996, the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) published, in the *Federal Register*, for public comment, proposed amendments to its "General Siting Guidelines for the Recommendation of Sites for Nuclear Waste Repositories" found at 40 CFR Part 191 (see 61 FR 66158). The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission concurred on the 1984 original version of these guidelines, in accordance with the requirements of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (Public Law 97-425). As a condition of NRC's 1984 concurrence, DOE committed to obtain Commission concurrence on future siting guideline revisions that related to NRC jurisdiction. In its *Federal Register* notice, DOE indicated that it would be submitting the proposed amendments to the Commission, and would again obtain its concurrence (61 FR 66160).

Inasmuch as DOE has given the staff an opportunity to review the proposed amendments before they submit the proposed amendments to the Commission, the staff has some general comments for DOE's consideration (see enclosure). Because DOE will be requesting Commission concurrence on its currently proposed amendments, the enclosed comments should not be considered the final NRC position on this matter.

If you have any questions about these comments, please contact Michael P. Lee of my staff. He can be reached at 301-415-6677.

Sincerely,

Carl J. Paperiello, Director
 Office of Nuclear Material Safety
 and Safeguards

Enclosure: NRC Staff Comments on
 10 CFR Part 960 Amendments

cc: See Next Page

DISTRIBUTION: Central File DWM r/f PSobel NMSS r/f CPoland PUBLIC LSS SWastler On-Site Reps
 CNWRA KMcConnell KStablein KCyr PAHL r/f IG ACNW
 DOCUMENT NAME: S: DWM\PAHL\MPL\doetr.960 • SEE PREVIOUS CONCURRENCE

OFC	PAHL		Tech Ed		PAHL		PAHL		ENGB
NAME	MLee*		EKraus*		JThoma*		JAustin*		MBa
DATE	03/06/97		03/05/97		03/06/97		03/10/97		03/11/97
OFC	DWM		DWM		OGC		NMSS		
NAME	MFederline		JGreeves		WRearner		CPaperiello		
DATE	03/13/97		03/ /97		03/19/97		03/ /97		

01. 3/12/97

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

BT 3/12

TE

Mar 05

10:58 NO.001 P.02

April 5, 1997
 U.S. Department of Energy
 Office of Civilian Radioactive
 Waste Management
 Yucca Mountain Site Characterization
 Office
 PO Box 88608
 Las Vegas, Nevada 89193-8608

**SUBJECT: GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR THE RECOMMENDATION OF SITES FOR
 NUCLEAR WASTE REPOSITORIES - NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING
 (DOCKET NO. RW-RM-96-100)**

Dear Ms. Gil:

NRC concurred ON
~~CONCURRED ON~~

X

On December 16, 1996, the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) published in the *Federal Register*, for public comment, proposed amendments to its "General Siting Guidelines for the Recommendation of Sites for Nuclear Waste Repositories" found at 40 CFR Part 191 (see 61 FR 66158). The 1984 version of these guidelines, received the original concurrence of the NRC, in accordance with the requirements of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (Public Law 97-425). As a condition of its 1984 concurrence, DOE committed to obtain Commission concurrence on future revisions to the siting guidelines that relate to NRC jurisdiction. In its *Federal Register* notice, DOE indicated that it would be submitting the proposed amendments to the Commission, and would again obtain its concurrence (61 FR 66160).

NRC's

DOE will be requesting

it has given

Before DOE
 In advance of submitting the proposed amendments to the Commission, the staff has reviewed them, and has some general comments, at the staff level for the DOE's Department's consideration (enclosed). Because the Commission will have a concurrence role on the amendments currently proposed by DOE, the enclosed comments should not be considered as the final NRC position on this matter.

(see enclosure)

If you have any questions with regard to these comments, please contact Michael P. Lee of my staff. He can be reached at 301/415-6077.

Sincerely,

Carl J. Paperiello, Director
 Office of Nuclear Material Safety
 and Safeguards

Enclosure: NRC Staff Comments
 on 10 CFR Part 960 Amendments

cc: See Next Page

DISTRIBUTION: Central File DWM #/ Filed NRC #/ Copied PUBLIC LSS SW/Order On-File Page
 CNWRA KMcConnell KStallin KCyr PAWL #/ LIS EG ACNW

DOCUMENT NAME: S:\NW\PAWL\WPL\doftr.960

OPC	PAWL		Tech Ed		PAWL		PAWL		ENGB
NAME	MLee		EL...		JThorne		JAugh		MBel
DATE	03/19/97		03/19/97		03/19/97		03/19/97		03/19/97
OPC	DWM		DWM		OGC		NRCSS		
NAME	MFederico		JGravito		WRamsey		CPaperiello		
DATE	03/03/97		03/19/97		03/19/97		03/19/97		

