Nuclear Waste Policy Act
(Section 112)

Environmental Assessment

Deaf Smith County Site, Texas

Volume III

May 1986

U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management
Washington, DC 20585

MASTER

tb
DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED

DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency Thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

DISCLAIMER

Portions of this document may be illegible in electronic image products. Images are produced from the best available original document.

Appendix C

COMMENT-RESPONSE DOCUMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
C.1 INTRODUCTION	C.1-1
C.1.1 The comment process for the environmental assessments	C.1-1
C.1.2 Classification of comments	C.1-2
C.1.2.1 Policy and programmatic issues	C.1-2
C.1.2.2 Siting process and decisions	C.1-2
C.1.2.3 Data base, proposed activities, repository design	C.1-3
C.1.2.4 Postclosure performance	C.1-3
C.1.2.5 Preclosure radiological safety	C.1-4
C.1.2.6 Environmental, socioeconomic, and transportation	C.1-4
C.1.2.7 Ease and cost of siting, construction, operation, and closure	C.1-5
C.1.2.8 Project-specific miscellaneous	C.1-5
C.2 POLICY ISSUES	C.2-1
C.2.1 Public involvement and institutional issues	C.2-1
C.2.1.1 The DOE's public participation process	C.2-1
C.2.1.1.1 Public review of the draft environmental assessments	C.2-1
C.2.1.1.2 Hearings	C.2-3
C.2.1.1.3 DOE relations with the public	C.2-6
C.2.1.1.4 Access to information	C.2-8
C.2.1.2 Interactions with States, affected Indian Tribes, and local communities	C.2-10
C.2.1.2.1 Interactions with States	C.2-10
C.2.1.2.2 Interactions with affected Indian Tribes	C.2-14
C.2.1.2.3 Working with local communities	C.2-14
C.2.1.2.4 Financial assistance	C.2-15
C.2.1.3 Working with other Federal agencies	C.2-18
C.2.1.4 Working with other countries	C.2-20
C.2.1.5 Socioeconomic impacts	C.2-20
C.2.1.5.1 Socioeconomic impacts and their mitigation	C.2-20
C.2.1.5.2 Land acquisition and property values	C.2-23
C.2.2 Legal and regulatory issues	C.2-25
C.2.3 Program management, costs, and schedules	C.2-28
C.2.3.1 Program management	C.2-28
C.2.3.1.1 Conflicts of interest	C.2-28
C.2.3.1.2 Technical peer review	C.2-29
C.2.3.1.3 Need for program plan	C.2-30
C.2.3.1.4 Protection of the environment	C.2-30
C.2.3.2 Program costs	C.2-30

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
C.2.3.3 Schedule	C.2-32
C.2.3.3.1 Dependence of site-selection process on schedule	C.2-33
C.2.3.3.2 Effects on the consultation process	C.2-33
C.2.3.3.3 Effects on the adequacy of technical data	C.2-34
C.2.4 Transportation, retrievability, and second repository . . .	C.2-35
C.2.4.1 Transportation	C.2-35
C.2.4.1.1 Cost and risk estimates for transportation	C.2-36
C.2.4.1.2 Route-specific analysis	C.2-37
C.2.4.1.3 Assessment of the consequences of accidents	C.2-37
C.2.4.1.4 Maximum exposure of individuals	C.2-38
C.2.4.1.5 Modal split for shipments	C.2-38
C.2.4.1.6 Defense waste	C.2-39
C.2.4.1.7 Monitored retrievable storage	C.2-39
C.2.4.1.8 Barge transportation	C.2-39
C.2.4.1.9 Consideration of a second repository	C.2-40
C.2.4.1.10 The use of existing casks in the EA analysis	C.2-41
C.2.4.1.11 Adequacy of current cask designs	C.2-41
C.2.4.1.12 Additional testing of casks	C.2-41
C.2.4.1.13 Cask weeping	C.2-42
C.2.4.1.14 Adequacy of NRC testing requirements	C.2-43
C.2.4.1.15 Legal impediments	C.2-43
C.2.4.1.16 State designation of alternative routes	C.2-44
C.2.4.1.17 Indian rights	C.2-44
C.2.4.1.18 Availability of railroads for transporting radioactive waste	C.2-44
C.2.4.1.19 Railroad regulations	C.2-45
C.2.4.1.20 Dedicated trains	C.2-46
C.2.4.1.21 Regional transportation analysis	C.2-46
C.2.4.1.22 Weather impacts	C.2-46
C.2.4.1.23 Potential for human error	C.2-47
C.2.4.1.24 Retrieval of waste	C.2-47
C.2.4.1.25 Financing infrastructure improvement	C.2-48
C.2.4.1.26 Adequacy of the transportation guideline	C.2-48
C.2.4.1.27 Inadequate treatment of transportation issues	C.2-49

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
C.2.4.2 Retrievability	C.2-49
C.2.4.3 Second repository	C.2-50
C.2.5 Other waste-management activities	C.2-52
C.2.5.1 Monitored retrievable storage	C.2-52
C.2.5.2 Onsite storage	C.2-53
C.2.5.3 Reprocessing	C.2-54
C.2.6 Types of waste to be received at a repository	C.2-56
C.2.6.1 Defense waste	C.2-57
C.2.6.2 Foreign waste	C.2-60
C.2.6.3 Other waste	C.2-61
C.2.7 The Draft Environmental Assessments	C.2-61
C.2.7.1 EA format and distribution	C.2-61
C.2.7.2 Supporting references	C.2-67
C.2.7.3 Content of the environmental assessments	C.2-69
C.2.7.3 Inconsistencies in the environmental assessments	C.2-73
C.2.8 Miscellaneous	C.2-79
C.2.8.1 Production of radioactive waste	C.2-79
C.2.8.2 Alternatives to geologic disposal	C.2-80
C.2.8.3 Generic technical issues	C.2-82
C.3 SITING PROCESS AND DECISIONS	C.3-1
C.3.1 Siting guidelines and site screening	C.3-1
C.3.1.1 The siting guidelines	C.3-1
C.3.1.1.1 Development of the guidelines	C.3-1
C.3.1.1.2 Time of publication	C.3-3
C.3.1.1.3 Adequacy of the siting guidelines	C.3-4
C.3.1.1.4 Comments on particular guidelines	C.3-7
C.3.1.2 General site-screening issues	C.3-8
C.3.1.2.1 Use of ambiguous criteria and lack of uniformity	C.3-9
C.3.1.2.2 Importance of host-rock diversity	C.3-10
C.3.1.2.3 Selection of sites on the basis of land use	C.3-11
C.3.1.2.4 Screening for sites in salt	C.3-12
C.3.1.2.5 Particular siting issues	C.3-14
C.3.1.2.6 Alternative repository locations	C.3-15
C.3.1.3 Deaf Smith County site-screening issues	C.3-15
C.3.2 Evaluation of disqualifying conditions	C.3-16
C.3.3 Diversity of geohydrologic settings and the selection of preferred sites	C.3-17
C.3.4 Nomination and recommendation of sites for characterization	C.3-20
C.3.4.1 Comparison of sites on the basis of postclosure guidelines	C.3-21
C.3.4.1.1 System guideline	C.3-21

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
C.3.4.1.2 Geohydrology	C.3-22
C.3.4.1.3 Geochemistry	C.3-30
C.3.4.1.4 Rock characteristics	C.3-35
C.3.4.1.5 Climatic change	C.3-39
C.3.4.1.6 Erosion	C.3-40
C.3.4.1.7 Dissolution	C.3-42
C.3.4.1.8 Tectonics	C.3-43
C.3.4.1.9 Natural resources	C.3-45
C.3.4.1.10 Site ownership and control	C.3-47
C.3.4.2 Comparison of sites on the basis of preclosure guidelines	C.3-48
C.3.4.2.1 Preclosure radiological safety	C.3-48
C.3.4.2.1.1 Population density and distribution	C.3-48
C.3.4.2.1.2 Site ownership and control	C.3-49
C.3.4.2.1.3 Meteorology	C.3-50
C.3.4.2.1.4 Offsite installations and operations	C.3-52
C.3.4.2.2 Environment, socioeconomics, and transportation	C.3-52
C.3.4.2.2.1 Environmental quality	C.3-52
C.3.4.2.2.2 Socioeconomic impacts	C.3-56
C.3.4.2.2.3 Transportation	C.3-59
C.3.4.2.3 Ease and cost of siting, construction, and closure	C.3-60
C.3.4.2.3.1 Surface characteristics	C.3-61
C.3.4.2.3.2 Rock characteristics	C.3-62
C.3.4.2.3.3 Hydrology	C.3-63
C.3.4.2.3.4 Tectonics	C.3-65
C.3.4.3 Decision method	C.3-66
C.3.4.4 Miscellaneous comments on the nomination and recommendation process	C.3-68
References for Chapter C.3	C.3-76
C.4 DATA BASE, PROPOSED ACTIVITIES, REPOSITORY DESIGN	C.4-1
C.4.1 Baseline conditions at the site	C.4-1
C.4.1.1 Geologic conditions	C.4-2
C.4.1.1.1 Regional geology	C.4-3
C.4.1.1.2 Geomorphology	C.4-5
C.4.1.1.3 Stratigraphy	C.4-6
C.4.1.1.4 Paleontology	C.4-8
C.4.1.1.5 Structure and tectonics	C.4-8
C.4.1.1.6 Rock characteristics	C.4-12
C.4.1.1.7 Geochemistry	C.4-14
C.4.1.1.8 Mineral resources	C.4-21
C.4.1.1.9 Soils	C.4-22

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
C.4.1.2 Hydrologic conditions	C.4-23
C.4.1.2.1 Surface water	C.4-23
C.4.1.2.2 Ground water	C.4-25
C.4.1.2.3 Current use	C.4-27
C.4.1.3 Environmental conditions	C.4-30
C.4.1.3.1 Land use	C.4-31
C.4.1.3.2 Ecosystems	C.4-32
C.4.1.3.3 Air quality and weather	C.4-34
C.4.1.3.4 Noise	C.4-35
C.4.1.3.5 Aesthetic resources	C.4-35
C.4.1.3.6 Archaeological, cultural, and historical resources	C.4-36
C.4.1.3.7 Background radiation	C.4-37
C.4.1.4 Transportation	C.4-37
C.4.1.5 Socioeconomic conditions	C.4-39
C.4.1.5.1 Population	C.4-40
C.4.1.5.2 Economic conditions	C.4-41
C.4.1.5.3 Community services	C.4-42
C.4.1.5.4 Social conditions	C.4-42
C.4.1.5.5 Government and fiscal conditions	C.4-43
C.4.2 Activities proposed for site characterization	C.4-43
C.4.2.1 Field studies	C.4-44
C.4.2.2 Exploratory shaft	C.4-46
C.4.2.3 Other activities	C.4-56
C.4.2.4 Alternative activities	C.4-57
C.4.3 The repository	C.4-57
C.4.4 References for Chapter C.4	C.4-74
C.4.4.1 References listed by author	C.4-74
C.4.4.2 Federal regulations and statutes	C.4-80
 C.5 POSTCLOSURE PERFORMANCE	 C.5-1
C.5.1 Geohydrology	C.5-1
C.5.2 Geochemistry	C.5-3
C.5.3 Rock characteristics	C.5-9
C.5.4 Climate changes	C.5-18
C.5.5 Erosion	C.5-20
C.5.6 Dissolution	C.5-21
C.5.7 Tectonics	C.5-24
C.5.8 Human interference	C.5-31
C.5.9 Postclosure site ownership and control	C.5-33
C.5.10 Postclosure system guideline	C.5-34
C.5.11 Assessment of postclosure performance	C.5-35
C.5.12 References for Chapter C.5	C.5-60
C.5.12.1 References listed by author	C.5-60
C.5.12.1 Federal regulations and statutes	C.5-67

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	Page
C.6	PRECLOSURE RADIOLOGICAL SAFETY C.6-1
C.6.1	Population density and distribution C.6-1
C.6.2	Site ownership and control C.6-2
C.6.3	Meteorology C.6-4
C.6.4	Offsite installations and operations C.6-5
C.6.5	System guideline - preclosure radiological safety C.6-5
C.6.6	Assessment of preclosure performance C.6-7
C.6.7	References for Chapter C.6 C.6-9
	C.6.7.1 References listed by author C.6-9
	C.6.7.2 Federal regulations and statutes C.6-10
C.7	ENVIRONMENT, SOCIOECONOMICS, AND TRANSPORTATION C.7-1
C.7.1	Expected effects of site characterization C.7-1
	C.7.1.1 Effects on the physical environment C.7-4
	C.7.1.1.1 Land use C.7-5
	C.7.1.1.2 Ecosystems C.7-6
	C.7.1.1.3 Air quality C.7-10
	C.7.1.1.4 Aesthetic conditions C.7-10
	C.7.1.1.5 Noise C.7-11
	C.7.1.1.6 Archaeological, cultural, and historical resources C.7-11
	C.7.1.1.7 Radiological C.7-12
	C.7.1.1.8 Water quality C.7-12
	C.7.1.1.9 Transportation and utilities C.7-16
	C.7.1.2 Effects on socioeconomic conditions C.7-18
C.7.2	Environmental quality C.7-20
	C.7.2.1 Land use C.7-21
	C.7.2.2 Ecosystems C.7-23
	C.7.2.3 Air quality C.7-25
	C.7.2.4 Aesthetic conditions C.7-25
	C.7.2.5 Noise C.7-26
	C.7.2.6 Archaeological, cultural, and historical resources C.7-26
	C.7.2.7 Radiological C.7-26
	C.7.2.8 Water quality C.7-28
C.7.3	Expected effects of transportation C.7-33
C.7.4	Expected effects on socioeconomic conditions C.7-37
	C.7.4.1 Population density and distribution C.7-38
	C.7.4.2 Economic conditions C.7-40
	C.7.4.3 Community services C.7-44
	C.7.4.4 Social conditions C.7-45
	C.7.4.5 Fiscal conditions and government structure C.7-46
C.7.5	System guideline C.7-47
C.7.6	References for Chapter C.7 C.7-49
	C.7.6.1 References listed by author C.7-49
	C.7.6.2 Federal regulations and statutes C.7-50
	C.7.6.3 State of Texas laws C-7-50

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
C.8 EASE AND COST OF SITING, CONSTRUCTION, OPERATION, AND CLOSURE . .	C.8-1
C.8.1 Surface characteristics	C.8-1
C.8.2 Rock characteristics	C.8-1
C.8.3 Preclosure hydrology	C.8-8
C.8.4 Preclosure tectonics	C.8-9
C.8.5 System guideline	C.8-11
C.8.6 References for Chapter C.8	C.8-14
C.8.6.1 References listed by author	C.8-14
C.8.6.2 Federal regulations and statutes	C.8-15
C.9 COMMENT-RESPONSE INDEX	C.9-1

Appendix C

C.1 INTRODUCTION

This appendix responds to the issues raised by Federal, State, and local governments, affected Indian Tribes, private citizens, and other organizations on the draft environmental assessment (EA) that was prepared pursuant to Section 112 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (the Act). In addition to presenting the issues raised in the comments and the responses, it describes where changes were made in the final EA.

C.1.1 THE COMMENT PROCESS FOR THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS

A notice of availability of the draft EA appeared in the Federal Register of December 20, 1984. This notice requested interested parties to review and comment on the draft EA, allowing 90 days for the comment period. The notice also announced an extensive series of public briefings to be held in each of the six States containing potentially acceptable sites for the first repository. These briefings were conducted solely to provide information on the draft EAs, not to solicit comments. Several weeks after the briefings, the DOE held hearings in which the public was invited to submit testimony for the public record.

Comments on the draft EA were in the form of letters addressed to the U.S. Department of Energy and of oral statements presented at 19 public hearings conducted in February and March 1985. Each comment letter or the recorded statement of each hearing participant was given a document-identification number and examined to identify comments. The comments in each letter were numbered sequentially. Copies of the comments and letters can be seen in the public reading rooms at DOE Headquarters and the Project Offices.

Each comment was classified according to subject area and assigned a classification number that corresponds to a section of the Comment Response Document. By referring to the index at the end of this section, each commenter can find the section of the appendix where the issues raised by the comments are addressed.

The subject matter of the comments fell into seven different areas: policy issues; siting process and decisions; data base, proposed activities, and repository design; postclosure performance; preclosure radiological safety; environment, socioeconomics, and transportation; and ease and cost of siting, construction, operation, and closure. The last four groups correspond to the division of technical areas in the general siting guidelines (10 CFR Part 960). Each group is further broken down into more specific topic areas shown in Section C.1.2. Where appropriate, Section C.1.2 shows the section of the EA to which the comment referred.

Within each topic area the the individual comments were screened to determine the specific issues they addressed. Responses were then prepared for each issue. Editorial comments (e.g., spelling and grammatical errors, incorrect cross-referencing, and errors in tables and figures) were considered during the preparation of the final EA, and the appropriate changes were made. Such comments are not specifically discussed in this appendix. Responses to technical issues identify how and to what degree the issue has been incorporated into the final EA. Where possible, the response identifies the places in the final EA where the change was made. For technical comments addressing concerns outside the scope of the document, a statement is made to that effect.

C.1.2 CLASSIFICATION OF COMMENTS

C.1.2.1 Policy and programmatic issues

Section C.2 summarizes and responds to comments that are concerned mainly with policy and programmatic issues. Most of these comments do not address siting decisions or the evaluations reported in the EAs. The exceptions are general comments on transportation, many of which are directed at Appendix A of the draft EAs.

<u>Classification number</u>	<u>Subject</u>
C.2.1	Public involvement and institutional issues
C.2.2	Legal and regulatory issues
C.2.3	Program management, costs, and schedules
C.2.4	Transportation, retrievability, and second repository
C.2.5	Other waste-management activities
C.2.6	Types of waste to be received at a repository
C.2.7	The draft environmental assessments
C.2.8	Miscellaneous

C.1.2.2 Siting process and decisions

Section C.3 addresses questions on the siting process and decisions. Many comments on siting decisions are closely related to technical evaluations of baseline conditions at the sites and of site suitability on the basis of the technical guidelines. Comments that primarily address site-suitability evaluations or supporting information are not included in this section; comments that address the application of suitability evaluations in the rankings of sites are included in this section.

<u>Classification number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>EA section</u>
C.3.1	Site screening and guidelines issues	1.2, 2.2
C.3.2	Evaluation of disqualifying conditions	2.3
C.3.3	Evaluation of the geohydrologic setting	1.3, 2.4
C.3.4	Nomination and recommendation of sites for characterization	7.1, 7.2, 7.3

C.1.2.3 Data base, proposed activities, repository design

Section C.4 addresses comments on the accuracy or adequacy of the baseline information about the repository system, site characterization activities, and the site itself that is used to evaluate site suitability and the impacts of developing the site.

<u>Classification number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>EA section</u>
C.4.1	Baseline conditions at the site	3.2, 3.3
C.4.2	Activities proposed for site characterization	
C.4.3	The repository (including the waste package	5.1

C.1.2.4 Postclosure performance

Section C.5 includes comments on the condition and performance of the repository after it is closed and sealed.

<u>Classification number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>EA section</u>
C.5.1	Geohydrology	6.3.1.1, 5.2.2
C.5.2	Geochemistry	6.3.1.2, 5.2.1, 3.2
C.5.3	Rock characteristics	6.3.1.3, 5.2.1, 3.2
C.5.4	Climate changes	6.3.1.4, 3.4.3
C.5.5	Erosion	6.3.1.5, 5.2.1, 3.2

<u>Classification number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>EA section</u>
C.5.6	Dissolution	6.3.1.6, 5.2.1, 3.2
C.5.7	Tectonics	6.3.1.7, 5.2.1, 3.2
C.5.8	Human interference (natural resources)	6.3.1.8, 5.2.1, 3.2
C.5.9	Postclosure site ownership and control	6.2.1.1, 3.4.1
C.5.10	Postclosure system guideline	6.3.2
C.5.11	Assessment of postclosure performance	6.4.2

C.1.2.5 Preclosure radiological safety

Section C.6 addresses comments on the behavior and effects of radionuclide releases during repository operations.

<u>Classification number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>EA section</u>
C.6.1	Population density and distribution	6.2.1.2, 5.4.1, 3.6.1
C.6.2	Site ownership and control	6.2.1.3, 3.4.1
C.6.3	Meteorology	6.2.1.4, 3.4.3
C.6.4	Offsite installations and operations	6.2.1.5
C.6.5	System guideline	6.2.2.1
C.6.6	Assessment of preclosure performance	6.4.1

C.1.2.6 Environment, socioeconomics, and transportation

Section C.7 addresses comments on (1) the environmental, socioeconomic, and transportation-related effects of repository development and site characterization; (2) the technical guidelines for socioeconomics, transportation, and the environment; and (3) the use of these guidelines in evaluating the relevant system guideline. Most comments in this category are concerned with the characteristics of the repository before it is closed and decommissioned.

<u>Classification number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>EA section</u>
C.7.1	Expected effects of site characterization	6.3.5
C.7.2	Environmental quality	6.2.1.6
C.7.3	Expected effects of transportation	5.3, 6.2.1.8, 3.5
C.7.4	Expected effects on socioeconomic conditions	6.2.1.7
C.7.5	System guideline	6.2.2.2

C.1.2.7 Ease and cost of siting, construction, operation, and closure

Section C.8 addresses comments about the problems and costs of siting, constructing, operating, and closing the repository.

<u>Classification number</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>EA section</u>
C.8.1	Surface characteristics	6.3.3, 3.4.1, 5.1
C.8.2	Rock characteristics	6.3.3, 3.2, 5.1
C.8.3	Preclosure hydrology	6.3.3, 3.3, 5.1
C.8.4	Preclosure tectonics	6.3.3, 3.3, 5.1
C.8.5	System guideline	6.3.4

C.1.2.8 Project-specific miscellaneous

Section C.9 addresses site-specific issues that are not addressed in the technical sections of the document.

C.2 POLICY ISSUES

Many of the comments on the draft EAs were concerned with various policy issues, which are addressed in this section: public involvement and institutional issues (Section C.2.1); compliance with Federal and State laws and regulations, including interpretations of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act (Section C.2.2); program management, costs, and schedules (Section C.2.3); policy issues related to waste management, such as transportation, retrievability, monitored retrievable storage, and spent-fuel reprocessing (Sections C.2.4 and C.2.5); and the types of waste to be received at the repository (Section C.2.6). Also included in this section are direct comments on the draft EAs (Section C.2.7) and miscellaneous issues (Section C.2.8).

C.2.1 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND INSTITUTIONAL ISSUES

This section addresses comments on public involvement and institutional issues. These issues are divided into five categories: conduct of the public-participation process; interactions with States, affected Indian Tribes, and local communities; working with Federal agencies; working with other countries; and socioeconomic impacts.

C.2.1.1 The DOE's public participation process

Comments on the DOE's public-participation process were concerned mainly with reviews of, and hearings on, the draft EAs. Other issues in this category were related to the DOE's relations with the public and access to information.

C.2.1.1.1 Public review of the draft environmental assessments

Many commenters said that the 90-day comment period for the draft EAs was not long enough for a thorough review. Others complained about delays or difficulties in receiving copies of the draft EAs and suggested that the documents should have been available in public libraries.

Issue

Many commenters said that the 90-day public comment period did not permit a thorough review of the lengthy and technical draft EAs, especially since the beginning of the comment period coincided with the year-end holidays.

Response

The DOE issued the draft EAs for public comment in the interest of expanding public participation in the site-selection process. The issuance of draft EAs was not required by the Act, and it entailed significant penalties in schedule. The DOE decided to accept these penalties because it deemed this

opportunity for public involvement to be important. Furthermore, in response to public comments on the draft Mission Plan (DOE, 1984a) the DOE extended the planned EA comment period from 60 to 90 days. One of the purposes of this extension was to compensate for potential delays in the mailing and distribution of the documents during the holiday season.

To help the public understand the draft EAs, the DOE conducted a series of interactive briefings in January 1985 and 19 public hearings in February and March 1985 in the six States containing the sites and in an adjacent State.

In revising the EAs, a special effort was made to consider comments received after the March 20, 1985, deadline. The final EAs reflect comments received as late as August 30, 1985.

Issue

DOE representatives allegedly had promised that the comment period would be extended, but it was not.

Response

The DOE did not officially extend the public-comment period. However, as explained above, the DOE made every effort to consider comments received after the deadline, and, as mentioned above, the final EAs reflect comments received up to 5 months after the deadline.

Issue

Because the 90-day comment period began before his term, the new Governor of Utah had less opportunity for involvement.

Response

The State of Utah submitted supplementary comments. These comments were received on May 1, 1985, and were considered in revising the EAs.

Issue

Some persons said they had experienced difficulty in obtaining copies of the draft EAs or felt that the DOE's response to requests for copies was very slow.

Response

To facilitate requests for the draft EAs, the DOE set up toll-free telephone numbers for use by the general public during the 90-day comment period. Despite some initial difficulties, the toll-free system worked well as a means for requesting the EAs. However, the DOE recognizes with regret that some persons may have experienced delays in receiving the EAs. The demand for the EAs was great, and over 5,000 copies were distributed.

Issue

Some commenters said that documents like the EAs should be available in libraries to facilitate timely review. One party complained that access to the reference documents for the EAs was very poor in the local libraries.

Response

Copies of the draft EAs were placed in the public libraries of local communities closest to the potentially acceptable sites. In addition, copies were available in DOE public reading rooms, which are open during normal business hours and have copies of all available program-related materials, including most of the reference documents cited in the EAs. Moreover, the draft EAs and the reference documents were available in the DOE public information offices in communities near all the potentially acceptable sites.

Issue

One commenter recommended that in soliciting comments the DOE should give a name to whom to write, rather than "comments."

Response

In the Federal Register notice that announced the availability of the draft EAs, interested parties were requested to send comments to "Comments--EA," which was a special mail stop set up to receive comments letters. The names of several DOE officials were also given for further information on specific draft EAs. The intent was to facilitate the comment-response process by not overloading any single individual or mail stop.

C.2.1.1.2 Hearings

Several commenters complained about the public hearings on the draft EAs; they said that the DOE had not adequately notified the public about the hearings and that the hearings were scheduled at inconvenient times and locations. Others said that there were problems with the conduct of the hearings themselves: that unreasonable limits were placed on the scope of the subject matter and on the time allotted each speaker; that the hearings became an exchange of misinformation; and that panel members did not adequately represent the views of the community.

Issue

Some comments alleged that the public was not adequately notified about the hearings.

Response

Notices about the public hearings were published in the Federal Register. In order to reach the general public that does not have ready access to the Federal Register, the DOE also issued press releases from the DOE offices in Washington, D.C., as well as the DOE Project Offices

responsible for investigating the three types of host rock (basalt, salt, and tuff). In addition, the Project Offices mailed copies of the Federal Register notice of the availability of the draft EAs and the announcements of the public briefings and hearings to more than 4,000 persons and organizations that had in the past commented on, or inquired about, various aspects of the DOE's geologic-repository program. The DOE Office of Consumer Affairs made a similar mailing to approximately 200 consumer and public-interest groups, and the DOE Office for Congressional, Intergovernmental and Public Affairs notified the offices of U.S. Senators and Representatives. In addition, news releases were issued, paid advertisements were run in many local newspapers, and notices were posted in the public buildings of the local communities. In January 1985, the DOE held interactive briefings for State officials and for the public to provide information on the EAs and the public-comment process; the dates and locations of the hearings were publicized during these briefings.

Issue

Some persons objected that the schedules and the locations of the public hearings were inconvenient.

Response

The hearings were scheduled to begin more than 6 weeks after the draft EAs were issued on December 20, 1984, and several weeks after the briefings held to provide information about the EAs. This schedule allowed several weeks for preparing comments before the hearings and also time for preparing written comments after the hearings. The written comments were accorded the same importance as the oral testimony.

During February and March 1985, 19 public hearings were held in the six States containing the sites under consideration and in 1 adjacent State. The hearings were scheduled for both day and evening hours to accommodate as many people as possible. They were held in major cities that are readily served by all modes of transportation as well as in the local communities closest to, and most likely to be affected by, a repository at a particular site.

Issue

Commenters said that unreasonable limitations were placed on the scope and the procedures of the hearings, undue time limitations were placed on speakers, and the ground rules of the hearings were changed at the last minute.

Response

Although the DOE had hoped that the public would address the draft EAs in its comments, no attempt was made to limit the scope of the hearings.

In the notices of the public hearings, the DOE requested all people who wished to testify to register in advance. The agendas of the hearings were based on this preregistration. However, the DOE made it clear at each hearing that every person wishing to speak would have an opportunity. This was

accomplished by adjusting the time allotted each speaker, by extending the length of a session where necessary, and by holding an additional hearing in the State of Washington.

Hearing procedures were discussed at the public briefings that preceded the hearings, explained during registration, and again explained at the beginning of each session. They included time limits, which were necessary to give all interested parties a chance to speak. However, it was made clear at each hearing that, to accommodate all speakers, the session would be extended or additional hearings would be held. In addition, the public was reminded that written comments were welcome and could be submitted after the hearings, through March 20, 1985.

Issue

According to some commenters, public hearings should be forums for the DOE to educate the public rather than public exchanges of misinformation.

Response

The purpose of the hearings was to give the public an opportunity to be heard. The DOE uses other forums to supply information; an example is the series of briefings held during January 1985 to explain the draft EAs and the siting process and to answer questions. The hearing is the citizens' forum for educating the DOE about their needs, concerns, perceptions, and ideas. The DOE did not present information, nor did it discuss, except to clarify, the comments received at the hearings.

Issue

Some parties felt that "community representatives" on the hearing panels did not always accurately reflect the views of the community; in some cases, the presence of a particular individual could have been considered a conflict of interest.

Response

The role of the panelists was to clarify the testimony for the record, not to represent the community. Although the non-DOE panelists were selected by the DOE, they were not selected to represent any specific viewpoint.

Issue

Some commenters suggested that the DOE should open each public hearing to testimony on all of the sites rather than one specific site. This would help the public to compare the sites.

Response

None of the public hearings was restricted to the discussion of a particular site. Chapter 7, which presents a comparative evaluation of the sites against the siting guidelines, is common to all of the EAs, and to provide the reader with a basis for the comparison, the draft EAs for all nine sites were available as a package.

C.2.1.1.3 DOE relations with the public

Comments on the DOE's relations with the public covered a variety of topics, ranging from recommendations for a public referendum on waste disposal to complaints about the DOE's attitude toward the public. They also included requests for an early announcement of the sites to be recommended for characterization.

Issue

Some commenters suggested that there should be a public referendum on the issue of radioactive-waste disposal.

Response

The American political process provides citizens with several opportunities to make their views known at the local, State, and Federal levels. In 1982, the U.S. Congress, the elected representatives of the American people, found that "high-level radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel have become major subjects of public concern, and appropriate precautions must be taken to ensure that such waste and spent fuel do not adversely affect the public health and safety and the environment for this or further generations" (Section 111(a)(7) of the Act) and therefore enacted the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982. The Act stipulates the technical and public process that the DOE has been following since January 1983.

Issue

A commenter requested that the EA emphasize the "development of appropriate mechanisms to achieve public consensus" mentioned in a report.

Response

The progress report referred to a series of socioeconomic studies that will be undertaken throughout the repository-siting program. The development of public consensus is one of the objectives for the socioeconomics portion of the siting program.

Issue

Some commenters felt that the DOE has a negative attitude toward the public. Several people said that the public-involvement process was carried out solely for the sake of appearance, public comments were not taken seriously, and local sentiments will not really be considered in making the final decision.

Response

The comments of the public have been, and will continue to be, seriously considered in the decisionmaking process. The comments of the public were considered in revising the siting guidelines, and issues raised in the EA scoping hearings were considered in preparing the draft EAs. Substantive comments on the draft EAs have been considered in producing this appendix and the final EAs. Furthermore, the DOE believes that local citizens have

legitimate and vital interests in the repository program and has sought to learn their attitudes and concerns through meetings and workshops. Any appearance that the DOE has a negative attitude toward local citizens is unintended and clearly not in the interests of the DOE.

Issue

The DOE was accused of not being honest with the public, both in the context of the general program and on specific issues. For example, some persons felt that the presence of a drill rig at the Hanford site suggests that the DOE is already committed to that site.

Response

The perception of dishonesty may stem from two sources: ongoing changes in policy direction and inadequate information. Changes in policy direction are the by-product of a process that involves many people on all levels of government and the private sector. They result from changing circumstances, long time spans, improving data, and program growth and development. Although the unfortunate result may be the appearance of a coverup of facts as policy direction changes, the only alternative is an unacceptable rigidity.

To improve the problem of inadequate information, the DOE is committed to provide a full and timely flow of information about program activities to all affected parties and to provide frequent opportunities, both formal and informal, for the fullest possible participation in program activities. Accomplishing this depends on developing and maintaining information and interaction programs that meet the needs and address the concerns of States and Indian Tribes, local governments, affected citizens, the general public, and other interested parties. Detailed plans for achieving these goals are discussed in Part I of Volume I of the Mission Plan (DOE, 1985a).

Contractual arrangements for a drill rig at the Hanford site were made before the passage of the Act, but the rig has not been used at the site since the Act was passed and will be used only if Hanford is one of the sites recommended and approved for site characterization. The DOE is not committed to the Hanford site or any other site.

Issue

Commenters said that the public has not been fully informed about the site-selection process, particularly for the Deaf Smith and the Swisher sites in Texas.

Response

The potentially acceptable sites in Swisher and Deaf Smith Counties, Texas, were identified in the report Identification of Preferred Sites Within the Palo Duro Basin (DOE, 1984b) which was issued in draft form for comment in March 1984. The final report was released in November 1984. The boundaries of the sites in the final report were revised on the basis of comments on the draft report by the State of Texas and other parties. Both the draft and the

final reports were broadly distributed and made available in local libraries and information offices. Further, after the draft reports, the DOE held briefings to explain the site-selection process.

Issue

Some persons felt that a general mitigation policy of indemnifying local citizens against the burden of uncertainties should be developed.

Response

The DOE cannot eliminate uncertainty. However, it is taking steps to inform local citizens about its activities and to involve both State and local representatives in the siting process.

Issue

A number of commenters requested early announcement of the sites to be recommended for characterization. They said that the DOE should remove as soon as possible the worry of repository siting from the areas not being recommended.

Response

The DOE is acutely aware of the apprehension that citizens of the States with potentially acceptable sites are experiencing. However, the announcements of the sites nominated and recommended for characterization had to await the completion of the final comparative evaluation of the sites and the publication of the final EAs, the multiattribute utility analysis of the nominated sites, and the recommendation by the Secretary of Energy of candidate sites.

C.2.1.1.4 Access to information

Many parties felt that opposition to the waste-management program results from misinformation about, and exaggeration of, the possible adverse effects associated with a geologic repository. They suggested that an improved program of public information and education would increase understanding and thereby the acceptance of the program. Several commenters recommended improved information programs because informed consent by the public depends on the availability of accurate, intelligible information. Others offered specific recommendations or complaints.

Issue

The DOE should establish a major information program, including (1) a constant flow of information that is timely, accurate, and easily understood and (2) more-frequent hearings and information sessions.

Response

Recognizing that public information is crucial to the success of the repository program, the DOE is committed to a thorough program of public participation. Its plans for public information and outreach are described in Chapter 4 of Part I of Volume I of the Mission Plan (DOE, 1985a). Valuable contributions to the development of these plans have come from States, affected Indian Tribes, and the public. The DOE will continue to seek information from interested parties on developing ways to identify public concerns, to provide information that addresses these concerns, and to involve the public in the decision process.

Issue

Some commenters alleged that the DOE will disclose information only under a formal request under the Freedom of Information Act.

Response

The DOE routinely shares program information with all of the affected parties and public and has specifically established information offices for that purpose. Information is disseminated through responses to letters, news releases, public announcements, and technical reports. Other vehicles for sharing information are exhibits, briefings, workshops, and meetings. In some cases, States and citizens have used the Freedom of Information Act as a means to obtain specific data or copies of letters.

Issue

Some persons felt that the DOE's ability to supply information to the public will be limited by the acceptance of defense waste in the repository.

Response

The acceptance of defense waste for disposal (see Section C.2.6.1) will not affect access to information or opportunities for public comment. Information on the quantities, characteristics, and environmental impacts of the defense waste is not classified.

Issues

Persons gathering information about the sites allegedly did not identify themselves as DOE employees or contractors.

Response

The DOE's policy is for its employees and contractors to clearly identify themselves when requesting information. The DOE or its contractors have not deliberately misrepresented the objectives of gathering information and would appreciate being informed directly of the specific dates and events when such misrepresentations were made.

C.2.1.2 Interactions with States, affected Indian Tribes, and local communities

C.2.1.2.1 Interactions with States

A number of commenters said that the DOE needs to set up better mechanisms for working with States and notifying them about the program. Others asked how the DOE intends to comply with existing State regulations. In addition, the DOE was asked to give Oregon affected-State status.

Issue

Commenters said that the DOE needs to develop better mechanisms for working with States, rather than simply assuming that States will agree to the DOE's suggestions.

Response

As explained in Chapter 4 of Part I in Volume I of the Mission Plan (DOE, 1985a), the establishment of mechanisms for working with States is an important objective of the DOE's institutional program. The DOE has worked closely with the representatives of every State that has a potentially acceptable site for the first repository. Furthermore, informal meetings with first-repository States and discussions with the second-repository States have been initiated. These meetings are intended to give the States additional opportunities to express their concerns and to participate in the development of the repository program. The DOE will continue to attempt to secure smooth working relationships.

Issue

Some States contended that they have not been notified in sufficient time, are not consulted, and their requests for information are not acknowledged or satisfied.

Response

Since the identification of the States with potentially acceptable sites for the first repository, the DOE has tried to consult with them on various siting issues. An example is the extensive consultation process on the siting guidelines, which involved both meetings with individual states and plenary sessions with the first- and second-repository States as well as the submittal of several drafts of the guidelines for State review. This process is described in the "Supplementary Information" for the DOE's siting guidelines (DOE, 1984c).

Although the DOE has made a concerted effort to provide full information to the States, it recognizes that information has not always been provided promptly. The DOE is trying to improve its capability to provide timely responses and is developing program data bases specifically for that purpose. If the States so desire, procedures for providing information may be specified in consultation-and-cooperation agreements.

Consultation and cooperation between the DOE and States is a dynamic process; it will not be limited to activities specified in the consultation-and-cooperation agreements. Further information about the consultation-and-cooperation process can be found in Chapter 4 of Part I of Volume I and in Chapter 3 of Part II in Volume I of the Mission Plan (DOE, 1985a).

Issue

One party recommended that the DOE conclude consultation-and-cooperation agreements with States to provide a formal structure for information and comment.

Response

To ensure that States are actively involved in the program, a formal consultation-and-cooperation process will be established through the written agreements provided for in Section 117(c) of the Act. High priority has been placed on concluding these agreements promptly. No formal consultation-and-cooperation agreements have yet been signed with any State, although negotiations have been initiated with the State of Washington.

In the absence of a consultation-and-cooperation agreement, the DOE will continue to provide both information and opportunities for comment.

Issue

Some commenters felt that the States should have been part of the EA process from the beginning and that the EAs could have benefitted from their involvement.

Response

The States with potentially acceptable sites were asked to participate very early in the EA process, starting with the scoping hearings held early in 1983. Subsequently, the DOE shared various drafts of the EAs with these States. The EAs did indeed benefit from the careful reviews performed by the States, and the DOE is grateful for their thoughtful comments.

Issue

Some States expressed concerns about the DOE's plans for compliance with State regulations in the siting process.

Response

The DOE intends to comply with the substance of any applicable State and local regulations that are consistent with its responsibilities under the Act.

The applicable regulations will be identified in consultation with the affected States and local governments. One of the objectives of the consultation process (see Section C.2.1.2) will be to identify which State or local regulations are applicable to a particular siting, construction, or operation activity and are consistent with the DOE's responsibilities under

the Act (i.e., do not include onerous reporting requirements or entail unacceptable delays). Another objective will be to agree on the mode or the extent of compliance. For the repository program, this consultation process is to begin immediately after the Presidential approval of the three sites recommended for characterization.

Issue

Several States oppose the siting of a repository within their borders.

Response

The Act outlines the process to be followed in the event that the Governor or the legislature of the State opposes the selection of a site in its borders for development as a geologic repository. The Act encourages the DOE to work closely with States in advance of recommendation and to develop a technical program that is credible to the State. However, the Act also provides the opportunity for the State to issue a notice of disapproval, with explanation, at the time that a site in that State is recommended for a repository (Section 116(b)(2)). Such disapproval can be overridden only by a joint resolution of Congress.

Issue

Some States felt that they should have the right to comment or concur on the DOE's plans without losing their rights to issue a notice of disapproval.

Response

The Act empowers a State with a site selected for a repository to submit a notice of disapproval to Congress. This right is not affected by previous comments on the site-selection process. Indeed, States are encouraged to submit comments throughout the process and to provide suggestions to improve the technical quality of the program.

Issue

Some comments urged that States be given the authority to monitor and review activities at every step of the process.

Response

The DOE has been encouraging States to participate in the siting process for more than 5 years through regular interactions with designated representatives. Consultation-and-cooperation agreements will allow each State and affected Indian Tribe to identify and describe in more detail the rights and responsibilities of the parties to each agreement. The agreements can include provisions for States to monitor and review program activities.

Issue

The State of Louisiana expects the DOE to honor the memorandum of understanding that grants the State veto power over any DOE plans for a repository. The agreement was signed February 27, 1978.

Response

The DOE has always maintained the position that the memorandum of understanding between the DOE and the State of Louisiana is valid consistent with the provisions of applicable law. However, if Vacherie Dome in Louisiana were clearly the best site, the DOE, being committed to implementing the Act, would recommend the site to Congress for development as a repository. At that time, Louisiana, like any other State, would have the opportunity to issue a notice of disapproval. The memorandum of understanding was signed before the enactment of the Act, which gave States the opportunity to veto the selection of a site within their borders; the Act supersedes prior agreements.

Issue

One commenter pointed out that a request by the Washington State legislature that granite be considered for the first repository was ignored by the DOE.

Response

The Act required the DOE to identify the potentially acceptable sites for the first repository within 180 days after the Act was passed. Studies of granite had not progressed to the point where the DOE could identify potentially acceptable sites in granite for the first repository. Granite is, however, being considered for the second repository.

Issue

The DOE was asked how it would respond to such State initiatives as Mississippi's statement that it is the policy of the State that radioactive waste may not be stored in Mississippi or the Oregon measure, passed by a ballot, requiring that there be no postclosure releases of radioactive material. Similarly, several comments from communities in Nevada said that their governing bodies had passed resolutions voicing opposition to waste transportation through these communities and to the siting of a repository in Nevada.

Response

The DOE intends to comply with all State regulations consistent with its responsibilities under the Act. However, in some instances State or local legislation that attempts to directly regulate the repository program may not be permissible under the U.S. Constitution.

Issue

According to some comments, Oregon should be recognized as an affected State and be accorded the rights and privileges of an affected State because of its proximity to the Hanford site and to the potentially affected Columbia River.

Response

Because none of the potentially acceptable sites is located within its borders, Oregon is not eligible under the Act for the rights and privileges of an affected State. Nonetheless, Oregon has participated actively in the site-selection process. It has appointed both a Hanford repository review committee composed of State officials and a citizens advisory committee to provide review from a public perspective. Recognizing the high level of interest among local citizens, the DOE held a public hearing on the EAs in Portland on March 11, 1985, and will continue to seek comment from the State of Oregon.

C.2.1.2.2 Interactions with affected Indian Tribes

Issue

Some commenters said that the DOE had not considered the religious attitudes of the Indians toward their land and the effects of site characterization on Indian lands. The Western Shoshone Indian Nation requested that it be declared an affected Tribe and that its tribal council be consulted before the start of any site-characterization activities at the Yucca Mountain site in Nevada.

Response

The DOE recognizes the importance of Indian religious and cultural resources and has specifically included proximity to significant Indian resources, such as major religious sites, as a potentially adverse condition in the siting guidelines.

The Western Shoshone Indian Nation requested affected-Tribe status because it claimed ownership of the land on which the Yucca Mountain site is located. The Federal Government's position that the Shoshone Tribe does not own the land was upheld by the Supreme Court (United States vs. Mary Dann and Carrie Dann, 105 U.S. Supreme Court 1058, February 20, 1985). The Tribe will be able to interact with the DOE through the public comment and interaction process.

C.2.1.2.3 Working with local communities

Issue

Several comments suggested that local communities should have more input and involvement in the siting process and in the development of the waste-management program.

Response

The DOE plans to continue working with both State and local governments during the siting process. The DOE intends to continue holding public meetings and outreach programs for local leaders and the general public in the

vicinity of potential sites and to keep State officials informed of such activities. Although not required by the Act, procedures for local-government representation could be included in consultation-and-cooperation agreements.

The DOE plans to encourage the participation of local community representatives in assessing the potential socioeconomic impacts of a repository, in developing plans to avoid or mitigate significant adverse impacts, and in preparing the impact-identification report that the State is to submit with its request for mitigation assistance. States will be encouraged to provide for and support such local participation.

The DOE is developing policies for providing financial assistance to support local participation in the program either through the State or, if necessary, by direct means. If the State government has established mechanisms for direct local participation and financial support for local efforts, the DOE will provide adequate funding to the State agency responsible for implementing local participation. Where the State government does not provide for direct local participation and support, the DOE will work directly with local representatives to assess potential impacts and may provide direct funding to units of local government.

The DOE meets frequently with local officials and other interested parties for exchanges of views and information.

DOE information offices in communities near the sites under consideration are walk-in sources of information. They provide answers to questions and educational materials. These offices also serve as libraries for public documents and short films, as well as places for the public to submit comments and questions about the program. (See Appendix B for the locations of these offices.)

Issue

Most people in Beatty, Nevada, want Yucca Mountain to be the selected site because of the economic benefits to the area, but the Governor responded negatively, overriding the desires of the citizens closest to the potential site.

Response

The DOE is aware that the interests of local citizens and the State may conflict, but will not intervene in intrastate political or economic disputes. Nonetheless, the DOE welcomes the input of local citizens in the waste-management program and will seek their participation through provisions in consultation-and-cooperation agreements with the States and through the socioeconomic impact assessments that will be conducted concurrently with site characterization.

C.2.1.2.4 Financial assistance

Several States and localities requested information about the distribution and availability of financial assistance. Some States complained that the grants they received for EA review were late; others requested funds to conduct independent technical studies. Several comments were concerned with grants to local communities or private organizations.

Issue

The DOE should provide information about the purpose, timing, and distribution of grants.

Response

The Act authorizes the DOE to provide financial assistance to States and affected Indian Tribes for (1) participation in the repository program and for facilitating effective public participation (2) participation in the consultation-and-cooperation process (see also Section C.2.1.2.1); and (3) the mitigation of socioeconomic impacts. To date, all six States considered for the first repository and three affected Indian Tribes have been awarded grants for participation in the program. In fiscal years 1983 and 1984 a total of \$2,157,301 and \$4,590,356, respectively, was awarded. Grants also have been extended to the 17 States being considered for the second repository to enable them to participate in site screening. In fiscal years 1983 and 1984, these awards totaled \$930,376 and \$2,942,186, respectively. Grants allow States and affected Indian Tribes to review and comment on documents, like the technical reports, the siting guidelines, the draft EA, and the Mission Plan and to participate in program meetings and workshops.

The nature and level of grants for the mitigation of socioeconomic impacts will be largely based on the socioeconomic-impact reports that States or affected Indian Tribes will submit and on discussions and negotiations between the DOE and States, affected Indian Tribes, and communities. Both financial and technical support will be provided for the development of such reports. This support can assist States and affected Indian Tribes in examining the public health and safety, environmental, social, and economic impacts of a repository. Also provided for the mitigation of fiscal impacts will be grants equal to the taxes that would be collected if the repository were a commercial project. (See Section C.2.1.5.1 for comments and responses on the mitigation of socioeconomic impacts.)

