

WMM Record File

WMM File #

10,116

Docket No.

PDR

LPDR B, N, S

Distribution:

(Return to WMM, 623-SS)

Mr. Ben C. Rusche, Director
Office of Civilian Radioactive
Waste Management
U.S. Department of Energy
Washington, D.C. 20585

Dear Mr. Rusche:

The NRC staff has completed its review of environmental assessments (EAs) issued by the DOE on December 20, 1984, in support of the site-selection process established by the Nuclear Waste Policy Act (NWPA) of 1982 for the first geologic repository. The EAs contain assessments of the nine potentially acceptable sites that DOE has identified for the first repository in accordance with the requirements of Section 112 of NWPA and General Guidelines for the Recommendation of Sites for Nuclear Waste Repositories (10 CFR 960--the siting guidelines) developed pursuant to Section 112. The NRC staff, in conducting its review, attempted to give essentially equal attention to all nine EAs.

The NRC staff recognizes the magnitude of the DOE effort -- the nine EAs consisted of about 9,000 pages supported by more than 3,000 reference documents -- and the difficulty of its ranking process since this called for a consideration of the many, widely varying conditions and situations which exist at nine sites.

These NRC comments should be viewed as a part of the continuing interface between the staffs of the DOE and NRC which will lead to early identification of potential licensing issues. In addition, our comments are influenced by the provisions of the NWPA for NRC to adopt the DOE Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to the extent practicable. We believe the EAs and DOE's reaction to the NRC comments will affect the ability of DOE to produce an EIS that NRC can adopt. As DOE is aware, adoption of the EIS and early identification and resolution of potential licensing issues will have significant impact on ultimate resource needs and schedules in this important national program. Therefore, we believe that the opportunity afforded by the EAs for early interaction between NRC and DOE on site issues will be beneficial to the progress of the repository program.

Our comments focus on some significant areas where, we believe, reexamination by DOE is necessary. The substance of our comments is founded principally on our view of the existing factual support for the DOE conclusions, the treatment of uncertainty in DOE's use of existing data, and on logical alternative treatments of data which, we believe, may lead to logical alternative or modified conclusions. In no case did the staff conclude that a disqualifying condition was clearly present or a qualifying condition clearly absent at the

8505010211 850320

PDR WASTE

WM-10

PDR

DISTRIBUTION

WM S/F 3103

WMRP r/f

NMSS r/f

CF

REBrowning

MJBell

DMAusshardt

JGDavis

RECunningham

WJ01mstead

JTGreeves

MRKnapp

JBunting

HJMiller & r/f

RRBoyle

JLinehan

JKennedy

SCoplan

RLJohnson

KStablein

RJWright

TVerma

PPrestholt

RCook

JGiarratana

KGano(0)

PDR

March 20, 1985

see pocket 3
for enclosure

BWLP 1325

NWWS 619

SALT 1014

85032076