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

2

**U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
STAFF COMMENTS ON THE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY'S
PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO ITS "GENERAL SITING
GUIDELINES FOR THE RECOMMENDATION OF
SITES FOR NUCLEAR WASTE REPOSITORIES" —
10 CFR PART 960**

1. The U.S. Department of Energy's (DOE's) draft postclosure system guideline found at Section 960.6-1 states that the "...repository shall perform in accordance with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) standards established specifically for the Yucca Mountain site and the NRC regulations implementing those standards...." (61 *FR* 66164, 66169) At the staff level, we believe that it is not accurate to describe the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's regulations solely as "...implementing these standards...." NRC's regulations have a broader role than just to implement the EPA standards. They contain the technical requirements and criteria for licensing a geologic repository, as provided for by Section 121(b) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, as amended. However, NRC's regulations must be consistent with the EPA standards for Yucca Mountain.

Action

The staff recommends that the relevant portion of the DOE draft guideline should read "... in accordance with both the EPA standards established specifically for the Yucca Mountain site and NRC's regulations applicable to the Yucca Mountain site"

2. Both the draft postclosure and preclosure system guidelines found at Subpart E (Section 960.6) state that the geologic repository shall be evaluated against the site-specific EPA standards and the NRC regulations (61 *FR* 66169). However, in the supplementary information, it is stated that "...DOE would not reach a determination on the suitability of the Yucca Mountain site under these Guidelines in the absence of the final promulgation of [the EPA] standards...." (61 *FR* 66164) From these statements, it is not clear whether DOE would also defer a site suitability determination on the Yucca Mountain site under its revised Guidelines in the absence of final NRC regulations that have undergone revision so as to be consistent with the EPA standards under the Energy Policy Act of 1992.

Action

The staff recommends that the supplementary information in question be revised to eliminate the lack of clarity.

Enclosure

April V. Gil
 U.S. Department of Energy
 Office of Civilian Radioactive
 Waste Management
 Yucca Mountain Site Characterization
 Office
 PO Box 98608
 Las Vegas, Nevada 89193-8608

April 17, 1997

**SUBJECT: GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR THE RECOMMENDATION OF SITES FOR
 NUCLEAR WASTE REPOSITORIES — NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING
 (DOCKET NO. RW-RM-96-100)**

Dear Ms. Gil:

On December 16, 1996, the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) published, in the *Federal Register*, for public comment, proposed amendments to its "General Siting Guidelines for the Recommendation of Sites for Nuclear Waste Repositories" found at 10 CFR Part 960 (see 61 *FR* 66158). The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission concurred on the 1984 original version of these guidelines, in accordance with the requirements of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (Public Law 97-425). In its *Federal Register* notice, DOE indicated that it would be submitting the proposed amendments to the Commission for concurrence (61 *FR* 66160).

Inasmuch as DOE has given the staff an opportunity to review the proposed amendments before DOE submits the proposed amendments to the Commission, the staff has some general comments for DOE's consideration (see enclosure). Because DOE plans to submit to the Commission for concurrence its currently proposed amendments, the enclosed comments should not be considered the final NRC position on this matter.

If you have any questions about these comments, please contact Michael P. Lee of my staff. He can be reached at 301-415-6677.

Sincerely,

(ORIGINAL SIGNED BY)

Carl J. Paperiello, Director
 Office of Nuclear Material Safety
 and Safeguards

Enclosure: NRC Staff Comments on
 10 CFR Part 960 Amendments

cc: See Next Page

DISTRIBUTION: Central File DWM r/f PSobel NMSS r/f CPoland PUBLIC LSS SWastler On-Site Reps
 CNWRA KMcConnell KStablein KCyr PAHL r/f IG ACNW
 DOCUMENT NAME: S: DWM\PAHL\MPL\doctr.new * SEE PREVIOUS CONCURRENCE

OFC	PAHL		Tech Ed		PAHL		PAHL		ENGB	
NAME	MLee*		EKraus*		JThoma*		JAustin*		MBell*	
DATE	03/06/97		03/05/97		03/06/97		03/10/97		03/11/97	
OFC	DWM		OGC		NMSS					
NAME	MFederline*		WReamer*		CPaperiello					
DATE	03/13/97		03/19/97		04/17/97					