The DOE will work with States, affected Indian Tribes, and localities to develop impact-mitigation plans in response to the siting of a repository. These plans will address ways to augment community services as well as ways to minimize socioeconomic disruptions and maximize the benefits of new economic activity related to program activities.

Issue

Some State grants for the review of the draft EA were allegedly late, and they were smaller than requested.

Response

All requests for financial assistance from States or affected Indian Tribes are reviewed for conformance to the DOE guidelines on financial assistance. These guidelines ensure compliance with the requirements of the Act as well as consistency and equity among States and Indian Tribes. Once the DOE has reviewed the request, negotiations with the State can begin. Sometimes these negotiations can be lengthy. Delays have occurred when a request lacked key information or when States requested funds for activities outside the scope of the Act or the DOE financial assistance guidelines.

The amount of a grant is decided case by case, but each request is evaluated against similar requests from other States and Indian Tribes. Once the DOE obtains all the information necessary and discusses it with the State, adequate funding levels are determined and awarded. Interim funding is often extended if a grant is delayed.

Issue

Several States asked for funds to conduct independent technical assessments, both for developing new information and for checking the DOE's analyses. Some States alleged that requests of this type were turned down by the DOE.

Response

The Act requires the DOE to provide financial assistance to States or affected Indian Tribes "to engage in monitoring, testing, or evaluation activities with respect to site characterization programs with respect to such site." The DOE's guidelines on financial assistance also extend this funding to phase II (i.e., States and Tribes that have potentially acceptable sites, but have not yet been notified of their status as candidate sites). The DOE had interpreted the Act to mean that activities thus funded should focus on independent monitoring, testing, and evaluation of DOE data.

On December 2, 1985, the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit ruled that the DOE is required under the Act to fund States and Indian Tribes to conduct pre-site characterization studies involving primary data collection if such studies "would be essential to an informed statement of reasons explaining why [the State/Indian Tribe, if on tribal land] disapproved the recommended repository sites" and if the ability of the studies to contribute to the statement of reason "depends on their being initiated prior to site characterization" (State of Nevada vs. Herrington, (No. 84-7846). The DOE is revising its financial assistance guideline in accordance with this ruling.

Issue

Local communities want to share in the grants available under the Act.

Response

Financial assistance to local governments is addressed in Section 4.12 of Part I, Volume I, of the Mission Plan (DOE, 1985a):

The DOE will continue to provide grants and other financial assistance, as appropriate, to States, affected Indian Tribes, and others to facilitate effective public participation in the program. In addition, the DOE will seek ways to encourage the involvement of other interested parties through grants and other technical or financial assistance.... The DOE will also seek ways to facilitate effective participation by units of general local government that may be affected by program activities.

As already mentioned, the DOE is developing policies for providing financial assistance to support local participation in the program. If the State government has established mechanisms for direct local participation and financial support for local efforts, the DOE will provide adequate funding to the State agency responsible for implementing local participation. Where the State government does not provide for direct local participation and support, the DOE will work directly with local representatives.

Issue

One party said that requests by a private organization for funds to develop balanced information have been denied by the DOE.

Response

The DOE provides financial assistance to national and regional organizations that represent an extension of State and Tribal interests to facilitate their participation in the waste-management program. The organizations that have received such grants are the National Congress of American Indians, the National Conference of State Legislatures, the Western Interstate Energy Board, and the Southern States Energy Board. Where such organizations are likely to improve coordination or the involvement of affected parties, future funding will be provided.

C.2.1.3 Working with other Federal agencies

A number of commenters addressed the participation of other Federal agencies in the repository program. Most of them were interested in the roles of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the Department of Defense. (See also Section C.2.2 for comments and responses about the regulations of Federal agencies.)

Issue

A commenter alleged that too many Federal agencies are involved in the siting process. Another suggested that it is vital that agencies whose primary concern is public safety be involved in developing the repository.

Response

The management of spent fuel and high-level waste requires the participation of many agencies of the Federal Government because of their regulatory responsibilities. The Act assigns lead responsibility to the DOE, but significant roles are expected for the following other agencies:

- The Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
- The Environmental Protection Agency.
- The Department of Transportation.
- The Bureau of Indian Affairs.
- The Bureau of Land Management.

- The U.S. Geological Survey.
- The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.
- The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

More-detailed information about the roles of these agencies can be found in the DOE's Project Decision Schedule (DOE, 1985b).

Issue

Information about the involvement and responsibilities of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the Department of Defense was requested by several commenters.

Response

The DOE must obtain from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) concurrence on the siting guidelines, a license to construct the repository, a license to receive and possess the waste at the site (i.e. to operate the repository), and subsequent license amendments for the closure and decommissioning of the repository. The NRC also will issue site-characterization analyses based on the DOE's site-characterization plan for each site approved for characterization. The NRC licensing process is based on the procedures and the technical criteria issued as 10 CFR Part 60 (NRC, 1983). The objective is to implement the standards set by the Environmental Protection Agency for waste isolation in geologic repositories and thus provide reasonable assurance that geologic repositories will isolate the waste for at least 10,000 years without posing undue risk to public health and safety. Since 10 CFR Part 60 was issued before the Act was passed, the NRC is revising it for compliance with the Act; 10 CFR Part 60 may also change in response to the Environmental Protection Agency's final environmental standard (40 CFR Part 191), which was published on September 19, 1985 (EPA, 1985).

The Department of Defense is involved in the program through the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, which is advising the DOE on the acquisition of private lands.

Issue

One party stated that the DOE should complete consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on threatened and endangered species before proceeding with site recommendation for characterization.

Response

The DOE has been communicating with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on designated critical habitats and the possibility of threatened or endangered species occurring at any of the sites. In response to specific concerns about the presence of protected species at the Davis Canyon site, the DOE participated with interested agencies and individual experts in a field survey conducted in July 1985. When a site has been selected for repository development, the DOE will enter into a formal consultation with the Service. Until then, the DOE will remain in contact with the Service and with State agencies regarding protected species.

C.2.1.4 Working with other countries

Issue

Because the disposal of radioactive waste is an international problem, the DOE should seek technical assistance and independent scientific analyses from other nations that do not have a vested interest.

Response

It has long been U.S. policy to cooperate with other nations in developing waste-management technology. As described in the Mission Plan (DOE, 1985a, Volume I, Part I, Chapter 5), the DOE actively participates in international cooperation and information exchange through bilateral agreements, multinational activities, and international forums and programs. These activities are part of the DOE's overall program under current agreements with Belgium, Canada, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Japan, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, the Commission of European Communities, the International Atomic Energy Agency, and the Nuclear Energy Agency (NEA) of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. The DOE is currently most active in joint projects with Canada, Germany, Sweden, and the NEA. These projects include (1) an underground crystalline-rock research laboratory in Canada; (2) ongoing tests in the Asse salt mine in Germany; and (3) tests in the Stripa mine in Sweden, which are being performed in crystalline rock.

C.2.1.5 Socioeconomic impacts

This section covers two topics that drew many comments: (1) socioeconomic impacts and their mitigation and (2) the acquisition of laws and effects on property values.

C.2.1.5.1 Socioeconomic impacts and their mitigation

Many comments, from the States, local communities, and the public, addressed various issues related to the socioeconomic impacts of a repository and their mitigation. Some of them alleged that the DOE had not adequately involved local communities in assessing the effects and did not understand local values. Others were concerned about the timing and adequacy of mitigation grants.

Issue

Some comments said that the DOE has not adequately involved the citizens of local communities in evaluating the effects of a repository on local people, businesses, and services.

Response

The DOE will conduct socioeconomic studies that will involve local communities and will collect information from local sources (schools, local officials, etc.). These studies will be conducted concurrently with site characterization and will be much more detailed than the preliminary assessments included in the EAs.

Some socioeconomic impacts, such as increased demands for public services, will affect local governments directly. For this reason, the DOE will encourage the participation of local governments in the preparation of the socioeconomic-impact reports as early and as fully as possible. The DOE will encourage the States to allocate of a portion of their grant to affected localities.

Issue

The DOE allegedly does not understand and appreciate the values of the local communities at the sites that are being considered.

Response

After the President approves the sites recommended for characterization, the DOE will begin detailed studies of the demographic and social and economic conditions in local communities, collecting information from local sources. These studies will examine the effects of the repository on the local economy, community services, housing, and the like. Transportation-related effects on local communities will also be analyzed. Local communities will continue to have opportunities to be directly involved in the assessment of socioeconomic effects, and their officials will be asked to provide information not only about local economic and social conditions but also about the attitudes of the community.

Issue

The EAs should include more information in Chapter 5 about the financial impacts of site characterization and repository development on local communities and the grant programs applicable to individual sites.

Response

Chapter 5 of the EAs has been revised to provide more-detailed information about socioeconomic effects. Information about grants is available in the Mission Plan (DOE, 1985a, Volume I, Part I, Chapter 4).

Issue

Some persons said that there is no guarantee that the local economy and local employment picture will improve because of the presence of a repository. On the other hand, one commenter noted the economic benefits that could accrue from a repository nearby and wanted assurances that the residents of the local community would have job opportunities. He said that the local business community saw the repository as being beneficial as long as the "boom-and-bust" cycle can be broken.

Response

Although there may be no guarantee of an improvements in the employment situation, such improvements are likely because of improvements in the local economy. Federal procurement law requires the DOE to advertise for, accept bids from, and hire contractors on the basis of competitive bids. However, the DOE will make available to local businesses complete descriptions of the required contract work and will meet with local leaders to describe the project. Where possible, the DOE and the general site contractor may divide contracts into smaller subcontracts to facilitate bidding by local contractors. This approach is being successfully used for the Waste Isolation Pilot Project in New Mexico. Furthermore, local residents may find employment with any outside contractors that may be hired. The DOE will also widely publicize locally business and job opportunities and work with community leaders to provide contract-procurement workshops and vocational training programs.

The DOE plans to take mitigative measures to reduce the impacts of the "boom-and-bust" cycle--the buildings and eventual reduction in local populations that will result from siting a repository in a rural area.

Issue

Some States and communities indicated that mitigation efforts and funds must precede or be concurrent with program activities to avoid adverse impacts. In particular, some potentially affected communities expressed concern that the need to improve community services may occur before impact-mitigation funds are distributed.

Response

The Act does not provide for impact-mitigation funds before repository construction begins, but the Act does allow grants equal to taxes to be provided to units of general local government beginning with site characterization. The DOE will therefore work with States, affected Indian Tribes, and local governments to minimize or avoid adverse impacts and to identify mechanisms for the timely provision of assistance within the authorization provided by the Act. Financial assistance will be provided to States and affected Indian Tribes throughout the construction and operation phases to enable them to mitigate repository-related impacts.

Issue

Some parties were concerned that the grants will be cut and thus will not provide adequate assistance (i.e., the grants will not be equal to the amount lost in the reduced assessments of the value of surrounding land and will not make up for taxes lost as a result of business relocations).

Response

The levels of impact-mitigation funding will be based on assessments of potential impacts, in which local communities will be encouraged to participate. The funding levels agreed on will be based largely on the socioeconomic-impact reports that will accompany the requests of States and

affected Indian Tribes for financial assistance. Included in the impact-mitigation assistance will be grants equal to taxes.

In general, applications for grants will be submitted by the State or the affected Indian Tribe to the appropriate DOE Project Office. The DOE will process these applications as quickly as possible under Federal procurement regulations. When agreement on terms has been reached by the DOE and the State or affected Indian Tribe, the grant will be awarded.

Issue

Commenters requested that the DOE furnish temporary housing for transient workers during site characterization.

Response

With the exception of the Davis Canyon site, adequate housing is expected to be available in the vicinity of the nominated sites during site characterization. The DOE may consider providing temporary housing at the Davis Canyon site if the site is recommended and approved for characterization.

C.2.1.5.2 Land acquisition and property values

The subject of land acquisition and property values was raised by many commenters, who expressed concern about decreases in property values, fair compensation for land acquired from private owners, the uncertainty resulting from a long site-selection process, and similar issues.

Issue

A number of persons expressed concern about the effects of site characterization and repository development on property values. Some made suggestions about the approach to compensation; others wanted to know what the DOE considers reasonable compensation. Some said that the value of property near a site being considered for a repository has already decreased and will continue to plummet as the process continues, but that compensation should be based on the nondepreciated land values that could be expected without the repository project.

Response

The DOE recognizes that some people believe that the value of some lands at or near a potential repository site may have decreased, but there is no concrete evidence of such decreases. However, for the sites that are not recommended for characterization, it can reasonably be expected that property values, if decreased, will return to normal once the site is removed from consideration. At the sites recommended for characterization, private land may be leased or purchased for the characterization phase. If there is private land at a site selected for a repository, the DOE will acquire the land through purchase, at fair market value.

All land-acquisition activities will be performed in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance Act. The DOE will ask for assistance from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in the acquisition process because of its extensive experience. The Corps will assess the value of the land, basing the assessments on the value of land that is similar but outside the immediate area. This approach will ensure that the assessment is not reduced by any land-value decreases that may result from the repository project.

Issue

One commenter suggested that a one-mile buffer zone should be established around the site, within which owners could choose to keep their property with compensation from the DOE for its devaluation or sell to the DOE under the same terms as those offered for land at the site.

Response

Land values will be assessed during the studies that will be conducted concurrently with site characterization. At this time the DOE has made no decision about establishing a buffer zone or how compensation in a buffer zone will be handled. If the siting of a repository causes a clearly demonstrated adverse effect on the values of the surrounding land, impact-mitigation funds may be made available as compensation.

Issue

Some felt that landowners who have already sold property at prices depressed by repository siting should be compensated for their losses.

Response

The DOE will examine case by case any claims from landowners who feel that they have received a depressed price for their property because the land is or was being considered for a repository.

Issue

The DOE was asked to issue a specific statement explaining what it considers reasonable mitigation and compensation for relocation.

Response

In providing relocation assistance, the DOE will follow the procedures specified in the Uniform Relocation Assistance Act. Information about relocation procedures has been distributed at meetings of landowners in the Deaf Smith site and is available from the DOE.

Issue

Some commenters urged the DOE to decide on a site as soon as possible because otherwise people cannot make decide about making necessary improvements to their property and do not know whether their lives will be disrupted. One party said that the DOE should "stop casting a cloud" on land titles near potential sites. Another commenter said that the DOE should develop a mitigation policy of indemnifying local citizens against uncertainty.

Response

The siting of a repository requires extensive and detailed study to collect sufficient information and must follow the process outlined in the Act. Therefore, it is not possible for the DOE to decide now which site will be selected. This choice will be made several years from now. However, the DOE believes that landowners should not base decisions about improvements to their property on the anticipation of a repository. If the land is acquired, landowners will be compensated at fair market value, including any improvements that have been made.

Issue

The DOE should arrange an exchange of land with the Bureau of Land Management rather than condemning private farmland for the repository.

Response

The DOE recognizes that the acquisition of private land may have significant impacts on its owners and will follow the provisions of the Uniform Relocation Assistance Act. However, in selecting a site for a repository, the ability of the site to contain and isolate the waste is more important than current land use.

C.2.2 LEGAL AND REGULATORY ISSUES

Most of the issues raised in comments on legal and regulatory matters were concerned with the EPA standards for geologic disposal. Other issues included emergency response responsibilities, liability for accidents, and the applicability of Federal mining regulations.

Issue

Several commenters asked which Federal agencies set standards for radioactive-material releases from the repository.

Response

The Act (Section 121(a)) directs the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to develop standards for protecting the general environment from radioactive-material releases from repositories. Responsibility for implementing the EPA standard is assigned to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

The EPA standards were issued in final form as Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 191 (40 CFR Part 191), on August 15, 1985; they were published in the Federal Register on September 19, 1985 (EPA, 1985), and became effective on November 18, 1985. The NRC criteria for implementing these standards were issued as Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations,

Part 60 (10 CFR Part 60). They were published on June 21, 1983 (NRC, 1983). Since 10 CFR Part 60 was issued before the Act was passed, the NRC is revising it for compliance with the Act; 10 CFR Part 60 may also change in response to the above-mentioned final EA standard (40 CFR Part 191).

Issue

A number of comments pertained to the postclosure safety of the repository. Some of them asked what levels of radiation are harmful and who determines what levels are not harmful and what is considered to be an acceptable death rate. One commenter objected that, in the absence of individual dose standards, the EPA's population standard is unacceptable.

Response

According to the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements (1974), the lowest radiation doses that produce evidence that a person has been affected by radiation are in the range of 75 to 125 rem, which is the "minimal dose likely to produce vomiting in about 10 percent of people so exposed." The individual dose limits set by the EPA for the repository are more than 1,000 times lower. During repository operations, no member of the general public may receive more than 25 millirem (0.025 rem) to the whole body, 75 millirem (0.075 rem) to the thyroid, and 25 millirem to any other critical organ; during the first 1,000 years after closure, the limits are 25 millirem the whole body or 75 millirem to any critical organ. The EPA estimates that, for the first 10,000 years, releases from a repository containing 100,000 MTU of waste would cause no more than 1,000 premature deaths from cancer, or an average of no more than one death every 10 years. The projections for actual repositories are expected to be about 10 times lower. For comparison, it is estimated that about 6,000 premature cancer deaths per year are caused by natural background radiation (radiation from cosmic rays, the rocks in the earth, etc.).

In its final standards, 40 CFR Part 191, the EPA has included individual protection requirements (40 CFR 191.15), which are expressed as the maximum permissible individual dose for 1,000 years after repository closure.

Issue

A few commenters questioned the 10,000-year standard for waste isolation.

Response

The 10,000-year standard was chosen by the EPA because at 10,000 years after repository closure the risk posed by the repository to public health and safety is comparable to the risk from unmined uranium ore.

Issue

Some parties expressed concern that the final EPA standards had not been promulgated at the time the draft EAs were issued.

Response

As already mentioned, the final EPA standards were published on September 19, 1985. These final standards were used in revising the EAs.

Issue

One commenter asked who would be responsible for responding to emergencies during repository operation and waste transportation.

Response

The DOE is responsible for emergency preparedness and response at the repository, as specified in DOE Order 5500.3 ("Reactor and Non-Reactor Facility Emergency Planning Preparedness, and Response Programs for Department of Energy Operations").

Responsibility for emergency preparedness and response in the event of a transportation accident involving radioactive materials is spread among the DOE, the carrier of the waste, and the Federal, State, and local governments. The carrier of the waste has the initial responsibility for "onsite" activities to minimize the hazards to life and property from a possible spill of radioactive materials. State and local governments have the primary responsibility for emergency measures that must be undertaken to protect persons, property, and the environment on lands within the State's boundaries from the threat of harm from an accident involving the transportation of nondefense radioactive waste. Upon request by State or local authorities, the DOE and the Federal Emergency Management Agency will provide assistance in responding to emergency situations. (The DOE's personnel will also respond to emergency-assistance requests from private persons and companies, including transportation carriers.)

In regard to emergency response at the Hanford and the Yucca Mountain sites which are Federal nuclear reservations, any onsite accidents would be the DOE's responsibility, not that of the State or the local jurisdiction.

Issue

Commenters questioned the extent of the Federal Government's liability in case of a transportation accident or an accident at the repository in light of the Price-Anderson Act, which limits coverage to \$570 million. They claim that the sum is inadequate and that the Federal Government must assume 100 percent liability in the case of an accident. The failure to address this indicates the government's unwillingness to realistically address the risks associated with the repository.

Response

The Price-Anderson Act provides liability for damages suffered by the public in the event of nuclear accidents at certain facilities, including DOE contractor-operated facilities. The Price-Anderson Act is now under Congressional review, and the Secretary of Energy has made recommendations for extending liability coverage for activities carried out under the Act. (See Appendix A of the EAs for a more detailed discussion.)

Issue

One commenter wanted to know whether DOE contractors are subject to the Mine Safety and Health Act.

Response

The DOE is not subject to the requirements of the Mine Safety and Health Act but intends to comply with its provisions in the repository program. The decision to construct two exploratory shafts (rather than one) at each site recommended for characterization was based partly on compliance with this regulation.

Issue

One commenter asked whether a repository would be excluded from "public health scrutiny" under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

Response

Under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, all facilities in the commercial nuclear fuel cycle, including repositories, are subject to licensing by the NRC, and for this purpose the NRC has promulgated regulations whose objective is to protect the health and safety of the public. For a repository, NRC licensing is also required by the Act, which also stipulates that geologic disposal must be safe and environmentally acceptable.

C.2.3 PROGRAM MANAGEMENT, COSTS, AND SCHEDULES

Included in the comments on the draft EAs were a number of comments on program management, costs, and schedules. The DOE's schedule for repository siting and development was of concern to many parties, most of whom urged the DOE not to sacrifice excellence for schedule.

C.2.3.1 Program management

The comments on program management were concerned mainly with the potential for conflicts of interest in DOE contractors, peer review of the technical program, the need for a program plan, and assurance that DOE contractors will take the necessary measures to protect the environment.

C.2.3.1.1 Conflicts of interest

Issue

Some commenters stated that contractors with a high financial stake in repository development should not perform analyses for site evaluation. Many commenters suggested that, out of the wide range of available data, the contractors choose to analyze only the data that favorably depict the site. The DOE should either employ different contractors for the analysis of site

data or allow the current contractors to continue with site-data analysis of with the stipulation that they will not be considered for prime-contractor positions for repository construction or operation.

Response

Conflict of interest is a potential problem in any large program where individuals and organizations may have a long-term vested interest in the continuation of the program. However, the repository program is divided into several major phases, and the contracts now in effect are limited to the current phase only (development and evaluation). Furthermore, the contracts of the major support contractors are opened for bids every 5 years. Because of the different skills and experience that will be required for repository construction and operation, many of the contractors for these phases are likely to be different from those involved in site evaluation.

There is little likelihood of biased analyses because the analyses conducted for site evaluation are reviewed by the DOE Project Offices, peer review groups, independent experts hired by other DOE organizations (e.g., the Office of Environmental Compliance, which is under the Assistant Secretary for Environment, Safety and Health), other Federal agencies, and technical experts hired by the States. Documents important to the siting process, such as the draft EAs and the environmental impact statement, are submitted for review by the public. The draft EAs were also reviewed by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the U.S. Geological Survey, and the National Academy of Sciences. Finally, the ultimate decision on the suitability of a candidate site will be made by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, which is continuously reviewing the DOE's work through its staff and consultants.

C.2.3.1.2 Technical peer review

Issue

Several comments referenced a report by the General Accounting Office (GAO) report, issued January 10, 1985, that concluded that the program lacks consistent peer review and that this lack may ultimately subject the DOE's technical analyses to challenges and revisions.

Response

Peer review is an important part of the process by which a repository is sited, constructed, and operated. Peer-review groups have already participated in the early stages of the process. For example, the DOE has assembled a group of independent experts, the Performance Assessment National Review Group, to examine the performance-assessment work of the first repository projects. As the repository program continues, the OCRWM expects to assemble similar groups to examine other parts of the work. Other DOE organizations--for example, the Office of Environmental Compliance--also use independent experts in their review of work sponsored by the OCRWM; their peer reviews are significant contributions to the program. The DOE Project Offices also employ peer review groups in many of the technical aspects of the program.

The States in which a repository may be located also provide independent peer reviews; some of the funds distributed by the DOE as financial assistance to the States are used for that purpose.

Another source of independent peer review is the National Academy of Sciences. This organization has contributed a review of the draft EAs and is expected to contribute further reviews in the future.

The ultimate peer review of the program will be provided by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Through its staff and consultants, the Commission will continuously review the DOE work, as it already has the siting guidelines and the draft EAs.

C.2.3.1.3 Need for program plan

Issue

A commenter said that the DOE needs a program plan for waste disposal.

Response

The DOE issued the draft Mission Plan for the Civilian Radioactive Waste Management Program in April 1984 (DOE, 1984a) and the revised plan in June 1985 (DOE, 1985). The Mission Plan describes the objectives and strategies of the program, summarizes current program plans, and summarizes the technical status of the program.

C.2.3.1.4 Protection of the environment

Issue

Some commenters said that government contractors will not spend the money to ensure that the environment is protected during the construction of the repository.

Response

The DOE will oversee all construction activities to ensure compliance with Federal environmental regulations. An environmental plan that specifies procedures to be followed will be prepared for the construction project. Potential impacts are discussed in the EAs. A more comprehensive analysis will be presented in the Environmental Impact Statement, which will also discuss measures for mitigating any significant adverse impacts.

C.2.3.2 Program costs

Several commenters inquired about the total cost of repository development, who was responsible for these costs, and whether the cost of defense-waste disposal would be borne by the Federal Government.

Issue

Commenters asked about the total costs of repository development and waste-management activities.

Response

The costs of the Civilian Radioactive Waste Management Program are divided into four major categories: (1) development and evaluation; (2) geologic repository construction, operation, closure, and decommissioning; (3) transportation; and (4) storage. Estimates of costs for each category depend on the assumptions about such variables as the quantity of waste to be emplaced, the minimum "age" of the waste, the host rock of each repository, the repository design receipt rate, the beginning operation date for each repository, the technology used for waste-transportation casks, and the basis for expressing costs. The figures discussed below were taken from Chapter 10 of Part II of Volume I of the Mission Plan (DOE, 1985a), which discusses in more detail the total costs of managing commercial radioactive wastes.

The costs of development and evaluation (D&E) include all the siting, repository design, testing, regulatory-compliance activities, and institutional activities associated with the repository, waste transportation, and monitored retrievable storage (MRS). The current reference case for total D&E costs is \$7.8 billion (in constant 1984 dollars).

Repository costs include the costs of construction, operation, closure, and decommissioning. Depending on the host rock, the costs of the first repository may vary from \$6.8 billion to \$10.7 billion (in constant 1984 dollars) for the reference cases. The repository costs of the second repository may vary from \$5.8 billion to \$6.1 billion (in constant 1984 dollars).

Waste-transportation costs will be derived from a unit charge for transportation cask use, shipping, and security for each potential transportation pathway. The pathways include transportation from the commercial reactors to each repository, from reactors to an MRS facility (if such a facility is approved by Congress and developed), and from an MRS facility to each repository. The total transportation cost is the sum of these three transportation unit costs. Estimates for transportation costs for the reference cases vary from \$3.3 billion to \$5.1 billion.

Current planning assumptions for an MRS facility estimate the costs at between \$1.6 and \$2.6 billion, or about 5 to 11 percent of the estimated costs of a waste-management system without an MRS facility.

Issue

Commenters asked who is responsible for the costs incurred in constructing the repository. How will these costs be covered and who will pay for the program if the nuclear power plant industry dies out before the closure of the repository?

Response

The Act requires the owners and generators of commercially generated radioactive waste to pay the full costs of its disposal and established a Nuclear Waste Fund to ensure the full-cost-recovery funding of the waste-management program. This Fund receives revenues from an adjustable fee charged quarterly for all electricity generated by commercial nuclear facilities beginning April 7, 1983, as well as a one-time fee, estimated to produce a total of \$2.3 billion, for radioactive waste produced before April 7, 1983. The revenues generated from these two sources, in addition to interest earned from the investment of any surplus in U.S. Treasury securities, are deposited in the Fund, and disbursements are made to cover costs as the program progresses.

Forecasts of future nuclear power generation are incorporated into the management of the Fund. Representative scenarios are presented in DOE documents describing the adequacy of the fund (DOE, 1985c) and analyzing the total-system life-cycle cost for the program (DOE, 1985d).

Issue

Some commenters wanted to know who is responsible for paying for the disposal of defense high-level waste?

Response

As stipulated in the Act, the Federal Government will cover all costs of defense-waste disposal through contributions to the Nuclear Waste Fund (see also Section C.2.6.1).

Issue

Some commenters noted the need for an independent waste-fund audit.

Response

As required by the Act, the Comptroller General of the United States makes annual audits of the Nuclear Waste Fund and submits reports to Congress. An independent audit is also performed for the DOE by a certified public accounting firm. The latest audit covered the period from January 7, 1983 to September 30, 1984, and the results are summarized in the DOE's Annual Report to Congress (DOE, 1985e).

C.2.3.3 Schedule

Many commenters expressed concern that the DOE's schedule for repository siting and development would adversely affect the selection of sites, the consultation process, and the adequacy of the technical data.

C.2.3.3.1 Dependence of site-selection process on schedule

Many comments contended that the mandated repository schedule is driving the site-selection process. Commenters felt that the DOE's schedule is inadequate in that it is an unrealistic list of dates dictated by political decisions rather than by sound geologic site-screening criteria. They requested that the date for the final site selection be postponed and the number of potential repository sites be increased. (See also Section C.3.4.4 for comments on related issues.)

Issue

A number of commenters requested that the date for the final site selection be postponed and the number of potential repository sites be increased.

Response

Being committed to a schedule that will lead to the receipt of waste in 1998 for emplacement in the first repository, the DOE will make every effort to meet intermediate milestones, such as the selection of the site for the first repository, without sacrificing technical excellence.

As explained in Section C.3, the DOE believes that the number of potential repository sites is adequate and in compliance with the requirements of the Act.

Issue

A commenter requested that the DOE recommend that Congress amend the Act to reduce the time constraints in order to allow sufficient time for the entire process.

Response

The DOE recognizes that its schedule is success oriented, but it is also achievable. Hence, a recommendation for an amendment of the Act is not needed.

C.2.3.3.2 Effects on the consultation process

Issue

One commenter said that the DOE could not stay on schedule and conduct a satisfactory program of consultation and cooperation with States and affected Indian Tribes.

Response

As discussed in detail in Chapter 4 of Part I of Volume I of the Mission Plan (DOE, 1985a), the DOE maintains an ongoing program of consultation and information exchange with the States and affected Indian Tribes. The scope of this program is not determined by the overall project schedule. The DOE will

seek to enter into negotiations with States for written consultation-and-cooperation agreements(s) within 60 days after the approval of sites for characterization.

Issue

Some commenters stated that the DOE's tight schedule means closed decisions and no public input.

Response

Recognizing that the schedule is very tight, the DOE is nonetheless fully committed to a process of open and active consultation with all interested parties (see DOE, 1985a, Chapter 4 of Part I of Volume I). Closed decisions are not in the DOE's interest because the schedule can be met only if the States, Indian Tribes, and the public are confident that the siting decisions are sound.

C.2.3.3.3 Effects on the adequacy of technical data

Many comments about the schedule stated that it did not allow time for adequate scientific study and hence might compromise the site-selection process. One commenter doubted that 5 years was enough time for data gathering during site characterization. Conversely, another party noted that the characterization process should follow the mandated schedule so as not to increase costs.

Issue

Many comments objected that the schedule does not allow sufficient time for adequate scientific study.

Response

The DOE cannot meet the schedule without adequate scientific study because it will not be able to obtain an NRC license unless it can demonstrate that the site can meet the standards of the EPA and the technical criteria of the NRC. Furthermore, the DOE believes that it can meet the schedule without sacrificing technical excellence.

Issue

The reference schedule does not allow adequate scientific analyses during site characterization.

Response

The DOE is confident that the schedule for site characterization is adequate.

Detailed plans for the studies to be conducted will be included in the site-characterization plans, which will be submitted to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the U.S. Geological Survey, the States, and the public for review.

The Mission Plan (DOE, 1985a) outlines four alternative cases for site characterization in addition to the reference case. Each case identifies and discusses potential delays. The measures that could be used to compensate for these delays are discussed in the draft Project Decision Schedule (DOE, 1985b).

C.2.4 TRANSPORTATION, RETRIEVABILITY, AND SECOND REPOSITORY

C.2.4.1 Transportation

This section presents general, rather than site-specific, comments on transportation and the analyses presented in Appendix A; these comments are national in scope.

Most of the site-specific comments on transportation pertain to the local and regional transportation impacts of repository operation and are discussed in Section C.7.3. Typical examples of the repository-related transportation comments covered in Section C.7.3 include (1) the impacts of constructing repository access routes, (2) the transportation impacts of repository operation on the local and regional population and environment, (3) the suitability of candidate local and regional transportation routes, and (4) the compliance of the site with the conditions of the transportation guideline.

Many commenters said that the Appendix A should contain more-detailed analyses (e.g., route-specific analysis) and more background information (e.g., legislative and regulatory history). The more-detailed analyses will be performed after the necessary data are collected during site characterization; they will be reported in the environmental impact statement that will accompany the recommendation of one site for development as a repository.

The information provided in the EAs is believed to be sufficient to support preliminary findings on the conditions of the transportation guideline and to discriminate among the sites and is in accordance with the requirements of the siting guidelines (DOE, 1984c). For transportation, the types of information that should be used in nominating sites as suitable for characterization are listed in Appendix IV as follows:

- Estimates of the overall cost and risk of transporting waste to the site.
- Description of the road and rail network between the site and the nearest interstate highways and major rail lines; also description of the waterway system, if any.
- Analyses of the adequacy of the existing regional transportation network to handle waste shipments; the movement of supplies for repository construction, operation, and closure; the removal of nonradioactive waste from the site; and the transportation of the labor force.

- Improvements expected to be required in the transportation network and their feasibility, cost, and environmental impacts.
- Compatibility of the required transportation-network improvements with the local and regional transportation and land-use plans.
- Analysis of weather impacts on transportation.
- Analysis of emergency-response requirements and capabilities related to transportation.

C.2.4.1.1 Cost and risk estimates for transportation

Issue

The transportation cost and risk analyses in the draft EAs were generally considered inadequate by many commenters. Specifically, four main inadequacies were identified: (1) the methods and inputs used were not valid; (2) food-chain and water pathways were overlooked; (3) centroids (i.e., points representing the geographical setting of groups of reactors) were used in lieu of actual reactor locations; and (4) route-specific data were not used.

Response

The DOE believes that the methods and input to the cost and risk analyses are valid and that the results provide an adequate basis for comparing the transportation impacts that would result from shipping waste to each of the sites. However, as discussed below and in Sections C.2.4.1.3, C.2.4.1.4, and C.2.4.1.7, some changes in the methods and input were made. The results of these changes are found in Appendix A.

The RADTRAN II radiological risk code was modified to include the food chain, though the overall impact of this exposure pathway is minor. This change is reflected in the results presented in Appendix A. The relative importance of water pathways can be inferred from similar analyses developed for studies of the risk from nuclear reactors. These studies have examined hypothetical accidents with large radionuclide releases to the environment and have shown that water pathways on the average are small contributors to the total health risk from accidents. However, the consequence analysis included in Appendix A does evaluate the radiation doses received from the water pathway. (See also Section C.2.4.1.3.)

In the draft EAs, which considered shipments from reactors to repository only, the sensitivity of the result to the use of centroids rather than individual reactor locations should be small. However, by introducing the MRS facility, the sensitivity may increase. In the final EAs, actual reactor locations were used in lieu of centroids to evaluate the fractions of travel in the various population-density zones because the MRS facility is now included in the analyses. The results in Appendix A reflect this change.

The issue of route-specific analyses is addressed below.

C.2.4.1.2 Route-specific analysis

Issue

The transportation-risk analyses, which were based on national average data, were challenged in many comments as being inadequate and improper for comparing the repository sites. Furthermore, some commenters said that such analyses do not highlight the special impacts on some States through which a large fraction of all shipments to the repository will pass.

Response

The DOE believes that the general methods and national average data used are adequate for this stage of the repository-siting process. Route-specific analyses and an evaluation of the impacts on host States and States along transportation corridors will be included in the environmental impact statement.

The route-specific analyses to be performed in the future will proceed in the following sequence: (1) define important parameters; (2) gather data; (3) develop models as required; (4) perform analysis; (5) consider mitigating measures; (6) report results. Much coordination and cooperation will be required from State governments and Indian Tribes, particularly in the early stages where parameter identification and data gathering will take place.

C.2.4.1.3 Assessment of the consequences of accidents

Numerous comments said that Appendix A should discuss the consequences of accidents that could occur during transportation and recommended that the analysis consider such factors as route-specific anomalies, the cost of emergency response and cleanup, ingestion pathways, and occupational and non-occupational exposures.

Response

The analyses described in the draft EAs were presented in terms of risk, which is the product of the probability of occurrence and the consequences of that occurrence. Consequence analyses had been performed, but their results were used in producing the risk values published and were not presented separately.

For the final EAs, the consequences of accidents were reevaluated, considering the suggestions of the commenters. The results, consisting of both costs and radiation doses, are in Appendix A. The potential impacts of releases to the atmosphere with deposition on land and on a reservoir are evaluated. Also included are the estimated probabilities of the accidents.

Emergency-response and cleanup costs are described in detail in a study prepared for the NRC (NRC, 1980) and thus are not included in the final EAs.

C.2.4.1.4 Maximum exposure of individuals

Several commenters stated that there were plausible scenarios in which an individual would receive more radiation exposure than the maximum dose estimated in Appendix A. Others said that Appendix A should include the maximum exposure received by an individual during an accident.

Response

Elements of the suggestions received have been combined to define a new set of circumstances for estimating the maximum exposure that individuals might receive during shipments to a repository under normal conditions. Similarly, accident descriptions have been developed for estimating the maximum radiation exposure received by a rescue worker and a member of the public. These analyses are presented in Appendix A.

C.2.4.1.5 Modal split for shipments

Several commenters were confused about the percentage of shipments that will occur by truck and by rail. Some analyses assumed that 70 percent of the shipments would be by rail and 30 percent by truck, while most of the analyses assumed for 100 percent by rail or 100 percent by truck. Furthermore, earlier studies were based on 50 percent of shipments going by rail and 50 percent by truck.

Response

Analyses have not been inconsistent. In order to calculate the maximum national impacts of transportation to a repository, two cases were evaluated. One case evaluated the impacts resulting from making all shipments by rail (100 percent rail) and the other from all shipments by truck (100 percent truck). It is expected, however, that during the early years of repository operations rail shipment will be used for no more than about 50 to 70 percent of the total spent-fuel shipments because of the lack of rail spurs at some reactor sites and other limitations. In later years it is expected that reactor capability to ship by rail will be improved, and the fraction of spent fuel shipped by rail will increase to a least 70 percent. In addition, the rail-to-truck ratio will vary from year to year, depending on which reactors are making shipments.

Assumptions of 100 percent by truck and 100 percent by rail will continue to be used, except that for shipments from the MRS facility to the repository only the rail mode will be considered. For national risk and cost impacts resulting from radioactive-material shipments and directly attributed to transportation operations, these cases result in the maximum predicted impact.

C.2.4.1.6 Defense waste

Several commenters stated that the volume of defense waste to be shipped to a repository was understated in the draft EAs. In particular, the EAs only considered the transportation of defense high-level waste from the Savannah River Plant and did not consider transportation from either the Hanford Site or the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory (INEL). One commenter asked about shipping liquid high-level waste.

Response

The final EAs consider shipments of defense high-level waste from the Savannah River Plant, the Hanford Site, and the INEL. Defense high-level waste will not be transported as a liquid nor will separate shipments of krypton-85 or iodine-129 be made.

The transportation of defense high-level waste is discussed in Chapter 5 and Appendix A of the final EAs. This discussion also recognizes that the President has decided that defense high-level waste should be shipped to a civilian repository for disposal; this decision had not been made when the draft EAs were issued.

C.2.4.1.7 Monitored Retrievable Storage

Issue

Some commenters objected that the transportation analysis was inadequate because a facility for monitored retrievable storage (MRS) was not included in the waste-management system considered in the draft EAs.

Response

The MRS facility had not been proposed when the analyses were prepared for the draft EAs. Preliminary transportation analyses indicate that the total number of miles traveled by the cask fleet can be decreased by introducing an MRS facility into the waste-management system. A description of a representative transportation system designed to support the MRS facility was used to estimate transportation costs and risks for a waste-management system with an integrated MRS facility; the results are included in Appendix A. This new analysis supplements, rather than replaces, the analysis for the reference case.

C.2.4.1.8 Barge transportation

Issue

Several commenters objected that the use of barges had not been given any consideration in the transportation risk assessment, calling this a serious deficiency because barge transportation is a discriminator among the potential

candidate sites; some of them felt that this omission was most serious for the Hanford site, which is close to a navigable waterway (approximately 16 miles away).

Response

A discussion of the barge mode is included in Appendix A to the final EAs. The discussion is in two parts: a description of the mode as a feasible alternative that can play a secondary or supplementary role in the transportation of radioactive wastes and a synopsis of a risk and cost study performed by the Argonne National Laboratory (Tobin and Meshkov, 1985) to examine the normal risk of transporting by barge and to examine costs of shipment, including transfers to truck or rail. The set of circumstances considered does not include the shipment of spent fuel from reactors in the East through the Panama Canal to the Hanford site. The discussions explain the premise that barge transport is not a sensitive discriminator among sites, and it is unnecessary therefore to include an exhaustive analysis in the final EAs.

The particular logistics for using barge to transport spent fuel from some reactors near the West Coast to the Hanford site are discussed in the final EA for Hanford.

C.2.4.1.9 Consideration of a second repository

Issue

Some groups were critical of the fact that the EAs did not consider the implications of a second repository on transportation. They postulate that a two-repository system would minimize the overall cost and risk of transportation.

Response

Favorable condition 5 of the transportation guideline is the "total projected life-cycle cost and risk for transportation of all wastes designated for the repository site which are significantly lower than those for comparable siting options, considering locations of present and potential sources of waste, interim storage facilities, and other repositories." The second-repository program has not yet reached the point where potential sites can be identified--in contrast to the MRS facility, where an analysis is now possible because, since the publication of the draft EAs, potential MRS sites have been identified. As a result, the DOE cannot perform rigorous cost and risk analyses analogous to those done for the MRS case. However, certain assumptions about the potential impacts of a second repository can be based on previous studies. A discussion of the potential impacts of a second repository is found in Appendix A.

C.2.4.1.10 The use of existing casks in the EA analysis

Issue

A number of comments challenged the validity of using the characteristics of currently existing and NRC-certified casks for the transportation risk analysis in the draft EAs. The commenters recognized that the design of the new casks to be used for most shipments will reduce the number of shipments because of higher capacities. However, they questioned that the greater quantities of fuel in a single cask would provide a greater source for the release of radionuclides in a serious accident.

Response

The risk and cost assessments for transportation have been reevaluated, using the predicted characteristics of the new family of casks, even though their designs are not yet available. Risks were assessed for both normal and accident conditions, and assumptions that would result in the maximum expected impacts were used. Because of the conservatism in all assumptions, the impacts are similar to those calculated for existing casks, even though the new casks will require fewer miles of travel and fewer shipments. The results are found in Chapter 5 and in Appendix A.

C.2.4.1.11 Adequacy of current cask designs

Issue

Some commenters questioned the adequacy of the design of currently existing casks.

Response

The adequacy of cask design is a regulatory issue, and, since the existing spent-fuel casks have been certified by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the DOE has no reason to question the adequacy of their design. The existing casks have carried thousands of shipments without an accident that resulted in the release of radioactive material. The DOE will develop a new family of casks because it seeks to increase efficiency, not because it is concerned about the safety of existing casks. The new-generation casks will also have to meet regulatory requirements for cask design and be certified by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. A more detailed discussion of the new family of casks is found in Appendix A.

C.2.4.1.12 Additional testing of casks

Issue

Several commenters expressed concern that casks are not sufficiently tested to ensure that the public is safe during transportation. Some suggested destructive testing of full-scale prototype casks.

Response

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has specified a series of hypothetical accident conditions that a cask must be shown to survive. Survival can be demonstrated through analysis should the designer so choose or through testing, but destructive testing is not mandatory. However, many tests, including full-scale crash tests, have been conducted to verify analytical models. The results of analyses and experiments have been quite close, and hence considerable confidence has been developed in the analytical models used in design analysis.

Casks developed for the shipments to a repository will be certified by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The private contractors chosen to design and obtain certificates for the casks will be allowed to choose the manner of demonstrating how their designs comply with NRC regulations. At a minimum, the DOE will use an independent testing laboratory to perform destructive tests of scale models for cask designs as a benchmark or check of structural performance under accident conditions. In addition, nondestructive tests will be performed on each cask during and at the completion of manufacture, and the casks will be inspected before each shipment.

C.2.4.1.13 Cask weeping

Issue

Some commenters said that the phenomenon called "cask weeping" had not been considered in the risk assessments.

Response

The phenomenon of cask weeping can be described as follows: A cask that has been loaded or unloaded in a reactor storage pool becomes contaminated with radioactivity on its surface. Before shipment, the external surface of the cask is decontaminated to levels specified by regulations, but when the cask is inspected on arrival at its destination, contamination above the levels allowed by regulation is found. Though the actual mechanism is not understood, a possible explanation is that, when a cask is repeatedly placed into water-filled spent-fuel storage pools, it becomes contaminated over time, with the contamination penetrating deeper into the pores of the cask body. The cleaning removes the surface contamination, but the contamination that is deep in the pores remains. During the transportation of a loaded cask, the surface can become contaminated again as the deep contamination is driven out of the pores by the heat of the spent fuel inside the cask.

However, the levels of contamination associated with the weeping phenomenon are not high enough to be factored into the risk assessment for transportation, and procedures will be used to effectively preclude this problem during shipments to a repository. For example, wrapping the cask in plastic before entry into reactor fuel storage pools is an effective practice that is currently used. Therefore, weeping is not expected to be a significant contributor to risk during spent-fuel transportation to a repository and is not included in the transportation-risk assessment presented in Appendix A.

C.2.4.1.14 Adequacy of NRC testing requirements

Issue

Several commenters said that the tests that casks must pass to receive NRC certification are not severe enough.

Response

The conditions being challenged are established by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and the DOE will continue to rely on the Commission to verify the adequacy of the test conditions.

C.2.4.1.15 Legal impediments

Issue

Two commenters took exception to the DOE's interpretation of State or local restrictions against radioactive-waste transportation as "legal impediments" in favorable condition 7 of the technical guideline on transportation (10 CFR 960.5-2-7). In particular, the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) commented that, since its regulation of highway routing of radioactive materials (HM-164) has been established as valid by the U.S. Supreme Court, the only "legal impediment" would be a State or local routing rule that renders compliance with HM-164 impossible but is found not to be preempted under provision 112(b) of the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act (HMTA). If such a finding cannot be made, any State or local routing rule that prevents or seriously impedes compliance with HM-164 is preempted by the HMTA (Section 112(a)).

Response

Favorable condition 7 of the transportation guideline is the "absence of legal impediments with regard to compliance with Federal regulations for the transportation of waste in or through the affected State and adjoining States."

Insofar as the Department of Transportation is the responsible regulatory agency, the DOE defers to its interpretation of "legal impediment." Because State, local, or tribal laws or regulations restricting the transportation of radioactive waste that are inconsistent with either the HMTA or the DOT regulations issued thereunder are preempted by the HMTA, such laws or regulations are not considered legal impediments in the final EAs; a formal nonpreemption determination by the DOT, in response to a specific request, is required for such laws or regulations to become legal impediments. The findings in Chapter 6 reflect this change in interpretation and appropriate rationales for the finding are included in all EAs. A more extensive discussion of HM-164 is presented in Appendix A.

C.2.4.1.16 State designation of alternative routes

Issue

The commenters noted that in Appendix A the EAs contain an incorrect statement--namely, that State designation of alternative preferred routes must be approved by the Department of Transportation. They said that HM-164 does not require States to seek DOT approval of alternative designated routes.

Response

The Department of Transportation requires, under HM-164, that a "preferred route" be used for the transportation of controlled-quantity shipments of radioactive materials. Preferred routes are interstate highways and State-designated alternative routes. Although the States and Indian Tribes must comply with DOT guidelines (or an equivalent routing analysis that adequately considers the overall risk to the public) and consult with affected local jurisdictions, Indian Tribes, and potentially affected adjacent States before establishing a preferred route, there is no requirement to seek DOT approval of alternative designated routes. The EAs have been revised to reflect this in Appendix A.

