

TOM BLILEY, VIRGINIA, CHAIRMAN

W. J. "BILLY" TAUZIN, LOUISIANA
MICHAEL G. OXLEY, OHIO
MICHAEL BILIRAKIS, FLORIDA
JOE BARTON, TEXAS
FRED UPTON, MICHIGAN
CLIFF STEARNS, FLORIDA
PAUL E. GILLMOF, OHIO
JAMES C. GREENWOOD, PENNSYLVANIA
CHRISTOPHER COX, CALIFORNIA
NATHAN DEAL, GEORGIA
SILEY LAHGEN I. OKLAHOMA
RICHARD BURR, NORTH CAROLINA
BRIAN P. BILBRAY, CALIFORNIA
ED WHITFIELD, KENTUCKY
GREG GANSKE, IOWA
CHARLIE NORWOOD, GEORGIA
TOM A. COBURN, OKLAHOMA
RICK LAZIO, NEW YORK
BARBARA CUBIN, WYOMING
JAMES E. ROGAN, CALIFORNIA
JOHN SHIMKUS, ILLINOIS
HEATHER WILSON, NEW MEXICO
JOHN B. SHADEGG, ARIZONA
CHARLES W. "CHIP" PICKERING, MISSISSIPPI
VITO FOSSELLA, NEW YORK
ROY BLUNT, MISSOURI
ED BRYANT, TENNESSEE
ROBERT L. EHRLICH, JR., MARYLAND

JOHN D. DINGELL, MICHIGAN
HENRY A. WAXMAN, CALIFORNIA
EDWARD J. MARKEY, MASSACHUSETTS
RALPH M. HALL, TEXAS
RICK BOUCHER, VIRGINIA
EDOLPHUS TOWNS, NEW YORK
FRANK PALLONE, JR., NEW JERSEY
SHERRON BROWN, OHIO
BART GORDON, TENNESSEE
PETER DEUTSCH, FLORIDA
BOBBY L. RUSH, ILLINOIS
ANNA G. ESHOO, CALIFORNIA
RON KLING, PENNSYLVANIA
BART STUPAK, MICHIGAN
ELIOT L. ENGEL, NEW YORK
THOMAS C. SAWYER, OHIO
ALBERT R. WYNN, MARYLAND
GENE GREEN, TEXAS
KAREN MCCARTHY, MISSOURI
TED STRICKLAND, OHIO
DIANA DEGETTE, COLORADO
THOMAS M. BARRETT, WISCONSIN
BILL LUTHER, MINNESOTA
LOIS CAPPS, CALIFORNIA

U.S. House of Representatives
Committee on Commerce
Room 2125, Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-6115

July 20, 2000

JUL 26 2000

JAMES E. DERDERIAN, CHIEF OF STAFF

Dr. Debra S. Knopman
Board Member
U.S. Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board
2300 Clarendon Boulevard
Suite 1300
Arlington, VA 22201


Dear Dr. Knopman:

I am writing to thank you for appearing before the Subcommittee on Energy and Power on June 23, 2000, to present testimony on the status of the Department of Energy (DOE) program to develop a permanent geologic repository at Yucca Mountain, Nevada for spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste. Your testimony allowed the Subcommittee Members to gain a better understanding of this extremely important issue.

Pursuant to the Chair's order of June 23, 2000, the record of the Subcommittee's hearing remains open to permit Members to submit questions to witnesses in writing. Attached you will find questions submitted by Members of the Subcommittee. I would appreciate it if you could respond to these questions in writing no later than the close of business on August 18, 2000 in order to facilitate the printing of the hearing record.

Thank you again for your time and effort in preparing and delivering testimony before the Subcommittee.

Sincerely,



Joe Barton
Chairman
Subcommittee on Energy and Power

Attachment

QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD FROM MR. BARTON FOR NWTRB

1. Is the Technical Review Board concerned that funding constraints are causing DOE to postpone or skip critical technical analyses necessary to support the site recommendation and licensing decisions? If so, please identify the specific areas that are not being addressed adequately by DOE.
2. Is it correct that the Technical Review Board is concerned that DOE is not paying enough attention to the uncertainties inherent in the repository's long-term performance, especially with respect to the "hot" repository design?
3. How would the Board suggest that DOE should take these uncertainties into account -- is this a matter of DOE actually changing its repository design, or merely a matter of presenting this uncertainty information to the decision-makers?
4. When does the decision on hot versus cool repository design have to be made? Can DOE leave this decision open into the licensing phase?
5. A recent GAO report on radiation standards suggested that the cooler repository design favored by the Board could add \$ 2 billion to the cost of the repository. What is the basis for that statement by GAO, and is that estimate correct?
6. Please identify any other outstanding technical issues with the repository design that, in the Board's view, are not being addressed adequately by DOE. Explain these concerns fully, and make recommendations on actions that DOE and the Congress should take to resolve these issues.