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Distribution List for Letter Dated: April 17, 1997

cc: R. Milner, OCRWM
C. Johnson, State of Nevada
B. Price, Nevada Legislative Committee
J. Meder, Nevada Legislative Counsel Bureau
W. Barnes, YMPO
C. Einberg, DOE/Wash, DC
M. Murphy, Nye County, NV
M. Baughman, Lincoln County, NV
D. Bechtel, Clark County, NV
D. Weigel, GAO
P. Niedzielski-Eichner, Nye County, NV
B. Mettam, Inyo County, CA
V. Poe, Mineral County, NV
W. Cameron, White Pine County, NV
T. Manzeni, Lander County, NV
L. Fiorenzi, Eureka County, NV
J. Hoffman, Esmeralda County, NV
J. Regan, Churchill County, NV
L. Bradshaw, Nye County, NV
W. Barnard, NWTRB
R. Holden, NCAI
T. Burton, NIEC
S. Brocoum, YMPO
R. Arnold, Pahrump, NV
N. Stellavato, Nye County, NV
J. Lyznicky, AMA
R. Milner, YMPO
B. Russo, EPA
A. Gil, YMPO
R. Anderson, NEI

**U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
STAFF COMMENTS ON THE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY'S
PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO ITS "GENERAL SITING
GUIDELINES FOR THE RECOMMENDATION OF
SITES FOR NUCLEAR WASTE REPOSITORIES" –
10 CFR PART 960**

1. The U.S. Department of Energy's (DOE's) draft postclosure system guideline found at Section 960.6-1 states that the "...repository shall perform in accordance with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) standards established specifically for the Yucca Mountain site and the NRC regulations implementing those standards...." (61 *FR* 66164, 66169) At the staff level, we believe that it is not accurate to describe the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's regulations solely as "...implementing these standards...." NRC's regulations have a broader role than just to implement the EPA standards. They contain the technical requirements and criteria for licensing a geologic repository, as provided for by Section 121(b) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, as amended. However, NRC's regulations must be consistent with the EPA standards for Yucca Mountain.

Action

The staff recommends that the relevant portion of the DOE draft guideline should read "... in accordance with both the EPA standards established specifically for the Yucca Mountain site and NRC's regulations applicable to the Yucca Mountain site"

2. Both the draft postclosure and preclosure system guidelines found at Subpart E (Section 960.6) state that the geologic repository shall be evaluated against the site-specific EPA standards and the NRC regulations (61 *FR* 66169). However, in the supplementary information, it is stated that "...DOE would not reach a determination on the suitability of the Yucca Mountain site under these Guidelines in the absence of the final promulgation of [the EPA] standards...." (61 *FR* 66164) From these statements, it is not clear whether DOE would also defer a site suitability determination on the Yucca Mountain site under its revised Guidelines in the absence of final NRC regulations that have undergone revision so as to be consistent with the EPA standards under the Energy Policy Act of 1992.

Action

The staff recommends that the supplementary information in question be revised to eliminate the lack of clarity.

Enclosure

**U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
STAFF COMMENTS ON THE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY'S
PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO ITS "GENERAL SITING
GUIDELINES FOR THE RECOMMENDATION OF
SITES FOR NUCLEAR WASTE REPOSITORIES" —
10 CFR PART 960**

1. The U.S. Department of Energy's (DOE's) draft postclosure system guideline found at Section 960.6-1 states that the "...repository shall perform in accordance with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) standards established specifically for the Yucca Mountain site and the NRC regulations implementing those standards...." (61 *FR* 66164, 66169) At the staff level, we believe that it is not accurate to describe the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's regulations solely as "...implementing these standards...." NRC's regulations have a broader role than just to implement the EPA standards. They contain the technical requirements and criteria for licensing a geologic repository, as provided for by Section 121(b) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, as amended. However, NRC's regulations must be consistent with the EPA standards for Yucca Mountain.

Action

The staff recommends that the relevant portion of the DOE draft guideline should read "... in accordance with both the EPA standards established specifically for the Yucca Mountain site and NRC's regulations applicable to the Yucca Mountain site"

2. Both the draft postclosure and preclosure system guidelines found at Subpart E (Section 960.6) state that the geologic repository shall be evaluated against the site-specific EPA standards and the NRC regulations (61 *FR* 66169). However, in the supplementary information, it is stated that "...DOE would not reach a determination on the suitability of the Yucca Mountain site under these Guidelines in the absence of the final promulgation of [the EPA] standards...." (61 *FR* 66164) From these statements, it is not clear whether DOE would also defer a site suitability determination on the Yucca Mountain site under its revised Guidelines in the absence of final NRC regulations that have undergone revision so as to be consistent with the EPA standards under the Energy Policy Act of 1992.

Action

The staff recommends that the supplementary information in question be revised to eliminate the lack of clarity.

Enclosure