C.2.4.1.17 Indian Rights

Issue

Several Indian Tribes commented that the EAs failed to recognize the authority granted to tribal governments on federally recognized Indian reservations under the HMTA and the rules set forth by the Department of Transportation in HM-164. One Indian Tribe noted that a ban on radioactive-waste transportation through its reservation constituted a "legal impediment."

Response

The final EAs use the DOT definition of "State routing agency." The DOT rules (HM-164) include appropriate Indian tribal authorities in the definition of "State routing agency" and, as such, allow the governments of Indian Tribes to exercise routing authority in a similar manner as provided for the State governments.

If a ban enacted by an Indian Tribe meets the criteria of the HMTA for nonpreemption, then (as in the case of any State ban) a legal impediment will be present. A more detailed discussion is given in Appendix A, (see also Section C.2.4.1.15).

C.2.4.1.18 Availability of railroads for transporting radioactive waste

Issue

One commenter noted that, though the DOE states that rail carriers are available for shipping radioactive waste, the willingness of the railroads to transport the waste is questionable.

Response

There have been a series of decisions by the Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC), affirmed on judicial review, on this and related issues over the past several years. The Commission has ruled that, as common carriers, the railroads cannot refuse to carry cask loads of spent fuel and to return empty rail casks. Furthermore, this transport must be accomplished in regular train service (as opposed to "special trains," which the Commission has found to be a "wasteful transportation practice"), unless the DOE chooses otherwise.

At this time uncertainty in rail transportation remains in the tariff rates. For eastern railroads, the Commission has upheld a DOE and industry challenge to the published tariff rates and has reduced and set the rate levels. However, for western and southern railroads, the question of rate appropriateness is pending before the Commission. Therefore, the issue does not appear to be whether the railroads will transport radioactive waste, but rather at what rates.

In order to more closely work with the railroads and to understand the concerns that do remain, the DOE has and will continue to invite them to participate in all stages of the transportation program, including the development and testing of shipping casks. Also, the DOE and the Association of American Railroads are planning joint activities to resolve issues.

C.2.4.1.19 Railroad regulations

Issue

A commenter asked for a description of the existing regulations for the transportation of radioactive waste by rail.

Response

Federal regulations regarding the transportation of hazardous material, including radioactive material, can be found in Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Parts 174.83-174.93. These regulations are concerned with the handling of placarded cars. In particular, for cars containing radioactive material, the regulations deal with the switching of cars, the ban on the use of passenger trains, and the position of cars in a train. A more-detailed discussion of rail regulations is included in Appendix A of the final EAs.

C.2.4.1.20 Dedicated trains

Issue

Several comments concerned the treatment of rail transportation in the EAs. In particular, the commenters objected that discussions and analyses of rail shipments were based on shipping in general commerce rather than by dedicated trains.

Response

Appendix A has been revised to include a general discussion of the use of dedicated trains and an analysis of the risks associated with using dedicated trains for the movement of waste from an MRS facility to a repository.

C.2.4.1.21 Regional transportation analysis

Issue

Federal agencies as well as several States and Indian Tribes criticized the regional transportation analysis, stating that it did not extend far enough from the site to include all of the pertinent impacts, such as weather hazards, the cost of building access routes, the radiological risk, traffic hazards and increased traffic volumes on highways connecting interstate highways with access roads, and possible routes across Indian lands.

Response

The "regional" transportation analysis includes, as a minimum, the routes from the potential site to the nearest interstate highway or mainline railroad; the analysis may be extended beyond that area if the circumstances at the particular location warrant it. However, the intent of the siting guidelines (10 CFR Part 960) is to focus on effects near the site. The estimates of the costs of building access routes will be improved during site characterization. Currently available data on road conditions (e.g., traffic volumes and potential hazards) are presented in the EAs. More-detailed data and a discussion of mitigation measures will appear in the environmental impact statement.

C.2.4.1.22 Weather impacts

Issue

Many commenters criticized the way in which weather impacts were considered in the transportation analysis. Some gave examples of weather-related road closings; others asked about the effect of weather on frequency and severity of accidents.

Response

Weather conditions are considered in favorable condition 9 of the transportation guideline: "A regional meteorological history indicating that significant transportation disruptions would not be routine seasonal occurrences" (emphasis added). This favorable condition is concerned with the absence of routine seasonal conditions that could disrupt repository activities to the extent that the annual waste-acceptance rate could not be met. Weather-related route closures are considered in the final EA, and the analysis of such closures is considered adequate for this stage of the site-selection process. When the number of sites has been narrowed and route-specific analyses are conducted, concerns about occasional weather-related bottlenecks between specific reactors and repository sites can be addressed.

C.2.4.1.23 Potential for human error

Issue

Some commenters stated that the potential for human error in the transportation of radioactive waste is not treated adequately in Appendix A.

Response

The DOE has considered the potential for human error in the assessment of transportation risks. A study prepared for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC, 1980) analyzed detailed incidents of human error and deviations from accepted quality-assurance (QA) practices in the transport of radioactive materials. The results indicate that the risks from human errors or deviations from accepted QA practices are extremely small (i.e., 0.000012 latent-cancer fatality per shipment-year for packages tested to accident conditions), and thus it is not meaningful to include these risks in the radiological risk analysis for transportation.

C.2.4.1.24 Retrieval of waste

Issue

Commenters asked about the impacts that would result from the transportation of waste retrieved from a repository should retrieval prove to be necessary.

Response

At this stage in the repository-design process, the full impacts of retrieval on transportation requirements are not known. If retrieval proves to be necessary, the spent fuel will be older and less radioactive than at the time of emplacement; it is therefore expected that the transportation of such waste should have less of an impact. A discussion of the retrievability issue in general can be found in Chapter 5.

C.2.4.1.25 Financing infrastructure improvement

Issue

Several commenters suggested that the costs of infrastructure improvements, such as the upgrading or reconstructing of roads or rail lines, should be considered in the cost analysis and that more information is needed on how such improvements would be integrated with local economic development plans.

Response

A preliminary analysis of the need for upgrading or reconstructing local roads and railroads was performed for the comparative evaluation of sites. Related discussions can be found in Chapter 6 of the individual EAs. The condition of local roads or railroads will be established during site characterization; it will be analyzed more rigorously for the environmental impact statement and again before the repository begins operation, and plans for integration into local development plans will be developed.

C.2.4.1.26 Adequacy of the transportation guideline

Issue

Many commenters expressed the opinion that the transportation guideline is not adequate for discriminating among sites. In particular, they stated that the use of legal impediments as a discriminator is inappropriate, as they may change over time; that transportation costs should not be considered in the ranking because they are of minor importance in comparison with transportation risks to the public and the environment; and that the guideline condition discussing weather impacts on transportation in the vicinity of the site should be expanded to include potential disruptions between the reactors and the site. Other commenters criticized the weight given to the transportation guideline, considering the potential impact of transportation.

Response

The siting guidelines (DOE, 1984c) were developed through consultation with affected and interested States, the Council on Environmental Quality, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the U.S. Geological Survey and received the concurrence of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The transportation guideline is one of three guidelines in the preclosure group on environmental, socioeconomics, and transportation. This group of guidelines is second in importance to the preclosure group on radiological safety but all the guidelines in any preclosure group are assigned equal importance.

C.2.4.1.27 Inadequate treatment of transportation issues

Issue

Many comments stated that a variety of general transportation issues received inadequate or no attention in either the body of the EA or in Appendix A. Among the issues listed were emergency-response responsibilities, the impacts of using overweight trucks, rail routing requirements, inspection and enforcement, liability, safe havens, advance notification, training, sabotage, NRC safeguards regulations, and the responsibilities of the DOE as the shipper of record.

Response

Many of the topics listed by the commenters are discussed in the EAs, particularly in Appendix A. Since the draft EAs were published, additional policy decisions about several of the issues have been made, and, where additional information is available, the discussion of the issue has been expanded. It should be pointed out, however, that most of these issues, while of concern in the overall context of the transportation program, have little bearing on the site-selection process. They were included in the EAs primarily to give the reader a better understanding of the transportation program. For further information on how the DOE plans to interact with the States, Indian Tribes, and industry to resolve these other issues, the reader is referred to the Transportation Institutional Plan (DOE, 1985f).

C.2.4.2 Retrievability

Several commenters addressed the need and the desire to retrieve spent fuel and high-level waste after emplacement in the repository. The issues they raised include the view that wastes should not be placed where they cannot be retrieved, the DOE's plans for the length of the retrievability period, and the methods to be used in retrieval.

Issue

Some commenters said that at some point the United States may want to retrieve the spent fuel or high-level waste to reuse some of its components or to take advantage of new technical developments. The wastes should therefore not be emplaced where retrieval is not possible.

Response

In compliance with the Act and the NRC criteria for geologic repositories (10 CFR Part 60), the waste will be retrievable for up to 50 years after the emplacement of the first waste. The reason for retrieval would be to protect public health and safety. The DOE does not intend to recover the wastes for their economic value. The commitment to geologic disposal implicitly forfeits the future use of the waste in return for assurance that the waste has been permanently isolated from the human environment.

Issue

A commenter asked whether there is a scientific and political consensus about whether the wastes should be retrievable or permanently disposed.

Response

By mandating geologic disposal, the Act implies a political consensus that disposal must be permanent. The concept of permanent disposal is widely supported by the technical community and is explicit in the NRC and EPA regulations (10 CFR Part 60 and 40 CFR 191, respectively). The NRC requirement for retrievability is directed at demonstrating that the performance of the repository is adequate for permanent disposal.

Issue

Commenters asked that the DOE specify the period during which it plans to be able to retrieve waste.

Response

As required by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in 10 CFR Part 60.111, the retrieval of waste from a repository will be possible at any time up to 50 years after the start of waste emplacement.

Issue

One commenter wanted to know how retrieval will be accomplished.

Response

If retrieval is necessary, it will be accomplished by reversing the steps taken for waste emplacement. The exact sequence and the equipment to be used for retrieval will depend on the design of the repository, the host rock of the repository, as well as the reason for retrieval (e.g., degree of container failure). Equipment for retrieval will be designed and tested before the license application, and the DOE's retrieval capability will have to be approved by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

C.2.4.3 Second repository

A number of comments concerned the location of the second repository and succeeding repositories and asked whether an indefinite expansion of the first repository is an alternative to constructing a second repository. Some parties wanted to know whether sites characterized for the first repository or sites not nominated for characterization for the first repository could be potential sites for the second repository. Others wanted to know why crystalline and argillaceous rocks were not considered for the first repository.

Issue

Commenters asked where the second repository will be located and whether both repositories could be located in the same State.

Response

With the exception of sites that were nominated but not recommended for characterization, the DOE may consider for the second repository any site previously considered for the first repository that was (1) not disqualified and (2) not selected for the first repository. The DOE is considering sites in crystalline-rock bodies in the eastern United States and announced 12 potentially acceptable crystalline sites as suitable for further consideration for the second repository (DOE, 1986).

The Act and the siting guidelines specify that the DOE must consider regionality in selecting the site for the second repository. It is therefore unlikely that the first and the second repository will be located in the same State.

Issue

A commenter wanted to know what will prevent an indefinite expansion of the first repository as an alternative to constructing a second repository.

Response

The Act allows the first repository to accept no more than 70,000 metric tons of uranium or the equivalent waste from reprocessing until a second repository is in operation.

Issue

Commenters asked for clarification on whether sites characterized for the first repository but not selected for the first repository can be considered for the second repository.

Response

The Act specifically states that sites that have been characterized for the first repository and are suitable but were not chosen for the first repository may be considered for the second repository. It is expected that all three sites characterized as part of the selection process for the first repository will be found suitable. The fact that only one of the three sites characterized is chosen for the first repository does not mean that the other sites are significantly less suitable.

Issue

The DOE should clarify whether potentially acceptable sites not nominated for characterization for the first repository can be nominated for characterization for the second repository.

Response

The Act permits the four sites designated as potentially acceptable sites but not nominated as suitable for site characterization to be considered as potential sites for the second repository. Whether they survive the selection process for the second repository will depend on the merits of those sites vis-a-vis other potential sites.

Sites that were nominated, but not recommended for site characterization, are not eligible to be considered for the second repository.

C.2.5 OTHER WASTE-MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES

This section presents comments and responses on monitored retrievable storage, which the DOE plans to propose to Congress as an integral part of the waste-management system, the storage of spent fuel at the site of the reactors, and the reprocessing of spent fuel for the recovery of uranium and plutonium.

C.2.5.1 Monitored retrievable storage

A number of comments were concerned with retrievable storage, the DOE's plans for a facility for monitored retrievable storage (MRS), and the lack of information in the draft EAs about the role of an MRS facility in the overall waste-management system. Several commenters recommended that the DOE consider monitored retrievable storage as an alternative to permanent disposal. Some commenters requested information on the possible locations of the MRS facility.

Issue

The DOE should consider the retrievable storage of spent fuel in a facility where it can be monitored.

Response

The DOE has indeed considered of the need for, and the feasibility of, monitored retrievable storage, and was required to do so by the Act. The DOE considered alternative roles and schedules for MRS facilities and has assessed their value to the waste-management system. Specifically, the DOE evaluated a backup MRS facility to be constructed only if there is a significant delay in the repository program and an integral MRS facility that would receive and prepare spent fuel for disposal. Both options have been compared with the currently authorized system, which does not include an MRS facility. Early in 1986, the DOE expects to propose to Congress the construction of an MRS facility as an integral part of the total waste-management system.

Issue

Some parties said that the draft EAs lacked information about the role of an MRS facility in the waste-management system and suggested that the DOE discuss the possible locations for the MRS facility.

Response

The principal functions of an MRS facility would be to receive and prepare the waste for disposal, thus eliminating the waste-preparation functions from a repository, to serve as a hub for transportation operations, and to provide temporary storage.

After issuing the draft EAs, the DOE concluded that monitored retrievable storage should play an integral role in the waste-management system. Section 3.2 of Part I of Volume I of the Mission Plan (DOE, 1985a) describes this integral MRS concept and plans for its development.

On April 26, 1985, the DOE selected three candidate sites in Tennessee for an MRS facility (DOE, 1985g). The preferred site is the site of the canceled Clinch River breeder reactor; alternative sites are a site on the DOE's Oak Ridge Reservation and the site of the canceled Hartsville nuclear power plant.

The introduction to Chapter 5 of each EA has been augmented to discuss the role of the MRS facility, and the transportation analyses have been expanded to treat the effects of using an MRS facility.

C.2.5.2 Onsite storage

Some commenters asked about the potential for long-term or permanent storage at the power plants that generate the wastes as an alternative to transporting wastes over long distances. Other commenters suggested that the DOE should continue storage in existing spent-fuel pools.

Issue

Commenters said that the DOE should consider developing repositories near the reactors generating the waste instead of in one or more central repositories.

Response

Nearness to the reactors generating the waste is not an acceptable criterion for siting repositories. The principal criteria are those embodied in the siting guidelines: waste containment and isolation from the accessible environment after closure; preclosure radiological safety; suitable environmental, socioeconomic, and transportation conditions; and ease and cost of construction, operation, and closure. Even if sites meeting the siting guidelines could be found near the reactors, it would be imprudent and impractical to develop many repositories. In addition to requiring very large

expenditures, a multiple-repository program would require acceptance of many States and individual licenses for multiple facilities, long-term safety of each repository--a task that is formidable even for one repository. Two centralized repositories, as currently planned, would be able to accommodate all the waste and would solve the national problem of radioactive-waste disposal at reasonable cost.

Issue

The DOE should consider continuing storage in existing spent-fuel storage pools at reactor sites.

Response

In accordance with the Act, the DOE encourages the efficient use and expansion of at-reactor storage. At-reactor storage and the expansion of the on site capacity for that storage are the prime responsibility of the plant operators and owners, and not of the Federal Government. The Federal role is to encourage and expedite, where necessary, the expansion of that storage capacity until the spent fuel is shipped for emplacement in a repository for permanent disposal. However, the Act specifies geologic repositories as the means for permanent disposal and requires the DOE to site two repositories. Onsite storage is to be provided for a limited amount of fuel (1,900 metric tons of uranium) if any utility requests it and the Nuclear Regulatory commission determines that the utility is eligible. The DOE's program for such Federal interim storage is discussed in the Mission Plan (DOE 1985a, Vol. I, Part I, Chapter 3).

The storage of spent fuel in storage pools at reactor sites is safe for the purpose for which the pools were designed. Spent-fuel pools are meant to provide temporary storage, not an alternative to permanent disposal.

C.2.5.3 Reprocessing

Some commenters asked about the feasibility of reprocessing spent fuel, the use of stabilizing matrices for high-level waste, and the possibility of retrieving wastes from a repository for reprocessing. Other commenters wanted to know whether the wastes from the repository could be applied to any useful purpose.

Issue

Commenters questioned whether there are ways to recycle the components of the spent fuel or waste to be placed in the repository or in some way reverse the process of creating radioactive materials.

Response

There is no practical way known today of reversing the process that creates radioactive materials. The spent fuel could be reprocessed to remove the plutonium and uranium for use in other reactors. However, that does not substantially reduce the volume, heat generation, or radioactivity of the

material requiring disposal. Currently there are no plans for reprocessing spent fuel. The DOE is planning to accept spent fuel for disposal with no intent to retrieve it for reprocessing unless required to do so for the purposes of recovering economically valuable as required by the Act.

Both President Ford and President Carter imposed a ban on reprocessing commercial spent fuel in the United States in response to concerns that the recovered fissile could be diverted to foreign nations or terrorists and used in making nuclear bombs. President Reagan lifted the ban on commercial reprocessing on October 8, 1981, but it is current U.S. policy that the reprocessing of spent fuel from nuclear power plants must be a private-sector enterprise. Because of the lack of economic incentives, industry concern about licensing uncertainties, and the potential for changes in government policy, there is little industry interest in reprocessing.

Issue

Commenters feared that the spent fuel and high-level waste in the repository will be dug up for reprocessing and be reused.

Response

As already mentioned, the DOE plans to accept spent fuel for disposal with no intent to retrieve it for reprocessing unless required to do so for the purposes of recovering the economically valuable resources, as required by the Act. However, the Act requires the repository to be designed and constructed to permit the retrieval of any spent fuel emplaced in the repository during an appropriate period of operation of the facility. The reasons for such retrieval, may pertain to public health and safety, the environment, or the recovery of the economically valuable contents of the spent fuel. In addition, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission requires that the waste emplaced in the repository be retrievable for 50 years after the start of waste emplacement, and the satisfactory completion of a performance-confirmation program. The DOE will comply with these requirements.

Issue

Some comments recommended that glass or ceramic matrices be used to immobilize high-level waste.

Response

All of the high-level waste to be accepted by the repository--the defense high-level waste and the commercial high-level waste from the West Valley Demonstration Project--will be in the form of borosilicate glass.

Issue

Some commenters expressed concern that the materials in the repository will be used to make bombs.

Response

The nuclear materials for weapons are obtained from defense reactors specifically designed to produce such materials. The spent fuel from power reactors is much less useful in the manufacture of modern nuclear weapons, and the DOE has no intention of using it for this purpose.

C.2.6 TYPES OF WASTE TO BE RECEIVED AT A REPOSITORY

A number of commenters asked about the nature of the wastes to be received at the repository. Other comments concerned the effects of slower or faster rates of waste generation and the minimum age of the spent fuel to be emplaced in the repository.

Issue

Commenters wanted to know what kinds of waste are to be emplaced in the repository.

Response

The Nuclear Waste Policy Act, which authorizes the construction of the repository and prescribes procedures for its siting and financing, specifies that the repository is to accept high-level waste and spent fuel. Thus, the wastes that will be accepted by the repository will consist of spent fuel from commercial nuclear power plants, solidified high-level waste from the reprocessing of nuclear fuel from defense reactors, and a small amount of commercial high-level waste from a demonstration facility at West Valley, New York. Also emplaced in the repository will be the low-level waste that is generated at the repository during operations. If spent fuel is consolidated before emplacement in a repository, the repository may also accept some or all of the fuel-assembly hardware that will be left by the consolidation process. No other low-level waste, such as the waste from research centers, hospitals, and general industry, will be accepted. Although the Act does not forbid it, the DOE does not at present plan to accept foreign wastes for disposal in the repository. The acceptance of foreign wastes requires a report to Congress.

The volume of the waste will be such that two repositories are expected to meet the requirements for disposal well into the twenty-first century.

Issue

Commenters wanted to know how changes in the rates of waste generation would affect the operation of the repository.

Response

The duration of operations at the repository will be determined to a large extent by the rate of waste. The currently projected operational period of 28 years for the first repository will not be affected by changes in the rate of waste generation because much of the waste that will go into the first repository will exist by the time the repository starts accepting waste. The

length of operations at the second repository will be determined to a larger extent by its planned capacity and the rate of waste generation in the twenty-first century. The rate of receipt of wastes at the repository will have an impact on employment during the operations phase of the repository, but the impact will be relatively minor.

Issue

The EA analyses are based on 10-year-old spent fuel, but the DOE is committed to accept spent fuel as early as 5 years after it leaves the reactor.

Response

The DOE's contracts with the utilities obligate it to accept spent fuel that is 5 years old or older. The current DOE specification of generic requirements for repositories shows 5-year-old fuel as the baseline for design. The analyses reported in the EAs are based on an earlier assumption that only fuel that is 10 years old or older would be emplaced in the repository. The DOE has not yet performed an analysis for 5-year-old fuel. The final EAs have been revised to add a discussion that explains the DOE's plans to perform analyses for 5-year-old fuel in the repository and the possible impact of an MRS facility on the age of the spent fuel emplaced in the repository.

C.2.6.1 Defense waste

A number of commenters addressed the status and potential impacts of plans to accept defense high-level waste in the repositories.

Issue

Some persons wanted to know how the decision made to include defense high-level waste in the repository was made.

Response

In compliance with the Act, the Secretary of Energy reported to the President, in January 1985, the results of a study showing that there are no clear health and safety, transportation, public acceptance, regulatory, or national-security advantages or disadvantages associated with a separate repository for defense high-level waste and that there are clear cost advantages to emplacing defense and commercial wastes in the same repository. The President agreed with the Secretary's findings that a separate repository is not necessary for defense high-level waste. Therefore, in accordance with the Act, the Secretary of Energy is proceeding to arrange for the use of repositories developed under the Act for the disposal of defense waste. The evaluation report was released for general distribution in June 1985 (DOE, 1985h).

Issue

Many commenters felt that the subject of defense waste was not adequately covered in the draft EAs.

Response

The draft EAs did not contain much information about defense-waste disposal in the repositories, because the report on the subject (DOE, 1985h) was sent to the President in January 1985 (after the publication of the draft EAs), and the Presidential decision to include defense waste in the repository was made after that date.

It is important to note that defense high-level waste presents a lower radiological hazard per unit volume than does commercial high-level waste or spent fuel and a much lower heat-generation rate. The radiological risk analyses in the draft EAs, which are based on the assumption that only civilian waste will be accepted, therefore overestimate the risk of a repository containing both commercial and defense high-level wastes.

Some changes have been made to the EAs to reflect the decision to emplace defense waste. These include the addition of an entry in the tables on the incremental impacts of alternative repository designs. This new entry deals with the addition of defense waste. For consistency, these tables all appear at the beginning of Chapter 5 in the final EAs.

Issue

Several parties wanted to know who would pay for the costs of defense-waste disposal.

Response

The Act requires that, if defense waste is emplaced in any of the repositories developed under the Act, then a proper share of the costs of developing, constructing, and operating the repository is to be paid by the Federal Government into the Nuclear Waste Fund, which is used to finance the activities required by the Act.

Issue

Some persons asked whether the same safety standards will be applied to both defense and commercial high-level wastes.

Response

The January 1985 report to the President on the use of commercial repositories for the disposal of defense high-level waste (DOE, 1985h) stated that all defense waste to be disposed of will be in a form that satisfies the regulations governing the repository--namely, 10 CFR Part 60 (NRC, 1983), 10 CFR Part 960 (DOE, 1984c), and 40 CFR Part 191 (EPA, 1985).

Issue

Many commenters asked about the nature of defense high-level waste and the effect of its emplacement in the repository.

Response

Defense high-level waste results from the reprocessing of spent fuel. It differs significantly from commercial high-level waste and spent fuel because it has much lower concentrations of radioactive fission products and hence a much lower rate of heat generation. The 20,000 packages of defense high-level waste expected to be produced by the year 2020 are considered equivalent to 10,000 metric tons of uranium (MTU) of spent fuel. At the end of 1982, approximately 15 percent of the total radioactivity in spent fuel and high-level waste in the United States was from defense activities; most of the remaining 85 percent was from commercial spent fuel. By the year 2000, the amount of radioactivity in the defense waste is expected to drop to 3 percent of that of all wastes to be accepted by the repository.

In his report to the President (DOE, 1985h) on the potential uses of the repositories for defense high-level waste, the Secretary of Energy explained the DOE's interpretation of the capacity limit (70,000 MTU) imposed by the first repository until a second repository is in operation; the DOE's interpretation is that the limit applies to total quantity of waste—that is, both commercial and defense waste. The analysis in the report assumed that the first repository would accept the 10,000 MTU equivalent of defense waste and 60,000 MTU of commercial waste and that the second repository would be in operation before the 70,000-MTU limit was reached. The report also said that, if all the defense-waste canisters expected to be produced by 2020 were emplaced in one repository with a capacity of 70,000 MTU, it would occupy only about 10 percent of the volume of repository. This fact is attributed to the low heat-generation rate of defense waste, which allows closer spacing between canisters than that for spent fuel. Thus, the inclusion of defense-waste canisters produced by 2020 will not necessitate any significant expansion of the repository. The Mission Plan (DOE, 1985a) includes a schedule for the acceptance of commercial and defense wastes in the first two repositories.

Issue

Commenters wanted to know about the origin of defense and commercial waste.

Response

Defense high-level waste results from reprocessing of spent fuel at DOE facilities. Commercial high-level waste and spent fuel come from nuclear power plants operated by electric utilities.

Issue

Commenters alleged that the DOE withheld the defense-waste report (DOE, 1985h) to make it appear that defense waste would be disposed of separately from commercial wastes.

Response

The DOE was required by the Act to submit a report to the President on the feasibility of combining defense and commercial waste in the repository. This report was released before the deadline (January 7, 1985), mandated by the Act. The DOE was not required to circulate the report for public comment before it was issued, but the report has been available to the public on request since its release was announced in the Federal Register (DOE, 1985i).

Issue

Some commenters were concerned that the repository might become a military operation because of the disposal of defense waste.

Response

The repository will not become a military operation. The defense wastes are produced at facilities operated by the Department of Energy, not the Department of Defense. Furthermore, there are no plans at present to use additional security measures because of the disposal of defense waste. Normal security measures taken to protect spent fuel during receipt and emplacement will be sufficient for protecting defense high-level waste. These security measures will not interfere with the liberties of citizens in the surrounding areas and will probably not involve military personnel in any capacity.

Issue

Some persons asked whether defense high-level wastes from Hanford will be disposed of in the repository.

Response

Defense wastes from Hanford, the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, and the Savannah River Plant will be disposed of in the repository. Appendix A in the EAs has been changed to reflect that fact.

C.2.6.2 Foreign waste

Issue

Commenters asked whether foreign wastes will be emplaced in the repository.

Response

Although the Act does not specifically forbid the acceptance of foreign wastes at the repository, the DOE has no plans to do so.

C.2.6.3 Other wastes

Issue

Several persons wanted to know whether the repository will accept low-level radioactive waste from various sources or wastes, other than spent fuel, generated from the decommissioning of nuclear power plants.

Response

The Act authorizes the DOE to site and construct a repository for high-level radioactive waste and spent fuel. Wastes from the decommissioning of military or commercial nuclear reactors are not considered high-level waste at present, and therefore these wastes will not be accepted in the repository. Instead, these wastes are considered low-level wastes.

C.2.7 THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS

Many comments were concerned directly with the EAs. The issues they raised included the format, content, organization, consistency, and documentation of the draft EAs. In addition, many of the comments offered editorial suggestions; all of these were carefully considered in revising the EAs.

C.2.7.1 General comments on the environmental assessments and their function

Some commenters asked why the EAs were issued or why they preceded the DOE's Mission Plan and the EPA final standards. Others objected to their size and complexity, alleged inaccuracies, or incompleteness.

Issue

Some commenters questioned the place of the environmental impact statement (EIS) in the siting process, asking why environmental assessments were prepared rather than an EIS.

Response

The Act specifically requires an EA to accompany the nomination of a site as suitable for characterization (Section 112(b)(i)(E)). An environmental impact statement is one of the documents that will accompany the Secretary's recommendation to the President of one site for development as a repository.

Issue

Commenters pointed out that the Act requires the DOE to prepare a mission plan that would provide a base of information for the site evaluation and selection process. They questioned whether the draft EAs, and the preliminary site nomination and recommendations they contain, should have been prepared before the issuance of the mission plan.

Response

Section 301 of the Act requires the DOE to develop a mission plan that provides sufficient information for informed decisions in carrying out the repository program. A draft mission plan was issued in April 1984 (DOE, 1984a), 8 months before the draft EAs. The revised mission plan was issued in June 1985 (DOE, 1985a) and was used in revising the final EAs. The process and schedule established by the Act, however, did not allow the draft EAs to be delayed until the mission plan was published.

Issue

Several commenters stated that the EAs do not satisfy the requirement of the Act to identify unresolved technical issues and the problems that impede the implementation of the Act. In addition, they felt that the DOE's response to data gaps had been to say that issues would be settled in the final EAs.

Response

Although not required by the Act to do so, the EAs do identify the unresolved issues with regard to the siting guidelines; these issues are discussed in Chapter 6 of the EAs. The DOE believes that the findings made for the guidelines are based on sufficient data and information; the findings made at this stage of the site-selection process are to be based on available information. Definitive data will be collected during site characterization.

Some of the statutory requirements identified by the commenters pertain to the DOE's Mission Plan, not the EAs. Among them are requirements to identify unresolved issues and problems that may impede the implementation of the Act (see Sections 301(a)(2) and (3) of the Act). These requirements are addressed in Chapters 2 and 3, respectively, of Part II in Volume I of the Mission Plan (DOE, 1985a).

Issue

A commenter suggested that the DOE issue another set of draft EAs. The commenter expressed concern that the EAs would be so extensively rewritten in response to public comments that the public should be allowed to review the revised EAs in draft before they are issued in final form.

Response

The DOE will not reissue the EAs in draft for comment for the following reasons. First, most of the changes in the final EAs were made in response to public comments and are explained in this comment-response appendix. Second, the final EA is a final agency action and is therefore subject to judicial review. Third, the DOE believes that it has been responsive to comments on the draft EAs and that an additional comment period would not result in further significant improvements. Finally, interested parties will have additional opportunities to comment on the site-selection process through hearings and comments on the site-characterization plans, the environmental impact statement, and other program documents.

Issue

A number of comments implied that the DOE treated the EA process in a perfunctory manner. Some commenters felt that the DOE did not produce EAs that met the intent of the Act; some even stated that the documents were worthless.

Response

The Act requires the following six major assessments to be included in the EAs:

1. An evaluation by the Secretary as to whether the site is suitable for site characterization under the guidelines.
2. An evaluation by the Secretary as to whether the site is suitable for development as a repository under each such guideline that does not require site characterization as a prerequisite for the application of such guideline.
3. An evaluation by the Secretary of the effects of site-characterization activities at the site on public health and safety and the environment.
4. A reasonable comparative evaluation by the Secretary of the site with the other potentially acceptable sites.
5. A description of the decision process by which the site was recommended.
6. An assessment of the regional and local impacts of locating the repository at the site.

The EAs contain all of these evaluations or descriptions.

The DOE went beyond the requirements of the Act in issuing draft EAs and revising the documents in response to the comments, which required substantive changes. The EAs provide a workable data base for site nomination and recommendation for characterization.

Issue

Commenters said that the draft EAs, and the preliminary site nominations and recommendations they contain, should not have been prepared before the issuance of the final NRC and EPA standards for geologic disposal.

Response

The Act requires the Environmental Protection Agency to establish standards for protecting the public from the radioactive material in geologic repositories. These standards are to be implemented and enforced by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The EPA standards are contained in 40 CFR Part 191. The NRC technical criteria for implementing the EPA standards are contained in 10 CFR Part 60. Both sets of regulations were issued in draft

form in 1982 and were used in developing the siting guidelines. The final NRC criteria were released in June 1983, before the draft EAs; the final EPA standards were released in September 1985, after the draft EAs. The schedule requirements of the Act did not allow the draft EAs to be delayed until September 1985, but the final EPA standards were used in revising the EAs.

Issue

Many commenters felt that the size and technical complexity of the EAs discourage review by the public.

Response

The EAs are indeed long documents that contain many technical discussions. Their length is the result of an attempt to present as much information as was deemed necessary for compliance with Appendix IV of the siting guidelines (DOE, 1984c), which specifies what kinds of information should be used to support findings about compliance with the guidelines, and as much information as was needed for the evaluations required by the Act. For the same reasons, much of the material presented in the EAs, especially in Chapter 6, is of necessity technical because it presents evaluations of sites against the various conditions specified in the guidelines--conditions that are usually specified in technical terms. Every effort was nonetheless made to make the technical presentations clear and comprehensible.

Issue

Some parties criticized the organization of the EAs, saying that it was confusing to find certain topics discussed in more than one chapter.

Response

The organization of the EAs was based on (1) the requirements of the Act, which specifies, in Section 112(b)(E), the evaluations, descriptions, and analyses that are to be included; (2) the requirements of the siting guidelines, which specify the order of certain evaluations (e.g., the identification of the preferred site in a geohydrologic setting); and (3) the general format and content usually followed in preparing environmental assessments.

Thus, Chapter 2 includes an evaluation of the site against the disqualifying conditions of the guidelines as required by the guidelines; for completeness, this evaluation is repeated in Chapter 6, which presents the Act-mandated evaluation against the guidelines. Chapter 7, which is also required by the Act, of necessity repeats some material contained in Chapter 6, though in a greatly abbreviated form. The repetition is unavoidable because Chapter 7 is essentially a summary compilation and comparison of the data presented in Chapter 6 for every site. A few commenters felt that the EAs should include more information in Chapter 5 about the financial effects of site characterization and repository development on local communities and the grant programs applicable to individual sites.

Issue

One commenter asserted that the analyses performed by a former DOE contractor that was fired for unsatisfactory performance were nonetheless used to substantiate the draft EAs.

Response

The commenter is incorrect in asserting that the work of a "fired" DOE contractor was used to substantiate the draft EAs. The DOE contractor in question was a general program-management contractor that prepared area-characterization studies. This contract expired and was opened for bids according to Federal procurement regulations. The contractor was not selected for further work, but was not dismissed for unsatisfactory performance as the commenter alleges. The DOE considers the analysis performed by this contractor to be valid and useful.

Issue

Some commenters suggested that technical review groups should be assembled to verify the data, procedures, assumptions, and conclusions in the draft EAs.

Response

Technical review groups were used to review the EAs at several levels. Such groups were used by the DOE Project Offices that prepared the EAs, by the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management and its contractors, and by the Office of Environmental Compliance of the DOE's Assistant Secretary for Environment, Safety and Health.

Issue

Some commenters objected that, although a significant percentage of the residents in the area of Swisher and Deaf Smith Counties, Texas, are Spanish-speaking, the reports were released only in English.

Response

To translate documents as long and complex as the EAs would require an expenditure of time and resources that could not be justified. However, the DOE is preparing a variety of public-information materials in Spanish in response to requests to provide information to the Spanish-speaking residents of Texas. The DOE expects that, by being prepared especially for the general Spanish-speaking public, these materials will prove to be a more practical means of access to information about the program than the EAs.

Issue

Some parties suggested that the DOE publish an abbreviated version of the EAs.

Response

Like the final EAs, the draft EAs contained an executive summary that briefly described the site, the process by which it was selected, and its evaluation against the guidelines. These executive summaries were also distributed separately as overviews. Overviews are also available for the final EAs.

Issue

Commenters complained that the DOE issues inaccurate reports, expecting the States and the general public to find the inaccuracies without paying for these services. Others said that the EAs are propaganda for the program and do not present scientific findings.

Response

The DOE tried hard to ensure that the draft EAs were correct, including several reviews by the DOE, its contractors, and peer review groups. However, in documents of the size and the scope of the EAs, some errors are bound to occur.

The objective of issuing the draft EAs, which was not required by the Act, was to increase the participation of the public in the siting process and to apprise the public of the bases for decisions in the siting process. Though the DOE is pleased to acknowledge the many helpful contributions made by the commenters, in no sense did the DOE view the publication of draft EAs as a means of obtaining free services from the general public.

Issue

Some commenters expressed the view that the technical inaccuracies in the EAs caused the public to lose confidence in the entire process.

Response

The draft EAs represent the best available information. In accordance with the Act, they were prepared before site characterization and hence before many site-specific data were available. During site characterization and the concurrent environmental and socioeconomic studies, the DOE will collect the detailed information required to demonstrate compliance with the guidelines and with NRC and EPA regulations. Even with thorough and repeated critical reviews by different parties, some technical inaccuracies are unavoidable in documents as large and complex as the draft EAs, especially since some of the analyses were based on information from the literature rather than studies performed at the site. As already mentioned, every effort was made to correct the inaccuracies in the final EAs.

Issue

Some commenters objected to the use of averages instead of worst-case scenarios in the EAs.

Response

The use of averages is appropriate, especially for this stage in the site-selection process. For nomination and recommendation of sites for characterization, the siting guidelines (10 CFR Part 960) require only that the evidence available does not support findings that the sites are unsuitable. At any stage, worst-case analyses that are not accompanied by information on the probabilities of those cases are inappropriate. The EPA has recognized the latter fact in its environmental standards for the disposal of spent fuel and other wastes. In those standards, specific probabilities of compliance--representative of less than worst-case scenarios--are required.

C.2.7.2 Supporting references

A number of comments were directed at the references that support the analyses and results presented in the EAs. Among these were comments objecting that these references were not available to the public or that the quality of the references was poor.

Issue

Some persons stated that the public was not able to participate fully in the evaluation of the EAs because it was not provided with the data base that supports the decisions.

Response

The reference documents for the draft EAs are available in the public reading rooms of DOE Headquarters and Project Offices (see Appendix B) and were mailed to each affected State and Indian Tribe for review.

Issue

Commenters said that some of the references that supported the draft EAs were either completely unavailable or were not released until half-way through the 90-day comment period. This delayed release did not allow the States and interested parties adequate time for review.

Response

The DOE made every effort to make references available for public review by collecting them in DOE public reading rooms. Some of the references were in draft form at the time the draft EAs were published and were not available for public review until later in the comment period. These were added to the collection as they became available. All references cited in the final EAs are available for review at the locations listed in Appendix B.

Issue

Some commenters contended that the quality of the references was poor; some analyses relied on personal communications for support, rather than published documents.

Response

In the absence of published data, it was occasionally necessary to rely on documents in preparation or on personal communications from the investigators performing the analyses for the EA. Personal communications, DOE memoranda, and DOE correspondence were also used to document the site-selection process, and communications obtained in interviews with representatives of local governments were used as sources of information about local conditions (e.g., availability of community services) for which no published data are available. These informal references could have been cited parenthetically in the text or presented in footnotes. The DOE decided, however, to treat them as formal references and to make them available to the public together with the formal references to published documents. The locations where these references are available for review are given in Appendix B.

Issue

Commenters requested that a list of references for Chapter 7 be included in the EAs.

Response

Since Chapter 7 is based on the information given in Chapter 6 and does not rely on additional sources of data, no references are included. Otherwise it would have been necessary to combine five long lists of references (those presented in Chapter 6 of the EAs for the nominated sites). The reader interested in the supporting data for the findings on which Chapter 7 is based should refer to the section of Chapter 6 that covers the particular guideline of interest.

Issue

A commenter requested that the final EAs list the locations where copies of the references cited in the EAs can be examined.

Response

At the public briefings held in each affected state, the DOE distributed booklets listing the locations where copies of draft-EA references were available. In response to the above request, a list of all locations where copies of references can be examined is given in Appendix B of the final EAs.

Issue

Some commenters pointed out that additional reference material was submitted for DOE review and requested that specific reports and lists be used in the final EAs.

Response

The DOE recognizes and appreciates the efforts expended in sending materials for review. The documents were directed to the appropriate EA authors to be considered in revising the EAs.

During the Utah hearings, several persons read pages from the log book for visitors to the Canyonlands National Park. The comments of the tourists were entered into the official EA comments and were considered in reanalyzing for the final EA the potential effects of a repository on tourism.

References that were not within the scope of the Civilian Radioactive Waste Management Program were forwarded to the appropriate persons in other DOE programs.

C.2.7.3 Content of the environmental assessments

Issue

Among the comments was the objection that the draft EAs did not list the rankings of all nine sites studied.

Response

As discussed in Chapter 1 of the environmental assessments, the siting guidelines specify the following steps for ranking the potentially acceptable sites:

1. Evaluate the potentially acceptable sites in terms of the disqualifying conditions specified in the guidelines.
2. Group all potentially acceptable sites according to their geohydrologic settings.
3. For those geohydrologic settings that contain more than one potentially acceptable site, select the preferred site on the basis of a comparative evaluation of all potentially acceptable sites in that setting.
4. Evaluate each preferred site within a geohydrologic setting and decide whether such site is suitable for the development of a repository under the qualifying condition of each applicable guideline.
5. Evaluate each preferred site within a geohydrologic setting and decide whether such site is suitable for site characterization under the qualifying condition of each applicable guideline.
6. Perform a reasonable comparative evaluation under each guideline of the sites proposed for nomination.

Because one site is selected in each geohydrologic setting that contains more than one site, it is not consistent with the siting guidelines to rank all nine potentially acceptable sites.

Issue

Some persons felt that the EAs did not adequately consider the religious attitudes of Indians about land.

Response

The DOE recognizes the need to identify and respect Indian values and is in the process of developing a programmatic memorandum of agreement with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. The agreement will ensure the consideration of Indian religious freedom under the American Indian Religious Freedom Act. In revising the EAs, Indian cultural values have been considered. The EA for the Hanford site notes that the Yakima Indian Nation has extensive historical and spiritual ties to the land on which the site is located.

Issue

Several commenters said that the draft EAs did not consider the impacts of site characterization on Indian Tribes, ceded lands, and treaty rights to off-reservation fishing.

Response

As explained in Chapter 4 of the EA for the Hanford site, the DOE believes that Indian Tribes will not be significantly affected by site characterization.

Issue

Commenters stated that discussion of the siting process for the first repository was deficient in the draft EA. Because siting decisions were made before the Act was passed and before the publication of the guidelines, the DOE should discuss the basis for these decisions in the draft EA.

Response

The siting decisions made before the publication of the guidelines were based on criteria similar to the guidelines. The bases for these decisions are discussed in detail in the documents cited in Chapter 1 of the EAs. A more detailed discussion of the process in Chapter 1 is therefore unnecessary.

Issue

Specific suggestions for improving the EAs included the addition of a glossary and a key-word index.

Response

A glossary was included in the draft EAs, as it is in the final EAs. However, because of the limited time available to prepare and revise these documents, it was not possible to add a key-word index.

Issue

A number of commenters suggested specific revisions to Chapter 1 of the draft EAs. Some of those suggestions were editorial; some were specific suggestions applicable to only one site. The suggested general changes can be summarized as follows:

1. Chapter 1 should describe how the DOE would substitute sites for those eliminated by characterization.
2. Chapter 1 should point out that the Act requires the DOE to issue the site-characterization plans for review by the States and the public as well as the NRC.
3. Chapter 1 should be revised to indicate that site characterization begins only after the completion and review of site-characterization plans and public hearings.
4. Chapter 1 should mention the right of an affected Indian Tribe to issue a notice of disapproval.

Response

In response to the first three comments, Chapter 1 was revised as appropriate.

In regard to comment 4, the Act allows an affected Indian Tribe to issue a notice of disapproval if a proposed site is located on its reservation (Section 118(a)). However, none of the potentially acceptable sites is located on any Indian reservation, and although the DOE welcomes their participation in the repository program as affected Indian Tribes, the Indian Tribes do not have the statutory authority to issue a notice of disapproval.

Issue

One commenter said that the EAs should include a detailed explanation of how the entire process is funded.

Response

The DOE's program for the management of civilian radioactive waste is funded from the Nuclear Waste Fund, which was established by Congress and consists of monies paid into the fund by the utilities that generate the radioactive waste. A more detailed explanation of the funding is given in the Mission Plan (DOE, 1985a).

Issue

One commenter felt that the EAs should include more information in Chapter 5 about the financial effects of site characterization and repository development on local communities and the grant programs applicable to individual sites.

Response

The socioeconomic impacts expected during site characterization are discussed in Section 4.2 of the EAs, which also explains what financial assistance would be available to the affected community.

The impacts expected during repository development are examined in Section 5.4.5 of the EAs; this section includes a discussion of the financial assistance that will be available. Information on financial assistance can also be found in the DOE's Mission Plan (DOE, 1985a, Vol. I, Part I, Chapter 4). (See also Sections C.2.1.2 and C.2.1.5.1 for comments and responses on the mitigation of fiscal and socioeconomic impacts.)

Issue

Some commenters said that more-detailed schedules are needed in the final EA.

Response

The EAs do not contain detailed schedules because the latter are given in the Mission Plan (DOE, 1985a) and the draft Project Decision Schedule (DOE, 1985b). The schedules of activities for site characterization will be presented in greater detail in the site-characterization plans. Plans and schedules for the environmental, socioeconomic, and transportation studies to be conducted concurrently with site characterization are also being prepared.

Issue

A commenter felt that the discussion of qualifying conditions in the EAs is given more prominence than the discussion of the disqualifying conditions.

Response

Disqualifying conditions describe conditions that are considered so adverse as to constitute sufficient evidence to conclude without further consideration that a site is disqualified; they were formulated to provide early evidence of the suitability of a site and hence require fewer data and less-complex analyses than do the qualifying conditions. They are discussed in both Chapter 2 and Chapter 6 of the EAs.

Issue

Some commenters asked that more information be included in the EAs about the program for public education and participation.

Response

The program for public information and participation is explained in detail in the DOE's Mission Plan (DOE, 1985a, Vol. I, Part I, Chapter 4). (See also Section C.2.1 for comments and responses on this topic.)

Issue

Commenters requested that the discussion of the guidelines in the EAs be clarified.

Response

The format, structure, purpose, and application of the guidelines in the EAs are discussed in Section 6.1. Additional information can be obtained from the "Supplementary Information" on the guidelines themselves (DOE, 1984c) or from the DOE's responses to comments on the proposed guidelines (DOE, 1983).

Issue

Commenters suggested that an appendix listing all EA authors and their qualifications should be added to the EAs.

Response

A list of contributors is not included in the EAs because a fair and comprehensive list would consist of hundreds of names. To prepare such a list of persons who contributed to the EAs would be a task requiring a great deal of time. The commenter can be assured, however, that the contributors to the EAs are qualified and experienced professionals, and many of them have earned distinction in their scientific discipline.

C.2.7.4 Inconsistencies in the environmental assessments

Inconsistencies in the EAs were the subject of many comments, which noted inconsistencies in the assumptions about the age of the spent fuel, the waste package, the exploratory shafts and the shafts for the repository, the descriptions of surface facilities, assumptions used in radiological assessments, the models and assumptions used in analyses of socioeconomic impacts, analyses of worker health and safety, and several other topics.

Issue

A number of commenters pointed out inconsistencies between the executive summaries and the corresponding chapters in the draft EAs.

Response

There were indeed some inconsistencies, resulting mainly from a failure to update the executive summaries after the last revision (one of several) of the draft EAs. In revising the final EAs, the executive summaries were corrected to reflect the corresponding chapters.

Issue

Some commenters pointed out that the draft EAs were inconsistent in their presentation of air-quality impacts. For example, the EA for the Deaf Smith site considers vehicle emissions and fugitive dust in evaluating the impacts

of repository operation, whereas the EA for Davis Canyon does not do so. The draft EAs were also said to be inconsistent in their treatment of regulations for the Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD).

Response

The air-quality evaluations for each site have been revised as a result of comments from the States, the public, and other Federal agencies; the results are presented in a format that is as consistent as possible. Some differences remain, however, because the evaluations must use available data, which can vary among the different sites, and because the air-quality regulations are implemented by different agencies for each site. The revised impact analyses have reconsidered air-quality models, inputs (e.g., vehicle emissions, fugitive dust), operating assumptions, and PSD applicability according to guidance from the appropriate regulatory agencies.

Issue

Many commenters said that the EAs need to provide a fuller and more realistic discussion of socioeconomic impacts and to expand the discussion of mitigation measures. They also need to address the positive socioeconomic impacts of a repository.

Response

Chapter 5 of the EAs addresses general provisions for financial and technical assistance to mitigate adverse socioeconomic impacts. Site-specific mitigation measures will be developed after the DOE has performed a detailed impact analysis and the affected State or Indian Tribe has submitted an impact report for the site recommended for repository development. (See also Sections C.2.1.2.4 and C.2.1.5 for comments and responses on this topic.)

The EAs also address some of the positive socioeconomic impacts of a repository, such as the potential for new local jobs, total project and local purchases, and likely sources of additional tax revenues. The final EA for the Hanford site also discusses the potential for greater use of the area's available human and physical resources.

Issue

Some commenters criticized the EAs for using different approaches and bases for the socioeconomic analyses--in particular, different labor-force estimates, different multipliers for the indirect employment expected to result from the repository, and different assumptions about the in-migration of repository workers. One comment objected that no adequate explanation was given in the EAs for the differences in the employment and in-migration estimates and stated that the population increase estimated in the EA for the Yucca Mountain site appears to be due to an "overly conservative analysis."

Response

It is true that the EA analyses for the different host rocks used different labor-force estimates, employment multipliers, and assumptions about in-migration. However, some of the differences to which the commenters object

are unavoidable because of differences in the design of the repository, the availability of data, and local conditions, which vary significantly among sites. Furthermore, the socioeconomic analyses were performed by several different groups of analysts, who used assumptions and multipliers they deemed most suitable for the socioeconomic conditions of the site and the available data.

The population increase estimated for the Yucca Mountain site did indeed differ greatly from that for the other sites, but a significant part of this difference was attributable to the larger work force required for a repository at Yucca Mountain. The work force estimated in the draft EA for Yucca Mountain was as much as three times the work force estimated for the other sites. In the final EA for Yucca Mountain, the work-force estimate is lower, and so is the population increase projected for southern Nevada. The employment multiplier, while higher than that for the other sites, is the most reasonable multiplier for southern Nevada and is based on published analyses of historical data on employment in southern Nevada. The assumption that all of the repository workers would in-migrate was recognized and identified as being conservative in Chapter 5 of the draft EA for Yucca Mountain. It was chosen because detailed information about labor skills was not available and because it allowed the DOE to estimate the worst-case impacts on community services.

For the Hanford site, the socioeconomic analysis presented two scenarios. A maximum population estimate was based on an assumption of 100 percent in-migration, and a more likely estimate assumed that 75 percent of the miners and 25 percent of all other workers would in-migrate. The employment multiplier used was only slightly lower than that for Yucca Mountain. Again, the 100 percent maximum estimate was used to present a conservative analysis that would demonstrate that even worst-case impacts would be insignificant in this area, which has an excess of housing and public services.

For the salt sites, the lack of local socioeconomic data for a project as large as a repository led to an approach based on data for the study area and the use of multipliers from the literature (energy developments in the western States and projects of the Tennessee Valley Authority). This approach produced a high and a low range of estimates for in-migration and the associated impacts. The case of high in-migration was selected as a realistic, though conservative, case and was used for the impact analysis. Unlike the Hanford and Yucca Mountain sites, an assumption of 100 percent in-migration for the salt sites would have been inappropriate considering the socioeconomic conditions of the study area. It would have produced unrealistic overestimates of population increases in the smaller communities near the sites.

Issue

One commenter noted that the draft EAs are inconsistent in their treatment of worker health and safety. In particular, the following inconsistencies were pointed out:

1. The EAs for Yucca Mountain and Hanford present estimates of expected worker injuries and fatalities during site characterization, while the EAs for Davis Canyon, Deaf Smith, and Richton present estimates of only injury and fatality rates.
2. The Yucca Mountain analysis uses 1982 statistics provided by the National Safety Council. The Hanford analysis is based on a 1980 DOE report, while the Davis Canyon, Deaf Smith, and Richton analyses used 1976-1979 statistics from the Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA).
3. The EA for the Hanford site discusses occupational safety and health in Chapter 5, including specific numbers of expected injuries and fatalities during mining and construction. The EAs for Davis Canyon, Deaf Smith, and Richton give only rates. The EA for Yucca Mountain has no such analyses in Chapter 5.
4. The EAs for Hanford and Yucca Mountain discuss occupational safety in Section 6.3.3.2. The other three EAs do not.
5. The EAs for Hanford, Davis Canyon, Deaf Smith, and Richton discuss the applicability of various Federal and State occupational safety and health regulations. The EA for Yucca Mountain does not.

Response

The draft EAs for Hanford, Yucca Mountain, and the salt sites used different sources for their safety analyses. Hanford cites DOE Order 5480.1A, Yucca Mountain cites the National Safety Council (NSC), while the salt-site analyses are based on injury experience reports from the MSHA. Nonetheless, the estimates of fatalities, accident rates, etc., are not inconsistent. There is a direct correlation between the various sources.

From 1930 through 1977, MSHA statistical measures for injuries in mining used a basis that was somewhat different from that for the other industries. However, beginning with calendar year 1978, the MSHA adopted measures for injury experience that compare closely with the measures used in the Office of Occupational Safety and Health Statistics, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and the U.S. Department of Labor. Therefore, beginning with 1978 data, the mining industry can be compared on a standard basis with other U.S. industries.

The MSHA requires all mine owners to report all accidents to the district office on a prescribed form. Because of the modification in reporting and processing procedures that became effective January 1, 1978, injury rates as currently computed are not precisely comparable to those of the previous years. Fatality rates, however, in which the "incidence rate" (the term used after 1977) is one-fifth of the "frequency rate" (the term used before 1978) for otherwise similar grouping, remain comparable.

The statistical data in the MSHA reports cover the work experience of all personnel engaged in exploration, development, production, maintenance, repair, and construction work, including supervisory and technical personnel, and onsite office workers. These activities cover the entire spectrum of the exploratory-shaft activities and, as such, are a better tool for statistical

projections of probable exploratory-shaft injuries. As compared with the reported accidents in the MSHA report, the National Safety Council uses sampling techniques for projections of probable injury experience.

The NSC statistics show that in 1982 there were 600 fatalities for 1.1 million workers in the mineral-extraction industry (including quarries). This figure reduces to 0.05 per 200,000 man-hours and compares with 0.06, 0.04, and 0.3 in MSHA's reports for the years 1976, 1977, and 1978, respectively. Similarly, the NSC statistics show 3.1 nonfatal injuries with days lost, which compares with 3.87, 3.78, and 5.48 such injuries reported by the MSHA for the 3 years. The NSC projected 4.7 total injuries per 200,000 man-hours for 1982, which compares with 5.96, 5.73, and 8.81 total injuries for the 1976-1978 period.

The final EA for Yucca Mountain includes a discussion in Chapter 5 of occupational health and safety.

Issue

Some commenters stated that the analyses for all sites should be based on the assumption of 10-year-old spent fuel because this assumption is likely to be conservative and will provide a common basis for comparison.

Response

All analyses in Sections 6.4.1 and 6.4.2 of the final EAs are based on the emplacement of spent fuel that is 10 years old.

Issue

One commenter recommended that the assessments of preclosure radiological safety under normal conditions should be based on similar assumptions about failed fuel rods.

Response

The analyses presented in the final EAs are based on the conservative assumption that 0.5 percent of the fuel rods arriving at the site have failed.

Issue

Several parties commented that, in estimating waste-package failure, all EAs should assume that failure occurs when some portion of the container wall corrodes, not necessarily the entire thickness.

Response

The approach suggested by the commenters is used in the Hanford EA and in the EAs for all of the salt sites. The approach of the Yucca Mountain EA was to use a simple estimate that is based on expected conditions, taking into account that few data have yet been obtained for repository conditions at Yucca Mountain. Thus, although the estimates indicate a lifetime of 30,000 years, the value actually used is 3,000 years to provide a very conservative lower bound for container lifetime.

Issue

Some commenters complained that comparisons among the sites are difficult because the EA analyses are based on different container designs.

Response

The design of the container depends on the characteristics of the site. For example, one of the criteria for design is usually the peak rock temperature, which depends on both the thermal properties of the rock and the amount of heat generated by the waste in the container. Therefore, container sizes and designs are different for different rock types, and the assumption of a common canister size or design in the EAs would not facilitate valid comparisons among the sites. For this reason, the EAs were not changed to reflect a common canister size or design.

Issue

One commenter stated that variations in container-design criteria need to be explained or justified in the EAs.

Response

Each of the repository projects is developing waste-package designs to meet the NRC's requirement for a container lifetime of 300 to 1,000 years and a radionuclide-release rate of less than 10^{-5} per year.

Issue

Several commenters asserted that the analysis and findings in the draft EAs did not reflect sufficient conservatism, considering the lack of site-specific data on which to base site nomination and recommendation decisions.

Response

Where no site-specific data were available, the EAs used extrapolations of regional data or conservative assumptions, in accordance with the DOE siting guidelines. A conservative approach was taken in evaluating the site characteristics that are important to the performance of the repository.

Issue

One commenter noted that the draft EAs differ in the number and the size of shafts drilled for site characterization and repository operations and said that the DOE should explain the technical basis for these variations.

Response

The draft EAs for the Yucca Mountain and the salt sites presented analyses based on the sinking of only one exploratory shaft. At the time the draft EAs were published, the DOE had already decided to sink two shafts at each site, but there was no time to revise the analyses in the draft EAs. The

construction of a second shaft would not significantly increase the impacts of site characterization. The final EAs have been revised to account for two shafts at all sites.

The number of shafts required for the repository depends on the host rock; thus the numbers of shafts is different for a repository in basalt, salt, or tuff.

Issue

One commenter stated that the surface-facility descriptions for all of the EAs should be the same, or the variations should be explained.

Response

The surface facilities of a repository depend partly on site-specific conditions, such as the terrain, and partly on the host rock; the host rock determines the number and size of shafts, the layout of the underground repository, the ventilation requirements, and similar factors that affect the design and layout of some surface facilities. Thus the surface facilities vary for repositories in basalt, salt, and tuff.

C.2.8 MISCELLANEOUS

Many of the comments in the draft EAs covered various topics, many of which were not concerned with the nomination of sites or even repository siting in general. These comments have been divided into three categories: production of radioactive waste, alternatives to geologic disposal, and general technical issues.

C.2.8.1 Production of radioactive waste

Several commenters maintained that the production of nuclear energy should never have been begun without establishing a method for radioactive-waste disposal. Many commenters recommended that the production of nuclear energy and thereby the production of radioactive waste be stopped until a solution is found for the permanent disposal of radioactive waste.

Issue

Commenters expressed the opinion that the production of nuclear energy should not have been begun before the development of a method for the permanent disposal of the radioactive waste.

Response

The search for suitable methods of permanent disposal began early in the development of nuclear energy. By 1957, for example, the National Academy of Sciences had already recommended geologic disposal in salt formations. Furthermore, in the early days of nuclear-energy development, it was generally

assumed that spent fuel would be reprocessed after being discharged from the reactor. The spent-fuel rods were stored in water pools at the sites of the reactors pending the start of reprocessing, and until the U.S. moratorium on reprocessing was declared in 1976 (see Section C.2.5.3), there was little incentive to develop disposal methods for spent fuel.

Issue

Commenters requested a moratorium on the production of commercial radioactive wastes.

Response

The production of electricity by nuclear energy is important to the national economy. In 1984, nuclear energy provided about 14 percent of the U.S. domestic electricity (DOE, 1985i). Nuclear energy is able to provide economical electric power, independent of foreign energy sources, while allowing the conservation of fossil-fuel reserves for other critical applications; it can help meet the future energy needs of this country. A moratorium on nuclear-energy production would severely damage U.S. energy and economic security.

Furthermore, a moratorium on radioactive-waste production would not remove the need for a repository. A large inventory of spent fuel has been accumulating at reactor sites. According to recent estimates, over 12,000 metric tons of spent fuel currently require disposal and over 130,000 metric tons will require disposal by the year 2020 (DOE, 1984d).

C.2.8.2 Alternatives to geologic disposal

Many comments suggested methods of disposal other than geologic repositories. Other commenters expressed concern that the DOE has not adequately considered all feasible options for disposal, such as disposal in space or beneath the seabed.

Issue

Some commenters wanted to know whether the DOE has considered space as a safe and feasible method for radioactive-waste disposal.

Response

Before deciding on geologic repositories, the DOE evaluated many alternative waste-disposal concepts, including space disposal (DOE, 1980). The DOE, in conjunction with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and others, studied the space-disposal concept, but did not favorably consider launching radioactive wastes into the sun because of excessive fuel requirements. Disposal on the moon was also rejected as an alternative because it might interfere with future lunar exploration. NASA's favored concept was to place high-level waste into a solar orbit about halfway between the Earth and Venus. This concept would use space shuttles to place the packaged waste into the appropriate solar orbit.

While the volume and weight of high-level radioactive waste are relatively small when handled on Earth, the cost would be enormous to launch all of the wastes into space. A fundamental requirement for space disposal is to separate the waste into short-lived and long-lived portions. The short-lived waste that would decay to innocuous levels in hundreds of years would be managed on Earth. Only the long-lived waste, which must be isolated for thousands of years, would be disposed of extraterrestrially. Therefore, disposal in space would only reduce, not eliminate, the need for terrestrial waste management.

The results of these studies led the NASA and the DOE to conclude that further study of space disposal is not warranted at this time. The reason for this conclusion was the expected additional cost of space disposal without achieving a significant reduction in long-term risk in comparison with the risk of disposal in a geologic repository. The concept of space disposal will be reconsidered if, at some future time, the DOE's program for waste-disposal technology or space-technology developments by NASA warrant the need for further study.

Issue

The DOE should consider disposal in relatively thick, stable beds of sediments located in deep, quiet, and remote regions of oceans or disposal in volcanic trenches throughout the world.

Response

The DOE is sponsoring a subseabed-disposal project as part of a multinational effort through Fiscal Year 1986. The disposal of high-level waste in the oceans has never been practiced by the U.S. Government and was prohibited by the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 and under the London Convention on the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping Wastes and Other Matter. The uncertainties and issues to be resolved regarding subseabed disposal are significant, and efforts to resolve them are under way.

Issue

A number of comments requested the DOE to start over with a safe answer to the problem of radioactive-waste disposal. It was noted that the concept of geologic repositories was developed in the 1950s. Many comments suggested that the DOE should accept new technology as it becomes available, and some commenters said that research and development on alternative methods of disposal should continue.

Response

A number of methods for the disposal of high-level radioactive waste have been examined by the Federal Government during the past 10 years, including subseabed, deep-hole, ice-sheet, and outerspace disposal. Of these alternative technologies, only subseabed disposal is currently funded by the DOE. The remaining alternative concepts were found to have no obvious advantages over geologic disposal. The primary consideration in evaluating these alternative technologies was public health and safety. The state of

technology, the potential environmental impacts, and suitability for spent-fuel disposal have been studied for each of these methods and are discussed in the final environmental impact statement for the management of commercially generated radioactive waste (DOE, 1980).

C.2.8.3 General technical issues

A number of comments addressed technical issues that are not site specific. There were a large number of such issues, and they covered a broad range of subjects, including the accuracy and conservatism of the analyses used in the EAs, conditions at the repository site after closure, etc.

Issue

Some persons asked whether a large number of small disposal facilities would be safer.

Response

No clear reduction in risk would result from using a large number of smaller repositories. No net advantages would be realized in terms of monitoring the performance of the repositories. While there may be some reductions in costs of transportation, these would be greatly outweighed by the extra cost of finding and qualifying a larger number of repository sites and developing many repositories.

Issue

Several commenters felt that a burden is placed on future generations for the disposal of the wastes.

Response

Geologic disposal was chosen for high-level waste and spent fuel because it minimizes the potential burden on future generations. Once the repository is closed, there is no need for maintenance. The use of geologic formations as barriers to radionuclide migration helps to ensure that there will be no significant health burdens to future generations even if the waste containers are eventually breached.

Issue

Some commenters said that the DOE needs to consider how it will prevent human intrusion over the long term.

Response

The DOE feels that human intrusion can be prevented through prudent siting in locations that have few, if any, natural resources and through institutional management. Several years ago, the DOE convened a human-interference task force to determine whether reasonable means exist (or

could be developed) to reduce the likelihood of unintentional human intrusion into a repository. The task force concluded that a significant reduction in the likelihood of human intrusion could be achieved, for perhaps thousands of years into the future, if appropriate steps are taken to communicate the existence of the repository to future generations.

Issue

One person asked whether the conclusions in the EAs on compliance with the guidelines are supportable.

Response

At the steps of site nomination and recommendation, the requirement for disqualifying conditions is evidence that does not support a finding that the site is disqualified. Likewise, the qualifying conditions are deemed to be present if the evidence does not support a finding that the site is not likely to meet the qualifying condition. The DOE believes that the available data and analyses for each site indicated that no site has a disqualifying condition and that all sites are likely to meet all the qualifying conditions.

Issue

One commenter asked whether the DOE can guarantee that no new mutations will occur from the waste-emplacement practices.

Response

Absolute guarantees are hardly ever possible, but the DOE believes that new mutations are extremely unlikely because there is very little likelihood that radioactive materials from the repository will reach the human environment.

Issue

One person asked whether the hydrogeologic conditions will be known well enough to make predictions over 10,000 years or more.

Response

At the time of application for a license for the repository, which comes after thorough site characterization, the hydrogeologic environment at the site will be well known. Not only will nominal values be determined for the parameters needed to predict the migration of radionuclides from the repository but also the uncertainties in those values due to measurement uncertainties and nonhomogeneous rock properties will have been determined.

Issue

One party asked whether the DOE plans to close the site without subsequent monitoring or retrieval.

Response

The DOE currently plans to be able to begin retrieval for up to 50 years after the start of waste emplacement and to monitor the site for some period, not determined at present.

Issue

One commenter noted that canisters need to stay intact for 300 years but monitoring will be for 50 years.

Response

The monitoring referred to by the commenter apparently is the 50-year period of waste retrievability and plans to monitor selected individual waste containers until the repository is closed; the objective of monitoring individual containers is to confirm their performance. Monitoring the containers after repository closure would be very difficult and could compromise the performance of the repository as a whole.

Issue

Some persons asked about the measures that will be used to protect the integrity of the controlled area for long periods after closure.

Response

At present, placing some form of physical markers around the site is the most likely method for notifying future societies of the presence of a repository. In addition, records will be kept.

Issue

Hanford will be accepting 60 percent of the Nation's defense waste.

Response

Whatever site is chosen for the first repository, it will receive up to 10,000 metric tons uranium equivalent of defense high-level waste.

Issue

One commenter said that phased repository construction will circumvent the NRC's requirement to review and approve complete site construction before accepting any waste for disposal.

Response

The Act (Section 114(d)) states that "the Commission shall consider an application for construction authorization for all or part of a repository...." Therefore the Act does not prohibit authorization for phased construction. The DOE has discussed this concept with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and has received no objections to the concept. The sequence of license applications is described in the Mission Plan (DOE, 1985a).

REFERENCES FOR SECTION C.2

- DOE (U.S. Department of Energy), 1980. Final Environmental Impact Statement--Management of Commercially Generated Radioactive Waste, DOE/EIS-0046F, Washington, D.C.
- DOE (U.S. Department of Energy), 1983. Record of Responses to Public Comments on Proposed General Guidelines for Recommendation of Sites for Nuclear Waste Repositories, DOE/RW-0001, Washington, D.C.
- DOE (U.S. Department of Energy), 1984a. Mission Plan for the Civilian Radioactive Waste Management Program, draft, Washington, D.C.
- DOE (U.S. Department of Energy), 1984b. Identification of Sites Within the Palo Duro Basin: Volume 1, "Palo Duro Location A," DOE/CH-(1); Volume 2, "Palo Duro Location B," DOE/CH-(2); and Volume 3, "Responses to Comments," DOE/CH-(3), Washington, D.C.
- DOE (U.S. Department of Energy), 1984c. "General Guidelines for Recommendation of Sites for the Nuclear Waste Repositories," Title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 960, Federal Register, Vol. 49, No. 236, p. 47714, December 6, 1984.
- DOE (U.S. Department of Energy), 1984d. Commercial Power 1984: Prospects for the United States and the Free World, DOE/EIA-0438(84), Energy Information Administration.
- DOE (U.S. Department of Energy), 1985a. Mission Plan for the Civilian Radioactive Waste Management Program, DOE/RW-0005, Washington, D.C.
- DOE (U.S. Department of Energy), 1985b. Draft Radioactive Waste Management System Project Decision Schedule, DOE/RW-0018, Washington, D.C.
- DOE (U.S. Department of Energy), 1985c. Nuclear Waste Fund Adequacy and Assessment, DOE/RW-0020, Washington, D.C.
- DOE (U.S. Department of Energy), 1985d. Analysis of the Total-System Life Cycle Cost for the Civilian Radioactive Waste Management Program: Executive Summary, DOE/RW-0025, Washington, D.C.
- DOE (U.S. Department of Energy), 1985e. Annual Report to Congress, DOE/RW-0004/1, Washington, D.C.
- DOE (U.S. Department of Energy), 1985f. Draft Transportation Institutional Plan, DOE/RW-0031, Washington, D.C.
- DOE (U.S. Department of Energy), 1985g. Announcement of site selection for an MRS facility, Federal Register, Vol. 50, No. 81, p. 16536.

- DOE (U.S. Department of Energy), 1985h. An Evaluation of Commercial Repository Capacity for the Defense High-Level Waste, DOE/DP-0020/1, Washington, D.C.
- DOE (U.S. Department of Energy), 1985i. U.S. DOE Monthly Review, May 1985.
- DOE (U.S. Department of Energy), 1985j. Transportation Business Plan, DOE/RW-0046.
- DOE (U.S. Department of Energy), 1986. Draft Area Recommendation Report for the Crystalline Repository Project, DOE/CH-15, Argonne, Ill.
- EPA (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency), 1985. "Environmental Standards for the Management and Disposal of Spent Nuclear Fuel, High-Level and Transuranic Radioactive Wastes," Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 191, Federal Register, Vol. 50, No. 182, p. 38066, September 19, 1985.
- National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements, 1974. Basic Radiation Protection Criteria, NCRP Report No. 39, second reprinting, Washington, D.C.
- NRC (U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission), 1980. Transportation of Radionuclides in Urban Environs: Draft Environmental Assessment, NUREG/CR-0743, Washington, D.C.
- NRC (U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission), 1983. "Disposal of High-Level Radioactive Wastes in Geologic Repositories," Title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 60.
- Tobin, R. L., and Meshkov, N. K., 1985. Preliminary Assessment of Costs and Risks of Transporting Spent Fuel by Barge, Argonne National Laboratory, ANL/ER-TM-85-2, Argonne, Ill.

C.3 SITING PROCESS AND DECISIONS

This section addresses comments on the siting process and decisions. It covers issues related to site screening and the siting guidelines (Section C.3.1), the evaluation of sites against the disqualifying conditions of the guidelines (Section C.3.2), the grouping of sites into geohydrologic settings and the selection of the preferred site for each setting (Section C.3.3), and the nomination and recommendation of sites for characterization (Section C.3.4). The section on nomination and recommendation is concerned with general issues related to the DOE's approach in selecting the sites proposed for nomination and recommendation in the draft EAs and with issues related to the comparative evaluation and ranking of sites. It does not include issues related to the evaluations of individual sites; these issues are addressed in Sections C.5 through C.8. With a few exceptions, Section C.3 addresses comments on Chapters 1, 2, and 7 of the draft EAs.

C.3.1 SITING GUIDELINES AND SITE SCREENING

Addressed in this section are comments on the DOE's siting guidelines, published as 10 CFR Part 960 on December 6, 1984 (DOE, 1984), and comments on site-screening issues. The latter are divided into two parts: general site-screening issues (Section C.3.1.2) and issues specific to a particular host rock or site (Section C.3.1.3).

C.3.1.1 The siting guidelines

Most of the comments on the DOE's siting guidelines (10 CFR Part 960) addressed general issues like the development of the guidelines, the timing of their publication, and their adequacy. These are summarized and answered in Sections C.3.1.1.1, C.3.1.1.2, and C.3.1.1.3, respectively. Comments on specific guidelines are covered in Section C.3.1.1.4.

C.3.1.1.1 Development of the guidelines

The development of the guidelines drew comments and questions from several parties who were concerned about the derivation of the guidelines, the level of State involvement, and the content of the guidelines.

Issue

Several parties questioned the origin and the derivation of the guidelines.

Response

After the Act was passed, the DOE assembled a task force of program experts to prepare proposed guidelines. The task force began by considering the criteria used earlier in the National Waste Terminal Storage (NWTs) Program, including program objectives, system-performance criteria, and site-performance criteria (DOE, 1981, 1982); other sets of criteria defined for geologic repositories by the National Academy of Sciences (NAS, 1978), the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA, 1977), and earlier programs in the United States (Brunton and McClain, 1977; DOE, 1980); advance information made available by the NRC (1980); and the requirements of the Act.

In the development the proposed guidelines, great care was taken to make them compatible with the existing applicable regulations of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), published as 40 CFR Part 190 (EPA, 1977) and the Nuclear Regulatory commission (NRC), published as 10 CFR Part 20 (NRC, 1960) and with the regulations that had been recently proposed by the NRC and the EPA concerning the disposal of high-level radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel in geologic repositories. The NRC had by then nearly completed the pertinent technical criteria for geologic repositories, 40 CFR Part 60 (NRC, 1982), and the EPA had issued, for public comment, proposed environmental standards, 40 CFR Part 191 (EPA, 1982).

Several draft versions of the siting guidelines were released: the proposed guidelines of February 1983 and the alternative guidelines of May 1983, both of which were issued for review and comment by the States, affected Indian Tribes, and the public; the revised guidelines of August 1983, which served as a basis for additional consultation with States, Indian Tribes, and Federal agencies; and the revised guidelines of November 1983, which were sent to the NRC for concurrence. The NRC held several meetings on the guidelines at which the DOE, States, affected Indian Tribes, and Federal agencies presented comments.

The revisions that resulted from this comment and consultation process are discussed in the "Supplementary Information" for the guidelines (DOE, 1984, pp. 47714-47751) and in the comment-response document for the guidelines (DOE, 1983). After NRC concurrence, the guidelines were published in final form (December 1984), and many copies were distributed to States, Indian Tribes, and the public.

Issue

Some commenters asked about the level of State involvement in developing the guidelines.

Response

As explained in the "Supplementary Information" for the guidelines (DOE, 1984, pp. 47717-47720), the siting guidelines were developed after two formal public-comment periods and two rounds of consultation with the interested States, including both separate meetings with individual States and plenary sessions. The comments submitted by the States on the proposed guidelines of February 7, 1983, led to a division of the guidelines into postclosure and

preclosure guidelines and to the addition of the implementation guidelines. Many other changes were made to the guidelines in response to comments from the States. In addition, the States and Indian Tribes had opportunities to provide comments to the NRC during the concurrence process.

Issue

One commenter asserted that the DOE intentionally slanted the content of the siting guidelines to favor the selection of a particular site.

Response

The guidelines were not prepared with the intent of selecting any particular site for the first repository. The purpose of the guidelines is to provide an objective framework for ensuring that potential repository sites meet the standards established for radioactive-waste disposal.

C.3.1.1.2 Time of publication

A number of comments addressed the timing of the publication of the siting guidelines, both in relationship to the site-screening process and the publication of the pertinent EPA and NRC regulations.

Issue

Several commenters inquired why the publication of the final siting guidelines was delayed.

Response

The DOE realized that it was important to get public and State input on the content of the guideline. This as a time-consuming process, but the DOE thought that the additional time required for this review was warranted in light of the benefits received.

Issue

Several commenters questioned how the nine potentially acceptable sites for the first repository could be identified before the final siting guidelines were issued and argued that the guidelines should have been issued before the identification of potentially acceptable sites.

Response

When the Act mandated the preparation of the guidelines, the DOE had already identified nine sites as potentially acceptable for the first repository; the screening that led to them had been based on criteria defined by the National Academy of Sciences (NAS-NRC, 1978), the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA, 1977) and earlier programs in the United States (Brunton and McClain, 1977; DOE, 1980). The DOE believes that Congress did not intend this screening to be repeated on the basis of the new guidelines required in

the Act. Section 116(a) of the Act requires that, within 90 days of its enactment, the DOE identify the States with potentially acceptable sites and, within 90 days after such identification, notify the States and affected Indian Tribes of the potentially acceptable sites within their jurisdictions. Such a notification would be impossible if Congress had intended a repetition of the screening against the guidelines, which were to be issued within the first 180 days. The screening that led to the nine potentially acceptable sites did not use the guidelines per se, but it was based on the same principles. The guidelines have been and will be used in the remainder of the site-selection process for the first repository and for screening potential sites for the second repository.

Issue

Several commenters contended that the guidelines should not have been developed before the promulgation of the EPA standards and the NRC criteria for geologic disposal because the guidelines are based on compliance with the EPA standards and the NRC criteria.

Response

The Act did not allow the DOE to delay the guidelines until the publication of the NRC and the EPA regulations. It required the DOE to issue guidelines within 180 days of the enactment of the Act (i.e., in August 1983), whereas the NRC and the EPA were to issue their regulations by January 1, 1984, and January 7, 1984, respectively.

However, the guidelines were based on proposed EPA and NRC regulations. Their compatibility with the NRC's 10 CFR Part 60, which was published in final form on June 21, 1983 (NRC, 1983), has been verified by the NRC, which used absence of conflict with 10 CFR Part 60 as one of the criteria for its concurrence on the guidelines. Throughout the guideline-development process, the DOE was able to review the working drafts of the EPA's 40 CFR Part 191 to ensure absence of conflict. The final EPA rule, published on September 1, 1985 (EPA, 1985a), is not in conflict with the guidelines. As explained in the "Supplementary Information" for the guidelines (DOE, 1984, p. 47721), in the event of any future conflict between the guidelines and either 10 CFR Part 60 or 40 CFR Part 191, these NRC and EPA regulations will supersede the guidelines and constitute the operative requirement in any application of the guidelines. The guidelines also contain provisions for their amendment to maintain compatibility with the NRC and the EPA regulations.

C.3.1.1.3 Adequacy of the siting guidelines

Many of the comments received on the guidelines addressed the adequacy of the guidelines. The issues raised ranged from doubts about the ability of the guidelines to protect public health and safety to suggestions for revising the guidelines.

Issue

A number of comments expressed doubt that the guidelines would protect public health and safety and the quality of the environment.

Response

The siting guidelines are based on compliance with the EPA standards for the geologic disposal of radioactive waste (40 CFR Part 191) and the NRC criteria for implementing the EPA standards (10 CFR Part 60). Protection of the health and safety of the public and the quality of the environment is the basic objective of both the EPA and the NRC regulations.

Issue

Several commenters requested that "proximity" be included as a factor in selecting and evaluating potential repository sites, and one commenter questioned why proximity to dedicated lands is not a disqualifying condition.

Response

Proximity is included as a factor in the preclosure guidelines on population density and distribution, offsite installations and operations, the environment and transportation. Proximity is also implicit in the third disqualifying condition on the environment, which is concerned with the previously designated resource-preservation use of National or State parks, forest lands, etc.

Issue

Some parties said that, because no sites have been disqualified, the validity of the guidelines is questionable.

Response

The nine potentially acceptable sites for the first repository were identified in a site-screening process that evaluated regions, areas, locations, and potential sites against various criteria that were based on the same principles as the siting guidelines. One of the objectives of this process was to eliminate sites that do not merit the investment necessary for detailed studies and site characterization. It is therefore not surprising that none of the sites identified as potentially acceptable have not been disqualified in evaluations against the guidelines.

Issue

The guidelines were criticized by some parties for failing to specify procedures for verifying findings.

Response

The guidelines are intended to provide the framework for a site-screening and site-selection process that can lead to the selection of suitable sites. They do not contain any procedures for the conduct of site screening, methods

of date collection and analysis, etc. Such procedures will be included in other documents, such as the site-characterization plans. The plans for site characterization will be reviewed by the NRC and the affected State, and the information collected during site characterization will be reported to the NRC every 6 months. The final determination of the suitability of any site will be made by the NRC.

Issue

Some comments alleged that, because the guidelines may be challenged by litigation, the EA findings are tenuous.

Response

As explained in Section C.3.1.1.1, the siting guidelines were developed through a process of extensive consultation with the States and affected Indian Tribes and review by the public. As required by the Act, they received the concurrence of the NRC. The DOE is therefore confident that litigation challenges will not bring about any significant changes in the guidelines or require changes in the EA findings.

Issue

The DOE was advised that the controlled area and the accessible environment should be defined before site characterization begins.

Response

The DOE siting guidelines define the accessible environment as the atmosphere, the land surface, surface water, oceans, and the portion of the lithosphere that is outside the controlled area.

The definition of the controlled area is derived from the NRC's 10 CFR Part 60 (NRC, 1983); it establishes an area of no more than 10 kilometers (6 miles) around a repository that is to be identified by markers, records, and other possible institutional controls intended to exclude incompatible activities from the area. The EPA's final standard in 40 CFR Part 191 (EPA, 1985) establishes a more restrictive definition of controlled area: it limits the controlled area to 5 kilometers in any direction from the outer boundary of the original location of the waste in a repository. Furthermore, the controlled area is also limited to 100 square kilometers, which is approximately the area that would be extend for a distance of 3 kilometers from all sides of an underground repository in a typical configuration. The EPA definition thus substantially reduces the area of the lithosphere that would be contained if the controlled area and thus decreases the distance to accessible environment. The 5-kilometer distance was chosen to retain reasonable compatibility with the NRC's requirement that the pre-waste-emplacement time of ground-water travel to the accessible environment be at least 1,000 years.

Issue

The adequacy of the guidelines for the ranking of sites was questioned.

Response

As explained in the multiattribute utility analysis of the nominated sites, the DOE developed a revised method for using the guidelines to rate the technical adequacy of sites. This method has been reviewed by the National Academy of Sciences and other peer reviewers.

Issue

Some parties suggested that the guidelines should establish procedures for determining the end point of site characterization.

Response

The end point of site characterization will be established by the site-characterization plans, which will describe in detail the tests to be performed, the data that are needed, and what the data will be used for. Each plan will be specific to a particular site and will be based on the data and analyses needed to resolve outstanding issues about the suitability of the site. Because the end of site characterization depends on site-specific conditions, it cannot be defined by general siting guidelines. As already mentioned, these plans will be reviewed by the NRC, the affected States and Indian Tribes, and the public through a formal hearing process. The data collected during site characterization will be reported to the NRC every 6 months in progress reports that will also discuss any needed changes in the plans for testing. After site characterization is completed, the NRC may request the DOE to collect more data for the confirmation of the results of site characterization.

Issue

One commenter suggested that the potential impact on system performance by discrete hydraulic features (joints, faults, fractures, and dissolution conduits) be incorporated into the DOE guidelines and the EAs.

Response

The impact on system performance of discrete hydraulic features is not included in the guidelines because the guidelines must be general enough to cover all types of host rock. The impacts of such features, if they are present, will be assessed during site characterization.

C.3.1.1.4 Comments on particular guidelines

Issue

The guideline concerning the 10,000-year travel time from the repository to the accessible environment is not appropriate for radioactive waste that will be subject to dispersive and diffusive mixing processes.

Response

A 10,000-year travel time to the accessible environment is a favorable condition in the postclosure guidelines on geohydrology; it was derived from the NRC's criteria in 10 CFR Part 60. The qualifying condition for geohydrology says that the present and expected setting of a site shall be compatible with waste isolation, taking into account the characteristics of, and the processes operating within, the geologic setting.

Issue

Ground-water modeling should be specified in the postclosure guideline on geohydrology (and the EAs) as a screening tool rather than as a predictive tool. Modeling results should not be substituted for "hard data" where inadequate data would make verification impossible.

Response

As already mentioned, the guidelines are not intended to specify procedures for data collection, data analysis, or performance assessment. Detailed information on the technical approach will be presented in the site-characterization plans.

Issue

Some commenters asked why the technical guideline on preclosure site ownership and control is assigned to the system guideline for preclosure radiological safety instead of ease and cost of construction, operation, and closure.

Response

The primary purpose of the preclosure guideline on site ownership and control is to ensure compliance with the NRC's requirement that the DOE obtain ownership as well as surface and subsurface rights to land and minerals within the controlled area of the repository (10 CFR 60.121). The objective of this requirement is to protect the general public from any radioactivity that might be released in the repository, and hence this guideline is concerned mainly with preclosure radiological safety. The system guideline on the ease and cost of repository siting, construction, operation, and closure, on the other hand, is concerned with the use of reasonably available technology and assurance that the cost of siting, constructing, operating, and closing a repository at a particular site is reasonable in comparison with the costs of other available and comparable siting options.

C.3.1.2 General site-screening issues

Summarized and addressed in this section are comments on several generic site-screening issues: the site-screening process, the importance of host-rock diversity, the selection of sites on the basis of land use, and the screening for sites in salt. In addition, this section includes comments on particular siting issues, such as proximity to a national park.

C.3.1.2.1 Use of ambiguous criteria and lack of uniformity

The site-screening process was criticized because it allegedly varied from site to site and because host rocks other than basalt, salt, and tuff were not considered.

Issue

One party alleged that Chapter 1 of the draft EAs reveals the site-screening process to be full of ambiguously defined criteria, arbitrary cutoffs, and site deferrals and said that the criteria used to eliminate sites were aimed at reaching an arbitrary number of sites, rather than eliminating inferior ones. Size was cited as one such arbitrary factor, particularly the 2,000-acre minimum that led to the elimination of three salt-dome sites.

Response

The criteria used in screening for potentially acceptable sites were based on waste-isolation requirements, natural processes and conditions that could affect isolation, engineering design requirements, and factors particular to the rock type under consideration (i.e., dome size is pertinent only to salt domes). The size criterion, for example, was derived from repository designs and NRC requirements. The three domes were eliminated because the 2,000-acre criterion was established during the time the salt domes were being screened.

Chapter 1 of the EAs only highlights the site-screening processes. For a complete description of the processes, the supporting references cited in Chapter 1 should be consulted.

Issue

The DOE was advised to begin the national screening process for the first repository again, implementing a uniform process for all sites.

Response

To begin another national screening process for the first repository would violate the requirements of the Act, which specifies that the potentially acceptable sites for the first repository be identified at the time the guidelines are issued--within 180 days of the enactment of the Act. The requirement for the identification of potentially acceptable sites was derived from the recognition by Congress that the DOE had been conducting screening studies for several years. As explained in the "Supplementary Information" for the guidelines (DOE, 1984), the screening processes were based on principles similar to the guidelines.

Issue

Several commenters questioned why granite, considered by countries like Sweden as the best rock for a radioactive-waste repository, or argillaceous rocks (shale) are not being considered for the first repository.

Response

Because basalt, salt, and tuff are suitable host rocks for waste isolation, screening in these rocks had identified promising sites, the cost of characterizing more than three sites for the first repository seemed unwarranted, and the Act required potentially acceptable sites to be identified within 180 days, the DOE decided to reserve granite for the second repository. Thus, studies of granite, a crystalline rock, have not progressed as far as studies of other host rocks. Several years will be required to identify potentially acceptable sites in crystalline-rock formations and to collect for such sites as much information as is available for the basalt, salt, and tuff sites in order for all sites to be considered on a comparable basis.

Argillaceous rocks at the Nevada Test Site were considered for the first repository in the late 1970s. As explained in Chapter 2 of the EA for the Yucca Mountain site, general studies were made of low-permeability shale, and detailed studies were made of the argillite-rich Eleana Formation. However, because the argillite rock was judged to be too complex for characterization, further consideration was suspended.

C.3.1.2.2 Importance of host-rock diversity

The DOE was criticized by some commenters for using the diversity of host rocks as a requirement in the site-screening process. Conversely, other commenters wanted to know why screening for the first repository was limited to basalt, salt, and tuff.

Issue

There were objections to the importance assigned to host-rock diversity. The requirement for diversity automatically places the Hanford and the Nevada sites in the top five and makes it possible for technically superior sites to be overlooked in favor of sites in different settings. (See also Section C.3.3 for comments and responses on geohydrologic settings.)

Response

The need to recommend and characterize sites in different host rocks is well established in the NRC requirements (10 CFR Part 60) to characterize three sites in two host rocks, at least one of which is not salt; in the requirement of the Act that, to the extent practicable, the DOE recommend sites in different host rocks; and in Section 960.3-1-1 of the siting guidelines. The consideration of alternative host rocks is also implicit in the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The DOE is nominating a set of sites that meet both the NRC's technical criteria in 10 CFR Part 60 and requirements for a diversity of host rocks. Without diversity, the discovery of a generic flaw in some particular host rock during site characterization would lead to unacceptable delays in the siting process.

C.3.1.2.3 Selection of sites on the basis of land use

Many comments addressed the screening of sites on Federal lands and the identification of the Hanford site in Washington and the Yucca Mountain site in Nevada as potentially acceptable on this basis.

Issue

Commenters said that the Hanford and the Nevada sites were selected on the basis of Federal ownership rather than geologic superiority, whereas the Act requires that geologic conditions be the primary criteria.

Response

Geologic conditions are the primary criteria. However, the DOE used two approaches to screening for geologically suitable sites for the first repository. One approach began with the identification of salt as a potentially suitable host rock and proceeded with a screening process that narrowed the size of the land unit under consideration from regions to sites.

The other approach began with the evaluation of certain Federal lands that are dedicated to nuclear-energy operations to see which contain potentially suitable host rocks; it led to screening at Hanford and at the Nevada Test Site. This approach was endorsed by the Comptroller General of the United States (General Accounting Office, 1979) and by a resolution by the House of Representatives (1979). Although land use formed the initial basis for the screening of Federal lands, the subsequent progression to smaller land units was based on evaluations of geologic and hydrologic suitability, using criteria that are similar to the siting guidelines. Since the publication of the guidelines, the evaluations of these sites have been based on the guidelines. If the results of site characterization cause a site on Federal land to be disqualified because of geologic conditions, the site would be dropped from consideration regardless of land ownership.

Issue

Some commenters asked why the DOE did not investigate government-owned sites other than Nevada and Hanford and other sites already set aside for nuclear-energy activities.

Response

Other DOE-owned sites dedicated to nuclear-energy activities were considered. However, the geologic and hydrologic conditions at the other sites did not seem as favorable as those of the Hanford Site and the Nevada Test Site. In addition, preliminary investigations of the Hanford Site and the Nevada Test Site had been conducted for defense programs, and experienced staff were available to assist in repository-site investigations. Another reason for choosing the Hanford and the Nevada sites for site screening is their large geographic area, which increases opportunities for finding sites with favorable combinations of geologic and hydrologic characteristics. For example, the large size of the Nevada Test Site allowed preliminary investigations in nine different host rocks in saturated and unsaturated environments before it was shown that the unsaturated environment in tuff was preferred to other geologic environments at Nevada.

C.3.1.2.4 Screening for sites in salt

There were a number of comments on the screening of sites in salt. Some of them questioned the suitability of salt, in general, whereas others asked about particular regions or sites.

Issue

Some commenters said that the EAs should explain why salt is the best host rock or the relative advantage of salt domes and bedded salt. They said that salt seems to be a candidate because it is the most-studied host rock rather than the best host rock, and its suitability has been questioned.

Response

Salt was recommended as a potentially suitable host rock for waste disposal in 1955 by the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council (NAS-NRC 1957), which made this recommendation after evaluating many options. This recommendation was reaffirmed in a subsequent report (NAS-NRC, 1970) and endorsed by the American Physical Society (1978).

The characteristics of salt that are favorable for waste isolation are discussed in Section 1.2.2 of the EAs. The features of salt beds and salt domes were described in Section 1.3.2.2 of the EAs and in the DOE's Mission Plan (DOE, 1985, Vol. I, Part I, Chapter 5). The DOE has never claimed that salt is the "best" host rock for waste isolation. All of the host rocks considered for repositories have both advantages and questions to be resolved.

Issue

One commenter wanted to know why the Salina Basin was deferred for further study even though it is closer to a larger number of reactors than other salt sites and its selection would alleviate the problem of transporting waste over long distances.

Response

The Salina region includes portions of Michigan, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Canada. Regional analyses had indicated that bedded salt potentially suitable for a geologic repository occurs in Michigan, northeastern Ohio, and a portion of northwestern New York. Plans for field investigations in Michigan were halted in 1977 because of the enactment of a State law (Public Act 113) barring the disposal of high-level radioactive wastes in the State. Regional studies of the Salina Basin based on the geologic literature and geologic data from public and private sources were completed in 1978. These studies identified study areas for field investigations in New York and Ohio, but no field work was carried out for the reasons explained below.

The studies of the Salina region were not specific or detailed enough to judge that any part of the region was suitable or unsuitable for a repository. They did reveal, however, unfavorable characteristics in several parts of the basin. Among the most important was the high population density

and the concentration of urban areas (more than 50,000 inhabitants) in Ohio and southern Michigan. Another was the abundance of natural resources, especially the oil and gas deposits in Ohio and throughout the Michigan Basin. When the State of Ohio objected to further studies, the DOE was in the process of examining its goals and objectives in the management of radioactive waste and had begun investigations of alternative host rocks (basalt and tuff). Evaluations of salt were restricted to the Permian Basin of Texas, the Paradox Basin in Utah, and the salt domes in the Gulf interior region of Louisiana and Mississippi.

Issue

The DOE needs to discuss why the first two sites selected in the salt-screening process--Lyons, Kansas, and the WIPP site--were rejected and are not even mentioned in the description of the siting process.

Response

The site at Lyons, Kansas (an already existing salt mine), was used by the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) from 1965 to 1967 for a large-scale experiment with simulated waste and electrical heaters. The purpose of this experiment, called Project Salt Vault, was to observe the response of salt beds to heat. In June 1970, the Lyons site was selected as a potential location for a geologic repository; the selection, however, was conditional on the satisfactory resolution of site-specific issues under study. The concept and the location were conditionally endorsed in November 1970 by the waste committee of the National Academy of Sciences. A conceptual design for a repository was completed in 1971. In 1972, however, the Lyons site was judged to be unacceptable for technical reasons: there were previously undiscovered drill holes nearby, and some water used in nearby solution mines could not be accounted for. Accordingly, the AEC decided to abandon Lyons as a demonstration site and to search for sites elsewhere.

In 1974, field investigations for a site for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) were begun in the northern part of the Delaware basin in New Mexico. Selected by the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, the site was on the Eddy-Lea County line, about 30 miles east of Carlsbad. However, drilling and geophysical investigations produced unexpected results showing that the geologic structure appeared to be unpredictable because of proximity to a major aquifer. The structure could have been delineated by more drilling, but extensive drilling would have been contrary to the principle of minimizing the number of holes drilled into the repository. That site was therefore given up, and a new survey for sites in the New Mexico portion of the Delaware basin was begun by the U.S. Geological Survey and the DOE's predecessor, the Energy Research and Development Administration. In 1975, these efforts led to the identification of a site in the Los Medanos area, about 25 miles east of Carlsbad. The Waste Isolation Pilot Plant now being constructed there has been designated (by Public Law 96-164) a research-and-development facility for the national defense effort (to demonstrate the disposal of high-level waste) and for the disposal of defense transuranic waste. This plant is not part of the DOE's program for the management of commercial radioactive waste.

C.3.1.2.5 Particular siting issues

A number of comments addressed particular siting issues, such as proximity to a national park or the potential for contaminating water supplies.

Issue

The DOE was urged not to consider a repository site near a national park.

Response

The DOE recognizes its responsibility to protect the national parks from irreconcilable conflicts. According to the siting guideline on environmental quality, if the "presence of the restricted area or the repository support facilities would conflict irreconcilably with the previously designated resource-preservation use of a component of the National Park System," the site would be disqualified.

Issue

Some persons were concerned that a repository would contaminate water supplies and nearby rivers, thus adversely affecting the water supply of downriver populations.

Response

Water supplies and nearby rivers are protected by EPA and NRC regulations, which require complete containment of all radioactive material for 1,000 years and limit any releases thereafter to extremely low rates that would pose no hazard to public health or safety. Requirements for ground-water protection are explicitly included in the EPA's final standards (EPA, 1985).

Issue

Several comments said that a repository should not be located near prime farmland.

Response

The siting guidelines provide a number of opportunities to evaluate the potential impacts of a repository site on prime agricultural lands. For example, the preclosure guideline on socioeconomics says that the "potential for major disruptions of primary sectors of the economy of the affected area" is a potentially adverse condition. The DOE is concerned about impacts on prime agricultural lands and will not select any site that would irreconcilably damage farm capability.

Issue

Many commenters wanted to know why the DOE is continuing to consider the Hanford site. They claim that the highly fractured basalt rock has been shown to be a poor host rock for a repository.

Response

The Hanford site and the basalt host rock have many favorable characteristics for waste isolation and some questionable characteristics, just as the other rock types have. The DOE recognizes that the hydrologic conditions of the Hanford site are an important issue, but the results of studies conducted since 1976 have not revealed any technical reasons for finding the site unacceptable. If Hanford is selected for site characterization, the studies performed will provide the information needed for determining compliance with the siting guidelines and hence NRC criteria and EPA standards.

C.3.1.2.6 Alternative repository locations

Issue

Many commenters suggested alternative repository locations with particular characteristics (e.g., location away from populated areas, in an arid desert, or on barren government-owned land) or recommended specific sites.

Response

The characteristics suggested by the commenters are considered favorable conditions in the siting guidelines. However, the geologic conditions that are important to waste containment and isolation after repository closure are the primary considerations. No single site characteristic is sufficient because each site must meet the qualifying conditions of every guideline. While other possible repository locations may possess particular characteristics that are favorable, the DOE is confident that the sites being considered for the first and the second repository possess the combination of characteristics needed for compliance with the DOE siting guidelines and with the regulations promulgated by the EPA and the NRC for the protection of public health and safety.

C.3.1.3 Site-specific site-screening issues

A number of commenters said that the data base for the the site-screening criteria was inaccurate, inadequate, or improperly applied in the selection of the Deaf Smith site. Specifically, commenters questioned (1) the identification of the 9-square-mile site boundary, (2) the accuracy of the evaluation against the disqualifying condition of the human-interference guideline, (3) the number of boreholes that have been drilled through salt at this site as compared with the other salt sites and their potential effect on waste isolation, (4) the thickness of the host rock as a discriminator at Palo Duro location A, and (5) the rationale for excluding certain DOE criteria in the area-to-location screening. Other comments requested that the Ogallala aquifer and prime farmland be used as discriminators in site screening. One party noted that the well from the Santa Rosa aquifer, which supplies the town of Vega, is located within the site.

Response

The process by which the Deaf Smith site was identified is documented in Identification of Sites Within the Palo Duro Basin (DOE, 1984), which is cited in Chapter 2 of the final EA. This three-volume final report, which received extensive review and comment, documents the available data, analyses, and methods used to identify the specific 9-square-mile sites in Deaf Smith and Swisher Counties.

The criteria considered at different steps in the site-screening process included the present rates of aquifer recharge and discharge, the expected rates of aquifer depletion, the saturated thickness of the Ogallala aquifer, prime farmland, and past resource use and exploration in the region. Variations in the thickness of the host rock across the Deaf Smith location were not a discriminator because the minimum thickness within the location exceeds 125 feet, which is thought to be conservatively restrictive (DOE, 1984, p. 23). The rationale for determining that certain criteria were not discriminating factors in various screening steps is stated in several of the references supporting Chapter 2 of the EA, specifically in DOE/CH 2/10140-2 (SWEC, 1983). In regard to boreholes, it is not the number of boreholes at a site that is important but knowledge of their presence and location. Boreholes can be filled and sealed, thus maintaining the waste-isolation capability of the site. The presence of unidentified boreholes, on the other hand, is an undesirable condition.

The evaluations of the site against the disqualifying conditions of the guidelines in Table 2-4 summarize the data and analysis presented in Chapter 6 of the EA. For the guideline on human interference, the basis for concluding that the disqualifying condition for human interference is not present at the Deaf Smith site is given in Section 6.3.1.8.

In the final EA, numerous sections have been clarified and updated, including a discussion of the Vega well field in Section 3.6.3.6. The updated data base and analyses did not change the screening results or guideline evaluations in Chapter 6 of the EA.

C.3.2 EVALUATION AGAINST DISQUALIFYING CONDITIONS

Issue

Many commenters disagreed with the evaluation of the Deaf Smith site against various disqualifying conditions of the guidelines, questioning the lack of data, the adequacy of the data, or the analyses from which the conclusions were drawn. Specifically, commenters suggested that the Deaf Smith site be disqualified for the following reasons:

1. The failure of the DOE to convince the public that repository construction, operation, and closure will not significantly affect the quantity or the quality of water for irrigation.

2. The possible degradation by the repository of the quality of water for Vega from sources in or near the site and the probability that such impacts cannot be compensated or mitigated.
3. The occurrence of frequent tornadoes in the area.
4. The presences of prime farmland, which should be considered a valuable natural resource, and the uniqueness of the Texas High Plains economy.
5. The proximity to the site of Vega's population of nearly 1,000 persons.
6. The possible effects of the repository on the Dockum aquifer.

Response

While acknowledging that all of the data required to make definitive findings for all guideline conditions and to address all environmental concerns are not presently available, the DOE believes that the evidence and analyses presented in Chapter 6, as well as new information obtained during the comment-review period, are sufficient for making the evaluations and findings specified for this stage of the site-selection process by the Act and Appendixes III and IV of the siting guidelines.

Considering the comments on the draft EA and the new data identified during the review period, the DOE has reviewed the evaluation of the Deaf Smith site against each of the disqualifying conditions presented in full in Chapter 6 of the EA, and has found no reason to disqualify the site.

C.3.3 DIVERSITY OF GEOHYDROLOGIC SETTINGS AND THE SELECTION OF PREFERRED SITES

The DOE's emphasis on a diversity of geohydrologic settings and the selection of the preferred site in each setting were the topics of many comments. The issues raised included objections to the grouping of sites into geohydrologic settings, requests for detailed explanations of the selection of preferred sites, and doubts about the availability of sufficient information to discriminate between sites in a geohydrologic setting.

Issue

There were objections that the requirement for grouping sites into geohydrologic settings and selecting one preferred site from each setting artificially elevates the importance of host-rock diversity over geologic conditions. It automatically places the Hanford and the Nevada sites in the top five and makes it possible for technically superior sites to be overlooked in favor of sites in different settings.

Response

It is indeed true that the second-best site in one geohydrologic setting may be in some respects superior to the best site in another geohydrologic setting. However, it is not necessary to find the absolutely best site for

the repository; a research for the absolutely best site could be almost endless. It is necessary to find and qualify good sites--ones that meet or exceed all of the technical requirements that bear on protecting public health and safety during repository operations and over the long term. In order to find satisfactory sites in a reasonably expeditious manner, and to satisfy the requirement of the Act that sites from different host rocks be recommended, the DOE has chosen to emphasize diversity of geohydrologic settings in the process of selecting sites for nomination and recommendation. Maintaining a diversity of rock types has the added advantage of minimizing the possibility of a program delay that could be caused by an as-yet-unrecognized basic flaw in a particular host rock.

The fact that the emphasis on geohydrologic diversity automatically places the Hanford and the Nevada (Yucca Mountain) sites in the top five is an artifact of the processes that led to the nine potentially acceptable sites. The searches that yielded the nine potentially acceptable sites were not necessarily identical. Those that took place on DOE-controlled land, ending with the selection of the Hanford and the Yucca Mountain sites, were directed at choosing a single site on Federal land dedicated to nuclear activities. For example, 9 rock types in 15 alternative locations were considered in the site-screening process for the Yucca Mountain site. The site-screening process for the salt sites had not yet narrowed the candidates down to a single site per geohydrologic setting at the time the nine potentially acceptable sites were identified.

Issue

Several commenters recommended that the final EA should state more clearly the importance to site selection of establishing candidates in a variety of geohydrologic settings and that the selection of the preferred site in each geohydrologic setting should be explained in detail, with reference to the siting guidelines.

Response

The importance of maintaining diversity in geohydrologic settings in the siting process is explained in the preceding response.

Section 2.4 of the EAs for the salt sites describes how the preferred site in each geohydrologic setting was chosen, with reference to the siting guidelines.

Issue

Some parties wanted to know why only one tuff and one basalt site were considered as compared to seven salt sites. The Nevada and the Hanford sites were compared with no others in the same geohydrologic setting or in the same host rock.

Response

Because the studies of the Nevada (tuff) and the Hanford (basalt) sites were started on the basis of favorable land use (Federal ownership and dedication to nuclear activities), they were focused on locating a

geologically suitable site on a particular Federal reservation. The DOE did not need to progress through regional, area, and location studies--the process that identifies alternative sites at each major screening step.

Issue

Some commenters did not believe that the DOE had sufficient information to discriminate between sites in a geohydrologic setting, including the Deaf Smith and Swisher sites.

Response

The basis for selecting the preferred site in a geohydrologic setting is discussed in Section 2.4 of each EA. It is the DOE's position that the information currently available on the different sites is adequate for choosing a preferred site in each setting.

Having evaluated new information about the salt-dome sites, including the information submitted in comments on Chapters 3, 4, 5, and 6 of the draft EAs, the DOE changed several findings for the favorable or potentially adverse conditions of the guidelines. The changes in findings produced three additional guideline conditions that discriminate among the salt dome sites (potentially adverse conditions 1 and 4 of the preclosure guideline on transportation and potentially adverse condition 1 of the preclosure guideline on surface characteristics. However, they also eliminated two conditions that were previously discriminating (potentially adverse condition 3 of the transportation guideline and favorable condition 2 of the preclosure guideline on hydrology). (A complete listing of the discriminating conditions is given in Section 2.4 of the EA.) Section 2.4 of the final EA was revised to reflect these changes in findings. The changes in findings do not change the conclusion that the Richton Dome is the preferred site in the Gulf Coast salt-dome geohydrologic setting.

Having evaluated new information about the Permian Basin sites, including the information submitted in comments on Chapters 3, 4, 5, and 6 of the draft EAs, the DOE changed several findings for the favorable or potentially adverse conditions of the guidelines. These changes in findings produced four conditions that discriminate between the Deaf Smith and the Swisher sites: favorable condition 4 of the postclosure guideline on geohydrology, favorable conditions 1(iii) and 2 of the preclosure guideline on transportation, and potentially adverse condition 1 of the preclosure guideline on transportation. One previously discriminating condition, favorable condition 3 of the preclosure guideline on transportation, was eliminated. These changes, which are discussed in Section 2.4 of the final EA, did not affect the conclusion that Deaf Smith is the preferred site in the Permian Basin.

Issue

A commenter objected that, because of the use of selected, currently available data for the comparative evaluation, there was considerable subjectivity or inference in the judgments, and the rhetoric used in the findings is so flexible that it could be used to find any remotely located site suitable. This party felt that the Swisher site could easily be substituted for the preferred Deaf Smith site in Chapter 7.

Response

The selection of preferred sites within a geohydrologic setting was done in accordance with implementation guideline 960.3-2-2-2, which calls for a comparative evaluation of all potentially acceptable sites within each geohydrologic setting. To accomplish this selection, the two potentially acceptable sites in the Permian Basin were compared against the postclosure and the preclosure technical guidelines. It is expected that sites that have been grouped within a single geohydrologic setting will have many similar features such that not all the guidelines will discriminate between the sites. Accordingly, the selection process evaluated only those guideline conditions that discriminated between the two sites.

The DOE believes that the similarities in findings between the two sites in the Permian Basin are directly related to the similarities between the sites. The conditions that differed between the two sites were used as the basis to discriminate between the two sites and to identify the preferred site, as described in Section 2.4 of the EA.

C.3.4 NOMINATION AND RECOMMENDATION OF SITES FOR CHARACTERIZATION

In Chapter 7 of the draft EAs, each of the five sites proposed for nomination (Davis Canyon, Deaf Smith, Hanford, Richton Dome, and Yucca Mountain) was assigned a ranking for each technical guideline. Three quantitative methods were then used to aggregate these rankings. Two of the methods were criticized by the commenters for lacking firm theoretical foundations. The third method--described variously as the utility-estimation, rating, or weighting-summation method--was criticized because its application did not follow the procedures suggested by the professional literature. The methods were briefly described in Section 7.4 of the draft EAs, which also presented the results of their application--the identification of three sites as preferred for nomination. A more detailed discussion of the three methods was given in Appendix B.

In response to these comments, the DOE undertook a more formal application of the utility-estimation method (referred to as the decision-aiding methodology) to provide a more defensible overall comparative evaluation as a basis for determining which three sites appear most favorable for recommendation for characterization. The decision-aiding methodology is intended to provide a framework for systematically accounting for the technical and value judgments required in selecting sites for recommendation. It has been reviewed by the Committee on Waste Management of the National Academy of Sciences.

The various steps of the analysis were conducted by a DOE team consisting of experts in decision analysis, the technical disciplines corresponding to the technical siting guidelines, and repository performance. The technical information for the analysis was obtained from the final EAs. The value judgments were provided by DOE management and staff. A detailed explanation of the decision-aiding methodology, the analyses that were performed, and the results are presented in the multiattribute utility analysis of the nominated sites and the recommendation of candidate sites, which are being issued separately.

The rankings reported in Chapter 7 of the draft EAs elicited numerous comments, some of which objected to the rankings assigned for a particular guideline and some of which suggested different rankings. A number of comments were also directed at the methodology used in aggregating the rankings, at the weighting used for the postclosure and the preclosure guidelines, and at the choice of preferred sites.

In the final EAs, Chapter 7 presents only a comparative evaluation of the nominated sites that does not rank the sites on individual guidelines and does not aggregate rankings to identify preferred sites for recommendation. The ranking is performed in the multiattribute utility analysis of the nominated sites. For this reason and because the process of identifying the most favorable sites for recommendation is significantly different from that described in the draft EAs, comments on Chapter 7 and Appendix B of the draft EAs that were specifically concerned with the ranking of sites or the methodology are not addressed here. These include comments on the specific ranking (i.e., criticisms or endorsements) of sites on particular guidelines, aggregate rankings, and the methodology itself. For such comments the issues are summarized, however, to show the concerns of the commenters. The reader interested in the ratings assigned to the sites is referred to the multiattribute utility analysis of the nominated sites and the recommendation of candidate sites. The comments that are addressed here are those that sought clarification about, or commented on, the comparative evaluation of the sites in the draft EAs rather than simply disagreeing or agreeing with a ranking; they include, for example, comments suggesting factors that should have been considered in the evaluation or questioning the use of a particular assumption. These comments were divided into two categories: (1) comparative evaluations against postclosure guidelines and (2) comparative evaluations against preclosure guidelines.

C.3.4.1 Comparison of sites on the basis of postclosure guidelines

Comments on the comparative evaluation of sites against the postclosure guidelines covered each guideline. They included questions about the findings made for particular conditions of the guidelines, comments about the data base, and recommendations for expanding or improving the analysis. As already explained, comments that were specifically concerned with ranking or methodology are not addressed here. Comments about the evaluations of individual sites against the postclosure guidelines are addressed in Section C.5 of the final EA for the particular site.

C.3.4.1.1 System guideline

Issue

A commenter stated that the DOE's failure to compare the sites on the basis of the postclosure system guideline masks the Hanford site's alleged inferior performance in comparison with the other sites.

Response

A comparison of sites against the system guidelines was not performed for the draft EA, because the available data were deemed insufficient for assessing the performance of the total repository.

Both the draft and the final EAs report the results of preliminary performance assessments, but these results were not appropriate for use as the basis for selecting sites for recommendation.

C.3.4.1.2 Geohydrology

The comparative evaluation of the sites against the postclosure guideline on geohydrology elicited many comments. The issues raised included the definition of the accessible environment, the estimates of ground-water travel times and the analyses on which they were based, risk to regional water sources, the comparison of sites in saturated and unsaturated zones, the adequacy of the data base, and criticisms of the findings for specific sites.

Issue

One commenter noted that Chapter 7 of the EAs should be revised to take into account the 2-kilometer distance to the accessible environment rather than 10 kilometers. This would be consistent with draft 5 of the EPA standard.

Response

Analyses in Chapters 6 and 7 have been revised to use a distance of 5 kilometers to the accessible environment. The 5-kilometer distance is consistent with the final EPA standards, which were published in September 1985 (EPA, 1985). (See also Section C.3.1.1 for comments on the definition of the accessible environment in the guidelines.)

Issue

Two commenters felt that the discussion of favorable condition 3, ease of characterizing and modeling, was much too brief. This condition is considered to be not present at all five sites.

Response

The DOE agrees with the comment; the text has been revised to indicate that favorable condition 3 is a major consideration. The discussion has been expanded to more completely discuss uncertainty in characterizing and modeling each of the sites.

Issue

Two commenters asked whether the four subconditions under favorable condition 4 are of equal weight and recommended that ground-water flux be a factor in assessing the sites.

Response

In terms of making a finding on this favorable condition, the four subconditions are of equal weight in that the presence of any one subcondition results in a finding of present. The DOE agrees that ground-water flux should be a factor in assessing the sites and has revised the evaluation of the sites against the geohydrology guideline to explicitly consider it.

Issue

Several commenters were concerned with the uncertainty in ground-water travel times in the comparative evaluations of sites against the geohydrology guideline. One commenter said that the lack of data on the complexity of ground-water flow paths was not adequately assessed. Another party provided alternative travel-time calculations, including faster travel times than those presented in Chapter 7. A third commenter contended that the approach to ground-water modeling in the draft EA is not conservative and therefore does not compensate for uncertainty in data. One commenter felt that the range of travel times, such as 87,000 to 361,000 years, is large enough to indicate that not enough data are available for an accurate prediction. Another commenter challenged the statement that the dry conditions at Yucca Mountain almost compensate for the shorter travel times in comparison with salt, saying that this conclusion is unsupported, and questioned DOE's ability to ultimately characterize and model this site.

Response

The travel-time analysis has been reviewed and extensively revised in response to various comments. A stochastic analysis has been completed for all five sites, using ranges of key hydrologic parameters to better represent the varying uncertainties in the data base. The DOE agrees that there are not enough data to make accurate predictions of ground-water travel times. However, the DOE considers that the preliminary modeling is sufficient for comparative evaluations of the five sites for the purposes of the EAs. With respect to Yucca Mountain, the DOE has reconsidered the relative ranking of the site to reflect the uncertainties in characterizing and modeling and in the range of travel times when compared with the salt sites. However, the DOE considers that all five sites can ultimately be characterized and modeled with reasonable certainty.

Issue

One commenter questioned whether the four subconditions under favorable condition 4 of the geohydrology guideline are of equal weight. If they are not, then the sites are not being evaluated against this guideline in an equitable manner.

Response

The four subconditions of favorable condition 4 address the components of ground-water travel time and therefore bear on a single parameter. In that respect, the guideline can be viewed as treating each site equitably.

Issue

One comment said that neither Chapter 7 nor Appendix A of the draft EAs discusses the relative risk posed by a repository to various regional water resources, such as the Ogallala aquifer and the Colorado River.

Response

Risk to various regional water resources is considered under the qualifying condition for each postclosure technical guideline: a site will be qualified under each of the postclosure technical guidelines only if the repository will not be likely to lead to radionuclide releases greater than those referenced in the postclosure system guideline. The postclosure system guideline requires compliance with the EPA and NRC regulations for waste disposal and requires that the geologic setting of a site allow for the physical separation of radioactive waste from the accessible environment in accordance with the specified regulations. The accessible environment by definition includes regional water resources outside the controlled area of the repository. In addition, the guideline on geohydrology includes a potentially adverse condition of the presence of ground-water sources, suitable for crop irrigation or human consumption without treatment, along ground-water flow paths from the host rock to the accessible environment. If this potentially adverse condition is present at a site and is judged to be sufficiently adverse to preclude meeting the qualifying condition, then a site will be disqualified.

Issue

Some parties said that the flow of ground water through salt may not be in accordance with Darcy's law. The process of diffusion and the flow of ground water through fractures in salt may predominate and should be considered.

Response

The question of Darcian flow in salt and the potential for diffusion and flow through fractures are evaluated in the final EAs. The question of ground-water flow through a body of salt has not been resolved at this time and will be addressed during site characterization.

Issue

Many comments said that the calculations of ground-water travel time for the Hanford site are inappropriate. In addition, one party noted that the Basalt Waste Isolation Project had failed to comply with NRC's request in the "Draft Issue-Oriented Site Technical Position (ISTP) for BWIP," Section 1.0, page 6.

Response

Concerns about the analysis of ground-water-travel time for the Hanford site have been reviewed and are addressed in Section C.5.11 of the final EA for the Hanford site. Modifications to the conceptual model, the data base, and the revised calculation of the ground-water-travel time from the

repository to the accessible environment 5 miles away have been made in Section 6.4.2.6.1 of the final EA for Hanford. Such an analysis is required to determine whether the first favorable condition and the disqualifying condition for the geohydrology guideline are present.

Compliance with the "Draft Issue-Oriented Site Technical Position for the Basalt Waste Isolation Project" is not in question. The purpose of the document was to identify technical issues that would have to be resolved during site characterization. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission did not request that the issues be resolved before the publication of the final EA.

Issue

One commenter noted that the travel-time discussion for the Hanford site gives the misleading impression that the travel times are based on 50 transmissivity values.

Response

The discussion of travel time has been extensively revised to be consistent with additional analyses completed for the final EA. The point raised by the commenter has been clarified.

Issue

One commenter stated that favorable condition 1 of the geohydrology guideline should not be considered present at the Hanford site. Hanford may be the only site where this condition is not met.

Response

Ground-water-travel times have been extensively reanalyzed for all five sites in response to comments on the draft EAs. For the Hanford site, key hydraulic parameters were conservatively evaluated over appreciable ranges in the stochastic model to account for uncertainty. The results indicate a probability of 0.22 for a travel time of less than 10,000 years. However, the median travel time is less than 34,000 years. Because the median travel time best represents the expected value, it appears that, on the basis of currently available data, this favorable condition can be met. The commenter is referred to Sections C.5.8 and C.5.11 of the final EA for the Hanford site for detailed responses to comments on the analysis of ground-water-travel time and uncertainties in the key hydraulic parameters used in this analysis.

Issue

One commenter argued that, since the ground-water-travel times for the bedded-salt sites in Utah and Texas were attributed to secondary permeability features and this was untrue, favorable condition 1 of the geohydrology guideline is not present at the Utah and the Texas sites.

Response

The appropriateness of including secondary permeability features is evaluated in the final EAs.

Issue

One commenter suggested that the DOE reconsider the rating of the Davis Canyon site under the geohydrology guideline in Chapter 7. Specific findings for Davis Canyon were questioned, with comments including the following:

- Favorable condition 1 should be considered to be not present, because a conservative analysis should include a catastrophic early release to the upper and the lower hydrostratigraphic units. If fracture flow is assumed, the ground-water-travel times within these units could be less than 10,000 years.
- Favorable condition 2 should be considered not present, because the effects of potential dissolution features, such as fault R, were not considered.
- Favorable condition 4 should be considered not present. Credit should not be taken for conditions 4(i) and 4(ii) if the effect of secondary permeability is considered.
- Potentially adverse condition 1 should be reevaluated to take into account the effects of thermal buoyancy or the hydraulic gradient.
- Potentially adverse condition 2 should be reevaluated to consider flow paths upward to overlying units with a total-dissolved-solids content of less than 10,000 ppm.

Response

The DOE has reconsidered the rating of the Davis Canyon site with respect to the geohydrology guideline. The relative ranking of this site with respect to the Richton Dome has been lowered. The specific comments on guideline conditions can be answered as follows:

- Favorable condition 1 is still considered to be present. No mechanism has been identified for a catastrophic early release to the upper and the lower hydrostratigraphic units. Revised travel-time calculations consider unlikely flow paths that might result from fracture zones, although there is no evidence that such zones exist. The revised travel times exceed 10,000 years.
- Favorable condition 2 is also still considered to be present. The revised discussion takes into account the potential for dissolution, including fault R. The stratigraphic offset along fault R is interpreted to be insufficient to be conducive to dissolution. Breccia pipes and other dissolution features are discussed in Chapter 6 of the Davis Canyon EA under the postclosure guideline on dissolution.
- The DOE has reevaluated favorable condition 4 and agrees that condition 4(ii) is not present. However, condition 4(i) is considered present because available data indicate that the host rock and the immediately surrounding units have low hydraulic conductivities. To claim that favorable condition 4 is present, only one of the subconditions needs to be present.

- Potentially adverse condition 1 covers only natural changes in geohydrologic conditions; changes related to repository construction and waste emplacement, such as thermal buoyancy, are evaluated under the postclosure guideline on rock characteristics.
- The revised travel-time analysis does evaluate flow paths upward from the proposed repository host rock because of the potential for localized upward gradients at the Davis Canyon site. The results of this analysis suggest that upward flow paths would reach the accessible environment laterally rather than through overlying units containing ground-water sources with a low total-dissolved-solids content.

Issue

One commenter noted that Davis Canyon has superior geohydrologic conditions when compared with Deaf Smith in terms of the ground-water-travel time and should rank high.

Response

The DOE agrees; the relative ranking on the geohydrology guideline has been revised to show that, with respect to the geohydrology guideline, the Davis Canyon site is preferable to the Deaf Smith site.

Issue

Two commenters suggested that the hydraulic conductivities in the host rock and the surrounding units are low at the Richton Dome; therefore favorable condition 4(i) and hence favorable condition 4 should be considered present at this site.

Response

The DOE agrees that the hydraulic conductivity within the host rock is very low at the Richton Dome. However, the horizontal hydraulic conductivity in the surrounding units ranges from 2.2 to 4.6×10^{-6} meter per day (7.2 to 1.5×10^{-5} foot per day). This range of horizontal hydraulic conductivities for the surrounding units does not support a finding that condition 4(i) is present.

Issue

One commenter suggested that the ranking of the Richton Dome should be lowered because of the likelihood of radionuclide transport in water and pointed out that, according to Chapter 3 of the draft EA, ground water moves up from the lower to the upper aquifer, providing a mechanism for radionuclide contamination of usable aquifers. Water in the upper aquifer flows toward Richton. There are no data on fluid movement in anomalous zones or within the salt. In addition, consideration should be given to the possible contamination of drinking water during site characterization.

Response

In the final EA for the Richton Dome, the boundary of the accessible environment is considered the edge of the salt dome. Therefore, if the Richton Dome is selected for site characterization, any radionuclide releases to the lower aquifer will have to be demonstrated to be within the limits specified by the EPA standards. In addition, the presence or the absence of anomalous zones and the mechanism of fluid movement within the dome will have to be resolved. Preliminary estimates of fluid movement within the Richton Dome suggest that ground-water travel within the Dome is very slow if it happens at all. Therefore, the DOE considers the Richton Dome to be more favorable than the other four sites with respect to the geohydrology guideline. No contamination of ground water is expected from site characterization; the commenter is referred to Chapter 4 of the final EA for the Richton Dome for a discussion of the possible effects of site characterization.

Issue

One commenter noted that the ground-water-travel times for the Yucca Mountain site in Chapter 7 are inconsistent with the travel time in Chapter 6 of the draft EA for Yucca Mountain. The final EA should contain a consistent value or range of values for travel times.

Response

For the Yucca Mountain site, Chapter 7 of the draft EA cites a minimum ground-water-travel time from the edge of the engineered-barrier system to the accessible environment of 23,000 years, and not 47,000 years as noted in the comment. Estimates of ground-water-travel time for the Yucca Mountain site have, however, been extensively revised for the final EA, and a consistent range of travel times is contained in the final document.

Issue

For Yucca Mountain, one commenter questioned the finding of "present" for favorable condition 2 of the geohydrology guideline, saying that the data on cyclic fluctuations in precipitation and changes in water-table elevation are insufficient to make a positive finding for this condition.

Response

The effects of Quaternary hydrologic processes on the ability of the Yucca Mountain site to isolate waste have been evaluated. These evaluations were based on geologic data, preliminary modeling of a rise in the water table under pluvial conditions, and a preliminary performance assessment. Preliminary modeling of increases in the water table during a full pluvial cycle with a 100-percent increase in precipitation suggests that the water table would experience a 130-meter rise. If pluvial conditions were to recur, significant increases in ground-water flux and decreases in ground-water-travel time could occur. However, a preliminary performance assessment for a repository at Yucca Mountain does not suggest a significant effect on waste isolation.

Issue

One commenter noted that, because of the lack of understanding of the unsaturated zone and the fact that the DOE concludes that the knowledge of the waste-isolation capability of Yucca Mountain is uncertain, it is unrealistic to compare a site in the unsaturated zone (Yucca Mountain) with four sites in saturated zones.

Response

The DOE acknowledges the lack of understanding of the unsaturated zone at Yucca Mountain. However, there are also uncertainties in the characterization and modeling of the four sites in saturated zones. For example, the mechanism of ground-water flow in salt is uncertain, the role of fracture flow at the bedded-salt sites is uncertain, and the magnitude of vertical conductivity at the basalt site has not been quantified. The DOE has not concluded that the waste-isolation capability of Yucca Mountain is uncertain; on the contrary, it expects that the uncertainties in the data base and in the preliminary modeling of the unsaturated zone can be resolved with reasonable assurance during site characterization. The DOE does not consider that a comparison of a site in the unsaturated zone at Yucca Mountain with four sites in the saturated zone is unrealistic.

Issue

One commenter noted that the data base used for the comparative evaluation of Yucca Mountain against the geohydrology guideline consists of two wells in the unsaturated zone and 30 wells in the saturated zone. Additional data from the unsaturated zone are required to base conclusions about geohydrology; data should not be extrapolated from the saturated zone to the unsaturated zone.

Response

The DOE agrees that additional data from the unsaturated zone will be required if the Yucca Mountain site is selected for characterization. However, the preliminary data from the unsaturated zone at Yucca Mountain are considered sufficient for comparative evaluations of sites against the guidelines. The site-specific data base for Yucca Mountain is, in fact, more extensive than the data base for the three salt sites.

Issue

One commenter asked why, in the discussion of favorable condition 2, which is related to hydrologic processes during the Quaternary Period, cyclic fluctuations in precipitation were considered only for the Yucca Mountain site.

Response

The discussion of cyclic fluctuations in precipitation during the Quaternary is emphasized for Yucca Mountain because increased precipitation affects flow through the unsaturated zone and the elevation of the water table, and therefore favorable condition 2 is not present at Yucca Mountain. As stated in the text, similar processes have been evaluated for the other

sites, but the effects of these processes are not likely to adversely affect waste isolation; therefore, the favorable condition is present at the other four sites. The text of the final EAs has been revised to discuss Quaternary hydrologic processes at each of the sites in greater detail.

Issue

One commenter recommended that the discussion of ground-water-travel time at Yucca Mountain, specifically travel through the Calico Hills nonwelded tuff unit, be clarified.

Response

The suggestion was accepted, and the discussion has been clarified.

C.3.4.1.3 Geochemistry

The comments about the comparative evaluation of sites against the geochemistry guideline covered inconsistencies in the discussion of geochemical conditions in Chapters 6 and 7 of the EAs, disparities in the data available for the various host rocks, and specific suggestions for the findings made for particular sites.

Issue

One commenter was concerned with disparities in the comparison of the sites with respect to the availability of data and the types of data for the geochemistry guideline. Favorable conditions 1 through 4 compare sites on the basis of various conditions that lead to a common result (i.e., isolation). It is not understood how distinct properties like oxidation-reduction conditions and sorptive properties can be equated, especially in light of differing uncertainties.

Response

Uncertainties in the geochemistry of all sites are admittedly present, and the geochemical data base for the sites varies with respect to the types as well as the amount of data. The definitive data for each site will be collected during site characterization. However, the data that are available are adequate for the purposes of the EAs. Geochemical data have been collectively evaluated in the preliminary performance assessments reported in Chapter 6 as the data relate to radionuclide solubility and retardation with respect to EPA standards (EPA, 1985) and NRC criteria (NRC, 1983).

Issue

A commenter criticized the DOE for its subjective treatment of available data to arrive at subjective conclusions as to which site is better than the other. Statistical procedures were then applied to the DOE's "subjectively determined data (rankings under each guideline)" to arrive at the best of five sites. The commenter also felt that the "subjective" conclusions were compounded by the ranking method.

Response

The DOE used the available data from each site, which includes site-specific data as well as regional data, plus professional judgment in order to perform a comparative evaluation of the sites against the guidelines. As already mentioned, the shortcomings of the ranking method used in the draft EA have been corrected.

Issue

The reviewer states that a major shortcoming with the draft EA for the Hanford site is that major concerns are evaluated "with short-term projections." Thus, the EA does not address the long-term problems that are posed by long-lived radionuclides (i.e., thousands of years).

Response

It is assumed that "major concerns" include waste-package lifetime, ground-water-travel time, and radionuclide release rate and retardation. Contrary to the impression of the reviewer, each of these concerns has been evaluated with respect to long-term waste containment and waste isolation. For example, the mean lifetime of the waste-package container is expected to be approximately 6,100 years $\pm$ 600 years on the basis of the corrosion rate.

Issue

One commenter said that the Hanford site does not have the advantages of salt. Salt provides excellent radiation shielding, is chemically active with regard to radiation-generated products, and has a higher thermal conductivity than basalt.

Response

Basalt and the associated ground water have significant advantages over salt (e.g., low oxidation-reduction potential, high sorptive capacity). It is true that salt and brine are chemically active when exposed to radiation; however, this reactivity makes salt somewhat less desirable than basalt. For example, gamma and alpha radiations produce more oxidizing products (from radiolysis) in a brine than in fresh water. In addition, rock salt is a poor sorbant for radionuclides. While it is true that salt has a higher thermal conductivity than basalt, the presence of water in the repository at Hanford would aid in the transfer of heat from the area.

Issue

One commenter felt that the salt sites should not be assigned a finding of "not present" for favorable condition 5 solely on the basis of data inadequacy. This party also questioned why such data needs were not investigated in the site-screening process that led to the identification of potentially acceptable sites.

Response

The mineralogic and chemical properties of salt deposits and the associated ground water are not conducive to the physical and chemical retardation of radionuclides (e.g., rock salt has poor sorption properties and brine further inhibits sorptive processes). On this basis, it was deemed conservative to assign the finding of "not present" for favorable condition 5.

Issue

One commenter noted that, even though high salinity inhibits the formation of colloids and particulates, the discussion for the Deaf Smith site suggests that all aquifers at the site contain saline water. It was noted that the upper aquifers contain fresh water.

Response

The discussion has been corrected in the final EA.

Issue

One commenter noted that the Deaf Smith site has no known radionuclide-sorbing minerals.

Response

Little work has been done on the mineral composition of the rock formulations at the Deaf Smith site. Preliminary work by the Texas Bureau of Economic Geology has shown that clay minerals may be present in the muds and mudstone interbeds of the Unit 4 halite of the San Andres Formation. However, because of the preliminary nature of this work, no credit is taken for sorption at the Deaf Smith site. This is noted in the final EA.

Issue

A commenter said that the Richton Dome site should be ranked lower than the Deaf Smith and the Davis Canyon sites for geochemistry because the "accessible environment" is defined as the edge of the salt stock and does not include adjacent aquifers and their retardation properties. Credit for the travel of radionuclides through the adjacent aquifers is irrelevant to the evaluation of the site.

Response

Because of the paucity of data for all of the salt sites, no credit is taken at present for the retardation characteristics of adjacent aquifers at any of these sites. While it is expected that additional retardation of radionuclides within these aquifers will take place, it is not possible to estimate the significance of such retardation effects without site-specific data. Thus, for the sake of conservatism, no credit for retardation in adjacent aquifers has been taken for any of the salt sites.

Issue

One reviewer noted that the radionuclide-complexing effects of carbonate are described in Chapter 7, mentioned only in passing in Chapter 3, and not mentioned at all in Chapter 6.

Response

A more balanced discussion of carbonate now appears in all three chapters.

Issue

One reviewer felt that the presence of carnallite, organic matter, and hydrocarbons at the Davis Canyon site and their absence at the Deaf Smith site should result in Davis Canyon being ranked lower than, or at least equal to, Deaf Smith.

Response

In the final EA, the Davis Canyon and the Deaf Smith sites are considered to have approximately equal geochemical properties. The uncertainties regarding organic materials (including hydrocarbons) are great because of the paucity of data for both sites. The available data indicate that carnallite may not be a problem at the Davis Canyon site because the carnallite-bearing zone apparently thins in the direction of Davis Canyon; however, this is also uncertain. Potential problems at the Deaf Smith site include the presence of mudstone interbeds and intercrystalline muds that contain clay minerals. Both carnallite and the muds and mudstone interbeds may provide high-magnesium brines during the lifetime of the repository.

Issue

A commenter expressed concern that a statement in Chapter 7 to the effect that the clays at the Swisher and the Deaf Smith sites would "strongly enhance" the sorption of radionuclides is not supported by the discussion in Chapter 6.

Response

In Chapter 7 of the final EAs no credit is taken for the sorptive properties of clays at either the Swisher or the Deaf Smith site.

Issue

One commenter noted that, in regard to favorable condition 2 of the geocemistry guidelines, Chapters 6 and 7 state that "brines will tend to promote the agglomeration of some types of colloids" and that the highly saline ground waters at the Richton Dome will inhibit the formation of colloids. On the basis of the evaluation in the draft EA, it cannot be unequivocally claimed that the evidence supports a favorable finding for this condition.

Response

It should be noted that favorable condition 2 covers a number of geochemical mechanisms, one of which is the formation of colloids. The final EA states that too little is known about particulates, colloids, and organics at each site to evaluate them at this time; favorable condition 1 is evaluated on the basis of other, and better-known, geochemical mechanisms.

Issue

A commenter pointed out that the Richton Dome is ranked lower than the bedded-salt sites, partly because the ground water at Richton is "less reducing than that of the bedded salt sites." The commenter claimed that the data do not support this statement.

Response

This discussion has been modified in the final EA. All three salt sites are now considered to be equal in terms of geochemical conditions, partly because of the paucity of data.

Issue

Some commenters noted that potentially adverse condition 3 of the geochemistry guideline (oxidizing conditions) is present at Yucca Mountain but was not considered in the overall evaluation of the five sites in Chapter 7.

Response

This omission is acknowledged. Potentially adverse condition 3, which is present only at Yucca Mountain, has been considered in the evaluation of the five sites in the final EA.

Issue

One reviewer suggested that, because the Yucca Mountain site is in the unsaturated zone and is not expected to become saturated with infiltrating surface water, the presence of oxidizing conditions (potentially adverse condition 3) is irrelevant. The lack of ground water in the Topopah Springs Member of the Paintbrush Tuff suggests that this condition does not apply to this site.

Response

This condition does apply because ground water, as defined in the guidelines, includes the water in the unsaturated zone whether transient or trapped in pore spaces.

Issue

A commenter noted that a statement in Chapter 7 indicates that no heat-induced alteration of zeolites in tuff at Yucca Mountain is expected. This is inconsistent with Chapter 6, which states that heulandite and smectite may be adversely affected by the heat emitted from the waste emplaced in the repository.

Response

This inconsistency has been corrected in the final EA.

C.3.4.1.4 Rock characteristics

Issue

Two commenters disagreed that "phenomena that could affect isolation... are not expected to have significant effects at any of the sites," as stated on page 7-27 of the draft EAs. One of them said that this statement revealed the DOE's intention of not using certain guidelines.

Response

The cited statement was poorly worded. It should have read "phenomena that could affect isolation...are not expected to produce effects exceeding regulatory limits at any of the sites." As can be seen from Chapters 6 and 7 of the draft and final EAs, each site was evaluated against every technical guideline, and every technical guideline was used in the comparative evaluation of sites.

Issue

One commenter felt that the summary section did not give a detailed explanation of the expected effects of brine migration at each site.

Response

Brine migration is discussed in Section 6.3.1.3.6 of each EA.

Issue

One commenter felt that on favorable condition 2 for postclosure rock characteristics all sites could be given a finding of "present," but should not be considered equal. The commenter felt that the salt sites should be given a higher rating because more of the three conditions specified--high thermal conductivity, low coefficient of thermal expansion, and sufficient ductility to seal fractures--have been demonstrated in salt.

Response

In the final evaluation of sites for recommendation for site characterization, the postclosure guideline on rock characteristics--including the cited favorable condition--is only one of the three guidelines grouped together in a major consideration that examines the effects of repository-induced heat.

Issue

One commenter asked whether rock porosity has been adequately measured.

Response

Since the largest specimens sampled to date are the cores from exploratory drilling, this is the size of specimens on which porosity has been measured. Larger-scale measurements of porosity can be made indirectly by geophysical logging techniques. Larger-scale measurements of porosity will be made during site characterization.

Issue

One commenter requested that the differences between the expected performance of the saturated and the unsaturated zones be mentioned in the discussion of postclosure rock characteristics in the EA for the Hanford site.

Response

The DOE recognizes that there are distinct and different advantages to each of these emplacement conditions. Since the candidate horizon at the Hanford site is in the saturated zone, it is inappropriate to describe the advantages of the unsaturated zone in the EA for the Hanford site.

Issue

One commenter requested that the magnitude of the thermal pulse be discussed in the EAs, to evaluate its significance for the postclosure guidelines.

Response

The effects of heat are described in Sections 6.3.1.3.4, 6.3.1.3.6, and 6.3.1.3.7 of the EAs. Not all the expected effects of heat are discussed in a particular section.

Issue

One commenter asked whether fractures can be thermally induced.

Response

Fractures can be thermally induced, but fractures have not been observed to be sizable under dry conditions. Thermally induced fractures usually occur from rapid increases or decreases in the heat content of a rock or through heat loadings that would be far more severe than those of a repository. Additional data on the potential effects of thermally induced fracturing on repository performance will be gathered during site characterization.

Issue

One party felt that, according to the results in Table 7-17, the basalt site (Hanford) should be ranked higher than the Deaf Smith site.

Response

In regard to Table 7-17 of the draft EAs, the commenter is correct.

Issue

A commenter disagreed with the finding for the Hanford site of "not present" for potentially adverse condition 2 of the rock-characteristics guideline, saying that "the potential for thermally induced fracturing and for the dehydration of fracture (infilling) material is present at the Hanford site, though it may occur only in areas near individual waste packages."

Response

The reasoning behind the finding of "not present" for potentially adverse condition 2 for this guideline is given in Section 6.3.1.3.6 of the final EA for the Hanford site.

Issue

One commenter questioned the basis for the statement that potential stability problems would not affect the containment and isolation capability of the Hanford site.

Response

At the Hanford site, all excavations would be backfilled before closure, but there would be some limits to the degree of rock adjustment that can take place. The Hanford site is not initially taking credit for the containment capability of the host rock and intends to demonstrate that the site performs acceptably without taking credit for travel through the dense interior.

Issue

One commenter felt that the evaluation of the Richton Dome site against the postclosure guideline on rock characteristics should consider the presence of anomalous zones.

Response

The DOE acknowledges this concern and has expanded Sections 6.3.3.2.1 and 6.3.1.3.2 in the final EA for the Richton Dome to discuss this topic.

Issue

One commenter asked why the Davis Canyon and the Deaf Smith sites were ranked close together on postclosure rock characteristics when the discussion for the preclosure guideline on rock characteristics indicates more-substantial differences between the sites.

Response

The term "flexibility" is considered to have a different meaning in the preclosure and the postclosure guidelines. Before closure, the DOE is concerned about whether a repository can be constructed. For the postclosure period, the DOE is concerned about how well the host rock (and other components) will isolate the waste from the accessible environment. Thus,

the flexibility portions of the two guidelines are not equivalent. The preclosure and the postclosure evaluations are consistent with the intent of each guideline.

Issue

One commenter felt that insufficient credit has been given to the Davis Canyon site for the higher rock strength that results from a lack of clay insolubles in the host rock.

Response

Because of the lack of data from boreholes, rock strength at the Davis Canyon site is associated with a high uncertainty. Salt in general is a low-strength rock and is described as such in Section 6.3.1.3 of the EA for Davis Canyon. To claim an advantage for the Davis Canyon site at this time is not considered conservative.

Issue

One commenter stated that at the Davis Canyon site the carnallite contained in the rock salt would melt at repository operating temperatures, producing corrosive brine and volume changes.

Response

The corrosive effects of carnallite are discussed in Section 3.2.7 of the EA for Davis Canyon. The volume percentage of carnallite is small, and the effect of melting such a small volumetric fraction is not considered significant at present.

Issue

One commenter was concerned that at the Davis Canyon site the repository horizon would be the uppermost salt bed (salt cycle 6), and hence the salt barriers to the upward migration of radionuclides would be minimal.

Response

The significant Pennsylvanian and Permian strata overlying the host rock would provide an adequate barrier. Furthermore, the hydrologic gradients at the site are predominantly downward.

Issue

One comment about the Davis Canyon site said that thermal uplift will cause fracturing in the upper 625 feet of the overburden above the site, including extensive portions of the Cedar Mesa and the Elephant Canyon Formations, both of which supply water to wells and springs in the Canyonlands National Park.

Response

Thermal uplift has been calculated to provide a maximum lift of approximately 1 meter. Thermal dispersion would probably prevent this uplift from seriously displacing strata and interrupting aquifer continuity.

Issue

One commenter felt that the Yucca Mountain site should be ranked more highly on postclosure rock characteristics than the Deaf Smith site because Yucca Mountain appears to be more favorable in Table 7-3.

Response

The principal reason for this apparent discrepancy is explained in the fourth paragraph on page 7-27 of the draft EAs.

C.3.4.1.5 Climatic change

Issue

One reviewer questioned whether it is worth worrying about an increased precipitation and runoff in the next 10,000 years and the potential for perched water that might intersect the repository shaft.

Response

The DOE agrees. Such a scenario does not appear in the final EA.

Issue

A reviewer said that the Hanford site should be ranked lowest on the climatic-change guideline because of the potential for catastrophic flooding and lakes, as evidenced by recent catastrophic flooding.

Response

The Hanford site would not be affected by catastrophic flooding after repository closure because such flooding occurs on the surface and the shafts and boreholes would be sealed.

Issue

The reviewer inquired as to whether changes in surface-water conditions at the salt sites could increase salt dissolution and why these changes were not considered.

Response

This question is addressed in Section 6.3.1.4.2 of the draft and the final EAs for the salt sites.

Issue

One party noted that, in the climatic-change guideline, the conclusion for potentially adverse condition 1 for the Deaf Smith site is based on available data for the Quaternary Period. Yet the discussion on favorable condition 2 states that data for the Deaf Smith site are insufficient to determine the effects of changes on the hydrologic system.

Response

Potentially adverse condition 1 and favorable condition 2 are quite different. The latter states that climate changes have had little effect on the hydrologic system, whereas the potentially adverse condition states that climate changes could affect the ground-water flow system to significantly increase the transport of radionuclides to the accessible environment. Thus, the available data are adequate to address one, but not the other, condition.

Issue

One comment pointed out that an increase in the recharge and discharge of aquifers may not alter permeability within a salt sequence but might increase salt dissolution at the salt-rock interface and salt margins.

Response

While dissolution in these areas may be increased during times of increased recharge and discharge, the calculated rates of dissolution are conservative to account for any additional dissolution that may result from the increased availability of water.

Issue

The sites are ranked equally with respect to climatic change, yet Table 7-4 seems to rank Yucca Mountain slightly better than the other sites.

Response

In Table 7-4 of the draft EAs the Yucca Mountain site shows "not present" for a potentially adverse condition related to a potential rise in the water table. This applies only to Yucca Mountain; the other sites are below the unsaturated zone.

C.3.4.1.6 Erosion

A number of commenters expressed concern that the DOE has not adequately considered all information in the comparative evaluation of the sites against the guideline on erosion. The issues raised include changes in the ranking of sites, the relative importance of the potentially adverse and favorable conditions, and specific comments on erosion at Yucca Mountain and Hanford.

Issue

One commenter proposed that all sites except Yucca Mountain be ranked equal on the erosion guideline; Yucca Mountain should have a lower ranking because the repository would be closer to the surface.

Response

As stated in the draft EA, the objective of the erosion guideline is to ensure that erosional process acting on the surface will not be likely to lead to radionuclide releases greater than those allowed by regulations. The ranking evaluations in the draft EA were based on the qualifying, favorable, and potentially adverse conditions as they influence this objective.

Issue

One party argued that the favorable and potentially adverse condition for the erosion guideline are not of equal importance and should not be treated as equal.

Response

The DOE agrees. The qualifying condition relates to the requirements of 40 CFR Part 191, as implemented by the provisions of 10 CFR Part 60, and therefore the second favorable condition, if it is present, is the most significant because, according to 40 CFR Part 191, events with less than one chance in 10,000 over 10,000 years need not be considered in assessing postclosure performance. In general, if favorable condition 2 is present at a site, favorable condition 3 also is likely to be present and both potentially adverse conditions are likely to be absent. Because favorable condition 2 is present at all sites, all sites are rated equal with respect to the qualifying condition.

Issue

For the Hanford site, questions were raised regarding the proposed depth of the repository versus favorable condition 1 and the erosion depth from regional base levels discussed in favorable condition 2.

Response

Favorable condition 1 does not limit the depth of a repository; it merely says that ability to emplace waste at least 300 meters below the surface is favorable. The regional base levels in the draft and final EA for Hanford should be considered as bounding estimates, not as best estimates. Even under bounding estimates, Hanford was found to have favorable condition 2 and thus is rated the same as the other sites.

Issue

One commenter expressed concern that the evaluation of Yucca Mountain did not fully take into account portions of the repository whose depth is less than 300 meters.

Response

As reported in the draft and the final EA for Yucca Mountain, the minimum thickness of the overburden above the underground facility is about 230 meters, at the western edge of the primary area. However, for about 50 percent of Yucca Mountain the overburden is more than 300 meters thick. Because all of the repository would be at a depth greater than 200 meters, the site would not be disqualified. As stated in the draft EA, the fact that Yucca Mountain does not possess favorable condition 1 (waste emplacement below 300 meters) does not appear significant, because an evaluation of erosion rates for Yucca Mountain, applied to the 230-meter minimum depth, indicates that erosion would not significantly affect waste isolation over the next 10,000 years.

C.3.4.1.7 Dissolution

Issue

One reviewer felt that the draft EA did not consistently treat the favorable and the potentially adverse condition under dissolution for the three salt sites.

Response

The dissolution section in the final EAs has been revised to present a more consistent discussion of the two conditions for the salt sites.

Issue

One commenter objected to the statement that no significant dissolution has been identified at the Deaf Smith site because the statement is based on data from a well 3 miles from the site and seismic-reflection data that do not "cover" the site.

Response

While the available data from the area of the site do not unequivocally show that there is no dissolution at or near the site, data from boreholes, seismic-reflection measurements, as well as surface mapping have uncovered no evidence that significant dissolution occurred beneath the Southern Highlands at any time during the Quaternary Period.

Issue

One reviewer asked why the Pennsylvanian faults that occur 7 miles from the Davis Canyon site were not mentioned in the discussion on dissolution and whether the rates at which dissolution fronts are migrating could increase with the predicted increase in precipitation.

Response

The faults described by the reviewer die out in the lower part of the Paradox Formation; these faults have no surface expression. In addition, no indication of dissolution has been observed to be associated with these faults. In regard to the second question, no dissolution fronts have been identified in the study area. Discrete dissolution features like Lockhart Basin and Beef Basin may be affected by an increase in precipitation; however, the current rate of dissolution is not known.

Issue

One commenter objected to Yucca Mountain's receiving a finding of "not present" for the potentially adverse condition under the dissolution guideline. The repository would be near the breccia of the Solitario Canyon fault zone, which the draft EA does not discount as a dissolution phenomenon. Therefore, unless sufficient data are available to show that the fault is not related to caldera collapse, it should be assumed that the fault is a dissolution feature and the Yucca Mountain site should be considered as having this potentially adverse condition.

Response

The solubility of tuff in ground water is extremely low; furthermore, the hypothesis that the Solitario Canyon fault is a dissolution feature is not credible. Any breccia associated with the fault zone is of tectonic origin, and there is no logical reason to believe that the fault is the result of dissolution.

C.3.4.1.8 Tectonics

A number of commenters expressed concern that the DOE did not adequately consider all information in determining numerical ratings for the postclosure guideline on tectonics. Among the issues raised were the treatment of preexisting faults at the Deaf Smith site, the potential for diapirism in general and salt movement at the Gibson Dome as it relates to Davis Canyon, and the level of tectonic activity at the Yucca Mountain site.

Issue

One commenter wanted to know how preexisting faults at the Deaf Smith site were treated in the comparative evaluation against the postclosure guideline on tectonics.

Response

The evaluation of tectonic and igneous events is based on our understanding of those processes during the Quaternary Period. Faults that have been active during the Quaternary are more likely than older faults to be active now and for the next 10,000 years. The Deaf Smith site is different from the Davis Canyon site because Quaternary faults have been identified near Davis Canyon but not near Deaf Smith. Thus, Deaf Smith is more favorable with respect to Quaternary faults.

Issue

Some commenters asked why diapirism was not discussed in the comparative evaluation of sites, citing the Gibson Dome in Utah as a structure in which salt movement continues today.

Response

Potentially adverse condition 1 of the postclosure tectonics guideline is based on evidence of active tectonic processes, including diapirism. Although not explicitly discussed in Chapter 7, diapirism was evaluated in the draft EAs for the salt sites. As explained in Chapter 6 of the EAs, there is evidence that diapirism has not been active at any of the three salt sites during the Quaternary Period.

In regard to the Gibson Dome, the final EA for Davis Canyon explains that some degree of salt flow has occurred within the evaporite units near the Davis Canyon site, but the area of the site generally contains relatively undisturbed bedded salt.

Issue

Several comments pertained to the level of tectonic activity at the Yucca Mountain site and the treatment of tectonics in site evaluation.

Response

The evaluation of sites against the postclosure guideline on tectonics is primarily concerned with the effects of tectonic events on waste containment and isolation. As stated in the draft EA, the available data do not suggest that tectonic events at Yucca Mountain, Davis Canyon, and Hanford could both alter the hydrologic flow system and lead to radionuclide releases after repository closure. An accurate evaluation against the postclosure guideline on tectonics includes not only an assessment of the probabilities of events but also an assessment of whether an event could adversely affect the repository system.

In the final EA for the Yucca Mountain site, the discussion of repository performance has been expanded in Chapter 6 because the tectonic activity warrants additional discussion. The revised discussion adds perspective to issues on postclosure tectonics. It includes such factors as ground-water flux and travel time, waste-package integrity, the careful consideration during repository development of recognizable faults that appear to have any possibility of movement, and the geochemical capabilities of the site. While many studies remain to be completed, particularly with respect to probabilities, preliminary assessments of system performance suggest that tectonic events are not likely to lead to radionuclide releases in excess of regulatory limits.

Issue

One commenter argued that the DOE failed to identify or evaluate the seismic risk at Yucca Mountain (as shown in a map of seismic risk produced by

the U.S. Geological Survey). The map clearly shows that Yucca Mountain is in a region of major seismic risk. The seismic risk in this region is much higher, in fact, than that at any of the other sites.

Response

The draft EAs recognize that the tectonic hazard at the Yucca Mountain site is higher than that for the other sites (page 7-116). Both the postclosure and the preclosure rankings (pages 7-44 and 7-115) reflect this relative comparison.

If the Yucca Mountain site is selected for characterization, site-specific estimates of seismic hazards will be made during characterization. In parallel with this, each site will be evaluated for the significance of tectonic hazards with respect to the total risk.

C.3.4.1.9 Natural resources

A number of commenters expressed concern that the DOE did not adequately consider all information in ranking the sites for the postclosure guideline on natural resources. The issues raised include the evaluation of future resources and the use of artificial markers as well as specific comments on resources at Deaf Smith, Davis Canyon, Hanford, and Yucca Mountain.

Issue

One commenter pointed out that the resources of today may not be the resources people will seek in the distant future.

Response

The evaluation of natural resources has been based on "reasonable projections of value, scarcity, and technology," as stated in the qualifying condition of the guideline. This statement is meant to reflect the NRC's 10 CFR Part 60, which states that the evaluation of the resource potential should consider whether economic extraction is currently feasible or potentially feasible during the foreseeable future. Thus the goal of natural-resource assessment is to ensure an acceptably low likelihood of postclosure human activities that would be detrimental to waste containment or isolation. This does not mean that the future development of a "new" resource can be absolutely ruled out, but, on the basis of our present understanding, this potential can be minimized. Furthermore, it is expected that permanent markers and records will also reduce the potential for human interference at the repository site.

Issue

One party commented that Chapter 7 of the draft EAs contained no more than a passing mention of artificial markers and asked whether there are any site-specific factors affecting the use of such markers.

Response

As stated in the qualifying condition for the postclosure guideline on natural resources, in assessing the likelihood of postclosure intrusion, the DOE will consider the estimated effectiveness of permanent markers and records. In evaluating the sites against the guidelines, the EAs qualitatively considered the effectiveness of markers and records in reducing the likelihood of human intrusion within the controlled area.

Issue

One party said that the Hanford site has a potential for ground-water resources and natural gas and should be disqualified for that reason.

Response

As discussed in the final EA for the Hanford site, the finding for potentially adverse condition 1 has been changed from "not present" to "present" because of the potential uses of ground-water resources and natural gas. It should be noted, however, that although source beds (for hydrocarbons) may exist beneath the basalt, present exploration activity has not found adequate evidence of significant concentrations of any mineral or rock that is unique to the Hanford site. The geothermal potential of the site is considered nonfavorable. The revised evaluation of the Hanford site is based on the latest information on the potential for hydrocarbon and other resources. As the potential for resource extraction is by nature speculative and the use of permanent markers and records will assist in reducing the likelihood of human intrusion within the controlled area to very low values, the Hanford site should not be disqualified because of the potential for natural resources.

Issue

One commenter suggested that the EA for Davis Canyon evaluate ground water and the Colorado River as valuable natural resources. Another commenter noted that, although Chapter 7 suggests that only minor aquifers exist above the host rock at Davis Canyon, the Cedar Mesa sandstone aquifer, which overlies the host rock, is used as a water supply for the Canyonlands National Park.

Resources

As discussed in the final EA for Davis Canyon, ground-water use in the area and vicinity of the site is minimal. Existing wells yield small quantities of ground water from the Glen Canyon Group as well as the Cedar Mesa and Cutler strata; however, these wells are less than 400 feet deep. As such, ground water is not expected to have an adverse effect on the ground-water flow system. Section 3.3.1.5 of the final EA discusses water availability and demand, including the amounts of water available from the Colorado River in a Davis Canyon region. Because the Colorado River is too far for its use to be practical, it was not considered significant as a potential resource that would directly affect the Davis Canyon site.

The commenter is correct in noting that the Cedar Mesa sandstone aquifer supplies water for Canyonlands; however, this aquifer is not highly productive at the Davis Canyon site. As summarized in Chapter 3 of the draft EA, this aquifer produced only a few gallons per minute from its entire thickness at well GD-1.

Issue

One party questioned the assessment of natural resources at Yucca Mountain, saying that the mineral potential had been ineffectually evaluated.

Response

As discussed in the final EA for the Yucca Mountain site, there are no energy or mineral resources for which economic extraction is feasible in the foreseeable future. The DOE does not agree that the mineral potential of the site has been ineffectually evaluated. The evaluation is based on a review of the literature, exploration and geologic mapping by the U.S. Geological Survey, and geochemical analyses of cores and cuttings taken from boreholes at and near Yucca Mountain.

C.3.4.1.10 Site ownership and control

Issue

The draft EA states that there is no basis for distinguishing among the sites in terms of site ownership and control at the beginning of the postclosure period, and therefore all sites were ranked equally on this guideline. One commenter asked why, if this is correct, land ownership is one of the guidelines.

Response

The postclosure guideline on site ownership and control is included in the siting guidelines to ensure consistency with the portion of NRC regulations in 10 CFR Part 60 that addresses the long-term control of the site by the DOE (10 CFR 60.121). In addition, this postclosure guideline is distinguished from the preclosure guideline on site ownership and control in two ways. First, the favorable condition for the preclosure guideline refers to the control of "...all surface and subsurface mineral and water rights by the DOE," whereas the favorable condition for the postclosure guideline refers to the "control of land and all surface and subsurface rights by the DOE." Second, the preclosure guideline is directed at the DOE's ability to control access to the site during repository operation, under the requirements of the system guideline for radiological safety. The postclosure guideline, in contrast, is a part of the human-interference guideline (960.4-2-8), which is intended to ensure that future generations will not compromise the integrity of the repository. Thus, although the DOE does not believe that there is currently a basis for discriminating among sites on the basis of postclosure site ownership and control, the guideline serves a necessary function in the siting process.

C.3.4.2 Comparison of sites on the basis of preclosure guidelines

The preclosure guidelines are divided into three groups, in order of decreasing importance: (1) preclosure radiological safety; (2) socioeconomics, environment, and transportation; and (3) ease and cost of siting, construction, operation, and closure. The issues raised in comments on the evaluation of the sites against these guidelines are summarized and addressed in this section.

C.3.4.2.1 Preclosure radiological safety

The preclosure guidelines on radiological safety consist of four separate guidelines: (1) population density and distribution, (2) site ownership and control, (3) meteorology, and (4) offsite installations and operations.

C.3.4.2.1.1 Population density and distribution

Issue

Many commenters stated that the evaluation of the Hanford site against the guideline on population density and distribution did not take into account the approximately 12,000 workers that the DOE and its contractors currently employ at the Hanford Site or the 3,500 of these 12,000 workers who work in the vicinity of the potential repository site. These commenters stated that the objective of the guideline is to protect the health and safety of both the public and repository workers and that the evaluation presented in the draft EA ignored the safety of the Hanford workers. Several of these commenters said that it is ridiculous to argue that the 3,500 Hanford workers in the vicinity of the site are "not members of the general public" as the draft EA states on page 7-57. Others insisted that the presence of these Hanford workers constitutes a high daytime population density for the site.

Response

The DOE agrees that the 3,500 Hanford workers must be considered members of the general public for the purposes of this evaluation. However, these persons work in the general vicinity of the site and not, as the guideline condition stipulates, "within the projected site boundaries."

Issue

One commenter noted that the draft EA reported the population density for the Hanford site as 43 persons per square mile and for the Richton Dome site as 40 persons per square mile, but nonetheless the Hanford site received a much higher score on this guideline than did the Richton Dome.

Response

The guideline on population density and distribution requires the DOE to evaluate the remoteness of the site from highly populated areas in

addition to the population density of the general region of the site. While the population density is similar for both sites, the controlled area of a repository at the Richton Dome site would be adjacent to the town of Richton.

Issue

A few commenters stated that the evaluations of sites against the first favorable condition of the guideline on population density and distribution should consider transient populations. These commenters suggested that this condition might affect the population density given for the Davis Canyon site.

Response

Transient populations are explicitly considered by the first potentially adverse condition, which addresses high residential, seasonal, or daytime population densities within the projected site boundaries. Chapter 7 of the final EA also addresses such transient populations as users of offroad vehicles. These considerations do not significantly affect the population density for the Davis Canyon site.

C.3.4.2.1.2 Site ownership and control

Issue

Many commenters stated that the ranking of the Yucca Mountain and the Davis Canyon sites--both of which are on land owned by the Federal Government-- below the Richton Dome and Deaf Smith sites is indefensible and highly artificial. They insisted that to transfer land belonging to the Federal Government is easier than obtaining private land. One person said that persons who face the loss of their property will go through every legal means possible to keep their land. Another pointed out that the acquisition of private land is time consuming and expensive and that affected landowners have testified that they will not enter into voluntary leases or purchase-sell agreements; this commenter claimed that even identifying all of the affected owners of surface and subsurface rights will take time, given the large number of owners involved.

Two commenters noted that the Congressional action described as necessary in the draft EA for the Yucca Mountain and Davis Canyon sites would not be necessary until the time, or after, Congress approves the site for a repository, pursuant to Section 115 of the Act. They felt that it was ridiculous to argue that Congress would override a State veto of a site selection and then fail to expeditiously transfer land title to the DOE. All of these commenters therefore recommended ranking the Yucca Mountain and the Davis Canyon sites above the Richton Dome and the Deaf Smith sites because they believe that the transfer of land between Federal agencies is easier than obtaining private land.

One commenter stated that to obtain land at the Richton Dome site would create major, negative, and highly disruptive impacts for innocent citizens and that these impacts could be avoided at either the Yucca Mountain or the

Davis Canyon site. Another party suggested that the Richton Dome site should be ranked below the Deaf Smith site because the privately owned land at Deaf Smith is agricultural land, of which there is no shortage.

Response

The guideline addresses only the complexity of procedures for acquiring the needed land. The complexity of these procedures does not necessarily reflect the value of the land or the associated social or economic impacts. The DOE is aware of the socioeconomic impact of acquiring lands, especially privately owned lands, and the socioeconomic aspects of land acquisition are considered under the socioeconomic guideline. For example, the DOE recognizes that the condemnation of privately owned lands could disrupt the lives of displaced landowners.

Issue

One commenter recommended that the Richton Dome site be ranked last, just below the Deaf Smith site, because there are more landowners at Richton Dome than at Deaf Smith.

Response

The DOE has not determined exactly how many landowners there are at the Deaf Smith and the Richton Dome sites. If one or both of these sites are recommended for site characterization, the DOE will identify the affected landowners as part of the formal land-acquisition process.

C.3.4.2.1.3 Meteorology

Issue

One commenter stated that it is not possible to make a comparative evaluation of the sites against the meteorology guideline, because of the lack of data and inconsistencies in the types and quantities of data available for the various sites.

Response

The siting guidelines acknowledge that complete data would not be available for all evaluations of the sites against the guidelines. The guidelines provide for evaluating sites on the basis of available data. In evaluating the sites against the meteorology guideline, the DOE used best estimates based on available data and conservative assumptions.

Issue

Several persons commented on population considerations under the guideline on meteorology. One commenter stated that the size of offsite populations has not been appropriately considered under the ranking. Another noted that site comparisons would be facilitated if all EAs expressed

population density as "persons per square mile" rather than "population densities higher than average." Another commenter requested that the workers employed at the Hanford Site be considered under this guideline.

Response

The meteorology guideline is concerned primarily with meteorological conditions and events that could affect the transport of radioactive materials to persons beyond the boundaries of the site. The characteristics of offsite populations are considered separately under the guideline on population density and distribution. Meteorological information is combined with information about the population to evaluate the sites under the system guideline for preclosure radiological safety. If in comparing the sites against the meteorology guideline the DOE used population characteristics other than those specified by the guideline (i.e., location and density relative to regional density), double counting for population conditions would result.

The workers at the Hanford Site have been considered in determining the regional population density and in the final EA are specifically addressed under the guideline on population density and distribution.

Issue

Some commenters noted that the draft EAs for the Davis Canyon and the Hanford sites were inconsistent in the evaluation of the first potentially adverse condition of the meteorology guideline, and this inconsistency is reflected in the comparative evaluations of Chapter 7. The draft EA for Davis Canyon states that the town of Moab, 33 miles downwind, is close enough for the first potentially adverse condition to be present. However, the draft EA for Hanford says that the downwind city of Richland is sufficiently far from the site (22 miles) for the first potentially adverse condition to be not present. Similarly, the Hanford site, which appears to have more stagnation episodes than Davis Canyon, was ranked higher for dispersion conditions.

Response

The EAs have been revised to take a consistent approach on this condition. They define "prevailing meteorological conditions" to mean the most common annual average wind direction in any 22.5-degree sector and consider nearby population centers to be within a radius of 50 miles from the site, unless it is possible to document that atmospheric dispersion is sufficient to permit a smaller radius. As a result of this approach, the final EAs for both the Davis Canyon and the Hanford sites consider this potentially adverse condition to be present.

Issue

The Hanford site is not considered to have the second potentially adverse condition, which pertains to extreme weather, although Chapter 3 of the EA shows that part of the site would be inundated by the probable maximum flood and that the area has experienced a maximum snowfall of 24.5 inches.

Response

The second potentially adverse condition refers to the historical frequency of extreme weather. The probable maximum flood is a statistical worst-case flood. The DOE considers the 100-year flood to be an appropriately severe flood for this condition. The record snowfall occurred in 1916 and is not considered representative of recurrent conditions in the area of the site.

C.3.4.2.1.4 Offsite installations and operations

Issue

One person asked the DOE to explain how two sites with the same number of deleterious conditions can have different utility values. Another commenter suggested that the Hanford site be disqualified under this guideline because of conflict with nearby atomic-energy defense activities or, if it can be demonstrated that the conflict is not irreconcilable, that the ranking of the site be significantly lowered.

Response

Section 6.2.1.5 of the EA for the Hanford site demonstrates that there will be no irreconcilable conflict between a repository and nearby atomic-energy defense activities.

Issue

One party asked the DOE to identify the other nuclear installations that contribute to radioactive releases in the area of the Davis Canyon site.

Response

The contributing facilities are three uranium mines. They are discussed in Section 7.3.1.1.4 of the draft EA for the Davis Canyon site.

C.3.4.2.2 Environment, socioeconomics, and transportation

This group of preclosure guidelines consists of separate guidelines on (1) environmental quality, (2) socioeconomic impacts, and (3) transportation.

C.3.4.2.2.1 Environmental quality

Issue

A commenter requested that the sites be compared on the basis of their relative risk to water resources.

Response

The final EAs contain an evaluation of compliance with the ground-water protection requirements of the final EPA standards, 40 CFR Part 191 (EPA, 1985). These standards require that the repository may not cause the radionuclide concentrations in "a special source of ground water" to exceed specified limits for 1,000 years after waste emplacement.

The presence of sources of ground water suitable for crop irrigation or human consumption without treatment is potentially adverse condition 2 of the postclosure guideline on geohydrology. The comparative evaluation of sites did include this condition (see Sections C.3.4.1.2 and C.5.1 for comments on geohydrology). In addition, the comparative evaluation included in the disqualifying condition for the preclosure guideline on socioeconomic impacts pertains to significant effects on the quantity or the quality of water from major water supplies (see Sections C.3.4.2.2 and C.7.4).

Issue

One commenter contended that the EA for the basalt (Hanford) site should acknowledge the presence of potentially adverse conditions regarding (1) projected major conflicts with environmental requirements and (2) significant adverse environmental impacts that cannot be avoided or mitigated. This contention was based on claims of uncontained hazardous materials and controversy over the discharges of radioactive materials from DOE facilities at Hanford.

Response

The guideline on environmental quality is concerned with significant adverse environmental impacts at the repository site. It does not address the effects of unrelated activities.

Issue

One commenter stated that the DOE has not done the work to determine whether or not significant Yakima Indian cultural or religious resources would be adversely affected, especially in light of previous effects on Gable Mountain. He felt that the fifth potentially adverse condition should be considered present at the Hanford site.

Response

Parts of Gable Mountain have been examined by a reconnaissance-level study that identified Gable Mountain and Gable Butte as having religious significance to local Indian groups. The DOE maintains that site characterization and repository development can be performed at the Hanford site without exerting any significant adverse effects on any significant Native American religious or cultural resources.

Issue

One person felt that the ranking of the Richton site should be lowered because environmental impacts would be experienced by the persons living at the site.

Response

The nearness of the town of Richton has been given due consideration in the evaluation of that site against the guideline on population density and distribution (see Sections C.3.4.2.1 and C.6.1 for comments on that guideline). To consider the population of Richton in evaluations against the guideline on environmental quality would result in double counting.

Issue

Several commenters said that greater emphasis should be placed on the proximity of the Davis Canyon site to the Canyonlands National Park.

Response

The guideline on environmental quality calls for an assessment of effects on any national parks and of irreconcilable conflicts with a park. The final EA for the Davis Canyon site presents such an evaluation for the Canyonlands National Park; the evaluation uses criteria developed by the National Park Service to test for irreconcilable conflicts. (See also Sections C.3.3 and C.7.1.)

Issue

One person said that the comparative evaluations should consider the uncertainties about the ability of the Deaf Smith site to comply with the requirements of the Texas Mine Shaft Act.

Response

The DOE acknowledges that uncertainties about compliance with environmental requirements should be considered in the comparative evaluation. The evaluation of the Deaf Smith site has been revised to address the uncertainty about compliance with the Texas Mine Shaft Act.

Issue

One commenter asked whether the DOE will guarantee protection of the Ogallala aquifer or, if not, how the DOE proposes to mitigate any releases into the Ogallala.

Response

It is the DOE's position that the quality of the environment at the Deaf Smith site can be adequately protected. Sections 4.2.1.4 and 5.2.2 of the Deaf Smith EA address protection of the Ogallala aquifer.

Issue

Several issues were raised about the Davis Canyon site. One commenter stated that air-quality impacts are double counted, being considered both under the environmental quality and the meteorology guidelines. Several commenters questioned the DOE's ability to determine the presence of an irreconcilable conflict with the Canyonlands National Park, since it appears

that the DOE is not fully aware of the Park's designated uses. A commenter felt that, since neither favorable condition is present, the Davis Canyon site should possess both corresponding potentially adverse conditions. A commenter agreed that the site has the third potentially adverse condition, but believes it should have the fourth as well. It was noted by one commenter that the Davis Canyon site discussion should include the possibility of critical habitat. A commenter noted that the findings for the Davis Canyon site under the first and the third disqualifying conditions were based on insufficient data and questioned the statement that repository-related activities will be conducted within the park.

Response

The only evaluation of air-quality impacts occurs under the environmental quality guideline. The meteorology guideline is concerned primarily with radiological safety; it addresses only those meteorological conditions and phenomena that affect the transport of radioactive material to offsite areas.

The DOE has expanded the evaluation of Canyonlands National Park and possible impacts throughout Sections 4.2 and 5.2, with summaries presented in Sections 4.4.1 and 5.5.1. The results of the evaluations show that there will be no irreconcilable conflict with the uses of the park.

The guideline did not intend for the pairs of first and second conditions to be reciprocal. Each pair delineates a possible range for that condition. Therefore it is possible to not have either condition. For example, on the second set the favorable condition is not present because it cannot be projected that impacts will be mitigated to insignificant levels. The corresponding potentially adverse condition is not present, however, because it is projected that significant impacts can be mitigated to acceptable levels.

Because of potential effects on the Newspaper Rock State Historical Monument, the evaluation of the Davis Canyon site was revised to state that the fourth potentially adverse condition is present. A summary of possible critical habitats was added to the comparative evaluation, but the finding for the sixth potentially adverse condition was not changed.

The evaluation of potential effects on the Canyonlands National Park has been revised and expanded, but the finding that the site is not disqualified (see Section 6.2.1.6.4) was not changed. It remains the DOE's position that no repository-related activities will need to be conducted in the Park.

The DOE considers the revised comparative evaluation to place an appropriate emphasis on the proximity of the Davis Canyon site to Canyonlands National Park. This evaluation is supported by Sections 4.4.1 and 5.5.1, which have been added to the EA for the Davis Canyon site.

C.3.4.2.2.2 Socioeconomic impacts

Issue

One commenter stated that, in evaluating the sites on Federal land, acceptance by the local population at present should not be weighted too highly because the acceptance must persist for 1,000 to 10,000 years.

Response

Acceptance by the local population is not directly considered in the comparative evaluation of sites because it is not included in the siting guidelines. Public acceptance, however, may affect the degree of conflict between old and new residents and can be used as an indicator of social impacts. In this light, the DOE does consider public acceptance as a contributing factor to the potential for social impacts. The long duration of the repository is acknowledged by the siting guidelines, which assign primary importance to postclosure conditions.

Issue

One commenter expressed concern over the choice of Hanford as a site for characterization, saying that whether a repository would help to "stabilize general economic conditions" is not as important as the long-term safety of the site. The commenter stated that the Columbia River, which borders on the Hanford Site, is used for irrigation and that site characterization at Hanford could adversely affect the agricultural economies of the States of Washington and Oregon.

Response

In order to be considered for a repository, a site must meet the qualifying conditions of all the siting guidelines. Failure to meet even one condition will disqualify the site. The objective of the guidelines is to ensure that any site selected for a repository will meet all the regulatory requirements for the protection of the health and safety of the public and the quality of the environment. The ability to meet these requirements will have to be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, which will issue the authorization to construct the repository.

The DOE does not expect that site characterization for the Hanford site would adversely affect agriculture in the State of Washington or Oregon. Since no radioactive waste would be accepted at the site during this phase, there is no potential for radioactivity to enter the Columbia River through ground-water seepage.

Issue

One commenter suggested that the comparative evaluation of the Deaf Smith and the Richton sites against the guideline on socioeconomic impacts should rank Richton lower. This commenter stated that Deaf Smith's ranking was based on impacts to agriculture, but that we currently have more agricultural land in production than needed. Another commenter suggested that ranking the Deaf Smith site higher than Davis Canyon on socioeconomic impacts was arbitrary

because the discussion states that in-migration requiring mitigation will occur at both sites and that effects on agriculture, a major sector of the economy of Deaf Smith County, are possible. Two commenters objected that the DOE had failed to consider any of the most important socioeconomic impacts.

Response

Chapter 7 of the final EAs presents a revised discussion of the comparative evaluation against the socioeconomic guideline, including the reasons the Richton Dome site is believed to be slightly more favorable in terms of socioeconomic impacts than the Deaf Smith site and why it is expected that socioeconomic impacts would be most severe at the Davis Canyon site. For example, Chapter 7 explains why the potential for effects on community services is greater at the Richton Dome site than at the Deaf Smith site and why in-migration would exert more severe effects at Davis Canyon site than at Deaf Smith. Chapter 7 also discusses the agricultural industry near the Deaf Smith site as an important primary sector of the economy that supports significant employment and business sales. The DOE does not believe that the evaluation of potential socioeconomic impacts at the Deaf Smith site can be based on the amount of agricultural land in production in the United States.

The guideline on socioeconomic addresses the most significant impacts that may be induced by a repository. The favorable and potentially adverse conditions of that guideline were widely reviewed by the States, affected Indian Tribes, Federal agencies, and the public during the consultation process for the guidelines.

Issue

Many commenters objected that the 1980 data presented in the draft EA for the Davis Canyon site are out of date and lead to a misrepresentation of the potential socioeconomic impacts of locating a repository in the area. One commenter stated that housing is available in the area, the vacancy rate being 15 to 20 percent. Other persons said that the current unemployment rate reported by the Utah Department of Unemployment Security is 23 percent whereas the draft EA reports 7 percent. Another commenter noted that the area has an abundance of water to sell and that the sewage-treatment plant was built to accommodate an increase in populations, but the area has recently experienced a decrease in population. Similarly, several other parties noted that, whereas in 1980 the area's population was booming, the area is losing population. Others explained that Grand and San Juan Counties had experience in handling "boom" conditions and had successfully handled two uranium and one oil boom. Many commenters pointed out that the testimony at the public hearings in Utah and Texas showed that some residents of southeastern Utah feel that the socioeconomic impacts would be both favorable and manageable, while the residents of the Texas Panhandle believe that the socioeconomic impacts on the town of Vega and the general agricultural economy would be dramatic and severe. All of these commenters, therefore, suggested that the Davis Canyon site should be ranked higher on the socioeconomic guideline and at least above the Deaf Smith site.

Response

Having considered and evaluated the comments and the information included in them, the DOE has revised the discussion of milling operations in the area of the Davis Canyon site. The recent suspension of mining and milling operations in the area has caused local socioeconomic conditions to change, with currently greater housing availability, higher unemployment rates, lower school enrollments, lower per capita incomes, and greater out-migration. Section 3.6 of the EA for Davis Canyon has been updated in regard to information on housing, personal income, unemployment rates, school enrollment, and the total population.

The DOE, however, does not believe that the Davis Canyon site should be considered more favorable than the Deaf Smith site for socioeconomics. Davis Canyon is still the only site where the analysis predicts significant repository-related impacts on community services, housing supply, and local government agencies in the affected area (see the evaluations of the sites against the first favorable and the first potentially adverse conditions of the socioeconomics guideline).

Issue

One commenter asked the DOE to clarify the first full paragraph on page 7-84. This paragraph, which discusses potentially adverse conditions for socioeconomics, states that "at Davis Canyon, water requirements are also not expected to adversely affect future development; however, this judgment is preliminary, as there is some uncertainty about potential short-term disruption of the area water supply during repository construction at this site." The commenter asked whether this statement implied disruptions of ground water at the site.

Response

The statement does not imply disruptions of ground-water systems at the site. The judgment is preliminary because it depends on the completion of two new reservoirs in the Blanding and Monticello areas. The San Juan Planning Council expects to build these two new reservoirs to take care of economic development needs and is willing to sell or lease part of its appropriations.

Issue

One commenter asked how the repository's effect on the High Plains aquifer in Texas would change if farmers move to dry-land crops or significant reductions in water use.

Response

Trends toward dry-farming could make the relative impact of withdrawing water for repository-related uses much more severe. The final EA does consider this trend and the potential for relatively more severe effects on water rights as well as consequent effects on future development near the Deaf Smith site.

Issue

One commenter recommended that the DOE use the disqualifying condition for the socioeconomics guideline to disqualify the Deaf Smith site; this disqualifying condition pertains to adverse impacts on water quality or quantity. The same commenter stated that, even if the DOE proceeded to rank the five nominated sites, it should not rank the Deaf Smith site as a preferred site.

Response

Because the DOE can mitigate or compensate for the adverse impacts on water quality and quantity, the Deaf Smith site is not disqualified on the basis of the socioeconomics guideline. The need to acquire water rights that could affect future development in the area was considered in the comparative evaluation of the five nominated sites against the socioeconomics guideline. The selection of preferred sites, however, depends on a comparative evaluation of the nominated sites against all of the siting guidelines.

C.3.4.2.2.3 Transportation

Issue

Several commenters stated that certain factors were not adequately accounted for in the relative ranking of the sites. Examples of such factors are cost, the emergency-response capabilities of affected States, and weather hazards. One commenter alleged that only distance was considered.

Response

All of the factors in the transportation guideline were considered during the comparative evaluation of sites. These factors include, but are not limited to, those mentioned by the commenters: cost, emergency-response capabilities, weather hazards, and distance. The evaluations of the favorable and potentially adverse conditions for each site in Section 6.2.1.8 of the final EAs discuss the information used to reach the findings on the guideline conditions.

Issue

Commenters noted that the draft EAs do not state what weight was given to the various conditions of the transportation guideline. It was also suggested that certain favorable conditions, such as cost and risk, should be weighted more heavily than others. These commenters contended that the DOE had stated publicly that national cost and risk would be weighted at half the total transportation ranking, but no similar statement is contained in published documents.

Response

The DOE agrees that national cost and risk should be weighted more heavily than the other factors in the transportation guideline. In the draft

EA, the DOE considered national cost and risk (favorable condition 5 of the transportation guideline) to be weighted at 50 percent of the total importance of that guideline. A detailed explanation of the process used to evaluate the transportation conditions of the nominated sites for recommendation is contained in the multiattribute utility analysis of the nominated sites.

Issue

Several commenters expressed disagreement with the finding made by the DOE on the transportation-guideline conditions. They felt that, on the basis of the data presented, several of the findings for the favorable and potentially adverse conditions were unjustified. One commenter questioned that only the Richton site received a finding of "present" on favorable condition 5 (national cost and risk), and not Deaf Smith and Davis Canyon as well. Also noted were inconsistencies in the data for the various sites.

Response

Several of the findings for the favorable and potentially adverse conditions of the transportation guideline have been revised in the final EAs. These revisions are based on responses to public comments, additional data, and additional analyses. To ensure consistency among the sites for the guideline-condition findings, a common set of criteria was applied. The DOE believes that all the findings reported under the transportation guideline in the final EAs are valid at this stage of the site-selection process. The rationale for each finding for each condition is presented in Section 6.2.1.8 of the final EAs.

Some of the favorable and potentially adverse conditions require a comparison among sites, and hence only one site can receive a finding of "present." These conditions are so noted in Section 6.2.1.8 of the final EAs. For example, favorable condition 5 contains the phrase "which are significantly lower than those for comparable siting options"; for this condition, only one site--the site with the lowest costs and risks--can receive the finding of "present." It should be noted, however, that in the comparative evaluation of sites all available data for each site for each guideline condition were considered.

C.3.4.2.3 Ease and cost of siting, construction, and closure

Issue

A commenter questioned why the DOE did not rank the sites with respect to the system guideline on the ease and cost of siting, construction, operation, and closure. The commenter argued that a "ballpark" figure would be useful and implied that the DOE avoided this because the result would be unfavorable to the Hanford site.

Response

As explained in this appendix and in the EAs, only preliminary assessments of performance against the system guidelines are possible at

present (i.e., before site characterization), and the DOE feels that the results of such preliminary assessments would be inappropriate as bases for site-selection decisions.

Issue

Another commenter pointed out that the way that the EAs report costs makes ranking the sites on this basis difficult. The use of reference cases does not allow the site-specific construction and lifetime costs to be considered. The commenter was critical of the DOE's estimates of uncertainty, pointing out that cost overruns on some nuclear projects have exceeded 100 percent.

Response

The cost estimates in the EAs were based on the estimates of the total-system lifecycle costs that the DOE prepares annually each year for submittal to Congress as part of the fee-adequacy report. The repository is not comparable to nuclear power plants, some of which have indeed experienced large cost overruns. Furthermore, the DOE is financially accountable to Congress, and the expenditures of the repository program are audited by the General Accounting Office.

C.3.4.2.3.1 Surface characteristics

Issue

Some commenters felt that the interpretation of the potentially adverse condition of the guideline on surface characteristics was inconsistent in the various EAs and that the sites that are subject to potential flooding were not evaluated equitably: the Hanford, Yucca Mountain, and Richton sites were given credit for flood protection through engineering measures, whereas the Davis Canyon, Lavender, Cypress Creek, and Vacherie sites were not given credit for flood protection.

Response

The DOE has decided that flood protection through engineering measures cannot be considered in evaluations against the potentially adverse condition of this guideline because by allowing credit for such flood protection the DOE would eliminate a discriminating condition for this guideline. As a result, the Hanford, Yucca Mountain, and Richton sites were given a finding of "present" for this condition.

Issue

Some commenters pointed out that the Davis Canyon site was penalized in two guidelines (transportation and surface characteristics) for the rugged terrain that would be traversed by the access road and railroad. This penalty could be avoided by locating the surface facilities eastward in the flats away from the cliffs.

Response

Each site must be evaluated against every guideline regardless of any apparent duplication of penalties for site conditions. The Davis Canyon site contains rugged terrain; therefore, the favorable condition is not present. If the site is characterized, the plans for the layout of the surface facilities could be changed.

C.3.4.2.3.2 Rock characteristics

Issue

One commenter asked why the Hanford site was ranked lower on preclosure rock characteristics than the Deaf Smith and the Yucca Mountain sites.

Response

Since more exploration activity has occurred at the Hanford site than at the other sites, more data have been collected. Some of these data indicate that there are more conditions posing potential problems at this site than at the other sites. The conditions underground will not be adequately sampled until exploratory shafts have been sunk and underground excavations have been made at all sites.

Issue

One commenter asked whether a change in the buffer zone at Richton could change the degree of flexibility available at Richton and even require the use of a two-level design.

Response

Chapter 6 of the EA for the Richton Dome site has been revised to identify the assumptions and measurements made in claiming sufficient flexibility in preclosure rock characteristics. Several changes (not just the size of the buffer zone) could require the use of a two-level design at the Richton site.

Issue

One commenter questioned the Hanford site's being given a finding of "not present" for potentially adverse conditions 2 and 3.

Response

Chapter 6 of the EA for the Hanford site has been revised to explain the basis for these findings.

Issue

One commenter took issue with the small difference in rating between the Deaf Smith and the Davis Canyon sites for both preclosure flexibility and for ease of operation.

Response

Flexibility is only one of eight conditions considered in evaluating the sites on preclosure rock characteristics.

Issue

One commenter felt that the potential for high-pressure water inflow in regions of fractured rock will require "innovative engineering" and incur high costs at the Hanford site.

Response

The measures that would be required to mitigate these conditions are routinely used in mining. They are explained in Section 6.3.3.2.6 of the final EA for Hanford.

C.3.4.2.3.3 Hydrology

Issue

Several commenters questioned the appropriateness of the relative ranking of the five sites on the preclosure guideline on hydrology. One comment noted that the importance of the complexity of ground-water-control measures should not be equated with the potential for flooding or the availability of water. Another stated that the potentially adverse condition of ground-water conditions requiring complex engineering measures that are beyond reasonably available technology is present at Hanford, and therefore this site should be disqualified or heavily penalized in the relative ranking. A few comments stated that the relative rankings of Deaf Smith and Hanford were too favorable and should not be equal to those of Davis Canyon and Richton.

Response

As explained in Chapter 7 of the final EAs, the complexity of ground-water-control measures is indeed considered more important than the potential for flooding and the availability of water. The DOE does not agree, however, that the potentially adverse condition for the hydrology guideline is present at the Hanford site. The design features and construction techniques that would be used to minimize ground-water inflow into shafts and drifts at the Hanford site are based on mining experience under saturated conditions. The range of ground-water inflow conditions that are expected at Hanford can be accommodated with conventional design and construction methods; requirements for engineering measures beyond reasonably available technology are not expected. However, the relative complexity of ground-water-control measures at Hanford, as compared with the other sites, was taken into account.

Issue

One commenter noted that the Davis Canyon site was not correctly ranked on the hydrology guideline. Davis Canyon has enough flat land above the floodplain for construction and, unlike the other salt sites, has no large aquifers that require freezing for shaft sinking.

Response

The DOE agrees that, unlike the other two salt sites, the Davis Canyon site has no aquifers that require freezing for shaft sinking because only minor aquifers are present above the host rock. This favorable attribute was considered in the comparative evaluation of sites against the hydrology guideline. However, the location of the surface facilities of the repository is dictated by the need to mitigate visual aesthetic impacts to an acceptable level. Therefore, the DOE does not have the option of locating a repository at the Davis Canyon site on flat land above the floodplain.

Issue

One commenter felt that the finding for favorable condition 3, the availability of water required for repository construction, operation, and closure, should be changed to "not present" for the Davis Canyon site. The estimated water requirements for the project do not include the water needed for mitigation measures, such as site revegetation and water sprays to suppress dust. Moreover, purchasing existing water rights would foreclose uses dependent on existing water rights and would adversely affect new development in the area.

Response

The DOE has revised the table on repository characteristics in Chapter 5 of the final EA for the Davis Canyon site to clarify the water-resource requirements for the repository. The DOE acknowledges that withdrawal from the Colorado River, if this resource is used, would contribute to the increasing demand on the region's sparse water resources.

Issue

One commenter asked what preliminary data indicate that at the Deaf Smith site adequate quantities of water can be obtained from the Dockum Group.

Response

Well yields in the vicinity of the Deaf Smith site are in the range of 400 to 900 gallons per minute.

Issue

One comment noted that Yucca Mountain is not as favorable as the text suggests and that the difference between Yucca Mountain and the other sites is not substantial.

Response

With respect to the Yucca Mountain site, the ability to locate the repository in the unsaturated zone, where minimal measures for ground-water control will be required, minimal potential for flooding, and an ample supply of water at the site for repository siting, construction, operation, and closure are favorable for this site. It is not clear from the comment what features of the Yucca Mountain site were considered adverse by the commenter with respect to the favorable ranking on the hydrology guideline.

C.3.4.2.3.4 Tectonics

Issue

A number of commenters expressed concern that the DOE has not adequately considered all information in ranking sites on the preclosure guideline on tectonics.

Response

The comparative evaluations of sites in the draft EAs were based on the information available for the qualifying, favorable, and potentially adverse conditions as they influence the potential for ground motion and fault displacement. The final EAs more explicitly discuss the expected effects of earthquake ground motion and fault displacement for each site; the discussion is based on the evaluations.

Issue

Some parties questioned the evaluation of the Yucca Mountain site, particularly with respect to the potential effects of nearby faults and in-situ stress, the derivation of ground-motion estimates, and the potential use of NRC criteria for nuclear reactors (10 CFR Part 100, Appendix A).

Response

As discussed in Chapter 7 of the final EA, there are uncertainties about potential ground motion and the time of the last movement on faults near the site. However, these uncertainties are not so large as to preclude the findings that must be made at this stage of the site-selection process. The data needed for higher-level findings will be collected during site characterization.

The NRC has said that (see page 103 of the NRC comments on the draft EA for Yucca Mountain) "at the present time, it is premature to state that the design requirements for nuclear power plants are the same as those required for a waste repository. The DOE should consider stating at this time that the design requirements of structures important to safety will comply with 10 CFR 60 and appropriate EPA regulations." The DOE agrees and has never intended or stated that reactor criteria would or should be used. The DOE is developing an approach to determining the appropriate earthquake inputs for repository design. An annotated outline of this approach was sent to the NRC for comment on June 20, 1985.

No quantitative statements about earthquake probability and magnitude can be made at present on the basis of stress data. In deriving estimates of potential ground motion for Yucca Mountain, the DOE did not ignore the nearby faults, but did not explicitly consider each fault because the magnitude and the probability of earthquakes on these are not known. The DOE's judgments are based on the data base for strong ground motion and on the type and levels of ground motion that other facilities have been designed for.

C.3.4.3 Decision method

The method used to identify the preferred sites for recommendation, described in Section 7.4 and Appendix B of the draft EAs, elicited many comments. As already mentioned in the introduction to Section C.3.4, the DOE, in response to these comments, developed a more formal decision-aiding methodology that was reviewed by the National Academy of Sciences. A detailed description of this methodology is presented in the multiattribute utility analysis of the nominated sites, which also shows how the methodology was applied in terms of the siting guidelines. Thus, comments on the methodology applied in the draft EAs, the process used for identifying preferred sites, and the choice of preferred sites are not addressed here; only summaries of the various issues that were raised in these comments are presented in order to show the concerns of the commenters.

Among the comments was an objection to the statement in Section 7.1.2 of the draft EAs that "disqualifying conditions did not enter directly into the comparison of sites." This happened because the disqualifying conditions could not be used to discriminate between sites. Each of the potentially acceptable sites was evaluated against the disqualifying conditions (see Section 2.3 of the EAs), and no disqualifying conditions were found at any site. Had a disqualifying condition been found at any site, that site would have been removed from further consideration and would not have included in the evaluations of Chapter 7.

Many commenters said that the importance of individual guidelines in a group of guidelines should not be equal, and some suggested specific guidelines that should be considered more important than others in the same group. Some suggested that the importance of specific guidance should vary from site to site. These suggestions contradict the provisions of the implementation guidelines, which specify the relative importance to be assigned to each group of guidelines and state that, within a group, all guidelines are of equal importance.

The issues that were raised in the comments on the decision method are summarized below.

- The evaluation process described in Chapter 7 of the draft EAs is arbitrary and confusing.
- There is little correlation between the findings reported in Chapter 6 and the rankings in Chapter 7.

- The methodology is unsatisfactory, inadequate, undocumented, and biased. The averaging and the pairwise comparison methods are not satisfactory because the spread in rankings is artificially determined; the utility estimation method can be valid for comparisons against the preclosure guidelines but is not adequate for assessing postclosure performance.
- Aggregation procedures are valid only if the guidelines are complete and not redundant, but some guidelines are redundant (i.e., population is considered in the guidelines on population density and distribution, meteorology, environmental quality, socioeconomics, and transportation).
- The aggregation of rankings compounds the subjectivity of the application of the guidelines.
- Alternative decision methodologies might result in the identification of different sites as preferred for characterization.
- The methodology of comparison should be highlighted as a stand-alone issue.
- A sensitivity analysis should be performed and documented.
- The DOE should find a site adequate under the postclosure guidelines before considering its rank under preclosure guidelines.
- The aggregate ranking does not consider interactions among major factors.
- The weighting used for the various conditions of each guideline is not explained; hence the basis for the score on each guideline is not clear and cannot be replicated. Furthermore, if all conditions are of equal weight, then any one condition is not very important.
- The weighting of the postclosure guidelines with respect to the preclosure guidelines is too low and not justified.
- Because three postclosure guidelines cannot be used to discriminate among sites (climatic changes, erosion, and site ownership and control), the inclusion of these guidelines in the aggregate rankings reduces the weight assigned to the other postclosure guidelines.
- The weighting of 35:33:32 for the three groups of preclosure guidelines assigns similar weights to the three groups, contradicting the requirement of the implementation guidelines that the three groups be assigned a specified order of importance.
- Because the weighting was adopted without rulemaking proceedings, its use violates the public participation and rulemaking requirements of the Act, the DOE Organization Act, and the Administrative Procedures Act.

- Because the application of the methodology is contingent on the professional qualification and experience of the members of the evaluation team, the DOE should provide such information about every team member.

The DOE carefully considered these issues in the development and application of the decision-aiding methodology.

C.3.4.4 Miscellaneous comments on the nomination and recommendation process

The DOE received many comments that addressed various aspects of the process of site nomination and recommendation and the results reported in Chapter 7 of the draft EAs. Many of these comments approved of the sites identified as preferred for recommendation; one party submitted an independent evaluation that supported the choice of sites reported in Section 7.4. Many other commenters, however, disagreed with the sites identified as preferred. As already explained, the DOE developed a formal decision-aiding methodology for the ranking of sites. The results will be presented in the multiattribute utility analysis of the nominated sites and the recommendation of candidate sites, which are being issued separately.

Summarized and answered below are various other issues raised in comments on the nomination and recommendation process.

Issue

Some commenters said that four of the potentially acceptable sites should not have been excluded from the comparative evaluation in Chapter 7 because the exclusion of the four sites might have altered the outcome of the site rankings. Some parties also asked what happens to the four potentially acceptable sites that were not evaluated in Chapter 7.

Response

Section 112(b)(1)(E) of the Act requires each EA to include a reasonable comparative evaluation of the nominated site against the other sites and locations that have been considered. The siting guidelines (Section 960.3-2-2-3) require that the nominated site be evaluated against all other such sites. In this context "such sites" has been taken to mean other nominated sites. Therefore the comparative evaluation of sites against the guidelines considers the five sites proposed for nomination.

It is not true that the four remaining site have been excluded from a comparative evaluation against other potentially acceptable sites. As specified by the siting guidelines (Section 960.3-2-2-1), the selection of the preferred site in each geohydrologic setting that contains multiple sites was based on a comparative evaluation of the sites in that basin (see Section 2.4 of the EAs for the Davis Canyon, Deaf Smith, and Richton Dome sites).

The four sites not evaluated in Chapter 7 are not being recommended for characterization. They could, however, be considered again in the first-repository program if none of the characterized sites is accepted for repository development. They could also be considered in the second-repository program.

Issue

Commenters stated that the DOE should use the guidelines that do not require site characterization in selecting the preferred sites for characterization because the data are more available and more reliable. If this approach had been used, the rankings of the salt sites would have been different.

Response

The Act, in Section 112(b)(E)(i), requires that the sites be evaluated against all of the siting guidelines. Furthermore, many of the guidelines that require data from site characterization for the demonstration of compliance pertain to postclosure conditions that would affect the long-term safety of the repository.

Issue

A commenter applauded the DOE's use of conservative assumptions for preliminary performance assessments of the repository system and for present evaluations of potential environmental impacts, but suggested that the DOE should emphasize that actual repository performance at all sites is likely to be better than predicted because of these conservative assumptions. Commenters also noted that there are inconsistencies in the application of conservatism throughout the EAs.

Response

In its evaluations, the DOE used, where necessary, assumptions that approximate the characteristics or conditions considered to exist or expected to exist in the future at a site. These assumptions are realistic but conservative enough to underestimate the potential for a site to meet the qualifying condition of a guideline. The results of the analyses indicate that all of the sites are likely to meet the performance requirements. Given the limitations and uncertainty in the available information, statements that actual performance is likely to be better than predicted would be inappropriate. The DOE has attempted in the final EAs to ensure reasonable comparability among the sites in the degree of conservatism applied to similar analyses, such as ground-water-travel times.

Issue

Several commenters felt that nonconservative positions were taken when evaluating the sites against the guidelines in spite of a statement in Section 7.1.2 to the contrary. One commenter stated that a conservative assumption stated in Chapter 7, involving the vertical ground-water-travel time, was not implemented for the Davis Canyon site.

Response

The DOE feels that it has used conservative assumptions where insufficient data were available. It should be borne in mind, however, that at this stage in the site-selection process (i.e., nomination for site characterization) the qualifying and disqualifying conditions in the

guidelines need only meet the tests that evidence does not support a finding that the site is disqualified or does not support a finding that the site is not likely to meet the qualifying condition.

Regarding the specific comment, the conservative assumption stated in Chapter 7 involves a time of vertical travel through the interbeds in the evaporite sequence. Chapter 6 does not indicate that anything other than zero was used in estimating travel time through the interbeds when the total travel time through the evaporite sequence was estimated.

Issue

Commenters were concerned because the DOE did not rank the sites on the system guidelines. Some suggested that the DOE delay ranking the sites until enough data for performance assessments are available and repository technology is more developed.

Response

The DOE described the basis for site evaluations in Section 960.3-1-5 of the guidelines. This section indicates that comparisons between and among sites shall be based on the system guidelines to the extent practicable, and, if the evidence is not adequate to substantiate such comparisons on the basis of the system guidelines, then the comparisons shall be based on the groups of technical guidelines. As discussed in the EAs, the results of preliminary evaluations based on the system guidelines were presented in the EAs, but the objective was to demonstrate the status of capability at this point in the program, not to provide the basis for recommending sites for characterization.

The information needed to develop system performance assessments with sufficient confidence to use them for applying the system guidelines can be gathered only during site characterization. This fact, together with the schedule mandated by Congress for repository development, makes it imperative that the sites to be characterized be chosen expeditiously.

Consistent with the Act, the applicable NRC regulations in 10 CFR Part 60, and the DOE's siting guidelines, the DOE believes that it is appropriate and prudent to proceed with site characterization in order to obtain the information needed for selecting one site for development as a repository, advancing the designs of the repository and the waste package, and completing a license application to the NRC.

Issue

Some commenters criticized the data bases for the analyses presented in the EAs.

Response

The DOE has met the intent of the Act to use available information to recommend sites for characterization (see Section 112(b)(3)) and has been consistent with the guidelines in making the findings required for nomination and recommendation (10 CFR Part 960, Appendix III).

Issue

Several commenters expressed concern over differences in the data bases for different sites.

Response

The information available for the various sites is admittedly nonuniform in accuracy and extent. However, it meets the requirements of the Act and of the siting guidelines for this stage of the site-selection process. The detailed data needed for later decisions will be collected during site characterization.

Issue

One commenter stated that the DOE does not have sufficient data to compare the Deaf Smith site with the other four nominated sites. The commenter cited a lack of site-specific data in many technical areas.

Response

The DOE recognizes that the data used in comparing the sites are not uniform. However, the DOE feels the data are sufficient to choose the sites for nomination and recommendation for site characterization; meet the requirements of the Act and of the siting guidelines.

Issue

One commenter remarked that site selection for characterization is pointed toward ease of public acceptance rather than the technical quality of the site. The commenter pointed to the proximity of DOE facilities to two of the sites as evidence that prior public acceptance of DOE installations was a major consideration.

Response

The process to be followed in recommending sites for characterization is specified in the Act. Included in that process is evaluation against the siting guidelines. In this evaluation, each site must be shown likely to meet all of the technical guidelines. Public acceptance is not directly considered. (It is considered indirectly as part of evaluations against the socioeconomic guideline). The proximity of DOE installations to two of the sites is, at least in part, a consequence of a Congressional mandate to search for sites on Federal lands dedicated to nuclear activities. That search led to the Hanford and the Yucca Mountain sites.

Issue

One commenter said that, whereas the Act requires a comparative evaluation in an EA for each nominated site, Chapter 7 compares only five sites. Therefore, only those five can be among the sites finally nominated. The commenter said that to nominate any other site would require new draft EAs or EA supplements for that site and new comparative evaluations.

Response

While Chapter 7 only compares five sites, the comparisons of sites within each geohydrologic setting, when taken together with Chapter 7, provide a comparison of all nine sites. The procedure of comparing sites in each geohydrologic setting to identify sites for nomination and then performing a comparative evaluation of the nominated sites follows the requirements of the siting guidelines, Section 960.3. New draft EAs will not be necessary unless there is a change in the preferred sites within a geohydrologic setting.

Issue

One commenter noted that no worst-case analyses were done for the sites, but courts have ruled that such analyses are required for demonstrating compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act.

Response

The EAs for geologic repositories are prepared under the statutory requirements of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act rather than the National Environmental Policy Act.

Issue

Several commenters suggested considerations that should be given the greatest importance in site evaluations. One said that the potential for harm to the Canyonlands National Park outweighs all other considerations. Another felt that safety is the most important criterion, followed by cost. Another commenter listed geologic stability, absence of ground-water intrusion, simple and regular transportation routes, and the ability to maintain repository integrity in spite of social upheaval as most important.

Response

The siting guidelines require that primary consideration be given to the postclosure guidelines. These include guidelines devoted to safety (postclosure), geologic stability, ground water (geohydrology), and long-term repository integrity. Furthermore, the preclosure guidelines are divided into three groups: radiological safety; environment, socioeconomic, and transportation; and EAs and cost of siting construction, operation, and closure. Those groups are specified to be in decreasing order of importance as listed above. It can be seen that the siting guidelines provide considerable constraint in the weighing, or at least in ranking the importance of, different factors used in evaluating and comparing sites.

Issue

One commenter felt that Chapter 7 did not explain how the evaluation of the favorable and potentially adverse conditions in the guidelines were related to the rankings given the sites.

Response

The approach used in the comparative evaluation of sites in Chapter 7 of the draft EAs was explained in Section 7.1.2, which discussed, among other things, the relationship between the favorable and potentially adverse conditions and the site rankings. It explained that the favorable and potentially adverse conditions, considered on balance and in relation to the qualifying condition, constitute the basis for ranking the sites.

Issue

One commenter suggested that all of the sites be characterized.

Response

Because of its high cost, the characterization of all nine sites would be an imprudent and unnecessary use of the funds collected from utility ratepayers.

Issue

A number of commenters stated that the waste should be disposed of at its point of origin and that the DOE should weigh regional considerations in siting the repository. Approximately 80 percent of the waste to be stored in a West Coast repository is generated east of the Mississippi, yet no States in the east are being considered for a repository.

Response

Among the nine sites found to be potentially acceptable for the first repository, and the five sites nominated as suitable for characterization is Richton Dome, which is in the State of Mississippi. In addition, the DOE is investigating potential repository sites in the north-central, northeastern, and southeastern regions. The study is investigating crystalline rocks of the eastern Appalachian region, but it was not sufficiently advanced to allow a crystalline-rock site to be included in the site-selection process for the first repository. The crystalline-rock program will be part of the effort to select a site for the second repository.

The Act requires consideration of regionality in selecting the second repository. Therefore, if the first repository is located in the west, the second repository may be located in a region closer to eastern nuclear power plants. However, it is important to remember that all sectors of the society benefit from nuclear power, either directly or indirectly, through the distribution of electrical power and decreases in the consumption of foreign and domestic oil. Therefore, the disposal of radioactive waste is a national problem. Although a State may not have a nuclear power plant within its boundaries, it is very likely that the State is, or will be in the future, consuming electricity produced by nuclear power plants outside the State. The paramount consideration in siting the repository is public health and safety, which cannot be sacrificed solely to ensure a regional distribution of repositories. If all host rocks and sites in the eastern United States were found unsuitable, then no repositories would be sited there.

Issue

Commenters were critical of the ability of DOE officials to make unbiased decisions. Some stated that political issues interfered with the site selection process. Specific concerns were stated as follows:

- Secretary Hodel's statements in Texas during the Congressional election race of Phillip Graham may have influenced site-selection decisions.
- The EAs were released one month after the election, rather than before, when they would have been a campaign issue. The commenter alleged that the schedule is being driven by politics.
- Political pressure may be brought to bear on the DOE to change the ranking of nominated sites. Several commenters felt that the residents of small towns and sparsely populated regions near the nominated sites do not have enough political clout to affect the choice of sites.
- Political and socioeconomic considerations should not outweigh safety and environmental considerations. Many commenters stated that the choice of Hanford was influenced by economic conditions in the region, and one commenter suggested that the government may be considering paying off the WPPSS bond in exchange for the State of Washington's agreement to locate the repository at Hanford. Other commenters stated that both the Yucca Mountain and the Hanford sites were recommended for characterization because, as federally owned sites, these would be less public opposition to these sites.

Response

Recognizing that the selection of a geologic repository should not be subject to political pressure, Congress specifically directed the DOE to issue guidelines to be used in selecting sites for a repository and specified the process to be used in site selections. The nomination and recommendation of sites for characterization were based on evaluation of the sites against the guidelines.

Former Secretary of Energy Donald Hodel did campaign in Texas on behalf of Representative Phillip Graham during the Congressional election of 1984. During that campaign, Secretary Hodel expressed his personal view that Mr. Graham would effectively represent Texans in the repository-development process. However, Secretary Hodel's participation in the 1984 campaign did not influence the evaluation of the potentially acceptable sites in the EAs. The identification of the Deaf Smith County as a preferred site for characterization was a technical decision that was not influenced by political considerations in view of the widespread opposition to a repository in Texas.

The collection and analysis of data for nine draft EAs was a complex and time-consuming process. The schedule was driven by the requirement of the Act for the DOE to prepare environmental assessments that include specific evaluations and analyses; the timing of the election had no influence on the schedule.

The DOE released the draft EAs for public comment and held briefings and hearings in the affected States. The DOE carefully considered the issues raised by individuals, public interest groups, States and Indian Tribes, and other Federal agencies submitted in writing or as testimony in the hearings. The DOE is confident that all citizens had ample opportunity to comment on the EAs. Any change in the rankings of the nominated sites would be due to additional data leading to changes in guidelines findings, and not to political pressure.

The guidelines are structured to ensure that the protection of health and safety is heavily weighted in selecting sites for characterization. In no way do the economic conditions in an area override considerations of health and safety.

The Hanford site's close proximity to the WPPSS project has no influence on its nomination or recommendation for site characterization. The WPPSS program is an entirely separate program, and there has been no "tradeoff" agreement with the State of Washington.

While the DOE did initially look as Yucca Mountain and Hanford sites as part of its program to screen Federally owned sites, this is not the basis for nominating or recommending these sites for characterization. Each of these sites has been evaluated against the guidelines and has been found suitable for site characterization.

Issue

Some commenters observed that the draft EAs do not prove that the DOE has chosen the best sites for nomination and characterization. One commenter requested that the DOE repeat the ranking process for the nine potentially acceptable sites after site characterization completed, to make sure that the three sites characterized are the best sites.

Response

It is not necessary to choose the best sites for nomination and characterization; it is necessary to choose sites that are likely to meet all applicable regulatory requirements for the protection of public health and safety and would allow the geologic repository program to proceed in an expeditious and cost-effective manner.

REFERENCES FOR SECTION C.3

- American Physical Society, 1978. "Report to the American Physical Society by the Study Group on Nuclear Fuel Cycles and Waste Management," in Reviews of Modern Physics, Vol. 50, No. 1, Part II.
- Brunton, G. D., and W. C. McClain, 1977. Geological Criteria for Radioactive Waste Repositories, Y/OWI/TM-47, Office of Waste Isolation, Union Carbide Corporation, Oak Ridge, Tenn.
- Comptroller General of the United States, 1979. The Nation's Nuclear Waste--Proposals for Organization and Siting, EMD-79-77, General Accounting Office, Washington, D.C.
- DOE (U.S. Department of Energy), 1980. Final Environmental Impact Statement--Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, DOE/EIS-0026, Washington, D.C.
- DOE (U.S. Department of Energy), 1981. Site Performance Criteria, National Waste Terminal Storage Program, NWTs-33(2), Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Columbus, Ohio.
- DOE (U.S. Department of Energy), 1982. Program Objectives, Functional Requirements, and System Performance Criteria, National Waste Terminal Storage Program, NWTs-33(1), Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Columbus, Ohio.
- DOE (U.S. Department of Energy), 1983. Record of Responses to Public Comments on Proposed General Guidelines for Recommendation of Sites for Nuclear Waste Repositories, DOE/RW-0001, Washington, D.C.
- DOE (U.S. Department of Energy), 1984a. "General Guidelines for the Recommendation of Sites for the Nuclear Waste Repositories," Title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 960, Federal Register, Vol. 49, No. 236, p. 47714.
- DOE (U.S. Department of Energy), 1984b. Identification of Sites Within the Palo Duro Basin, Volume 1 "Palo Duro Location A," DOE/CH-10(1), prepared for the Salt Repository Project Office by the Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Columbus, Ohio.
- DOE (U.S. Department of Energy), 1984c. Identification of Sites Within the Palo Duro Basin, Volume 2, Palo Duro Location B," DOE/CH-10(2), prepared for the Salt Repository Office by the Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Columbus, Ohio.
- DOE (U.S. Department of Energy), 1985. Mission Plan for the Civilian Radioactive Waste Management Program, DOE/RW-10005, Washington, D.C.
- EPA (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency), 1977. "Environmental Protection Standards for Nuclear Power Operations, Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 190, Federal Register, Vol. 42, p. 2860.

- EPA (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency), 1982. "Environmental Standards for the Management and Disposal of Spent Nuclear Fuel, High-Level and Transuranic Radioactive Wastes," Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 191, Federal Register, Vol. 47, p. 58196.
- EPA (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency), 1985. "Environmental Standards for the Management and Disposal of Spent Nuclear Fuel, High-Level and Transuranic Radioactive Wastes," Final Rule, Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 191, Federal Register, Vol. 50, p. 38066.
- House of Representatives, 1979. Congressional Record--House, October 18, 1979, H9367.
- IAEA (International Atomic Energy Agency), 1977. Site Selection Factors for Repositories of Solid High-Level and Alpha-Bearing Wastes in Geologic Formations, Technical Report 177, Vienna, Austria.
- NAS-NRC (National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council), 1957. The Disposal of Radioactive Waste on Land, Report of the Committee on Waste Disposal, Division of Earth Sciences, Publication 519, Washington, D.C.
- NAS-NRC (National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council), 1970. Disposal of Solid Radioactive Wastes in Bedded Salt Deposits, Committee on Radioactive Waste Management, Washington, D.C.
- NAS-NRC (National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council), 1978. Geological Criteria for Repositories of High-Level Radioactive Waste.
- NRC (Nuclear Regulatory Commission), 1960. "Standards for Protection Against Radiation," Title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 20, Federal Register, Vol. 25, p. 10914.
- NRC (Nuclear Regulatory Commission), 1980. "Advance Notice of Rulemaking on Technical Criteria for Regulating Geologic Disposal of High-Level Radioactive Waste," Title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 60.
- NRC (U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission), 1983. "Disposal of High-Level Radioactive Wastes in Geologic Repositories--Technical Criteria," Final Rule, Title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 60, Federal Register, Vol. 48, p. 28194.
- SWEC (Stone & Webster Engineering Corporation), 1983. Area Geological Characterization Report for the Palo Duro and Dalhart Basins, Texas, DOE/CH/10140-1, prepared for the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management, U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, D.C.

C.4 DATA BASE, PROPOSED ACTIVITIES, REPOSITORY DESIGN

This section addresses comments on the accuracy or adequacy of baseline information about the repository system, site characterization activities and the site itself, which is used to provide the foundation for the evaluations and assessments concerning site suitability and the impacts of developing the site. This section corresponds to comments on Chapter 3 and on Sections 4.1, 4.3, and 5.1 of the EA.

C.4.1 BASELINE CONDITIONS AT THE SITE

This section considers general issues raised by the commenters regarding the baseline data at the site, such as adequacy of data and the use of generic data.

Issue

Several commenters expressed these concerns about the baseline data presented in the EA:

1. The data presented are inadequate to meet the requirements of the NWPA.
2. It is unclear which data are site specific.
3. Data presented within the EA is inconsistent, especially within the transportation analysis, Appendix A, and in discussions of site locations.
4. The DOE has ignored information provided by landowners and State agencies after the March, 1984, draft of the site document because it would disqualify the site.
5. The 5 miles of seismic line cited in the EA is disputed, because the local landowners have refused to allow right-of-way for this study.

Response

The DOE presented a description of its information base in Chapter 3 of the EA. This information has been improved by incorporation of newly obtained references and information provided by the public comments. The data base has been reviewed for adequacy and the DOE has obtained additional information from Federal and State agencies as well as from review of additional reference documents. The DOE concludes that there is sufficient evidence to meet the requirements of 10 CFR 960.3-1-4-2 to support the nomination of a site as

suitable for characterization. The DOE therefore has confidence that it has adequate information on the Deaf Smith County site to prepare the Environmental Assessment required by the NHPA.

The DOE has revised the introduction to Chapter 3 to address the suggestion that explanations be provided to indicate when non-site-specific data are used. The text in Chapter 3 now more clearly indicates the source of the data. Data and information presented in Chapter 3 have been developed from literature review and field surveys. The site descriptions are focused from that data most applicable to the site.

The DOE has confirmed that information provided by landowners and State agencies has been appropriately and accurately included in the EA.

The DOE has shown the locations of seismic surveys it has performed in the site vicinity and region in Figure 3.3, OCRWM Program Test Wells and Seismic Coverage of the Central Palo Duro Basin. Because seismic surveys have been successfully completed in the past, the DOE anticipates that it will be able to obtain access for any necessary seismic surveys, preferably by landowner consent.

Inconsistencies between Appendix A and the site locations have been resolved and appropriate changes made to the EAs.

C.4.1.1 Geologic Conditions

This category addresses comments, questions, and concerns on the accuracy or adequacy of the baseline geologic conditions at the Deaf Smith County site. Because of the large number of comments received in this category and the variety of subjects that this category covers, it has been subdivided into several smaller subcategories: regional geology, geomorphology, stratigraphy, paleontology, structure and tectonics, rock characteristics, geochemistry, mineral resources, and soils. These subcategories were selected to be closely aligned to specific sections in Chapter 3 of the EA.

Issues raised by the commenters include:

- Concern about the baseline data presented in the EA
- Geologic conditions
- Discussion of the Precambrian geology
- Erosion rates
- Processes that may affect playa and stream development
- Stratigraphy

- Structure and tectonics
- Insufficient seismic data records
- Faults and joints
- Discontinuities, heterogeneities, and impurities on rock mass behavior
- Variations in the rock and soil properties measurements
- In situ stresses
- Coupled-effects performance scenarios
- Quality of the data base for radionuclide mobility and migration
- Potential for significant petroleum resources.

Issue

A few commenters indicated a lack of site-specific data to properly describe the site.

Response

The DOE has reviewed the data base in Chapter 3 of the EA and determined that it meets the requirements of 10 CFR 960.3-1-4-2 which specifies the evidence required to support the nomination of a site as suitable for characterization.

C.4.1.1.1 Regional Geology

Issue

A few commenters noted that the discussion of the Precambrian geology needs to be expanded, particularly with regard to structural elements.

Response

The DOE notes that Section 3.2.1 is a brief introduction that sets the tectonic framework. Section 3.2.3.1.1 has been expanded and describes Precambrian terrain. Section 3.2.5 has also been expanded to include additional discussion of major tectonic elements.

Issue

A few commenters suggested that more detail is needed on regional geology maps.

Response

The DOE has revised and improved the map in Section 3.2.1 of the EA which illustrate the elements of regional geology. Areas of uplift are now labelled, and location of structural features has been updated based on a new study by Regan and Murphy (1984).

Issue

Some commenters have suggested that the discussion of regional structure is incomplete and should be expanded to cover various topics.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated the data and certain revisions has been made. Unidentified faults younger than Glorieta have recently been identified and reported (Regan and Murphy, 1984). The EA has been appropriately updated, and a discussion of Pennsylvanian tectonic history has been expanded in the final EA in Section 3.2.5. The Amarillo Uplift (referred to in the early literature as the Amarillo Mountains) was discussed and shown in the draft EA. A statement has been added to Section 3.2.1, summarizing hydrocarbon potential (Regan and Murphy, 1984).

Issue

A few commenters noted that the seismic reflection data do not adequately describe the subsurface characteristics for the specific site.

Response

The regional seismic reflection surveys were designed to obtain representative subsurface information across the Palo Duro Basin. These surveys were combined with information from numerous deep boreholes to provide a description of the distribution of stratigraphic units over the region. This level of information is sufficient to meet the requirements for site nomination established in DOE's Guidelines (10 CFR 960.3-1-4-2).

C.4.1.1.2 Geomorphology

Issue

A few commenters noted that the actual erosion rates may be higher than those presented in the EA and not near maximum, as implied.

Response

For the purposes of establishing long term denudation rates, regional conditions are applicable. Baumgardner's (1983) incision rate of 6.3×10^{-3} meters (2.1×10^{-2} foot) per year is meaningful only in terms of short-term conditions (1,600 years) on the Rolling Plains adjacent to the escarpment, a distinct and separate section of the physiographic province. The rates used in the EA are based on two published references that consider average drainage-basin conditions and, hence, all types of erosion at work within the basin. However, the EA discussion has been expanded in Section 3.2.2.2 to present a summary of the erosion rates measured in the area and presents the rationale for selecting the rates used for analysis.

Issue

Several commenters noted different processes that may affect playa and stream development. Playas and streams may be joint-controlled and/or related to and controlled by salt dissolution. Playa formation may also be related to salt margin collapse features.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated the data and concluded that the origin of playas is uncertain. To date, no evidence has been reported that would definitely link playas to salt dissolution, although some authors have suggested that dissolution may be one factor in playa development. In Section 3.2.2.1 of the final EA, playas have been described in more detail, and a discussion has been added for the various hypotheses of origins that have been advanced in the scientific literature over many years.

Issue

A number of commenters noted inconsistencies, incorrect references, and some figure and table errors in this section of the EA.

Response

A significant effort has been made to cross-check values within different sections of the EA and to make them consistent. The cross referencing between

sections of the EA has also been checked. In particular, the DOE has checked the figures in the geomorphology sections of the EA and found that while some figures present different information at substantially different scales, there is no inconsistency. The reference to Gustavson et al. (1980, p. 78) on page 3-11, paragraph 1, of the draft EA has been changed to 1980b. Gustavson et al. (1980b, Figure 30) shows a broad alluvial channel and, therefore, is a correct reference.

C.4.1.1.3 Stratigraphy

Issue

A few commenters suggested that there is an insufficient discussion of the Upper Aquifer Section (Quaternary, Ogallala, Dockum).

Response

The DOE has examined its discussion of the Upper Aquifer Section and has included a surficial geologic map in Section 3.2.3 of the final EA. Soils at the Deaf Smith County site are described in Section 3.2.9 of the EA. Seni (1980) and McGowen et al. (1979) have reported detailed studies of the Ogallala (Tertiary) and Dockum (Triassic), respectively; that extensive research was incorporated, by reference, in the draft EA. The final EA has been expanded to include maps showing the thickness and extent of those formations. The published literature has been reviewed and used to expand the discussion of the Quaternary, Ogallala, and Dockum aquifers in Sections 3.2.3.1.5, 3.2.3.1.6, and 3.2.3.1.7.

Issue

A few commenters noted that dissolution may be controlled and accelerated by joints and fractures, which may extend through the salt section or may occur at or near unplugged or inadequately plugged boreholes (known and undiscovered). Commenters were also concerned that anomalous thinning of the San Andres Formation may indicate basin interior dissolution.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated its discussion of dissolution in Section 3.2.3.3 and believes that no modification of the conclusions presented in the EA is necessary. Dissolution rates vary areally and through time, on a local scale. However, when viewed across substantial periods of geologic time, it is apparent that the short term variations in peripheral dissolution rates tend to average out. The absence of significant embayments in the San Andres salt margins near the Palo Duro Canyon and elsewhere (refer to EA Figure 3-24, Salt Margins, and Gustavson et al., 1980a, Figures 4 and 29) support the assumption of generally

uniform peripheral dissolution rates. Hypotheses recently published by Gustavson and Budnik (1985) concerning preferential interior dissolution near the site have been addressed and incorporated in Section 3.2.3.3.2 of the final EA. The effect of wells on dissolution are also discussed in the final EA. As discussed in Section 4.1 of the EA, any wells that could have an impact on the performance of a repository may need to be reentered for testing and evaluation. Unreported abandoned wells will be searched for at and near the site during site characterization, as discussed in Chapter 4 of the EA. In addition, Section 3.2.3.3.2 of the final EA has been revised to include a summary from a study of the Hutchinson Salt Member of Central Kansas, describing the effects of both modern and old boreholes on salt dissolution in that area.

The patterns of anomalous thinning of the San Andres Formation have been interpreted to be a product of the late Permian dissolution. Hovorka et al. (1985, p. 51, Figure 79) conducted a detailed examination and correlation of core from seven DOE-sponsored wells in the northern Permian Basin. They observed low-salinity facies at the base of Unit 5, separated from thin halite at the top of Unit 4 by anhydrite mudstone (interpreted as an insoluble residue). From this they concluded that the Permian-age transgression initiating Unit 5 was responsible for dissolution of salt from Unit 4 in this area. Thus, the salt loss is late Permian in age and is not a product of interior dissolution beneath the High Plains. These points have been addressed in the final EA in Section 3.2.3.3.2.

Issue

A few commenters noted that the discussion of the Lower San Andres (LSA 4) salt is inconsistent and does not adequately address salt impurities or fracturing.

Response

The DOE has revised and expanded its discussion of the LSA 4 salt in Sections 3.2.3.2, 3.2.6.1.4, and 3.2.7.1 to clarify the presence of salt impurities. The term "relatively clean" means that the LSA 4 salt is cleaner than most other salt within the stratigraphic section. Hovorka et al. (1985) indicates that the LSA 4 salt is generally 85 to 95 percent halite.

The discrepancies between Section 3.2.3.2 and Section 6.3 in the draft EA were the result of the different items being discussed. Section 3.2.3.2 dealt with stratigraphy and salt composition, and was generalized. Section 6.3.1.3.2 dealt with mechanical properties and was somewhat more specific and detailed, reflecting a different classification system. The classification system is the reason for differing terminology. The apparent depth discrepancy is a function of rounding. In the primary English units, the difference is a few feet, with Section 6.3.1.3.2 being more precise. In the final EA, Section 3.2.3.2 has been expanded to include a more detailed description of both the overall stratigraphy and the LSA 4 Salt.

Fracture characteristics of cores taken from Permian Basin program wells are available in detailed core descriptions from the well completion reports referenced in the EA. Given the volume of referenced material, this information could not be included in the EA, other than by summary in Section 3.2.6. No fractures have been identified that extend through the salt section. Fractures within the salt beds were filled. It is generally agreed that fractures in salt heal over time due to creep at the temperatures and pressures present in the Permian Basin. Laboratory studies on artificial fractures in salt confirm this.

Issue

Several commenters noted that inconsistencies, incorrect references, and figure, table, and editorial errors need to be corrected in the EA. Some specific problems within the stratigraphy section were noted.

Response

There is an inconsistency in the use of the terms "neogene" and "neocene." The term "neocene" is obsolete, and "neogene" has been substituted in the final EA. Figure 3-9, East-West Cross-Section Precambrian Through Wolfcamp, is a useful illustration of regional conditions; it is not intended that it represent site conditions. A location inset was included in the original drawing, but it failed to reproduce during printing. An apparent minor discrepancy in host rock thickness between the text and Figure 3-23, Thickness of Thick Salt Bed in Lower San Andres Unit 4, is considered within the range of error of the estimates. The recently completed Hudson Resources/Taylor No. 1 well, just east of the site, encountered a 49-meter-thick (160-foot-thick) salt bed. Salt thickness criteria are described in this figure of the EA. This figure has been updated to include data from the Black and Taylor wells. The reference to Gustavson et al. (1980a, Table 1) in Section 3.2.3.3.1 is correct. To illustrate the basinward deepening of strata, reference has been made to a typical structure-contour map.

C.4.1.1.4 Paleontology

No comments were received.

C.4.1.1.5 Structure and Tectonics

Issue

Some commenters noted that in the EA's earthquake analysis, the maximum credible earthquake and resulting acceleration may be underestimated, the maximum seismic events and associated ground motions discussion is confusing, and an inappropriate reference was used.

Response

The DOE has examined the data and believes that the Nuttli and Hermann analysis assumed fault activity and large shocks along the Amarillo Uplift, and their analysis is consistent with recent data on the Meers Fault.

The DOE believes the reference, Schnabel and Seed (1973), is valid; however, the EA now indicates that the Nuttli and Herrmann (1981) attenuation relationship, developed from midwestern data, is used in estimating accelerations from shocks along the Amarillo Uplift. For local shocks, distance is not a factor and western United States data or a Nuttli and Herrmann relationship for midwestern data can be used.

The EA text has been revised to emphasize that several hypothetical earthquake sources have been analyzed, and the worst case was taken as the maximum earthquake. Specifically a magnitude 5.3 local earthquake is determined to have the maximum acceleration at the site.

The DOE has modified Section 6.3.3.4.2 of the EA to indicate that the ground-motion estimates are meant to be conservative (i.e., overestimated) at this time. The data used for this analysis are presented in Section 3.2.5.3.

Issue

A few commenters noted that the seismic data record is insufficient and that earthquakes have been recorded closer to the site than indicated. They also suggested that the EA should include a more detailed discussion of the microseismic network.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated its discussion of the seismic data record and has modified the EA to state that although the historic record is brief, it does give a good indication of the level of seismic activity. Further, the seismic record is not used by itself, but is combined with geologic data for an earthquake hazard analysis.

The DOE has reevaluated the data and found that the commenters are correct in stating that earthquakes have been recorded closer to the site than the draft EA indicated. Therefore, the DOE has corrected the text and figure in Section 3.2.5. There was a small earthquake approximately 25 kilometers (15 miles) north-northwest of the Deaf Smith County site in April, 1985.

The locations and specifications of seismograph stations have been described by reference in the EA text. The evidence indicates low seismicity in the area.

Issue

A few commenters noted that there may be potential for fault reactivation along the Amarillo Uplift, and that recent activity along the Meers Fault should be recognized and analyzed.

Response

The DOE has examined the data and has modified Section 3.2.5.1 of the EA to include a recognition and analysis of the Meers Fault, which is located about 320 kilometers (200 miles) from the site, lying on the north edge of the Amarillo Uplift.

For the purposes of the EA, the DOE has conservatively based the earthquake hazard analysis on the assumption that large earthquakes (up to Richter magnitude 6.3) could originate along the Amarillo Uplift, and smaller shocks (up to Richter magnitude 5.3) could occur throughout the geologic setting.

Issue

Several commenters were concerned about faults and joints and their relationship to structure. Specifically, they feel that there are more faults than stated in the EA, and that these faults are younger and closer to the site than is indicated. Commenters also suggested that the EA contains an insufficient discussion of jointing, fracturing, and tectonic stress.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated the data and acknowledges that interpretations of faults in the Palo Duro Basin are uncertain because they are based on the limited well control, the weak basement reflector, and the substantial lateral variations in seismic velocity in the Mesozoic and Tertiary strata. The DOE has updated EA Figure 3-38, Principal Compressive Stress Directions Determined by In Situ Measurements and Fault Plane Solutions, to include recent analyses and fault interpretations from the Permian geologic data base as shown in Regan and Murphy, 1984.

The DOE has revised the text to indicate a distance of approximately 64 kilometers (40 miles) between the site and the Potter County Fault. Work by Budnik (1983) does not indicate offset of the Alibates Formation, although such offset is recognized on the Amarillo Uplift. The DOE has expanded the description of jointing and fracturing in Section 3.2.5.2 of the EA. The relationship of modern lithospheric stresses to these structures is not known at this time.

Issue

A few commenters noted that there was insufficient discussion of regional structures and their relationships, and of regional uplift and subsidence. They

also suggested that the history of structural elements (i.e., regional faulting, jointing, folding, uplift, subsidence, volcanism, etc.) should be addressed in an integrated fashion.

Response

The DOE has reexamined the data and has expanded Section 3.2.5 of the EA to include a discussion of the development, history, and interrelationships of the major tectonic elements within the Permian Basin.

Issue

Several commenters noted that miscellaneous changes are needed to correct inconsistencies, references, and some figures and tables. Some specific problems with the Structure and Tectonics section were noted.

Response

The DOE has checked the figures and tables and believes that, in some cases, minor changes are necessary.

In response to the question whether Figure 3-30, Elevation of Precambrian Basement, illustrated the basinal axis as referenced in Section 3.2.5 of the EA, the DOE believes that the figure clearly does show the basinal axis.

The DOE has modified the EA to change the reference from Figure 3-20 (Figure 3-24 in the final EA) to Figure 3-4 (Regional Tectonic Map) in response to a concern that Figure 3-24 (Salt Margins) had been referenced for location of regional volcanics.

The Bonita and Alamosa Faults are mapped and located on the Regional Tectonic Map (Figure 3-4 in the draft EA), but the reproduction is poor. In the final EA, attempts have been made to obtain better reproductions.

In response to the comment on insufficient discussion of uplift, no additional discussion in Section 3.2.5.5 is needed to support the findings in Chapter 6 of the EA.

The structure-contour maps as presented in G. J. Long (1983) and the draft EA are different because the EA is more recent and includes a broader data base.

In response to the observation that the data shown on EA Figure 3-37 (Epiceenters of Historical Earthquakes in the Texas Panhandle Area) and the Area Geological Characterization Report (AGCR) by Stone and Webster Engineering Corporation (SWEC, 1983, DOE/CH/10140-1) are not consistent, the DOE points out that the figure in the draft EA was an updated revision of the epicentral location data as presented in the AGCR. In addition, the figure has been updated in the final EA to incorporate Acharya (1985). The work by Pennington and Davis (1984) has been addressed in the text.

C.4.1.1.6 Rock Characteristics

Issue

Some commenters stated that the effects of discontinuities, heterogeneities, and impurities on rock mass behavior and rock mass characteristics needed to be further discussed. These discontinuities, heterogeneities, and impurities include interbeds, rock mass property anisotropy, and impurities that significantly affect rock behavior.

Response

The DOE has considered the issue and has clarified the discussion in Section 3.2.6 of the EA in the following ways.

The host rock, as noted in the EA, is not homogeneous pure halite, and the presence of interbeds and distributed impurities are described. The DOE has clarified discussions on the effects of distributed impurities on various rock properties, including creep, which were evaluated by laboratory tests on samples containing various amounts and types of these impurities.

Discussions in EA Sections 3.2.3 and 3.2.6 regarding the continuity and distribution of interbeds and impurities within the host rock (Lower San Andres [LSA-4] salt) and the LSA-5 salt above it have been clarified on the basis of information and analysis presented in Hovorka et al. (1985).

Comparison of the data presented in this recent study with the average values cited in the draft EA indicates that the values for halite and clay are reasonable, not overly optimistic, and analyses and conclusions based on them have not changed. The new analyses confirm the conservatism of the values of volume brine presumed to be available for migration in performance assessment calculations. Furthermore, while the composition of the LSA 4 salt varies somewhat, the variability between the three wells with detailed data available is not large, and salt composition at the site is not expected to be substantially different from the surrounding area.

Issue

A few commenters noted that variations in the rock and soil properties measurements presented may vary in several ways and should be discussed. In particular, these properties may vary between laboratory or in situ tests and the rock mass behavior, or they may vary among locations even if general characteristics appear quite similar. The source of these variations were suggested to be the following:

- Variations from location to location due to natural spatial variation, lack of statistically representative number of measurements, or technical uncertainties in making extrapolations

- Variations between laboratory and in situ test measurements and rock mass behavior, the effects of the scale of the area or specimen tested as compared to a large rock mass, or lack of statistically representative or spatially representative measurements.

Response

The DOE has considered the issue and has clarified the discussion in Section 3.2.6 of the EA subject to the observations that follow.

The draft EA clearly stated that no data was available from the proposed site, and the closest data was from wells several miles away. Thus, site conditions are inferred by extrapolation and are, therefore, only estimates.

While data are limited, and no drill well testing has been done on the site, the available stratigraphic and laboratory information strongly suggests that the engineering properties of materials encountered at the site will not differ significantly from those at other locations in the region where testing has been done. Appropriate qualification has been added to Section 3.2.6 with regard to the applicability of the existing data to the site.

With regard to the second aspect of this comment, it is generally established that laboratory tests can not by themselves accurately predict rock mass behavior at depth, because truly representative samples of the rock mass cannot be obtained except in rare cases where the rock mass is homogeneous and essentially intact. The salt units at the Deaf Smith County site are not homogeneous, since they contain interbeds, so field tests are most appropriate to evaluate the behavior of a representative volume of rock.

Despite their limitations, laboratory tests on core samples are useful in approximating how a rock mass will behave. It is usually possible to relate lab behavior to rock mass behavior through a classification system, and to use the laboratory data in a comparative way to estimate how the rock mass will behave. Empirical relationships must be developed between laboratory test data and field test data or observed performance of underground openings to confidently utilize this approach, and the latter are not yet available in the Palo Duro Basin. Therefore it is not possible, with current data, to accurately predict in detail how an underground opening in the LSA-4 salt will behave; however, the existing information discussed in Sections 3.2.3.2 and 3.2.6 has been used to estimate its general behavior.

The following changes have been made to Section 3.2.6 of the EA in response to the two aspects of these comments, respectively:

1. The discussion of lateral continuity of rock units has been expanded to address spatially related property changes.
2. The introductory section has been expanded to more clearly describe the uncertainties due to lack of field test data at the site.

Issue

A few commenters indicated that more comprehensive discussion of the in situ stresses needed to be provided. In particular, the interpretation of existing stress measurements and an evaluation of the limitations of the measurement methods utilized needed to be discussed.

Response

The DOE agrees with the comment and has modified and expanded Section 3.2.6 to include a discussion of the stress measurement, their limitations, and their possible relationship in approximating the regional stress field. In summary, it is concluded that the stress field in nonsalt rocks is characterized by horizontal stress ratios between 1.0 and 1.5. The stress orientations observed are consistent with a rotation in the orientation of the maximum horizontal stress from northwest in the western part of the stress province to northeast in the eastern part as suggested by other investigators.

Issue

Some commenters stated that a number of coupled-effects performance scenarios need to be addressed more extensively. In particular, commenters mentioned the thermo-chemical effects on the engineering properties of the rock mass, thermomechanical effects on the engineering properties of the rock mass (e.g., fracture healing), thermohydrologic effects on the engineering properties of the rock mass, and brine migration behavior.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated the pertinent data and has expanded discussions in EA Section 3.2.6.1 on the expected thermomechanical behavior of the repository host horizon and engineering properties of the rock mass. Additional information on expected nature of brine migration is described in Section 6.3.1.2. Throughout Section 3.2.6, the limitations and uncertainties in the evaluations have been clarified. The implications of these more recent analyses and the new information to evaluations of coupled-effects are described in Section 6.4.2.

C.4.1.1.7 Geochemistry

Several commenters expressed concern that the DOE has not adequately considered the potential effects of geochemical conditions and processes on the high-level waste (HLW) disposal system. Areas of particular concern were the description of in situ conditions (including the uncertainty in that description) and the potential for adverse chemical and geochemical effects on the performance of the waste package and the overall system.

The comments were grouped into the following major issues: radionuclide mobility and migration, clay content and water availability in Palo Duro Basin host rock, geochemical evidence of post-depositional dissolution, shallow aquifer water quality and geochemistry, host rock salt mineralogy and petrology, and geochemical modeling. None of the EA revisions regarding radionuclide mobility and migration issues changes the outcome of the waste package performance calculations in Section 6.4.2.

Given that site-specific geochemical information is not available for the Deaf Smith County site, pertinent data are provided by rock and formation fluid samples obtained from drill holes near to the site. Expected chemical interactions in the host salt are (1) corrosion of the waste package by thermally-migrating brines from the salt and (2) leaching of radionuclides from the waste package in the event of waste package failure. The unexpected condition of waste package corrosion by unlimited volumes of intrusive ground water has also been considered in the performance assessment calculations (Section 6.4.2).

Unit 4 salt contains brine in fluid inclusions, grain boundaries, and clay interbeds. The maximum volume of brine available for migration toward and corrosion of the waste package has been recalculated in the revised EA (Section 3.2.7.2) and is less than 5.0 volume percent value used in the waste package performance calculations. A thermally migrating brine will likely have a relatively high magnesium content (approximately 35,000 milligrams per liter), and an intrusion brine will likely be a low-magnesium (approximately 130 milligrams per liter) type (Pederson et al., 1984). Furthermore, the performance assessment calculations conservatively assume other input values that result in shorter projected lifetimes of the waste packages and greater radionuclide release than the expected values. The results of the performance assessments (Section 6.4.2), which demonstrate the presence of the qualifying condition (Sections 6.3.1.2.1 and 6.3.1.2.5), are summarized as follows:

1. Waste package corrosion by unlimited quantities of low-magnesium intrusion brine will not lead to waste package failure within 10,000 years after burial.
2. Thermally-induced brine migration will bring only a moderate quantity of high-magnesium brine in contact with the waste package, and this amount of high-magnesium brine will not destroy the ability of the waste package to meet the requirements of 10 CFR 60.113.
3. A conservative analysis of expected conditions shows that less than 0.001 percent of the 1,000-year radionuclide inventory would dissolve per year.
4. There are no driving forces that would cause release of radionuclides from the repository. Should brine that contains dissolved radionuclides escape the repository, it must travel vertically more than 610 meters (2,000 feet) through low-permeability rocks below the repository, enter hydrostatigraphic unit C (HSU C), and flow laterally to the accessible environment.

Specific issues are discussed in greater detail below.

Issue

Commenters were concerned about radionuclide mobility and migration. It was noted that the calculations of radionuclide release presented in the EA may be in error.

Response

The DOE notes that the question of radionuclide mobility and migration can be broken down into four areas of specific concern: oxidation and reduction conditions, potential for colloids or organic complexes contributing to radionuclide transport, mineral sorption properties, and the data base used to calculate solubilities.

The DOE has reexamined the available evidence on oxidation/reduction conditions in the repository horizon and in the deep aquifers. This evidence shows that the at-depth chemical environment is sufficiently reducing for uranium and other actinide species to be in the less soluble, less mobile, reduced states (e.g., tetravalent uranium). The evidence, which has been summarized in Sections 3.3.2.1.3, 6.3.1.2.2, and 6.3.1.2.3 of the revised EA, consists of the following:

- Presence of organic carbon and pyrite in the sedimentary strata (Fisher, 1984a, b)
- Presence of methane and ethane in deep-basin brines (Sewell, 1984)
- Presence of short-chain aliphatic acid anions, which are anaerobic decomposition products of sedimentary organic matter, in deep basin brines (Means and Hubbard, 1985, BMI/ONWI-578).
- Uranium-234/thorium-230 ratios suggesting that naturally occurring uranium in 9 of 10 deep basin brines examined is present primarily in its tetravalent (reduced) state (Hubbard et al., 1984).

Gamma radiolysis may alter ground-water redox states through the production of species such as hydrogen peroxide, oxygen, hydrogen, chlorine, and possibly perchlorate (Panno and Czyscinski, 1984). Similar effects are predicted from alpha radiolysis of brine (Pederson et al., 1984), which will not occur until waste package failure. Brine radiolysis reactions have been experimentally documented at dose rates many orders of magnitude greater than that expected at the waste package surface, and will be localized to the near-field repository environment should they occur. If future research demonstrates significant brine radiolysis at expected repository dose rates, then engineering measures can be implemented to reduce radiation dose rates and to minimize any adverse effects.

The potential for transport of radionuclides as complexes with organic chemical species has been reevaluated. EA Sections 3.3.2.1.3 and 6.3.1.2.2 have been modified to include a summary of the available data on organic species in Palo Duro deep basin brines and a discussion on the potential for the formation of stable organic complexes with radionuclides. In Deaf Smith County, total organic carbon concentrations in deep ground-water samples are low and consist primarily of acetate and other short-chain aliphatic acid anions (Means and Hubbard, 1985, BMI/ONWI-578). Chemical equilibria calculations demonstrate that the organic compounds present have weak radionuclide complexation characteristics and are not expected to enhance radionuclide transport. The potential for generation of complex organic species by radiolysis of methane and other naturally-occurring organic materials has also been reevaluated and found to produce degradation products such as formic acid, carbon dioxide, water, or polyethylene (Lind, 1961; Gray, 1984). These compounds are not expected to affect radionuclide mobility (Section 6.3.1.2.2).

Colloids may enhance the transport of radionuclides in ground water under some conditions. Sections 3.3.2.1.3 and 6.3.1.2.2 of the EA have been revised to clarify the available information on radiocolloid formation and stability. Brines promote the conversion of stable hydrophilic colloidal suspensions to unstable hydrophobic particles (Stumm and Morgan, 1970, pp. 500-507). The conversion process is accompanied by colloid growth and charge reversal, resulting in large, relatively immobile particles that can be more effectively filtered by geological substrates. The applicability of this phenomenon to radiocolloid transport in a salt repository needs to be further established. Laul et al. (1985) examined particle sizes of natural radium, thorium, and uranium isotopes in a Palo Duro Wolfcampian brine and concluded that colloidal transport was not occurring.

The draft EA briefly stated in Sections 3.3.2.1.3, 6.3.1.2.2, and 6.3.1.2.3 that, while sorption might occur in the host horizon, high salinity would minimize its effects. Considerable radionuclide sorption may occur in the clastic sedimentary units surrounding the Unit 4 host salt, although present data are insufficient to permit a quantitative assessment of this phenomenon. Because no credit for sorption is taken in the performance assessment calculations, no further adverse effects from repository-related processes are possible (see Section 6.3.1.2.3). Data collected during detailed site characterization will address the extent to which radionuclide sorption is expected to occur.

The solubility data used for calculation of postclosure system performance (Section 6.4.2.3.4) contain uncertainties and assumptions. There are inadequacies in any currently available data set. Because of the lack of measured values for various species in concentrated brines at elevated temperatures and pressures, the thermodynamic data base used for calculating radionuclide solubilities is not adequate for definitive calculations. The computer code, EQ3/EQ6, is currently being modified for use on repository conditions (INTERA, 1983, ONWI-472). The radionuclide release calculations in Sections 6.4.2.3 and 6.4.2.4 will continually be updated using state-of-the-art codes as new data and computation methods become available. The uncertainties in system performance calculations caused by the uncertainties in the thermodynamic data base are discussed in revised EA Section 6.4.2.3.4.

Issue

Commenters noted that the clay contents given in the EA are too low, and the discussions on clay dehydration and resulting effects are inadequate.

Response

Site-specific information on the clay content of Unit 4 salt at the Deaf Smith County site is not available; thus data from drill holes near the site must be used in its place. The DOE has reevaluated the available data on mudstone content and revised EA Sections 3.2.7.2, 6.3.1.2.2, and 6.3.1.2.3, accordingly. The clay content cited in the draft EA was found to be underestimated, and the conservatively recalculated value is now in good agreement with data from three independent investigations (Hovorka et al., 1985; Fisher, 1984b; Fukui, 1984, BMI/ONWI-540).

One of the most important aspects of the mudstone content in Palo Duro salt is the amount of water that might be liberated through thermal dehydration under repository conditions. The total amount of brine available for migration to the waste package environment has been recalculated based on conservative overestimates of the water content of "clay-free" halite (Fisher, 1984b, c), the maximum water content of Unit 4 mudstone (Fisher, 1984b), and the mean mudstone content of the Unit 4 host rock (Hovorka et al., 1985). An error in the draft EA regarding the conversion factor from weight percent water to volume percent brine has also been corrected. The detailed brine availability calculations are presented in EA Section 3.2.7.2 and summarized in EA Sections 6.3.1.2.2 and 6.4.2.3.2. The revised brine content value does not result in a modification to the 5.0 volume percent brine value used in the waste package performance calculations.

Recent studies of clay mineralogy in the Palo Duro Basin are summarized in Section 3.2.7.1 of the final EA. The analysis presented in Section 6.4.2.3.2 assumes the water held in clays is available for migration, so the thermal stability of clays is not in question. The reduction in volume that accompanies clay dehydration is not expected to create new pathways for ground-water movement of significance, as thermal dehydration is not expected beyond the disturbed zone, as defined in the EA Glossary (Appendix B).

Issue

Commenters stated that geochemical evidence of postdepositional dissolution should be discussed. Evidence of postdepositional dissolution may indicate poor stability and lack of isolation of the repository horizon from the accessible environment.

Response

The DOE has revised the EA to include a more complete summary of the chemical, mineralogic, and petrographic evidence of postdepositional salt dissolution (see Section 3.2.7.3). Numerous petrographic and isotopic signatures of the salts and fluid inclusions indicate that the Unit 4 salts are unaltered and preserved since their deposition during Permian time (Knauth and Beeunas, 1985, BMI/ONWI-569). Stable isotopic signatures from fluid inclusions in solid salts from the Palo Duro Basin do not represent any of the following: modern meteoric water, connate sea water, connate marine evaporite brine, gypsum dehydration water, or subsurface formation water. However, isotopic data do suggest that fluid inclusion water represents the original highly evaporated Permian brines (Knauth and Beeunas, 1985, BMI/ONWI-569). The existence of primary textures, for example "chevron" structures, indicates that some of the halite has remained preserved since Permian time. Furthermore, the systematic differences between the mean bromide content of Unit 4 and Unit 5 salt in the area strongly reflect depositional or diagenetic processes, but not postdepositional dissolution (Fisher, 1984b).

Issue

Commenters noted that the quality of water available for use from shallow aquifers in the vicinity of the site needs to be identified and discussed in the EA.

Response

The discussion of ground-water quality in aquifers near the site has been expanded and documented by the DOE in the revised EA (Section 3.3.2.2). No new information was found that explains the nature and cause of salinity in the Dockum Aquifer.

Issue

Several commenters maintained that the quantitative description of the host salt unit was in error, and that the thermal and solubility behavior of the minerals was not thoroughly discussed or accounted for in performance calculations.

Response

The DOE has revised Section 3.2.7.1 to more thoroughly present the mineralogy and petrology of the host salt as sampled by drill holes near the site. Halite, anhydrite, and mudstone comprise the dominant mineralogy of the Unit 4 host horizon. The average Unit 4 mudstone content has been revised in light of recent data (Hovorka et al., 1985; Fisher, 1984b; Fukui, 1984, BMI/ONWI-540). Hydrous minerals such as carnallite, kieserite, and polyhalite have not been

reported in Unit 4 salt at this time. Data on the physico-chemical form and volume of water present in the candidate host horizon have been summarized in Sections 3.2.7.2, 6.3.1.2.2, and 6.4.2.3.2 of the revised EA. The revised text on salt mineralogy and petrology and on maximum Unit 4 water content has not lead to changes in the performance assessment calculations in Section 6.4.2.

Processes that might degrade rock strength include melting of host rock mineral phases, thermal dehydration accompanied by volume reduction, and radiolytic decomposition of mineral phases. EA Sections 6.3.1.2.2 and 6.3.1.2.3 have been revised to more thoroughly document expected repository effects on the host rock. Minerals present in the Unit 4 host horizon melt at temperatures far exceeding the maximum expected repository temperature of 250 C (482 F) (Weast, 1984), and eutectic phases with significantly lower melting points are not expected. Changes in the physical properties of the host rock from thermal dehydration of the mudstone layers are expected to be small, and any volume reduction accompanying clay dehydration is expected to be completely offset by salt creep and expansion around the waste package. Gamma irradiation of halite can produce sodium metal and free chlorine; however, the effect is very localized and experimentally documented only for total doses exceeding 10^7 rads (Levy and Kierstead, 1982, BNL-32004; Panno and Soo, 1983). Also, if free chlorine does not evolve from the salt, the decomposition products may react back to form sodium chloride (Pederson et al., 1984). The radiolytic decomposition of halite has not been documented at expected dose rates of approximately 20 to 40 rads per hour at the waste package surface (Jansen, 1985). If future research suggests adverse radiolytic effects on halite stability at repository-relevant dose rates, then engineering measures can be adopted to minimize such effects.

Issue

Commenters expressed concern that geochemical modeling was not used adequately as a tool for describing and predicting geochemical conditions and interactions with engineered materials.

Response

The DOE has an ongoing program, as part of performance assessment, in the development and application of geochemical models for various aspects of system performance. A repository in salt presents a chemical environment characterized primarily by an extremely high level of dissolved solids in any water present. Geochemical models currently available have been designed for use in dilute solutions and are not adequate predictors of geochemical interactions in brines. Also, the thermodynamic data base for various radionuclide solution species is subject to uncertainties and estimations and, therefore, is not adequate for definitive calculations. One computer code, EQ3/EQ6, is currently being modified for use on repository conditions (INTERA, 1983, ONWI-472). The radionuclide release calculations in Sections 6.4.2.3 and 6.4.2.4 will continually be updated using state-of-the-art codes as new data and computational methods become available. The uncertainties in system performance calculations caused

by the uncertainties in the thermodynamic data base are discussed in revised EA Section 6.4.2.3.4. Plans for the application of the EQ3/EQ6 code for waste package, repository, site, and total system performance assessments are discussed in the performance assessment plan for the salt repository project (ONWI, 1984, BMI/ONWI-545).

C.4.1.1.8 Mineral Resources

Issue

Several commenters suggested that the potential for oil and gas discoveries has been underestimated in the draft EA. Therefore, the likelihood of future exploration may have been understated.

Response

According to the U.S. Geological Survey and U.S. Bureau of Mines (1980), undiscovered resources are either "speculative" or "hypothetical." In the draft EA, the term "hypothetical" was used because it is the more optimistic of the two terms. The draft EA provided a discussion of what is known and what is not known concerning the hydrocarbon resources of the area.

The DOE has evaluated data made available since the draft EA was written and has revised Sections 3.2.8.1 and 6.3.1.8 of the EA accordingly. In a detailed study of the Palo Duro Basin, Rose (1984a, b) evaluated the structural and stratigraphic trapping mechanisms, top-seals, reservoir rock, source rock geochemistry, hydrocarbon generation potential, and the migration mechanisms and pathways. This analysis shows that the Palo Duro Basin is one of the leanest petroleum-bearing basins in the world, and that the least favorable inter-relationships occur in the large central or interior portion of the Palo Duro Basin, within which lies the Deaf Smith County site.

The relative petroleum potential of the Deaf Smith County and Swisher County sites were evaluated by Means and Hubbard (1985, BMI/ONWI-578). Nine different petroleum proximity indicators, including six source rock indicators from Dutton et al. (1982) and three ground-water indicators including iodide, bromide, and short-chain aliphatic acid anion contents were compared. All nine indicators suggested that the petroleum potential of the area surrounding the Swisher County candidate site is relatively greater than that of the region encompassing the Deaf Smith County site, although the petroleum potential of the basin as a whole is relatively low.

Section 3.2.8.1 of the final EA presents a reevaluation of hydrocarbon resource potential using the most up-to-date data, and includes a recently completed basin-wide analysis of hydrocarbon potential by an independent consulting firm. These additional evaluations confirm previous estimates of only hypothetical resource potential in the Palo Duro Basin.

Issue

A few commenters stated that the evaluation of potential mineralization, specifically for potash, should be expanded.

Response

The DOE reevaluated its discussion of potassium resources in Section 3.2.8.2 and has expanded it to address economic deposits within the region, and the results of analyses of drill cores from the Permian Basin. The evidence does not indicate the presence of unique or economic potassium mineral resources in the site vicinity.

C.4.1.1.9 Soils

Issue

One commenter was concerned that the most recent data were not used in preparing Table 3-14, Deaf Smith and Oldham County Soils Engineering Properties (Table 3-21 in the final EA). It was pointed out that although Table 3-14 references a 1968 source, Figure 3-40 (Figure 3-50 in the final EA), Deaf Smith County Site and Vicinity Soils, references a 1980 source. This same commenter pointed out that Figure 3-40 is not useful because the patterns used to map the soils are virtually indistinguishable.

One commenter pointed out that Figure 3-49 does not completely agree with prime farmland shown in Figure 3-37 of "Identification of Sites Within the Palo Duro Basin: Volume 1 - Palo Duro Location A" (DOE, 1984, DOE/NE/44301-1).

One commenter stated that the USDA Soil Conservation Service does not categorize soils as "Prime Native" as cited.

Response

The information contained in Table 3-14 (Table 3-21 in the final EA) of the draft EA is based on data contained in soil surveys for Deaf Smith County (Geiger et al., 1968). This is the most recently published data on the soils of Deaf Smith County. The information contained in this table was reviewed by the Texas State Office of the Soil Conservation Service (Williams, 1984) and updated to reflect recent knowledge and terminology for the soil series mapped for the site and site vicinity. Figure 3-40 of the draft EA (Figure 3-50 in the final EA) references both the Deaf Smith County Soil Survey (Geiger et al., 1968) and the Oldham County Soil Survey (Soil Conservation Service, 1980). The site vicinity shown in Figure 3-40 includes a very small portion of the Oldham County and the soil map was completed using data drawn from the Oldham County Survey. The loss of desired detail for Figure 3-40 (Figure 3-50 in the final EA) was a result of the printing process for the draft EAs. The information that this

figure was attempting to convey can be found in the following references: Soil Conservation Service, 1965 and 1980, and NUS, 1984, BMI/ONWI-510.

Figure 3-37 in the DOE Site Identification Report (DOE, 1984, DOE/CH-10[1]) and Figure 3-39 (Figure 3-49 in the final EA) in the draft EA were both prepared with the same data base, using a computer graphic system. Thus, there is no inconsistency in the areal extent of prime farmlands. In effect, the scale defines how "accurately" the figure can be drawn because it determines how the data will be aggregated. No change in the EA was needed because Figure 3-37 used a much smaller scale.

The term "Prime Native" for certain Texas soils is documented by personal communications with the Texas State Office of the Soil Conservation Service (Williams, 1984). Thus no change in the EA was needed.

C.4.1.2 Hydrologic Conditions

This category addresses comments, questions and concerns on the accuracy or adequacy of the baseline hydrologic conditions at the Deaf Smith County site. Because of the large number of comments received in this category and the variety of subjects that this category covers, it has been subdivided into several smaller subcategories: surface water, ground water, and current use. These subcategories were selected to be closely aligned to specific sections of Chapter 3 of the EA.

Issues raised by the commenters included:

- Definition of hydrologic parameters using existing data
- Oversimplification of the hydrologic system
- Surface-water data inadequacies and inaccuracies
- Potential for contaminating the Ogallala/Dockum freshwater system
- Effect of the program on water supply.

C.4.1.2.1 Surface Water

Issue

Some commenters were concerned about errors, discrepancies in data and discussions, and the need for additional data and information. Specifically, two commenters indicated that there are fewer farm ponds on site than noted in the draft EA. A few commenters felt that there were errors in the title for Figure 3-44 (Peak Flood Flows in the Palo Duro Creek Drainage Basin), the playa flood limits in Figure 3-46 (Probable Maximum Flood Limits Near the Deaf Smith County Site), and the probable maximum flood (PMF) estimates reported in Figure 3-44. Commenters noted discrepancies regarding runoff data (draft EA pp. 3-104 and 4-94), elevations (draft EA pp. 3-1 and 3-104), and the location of Lake Tanglewood (Table 3-15, Impoundments in Palo Duro Creek Drainage Basins

and on Prairie Dog Town Fork on the Red River and Figure 3-42, Impoundments and Stream Flow Gaging Stations Near the Deaf Smith Site). Commenters requested additional data and information regarding stream discharge data in Table 3-16 (Mean, Maximum, and Minimum Discharge for Streams in the Upper Red River Basin) and the location of impoundments in Figure 3-42.

Response

The EA was reviewed for errors, discrepancies, and the need for additional data or information regarding the number of farm ponds on site. The farm pond data were based on information obtained through literature searches and consultations with local officials; the unverified reference to four small farm ponds was deleted in the final EA.

The title of Figure 3-44 was incorrect and was retitled "HEC-1 Computer Program Inputs and Outputs for Palo Duro Creek Drainage Basin" (Figure 3-53 in the final EA) in the final EA to give the correct reference to Palo Duro Creek. The playa flood limits were correctly depicted in Figure 3-46, which gives probable maximum flood limits, since either flooding scenario would result in the same playa flood limits. Consequently, Figure 3-46 (Figure 3-55 in the final EA), Probable Maximum Flood Limits Near the Deaf Smith County Site, was not changed. Similarly, the PMF estimates were not changed since the data offered by the commenter fit within the trend defined by the ratio of peak flood flows to subbasin area in Figure 3-53, HEC-1 Computer Program Inputs and Outputs for Palo Duro Creek Drainage Basin. The trend varies due to expected variations in watershed characteristics.

The EA was revised regarding inconsistencies in estimated runoff. In particular, information in EA Section 3.3.1.1 (draft EA p. 3-104) reflect actual historical data, and more conservative runoff estimates were used in assessing site characterization impacts (EA Section 4.2.1.4.2, draft EA p. 4-94). The EA was also reviewed regarding site elevation data in Sections 3.1 and 3.3.1.1. The elevation data in Section 3.1 referenced overall site elevations, whereas Section 3.2.1.1 discussed drainage elevations, and thus no modification of the EA was required. Figure 3-42 was reviewed and it was found that it did include the location of Lake Tanglewood (as Impoundment No. 6). Consequently, EA Figure 3-42 (Figure 3-52 in the final EA) is consistent with the listing of lakes in EA Table 3-15 (Table 3-22 in the final EA), and no modifications were necessary.

Table 3-16 (Mean, Maximum, and Minimum Discharges for Streams in the Upper Red River Basin) was reviewed to determine if the data were broad enough to depict historic trends. Because the data in Table 3-16 (Table 3-23 in the final EA) represent time spans ranging from 6.5 to 33 years, with data collected from 1924 to 1983, it was concluded that the data were adequate for use in the EA. Thus, Table 3-23 and Section 3.3.1.2 were not changed as a result of this comment. Similarly, Figure 3-42 depicting impoundments and streamflow gaging stations was not altered to locate impoundments relevant to the other site (viz., Swisher). Figure 3-42 (Figure 3-52 in the final EA) is adequate in that it includes those impoundments relevant to the Deaf Smith County site, some (but not all) of which are also relevant to the Swisher County site.

C.4.1.2.2 Ground Water

Issue

Several commenters were concerned with the techniques used for determining potentiometric surfaces and regional permeabilities from drill-stem test data. It was suggested that the effects of present-day transient pressures caused by oil and gas extraction be considered in the hydrologic analyses, and that hydraulic gradients be reassessed in light of these transient conditions. The concept of "environmental water head" was recommended as a more accurate way of assessing vertical flow.

Response

The DOE believes that techniques used in the analysis of historic drill-stem test data are explained in detail in the referenced reports. They are commonly used techniques. Potentiometric surface maps of the Wolfcamp and Pennsylvanian aquifers, including depressions caused by petroleum extraction, have been added. They indicate no transient effects to the hydrology in the site area. Environmental water heads could be used to assess hydraulic gradients. For confined aquifer systems, the use of formation pressures and formation water densities will allow a more accurate appraisal of vertical hydraulic gradients. However, vertical hydraulic gradients have been reassessed and described, taking into consideration the variabilities of groundwater densities (Section 3.3.2). Hydraulic gradient directions remain downward with minor changes in magnitude.

Issue

The hydrogeologic analyses were criticized by several commenters as being based on an overly simplified interpretation of the system that was defined primarily by time-stratigraphic units rather than generic, depositional environment units.

Response

As most historic work has been based on a time-stratigraphic definition of the basin hydrogeology, the DOE has continued this definition in its assessments. Some additional work has been performed to redefine the basin using basic hydrogeologic units interpreted from geophysical logs, drill-stem tests, and numerical modeling. Much of this work is now complete and is discussed in the final EA in Section 3.3.2.

Issue

Commenters requested more detailed information concerning the hydrogeology of Hydrostratigraphic Unit A (HSU A), the freshwater Ogallala and Dockum system.

Response

A potentiometric map, a water quality assessment, and a brief discussion of the hydrogeology of the Dockum have been added in Section 3.3.2. Text is now included that compares Ogallala and Dockum heads and Dockum recharge and discharge. These show that the Dockum is recharged primarily by downward seepage from the Ogallala and that there is generally a downward gradient through HSU A.

Issue

Many commenters focused on the perceived incomplete or missing discussion of various details of the hydrogeology, such as identification of discharge and recharge areas, water quality information, well inventories, and, further, overlooked water-bearing formations and oxidation and reduction conditions.

Response

The hydrogeology presented in the draft EA was designed to provide a description of the geohydrologic conditions at the site in context with its geologic setting in order to estimate the present and expected ground-water flow conditions. The information presented in the EA is sufficient to evaluate the Deaf Smith County site to the siting guideline conditions (10 CFR Part 960). Additional information will be gathered during site characterization (which is described in Section 4.1.1), such as updating well surveys, searching for abandoned wells, and developing baseline water-quality data. The final EA includes some supplemental information on the Ogallala and Dockum system in Section 3.3.2.

Issue

Several commenters stated that more analyses of both vertical and horizontal flow through the evaporite section (HSU B) were required.

Response

The DOE has rewritten the text in Section 3.3.2 to include results of recent and ongoing investigations of horizontal and vertical seepage through HSU B. A regional vertical gradient map across HSU B has been added that indicates potential for vertical flow. At the site, vertical flow was analyzed between the Queen Grayburg and the Lower San Andres Unit 4 (LSA #4) Carbonate,

which bracket the host salt horizon. These all indicate little or no flow and a significant potential for downward flow in HSU B.

Issue

Many commenters requested an assessment of the potential for contaminating the Ogallala and Dockum freshwater system.

Response

The DOE believes that the shallow, freshwater aquifers do not provide likely pathways for postclosure contamination because of downward vertical flow between the hydrostratigraphic units and the large vertical distances between the repository horizon and the freshwater aquifers located near the ground surface. Some additional assessments and discussion of risk to the freshwater system have been provided in the final EA. The DOE has expanded the EA in Sections 3.3.2 and 3.3.3 to include more detail and an analysis of risk in Section 6.3.1.1 has been added.

C.4.1.2.3 Current Use

Issue

Several commenters were concerned with identification of the Santa Rosa well located on the Richardson Seed Company property and its importance as a contracted future water supply for the city of Vega.

Response

The DOE has revised Section 3.3.3.2, Water Users, to include the Santa Rosa well located on the Richardson Seed Company property. A discussion of this well as a future water supply for the city of Vega is provided in Appendix C, Section C.7.4.3.

Issue

Several commenters expressed concern that the DOE does not have a complete inventory of the existing wells within the site vicinity.

Response

Information on existing wells in the vicinity of the site is based upon a thorough literature review and contacts with state and local agencies. The DOE recognizes that the EA does not present all wells in the site vicinity and has

modified Section 3.3.3.2, Water Users, to clarify this misunderstanding. In addition, a more complete listing of local wells based on available information, was added to Section 3.3.3.2.

Issue

Commenters were concerned with discrepancies of saturated thickness of the Ogallala Formation appearing in the draft EA (Figure 3-55 [Figure 3-68 in the final EA], Ogallala Aquifer Saturated Thickness, and Section 3.3.3.2). One commenter questioned whether the declines in the water table presented in the EA reflect recent declining withdrawal rates.

Response

The DOE has revised figures and text in Section 3.3.3 to eliminate any discrepancies concerning the saturated thickness of the Ogallala Formation. The DOE has updated its data base to include the latest available withdrawal rates after discussions with the Texas Department of Water Resources. These new data have been added to Section 3.3.3.3 of the final EA.

Issue

A request was made for the DOE to incorporate the most recent data provided by the Texas Department of Water Resources (TDWR) into the final EA Section 3.3.3.3.

Response

The DOE has updated its water-use data base to include recent information provided by TDWR and has revised Section 3.3.3.3, Current and Projected Water Use, to reflect these new data.

Issue

One commenter disagreed with the DOE's statement regarding variable well yields, indicating that yield is more related to permeability and transmissivity rather than saturated thickness.

Response

The DOE acknowledges that well yields are affected by permeability and transmissivity, as well as by saturated thickness. The addition of the other two variables would not alter the conclusions within the EA, however.

Issue

A commenter disagreed with the DOE's statement that minor aquifers in the deeper strata possess water of poor quality, citing as an example the water quality of the Santa Rosa Aquifer which is of a higher quality than that of Lake Meredith, which is used as a municipal water source.

Response

While, in general, minor aquifers in the deeper strata possess water of poor quality, the DOE acknowledges that in some areas the water of the Santa Rosa Aquifer is considered potable, while in others it is saline.

Issue

Commenters stated that data on the city of Vega's water supply requirements do not reflect currently available data for the years 1981, 1982, 1983, and 1984.

Response

The Texas Department of Water Resources has used 1980 data in developing its water supply and use projections. Consequently, 1980 has been designated as the base year for discussions in the EA. Referenceable water-use data supplied by commenters have been included in Section 3.6.3, Community Services.

Issue

One commenter indicated that the discussion of the depletion of the Ogallala Formation and Dockum Group is in conflict with the suggestion that the Dockum be considered as an alternative water supply.

Response

Limited published information is available on the Dockum Group as compared to the Ogallala Formation. While the potential exists for the depletion of this aquifer, the DOE cannot eliminate it as an alternative water supply until additional data are obtained. In addition, some repository water needs may not require potable water, and the Dockum Group could be considered as a source for these needs.

Issue

Several general comments were received concerning the contamination and depletion of the Ogallala Formation, and the lack of site-specific data in the draft EA. Comments noting errors in the draft EA included the following:

1. The DOE has used the terms "specific yield" and "porosity" interchangeably.
2. The "Dockum Formation" should be referred to as the "Dockum Group."
3. Two wells are labeled incorrectly on Table 3-22 (Wells Within 4.5 Miles of the Center of the Surface Facilities on the Deaf Smith County Site).
4. Figure 3-60 (Irrigated Farmland in the Seven-County Area) and Table 3-23 (1980 Water Use in Deaf Smith County and in the Seven-County Area, Texas in Acre-Feet) are incorrectly numbered.
5. Statements in the draft EA regarding the unavailability of unappropriated surface water in the Canadian River basin are in conflict with those statements suggesting surface water projects be used as a supplemental repository water source for the repository.

Response

1. References to "porosity" and "specific yield" in the EA have been revised to read "effective porosity."
2. The text in the EA has been revised to read "Dockum Group" rather than "Dockum Formation."
3. The DOE acknowledges that two wells presented in Table 3-22 (Table 3-30 in the final EA), Wells Within 4.5 Miles of the Center of the Surface Facilities of the Death Smith County Site, were incorrectly labeled and these have been corrected.
4. The EA has been revised to correctly number Figure 3-60 (Figure 3-73 in the final EA) (Irrigated Farmland in the Seven-County Area); the Table 3-23, 1980 Water Uses in Deaf Smith County Area, Texas, in Acre-Feet, has been replaced with revised tables.
5. The DOE recognizes that unappropriated surface water is not available at this time. The DOE must, for the purpose of considering alternate repository water supplies, consider the possibility of purchasing appropriated surface water.

C.4.1.3 Environmental Conditions

Issue

Commenters raised several issues relating to the EA's presentation of baseline environmental conditions. Issues pertained to the data which described area land use, ecosystem impacts, climatology, and air quality and other

environmental factors. General comments were also made about the adequacy of the EA. These issues are summarized below. A more detailed discussion of these, and other related issues, occurs in the following CRD subsections: C.4.1.3.1, C.4.1.3.2, C.4.1.3.3, C.4.1.3.4, C.4.1.3.5, C.4.1.3.6, and C.4.1.3.7.

Land Use Data: Several commenters were concerned with the adequacy of the baseline data employed in Chapter 3 of the EA. Many data inconsistencies in the descriptions of farmlands and agricultural and other local industries were found.

Ecosystem Impacts: Comments centered on the need for more detailed descriptions of the types of habitats that occur in the area. Commenters questioned the adequacy of the data base utilized for the assessment of environmental impacts.

Climatology and Air Quality: Commenters noted that the EA lacked adequate descriptions of current onsite climatological or air quality information. An analysis of the potential effects of a tornado strike was requested.

Other Environmental Factors: Specific issues centered on the need for more extensive information on background sound and radiation levels and for archeological surveys in order to assess the potentially adverse effects of repository activities. Commenters also stated that the area possessed aesthetic resources.

EA Adequacy: Comments centered on the inadequate presentation of the environmental data base which contained inconsistencies between the text and figures and relied on regional qualitative data for the prediction of environmental resource impacts.

C.4.1.3.1 Land Use

Issue

Several commenters were concerned about the completeness of the land-use data base presented in Chapter 3 of the EA. Specifically, commenters felt that the discussion of the sorghum seed industry, and its role in the Deaf Smith County area, were given only cursory treatment. Estimates for irrigated land and rangeland were questioned. Recognition of the importance of prime farmland and the difference between cropland and agricultural land was felt to be lacking in the Chapter 3 discussion.

Response

The DOE has obtained additional information on sorghum production within the Deaf Smith County area, and has added 1983 statistics to Table 3-39, Deaf Smith County Crop Planted. The DOE has also added text describing the sorghum seed industry to Sections 3.4.1.1, 3.6.2.4, and 5.4.2.4.2 of the EA. (See

additional discussion on the sorghum seed industry in Section C.7.4.2 of this Appendix.) The DOE has verified the estimates of irrigated land and has added additional statistics for 1983 to Table 3-38, Deaf Smith County Land Use. The DOE has verified the estimates on prime farmland in Section 3.4.1.1.

Issue

Commenters questioned the accuracy of oil production statistics in the Deaf Smith County area.

Response

The DOE has reviewed the oil production statistics presented in the Deaf Smith County EA and has found the data base to be correct. The Texas Railroad Commission provided the information on oil and gas production. Commenters provided no specific information on the inaccuracy; thus, no change to the EA was made.

Issue

Commenters noted missing information, specifically the Vega's Strafuss well field, in Figure 3-63 of the draft EA.

Response

The DOE has reexamined this figure in the EA. The diagram reflects the information known to the DOE at this time regarding the types of land uses in the site area. It was not intended to show locations of water wells. Thus, no change in the figure was made. However, Vega's Strafuss well field, consisting of two wells, has been plotted on Figure 3-72, Wells Near the Deaf Smith County Site.

C.4.1.3.2 Ecosystems

Issue

Several commenters felt that the current data base is inadequate to conclude that several of the threatened and endangered species, whose biogeographical ranges include the site, could not be present due to habitat limitations. Two commenters suggested that the whooping crane should be included in the site description, due to movements in the species' migration routes and the addition of new wintering ground and flocks.

Response

The DOE has revised Section 3.4.2.3 to update the regional status of such protected species as the bald eagle, peregrine falcon, and whooping crane, based on 1984 Fish and Wildlife Service publications, cited in the final EA.

Information on the status of protected species in the vicinity of the site is based on a thorough literature review and contacts with both public and private experts. This information is summarized in EA Section 3.4.2.3 from the cited references used to support conclusions made. The nature of current agricultural land-use practices in the vicinity of the site precludes the existence of significant habitat for the protected species listed.

Issue

Several commenters questioned the descriptions of habitat types in the vicinity of the Deaf Smith County site. One concern included the use of the term "shrubland" and disputed the classification of some draws on the Texas High Plains as wetlands. Another commenter suggested that the condition of rangeland be described.

Response

The DOE has reviewed the classification and description of habitat types present in the region containing the Deaf Smith County site. The reference material used is considered to be definitive. The literature review that was done in preparation of the EA has been exhaustive and has been supported by some field reconnaissance, as stated in the EA. In addition, in Section 3.4.2 and its supporting documentation rangeland condition has been qualitatively discussed.

Concerning the classification of some draws as wetlands, the DOE has used the National Wetlands Inventory classification system as discussed in Sections 3.4.2 and 3.4.2.2. Portions of the draws in the vicinity of the site are considered as intermittent or ephemeral wetlands.

Issue

It was suggested that the status of each playa within the site vicinity be characterized, whether it is natural or modified. Natural playas containing distinct populations of flora and fauna should be identified in order to establish their ecological importance.

Response

The DOE has revised Sections 3.4.2 and 4.2.1.2.4 to describe aquatic habitats and biota within the site vicinity. A section specifically describing

wetlands (Section 4.2.1.2.4) has also been added. The Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetlands Inventory was used to classify site wetlands, and recent aerial photographs were used to determine the status of playa wetlands in the site vicinity. Documents used to support the EA indicate that over 80 percent of the playas in the Texas Panhandle have been modified, but those that are relatively unmodified do contain a distinct flora and fauna. This action incorporates additional literature review and consultation with several recognized experts in playa wetland ecology. The results of this research effort have been documented in the final EA.

Issue

One commenter questioned the actual number of playas within the site vicinity.

Response

Section 3.4.2 and Table 3-36 (Table 3-41 in the final EA) have been revised to indicate there are 17 playas within the 10-kilometer (6-mile) site vicinity.

C.4.1.3.3 Air Quality and Weather

Issue

Several commenters stated that climatological and air quality data are inadequate. Specifically, the following were noted:

1. No onsite climatological or air quality data have been obtained. Climatological data are not presented clearly, nor are they current.
2. Tornado occurrence should be discussed and include an estimate of strike probability at the site.

Response

Existing climatological data presented in Section 3.4.3.2 of the draft EA are considered adequate to describe regional climatic means and extremes for purposes of the environmental assessment. Data have been extracted from official records from Amarillo, Vega, Canyon, Hereford, Dimmitt, Tulia, Silverton, and Plainview. Existing air quality data presented in Section 3.4.3.1 of the EA are considered adequate for purposes of the environmental assessment. Data have been extracted from official records from Amarillo, Lubbock, and Clovis. Measured particulate matter, nitrogen dioxide, and sulfur dioxide concentrations reported are considered to be more characteristic of urban areas of the desert southwest than of rural areas such as the Deaf Smith County site. Applying them directly to the site, as baseline, is considered conservative. Wind and

stability class data presented in Section 3.4.3.4 of the EA, based on the Amarillo National Weather Service station, are considered adequate for assessing environmental impacts of project emissions.

Tornado occurrence in a 25,898-square-kilometer (10,000-square-mile) area containing the Deaf Smith County site was examined and the probability of a tornado striking a point in the area was estimated (Section 3.4.3.4). A tornado would be expected to strike a point within the 25,898-square-kilometer (10,000-square-mile) area approximately once every 7,400 years. Mention of the Fujita-Pearson F value, a tornado intensity scale, and its application to area tornados is included. It was found that the intensity of tornadoes observed in the area seldom exceeds an F value of 2, characterized by wind speeds of about 50 to 70 meters per second (112 to 157 miles per hour) and considerable structural damage.

C.4.1.3.4 Noise

Issue

Several commenters stated that the background sound-level data are inadequate.

Response

The DOE had two surveys conducted in Deaf Smith County during summer 1982 and winter 1983. Measurements were made of background A-weighted sound levels on several days each season, day and night, and at several locations. The data tend to confirm expectations of baseline sound levels in this type of area as based on information published by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (Wyle Laboratories, 1971). These data were reported in Section 3.4.4 of the draft EA. The survey data are supported by published data and are adequate for the analyses performed in the EA.

C.4.1.3.5 Aesthetic Resources

Issue

One commenter noted that the statement, "Nine percent of the site vicinity exhibits a moderate amount of visual variety," cannot be reconciled with Figure 3-82, Deaf Smith County Site and Vicinity Visual Variety Classes.

Response

The EA text is correct and the figure has been revised to be consistent with the text.

Issue

One commenter noted that the EA implies that the area has no beauty and asked whether sunrises, sunsets, and rainbows are not also aesthetic resources.

Response

The EA does not indicate that the Deaf Smith County site has no beauty or aesthetic resources. Section 3.4.5 of the EA states that the area has little visual variety. Little visual variety does not mean that the area lacks visual beauty.

C.4.1.3.6 Archaeological, Cultural, and Historical Resources

Issue

One commenter stated that the explanation area of Figure 3-83, Deaf Smith County Site and Vicinity Archaeological, Cultural, and Historic Resources, had two items that used the same pattern and thus the figure was not usable. Specifically, it was noted that "Area of Potential Historic Resources" and "Other Land" have the same pattern and the viewer cannot distinguish between these areas in the figure.

Response

The DOE has checked this figure and has found that the explanation on the original figure became lighter in color during the printing process. The figure has been redrawn so that the reader can distinguish between an "Area Potential Historical Resources" and "Other Land."

Issue

One commenter expressed concern about the timing of certain cultural resource activities related to the repository site characterization process. Specifically, it was noted that archaeological surveys and assessments of identified sites should be completed well in advance of site characterization activities, and, if significant resources are identified, the assessment of effect and mitigation should be completed prior to construction.

Response

The DOE has reviewed the archaeological, cultural, and historical resources sections in the EA and has found that these concerns have been addressed.

The DOE will enter into a Programmatic Memorandum of Agreement (PMOA) with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the State Historic Preservation Officer. Implementation of the stipulations and site-specific agreements of a PMOA would avoid or satisfactorily mitigate the potential adverse effects of this project on historic and cultural properties.

Issue

One commenter stated that onsite archaeological surveys should have been performed as part of the determination of site suitability. Specifically, it was noted that the results of archaeological surveys should have been part of the criteria used to select a site for characterization and to differentiate between sites.

Response

A review of the historic and archaeological records for Deaf Smith County was completed prior to the preparation of the EA (Girard et al., 1984, BMI/ONWI-560). This survey relied entirely on records and allowed the preparation of maps that identified areas likely to contain unidentified cultural resources. In addition, the DOE will enter into a Programmatic Memorandum of Agreement (PMOA) with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the State Historic Preservation Officer.

C.4.1.3.7 Background Radiation

Issue

A commenter asked for clarification of variations in radiation data in relation to altitude.

Response

The DOE has revised EA Section 3.4.7, Background Radiation, to clarify the discussion of variation of background radiation with altitude.

C.4.1.4 Transportation

This category addresses comments, questions, and concerns on the accuracy or adequacy of the baseline conditions relating to transportation at the Deaf Smith County site. This category corresponds to comments received on Section 3.5 of the EA.

Issues raised by commenters included presentation inaccuracies, lack of detail in certain areas, and need for the presentation of additional detail.

Issue

One commenter noted that Section 3.5, and particularly Table 3-42, contained the following problems that required correction:

1. The range of average daily traffic (ADT) counts for Interstate 40 was too large to be useful; counts should be broken down by location of counter (most logically at Vega, Wildorado, Bushland, Amarillo); more recent data are needed.
2. A weekday and weekend ADT count is suggested.
3. Additional routes carrying repository-related traffic should be considered.
4. Conditions of roads should be reviewed, particularly those considered substandard. Maximum service would be decreased on a road in substandard condition.
5. Conditions and capacities of rail lines in the region should be presented.

Response

The DOE has revised Table 3-42 (Table 3-52 in the final EA) to correct traffic numbers reported in the draft EA. Interstate 40/U.S. 66 has been segmented to isolate U.S. 66 business route traffic. Also, maps have been revised to include additional routes which may be used for repository-related traffic. The DOE reviewed the rest of Section 3.5 of the EA in response to the concerns listed above and has determined that the present information is sufficient for developing a description of the transportation facilities and utility systems in the vicinity of the site in order to evaluate existing or required access routes or improvements.

Issue

Two commenters noted that Figure 3-70 (Figure 3-84 in the final EA) does not include a depiction of the water pipeline from the Strafuss well field into the city of Vega.

Response

The DOE has revised this figure (Figure 3-84 in the final EA), Deaf Smith County Site and Vicinity Transportation and Utilities, to include the water pipeline.

Issue

One commenter noted that Section 3.5 of the draft EA failed to discuss airports, waterways, and utilities as outlined in the Table of Contents. One commenter stated that Figure 3-20 (Figure 3-84 in the final EA) depicts a natural gas pipeline passing through the proposed ESF site, but does not refer to the pipeline in the text.

Response

Some information omitted from the draft EA concerning Section 3.5.2.2 (Traffic Capacity) and Section 3.6.1 (Population) has been added to the final EA.

C.4.1.5 Socioeconomic Conditions

This category addresses comments, questions, and concerns about the accuracy or adequacy of the baseline socioeconomic conditions at the Deaf Smith County site. Because of the large number of comments received in this category and the variety of subjects that this category covers, it has been subdivided into several smaller subcategories: population, economic conditions, community services, social conditions, and government and fiscal conditions. These subcategories have been selected to be closely aligned to specific sections in Chapter 3 of the EA.

Issues raised by commenters included the following:

- Use of obsolete data
- Inaccurate projections
- Data insufficiency.

Issue

Some commenters indicated that there are errors and omissions in the socioeconomic section of the EA that should be corrected.

Response

The DOE has revised the EA in response to these comments. Portions of paragraphs that are missing and missing pages have been included in the final EA. The introduction to Section 3.6 has been added to the final EA.

Issue

A few commenters indicated that socioeconomic baseline data are outdated.

Response

Data for the EA were gathered from Federal, State, and local sources. The data were collected during 1982-1983 and published in the Socioeconomic Data Base Report (NUS, 1984, ONWI-461). These were the most recent data available at the time the EA draft was written in 1984. Based on the comments, the DOE has checked for the availability of more recent data. Updated data for community service standards are not available from the International City Management Association. In several instances, more recent data were available. Updated water-use projections from the Texas Department of Water Resources have been included in Section 3.3.3. In addition, updated estimates for water consumption and future water sources were provided for Vega in Section 3.6.3. The DOE has revised the EA where more recent data were available.

C.4.1.5.1 Population

Issue

A few commenters indicated that population projections are incorrect and newer data should have been used.

Response

Population projections in Section 3.6.1 are based on 1983 projections made by the Texas Department of Water Resources for Texas counties as reported in ONWI-461. These projections were the most recent data available for the draft EA.

Issue

A few commenters indicated that there are discrepancies in data and data sources in some of the tables.

Response

The DOE has checked the data and data sources in the EA for accuracy for the final document. Agricultural statistics and references have been checked for accuracy, portions of paragraphs that were missing were included, typing errors were corrected, and community service data were checked for accuracy according to documented sources.

C.4.1.5.2 Economic Conditions

Issue

Many commenters indicated that the Ogallala region of the High Plains is a major seed-producing area and information on the seed industry should be included in the EA. Commenters indicated that the seed production was higher than the value of the other crops.

Response

The DOE has considered commenters' suggestions and has modified Section 3.6.2 of the EA. Information on the type and volume of seed produced in the Panhandle has been obtained from the Texas Department of Agriculture and other sources. The number of acres producing seed in the study area counties has been included in EA Section 3.6.2.4. Data on the value of seed sold in Texas have also been included. Information on the types of seed produced in the Panhandle and the growing conditions conducive to seed production are also discussed. A comparison of the acres involved in seed production and the amount of cropland in the region was evaluated in this section. A comparison of seed values and other crop values have also been added. The data do not show a substantial difference between seed values and values of other crops. These data are presented in Section 3.6.2.4.

Issue

A few commenters indicated that baseline data on the local labor force are sparse.

Response

The DOE has reviewed the data and determined that no modifications to the EA are required. Data on employment by industrial category, total employment, and unemployment rates were provided in the EA for the socioeconomic study area. These data are used to establish the size of the regional labor force and number of workers with construction skills, in relation to the repository work-force requirements. The level of detail provided in Table 3-61, Employment by Type and Broad Industrial Sources, by Place of Work, 1980, in Section 3.6.2.3 is useful in helping to estimate the number of workers that could be hired from the local area.

Issue

A few commenters indicated that the cattle-feeding industry of this region should be a major economic consideration.

Response

The cattle-feeding industry of the region is an important part of the area's agricultural sector, which is a primary sector of the economy. Data on the agricultural sector are presented in Section 3.6.2.4, which includes information on livestock and feedlots. A more detailed sector breakdown would not change the agricultural impact analysis presented in Sections 5.4.2.4 and 6.2.1.7.

Issue

A few commenters indicated that seasonal fluctuations in the work force should be considered.

Response

The DOE has reviewed the data and has determined that no modification of the EA is required. The number of migrant workers in the study area counties are presented in Section 3.6.2. These migrant workers are considered in Section 6.2.1.2.3, under the population density guideline. The number of workers is also subject to seasonal variation from other sources. However, for purposes of determining repository-related impacts, considering these seasonal variations would have no effect on the calculations to be made.

C.4.1.5.3 Community Services

Issue

A few commenters indicated that some of the community service data and per capita service standards are out of date and incorrect.

Response

The DOE has reviewed the updated community service data that were provided by some commenters. Where data have been submitted with reference sources, the new information was included in the EA. Local service standards (ratios) are presented in Section 3.6.3. The latest available community service standards from the International City Management Association (1979) have been used in the EA in order to compare impacts on services across sites.

C.4.1.5.4 Social Conditions

No comments were received.

C.4.1.5.5 Government and Fiscal Conditions

Issue

A few commenters indicated that the fiscal section is inadequate and should include additional data on fiscal trends, such as bonded indebtedness, and specific data on all local governments.

Response

More detailed data on local fiscal structure are provided in the Socioeconomic Data Base Report (NUS, 1984, ONWI-461). The EA analysis extracts data from this report and focuses on those governmental units that may be affected by project activities. Data on counties, communities, and school districts that could be affected are provided in Section 3.6.5. The DOE has considered commenters' suggestions and has modified Section 3.6.5. A discussion of the special districts in the area was added to this section along with a reference to the Socioeconomic Data Base Report.

C.4.2 ACTIVITIES PROPOSED FOR SITE CHARACTERIZATION

This category addresses comments, questions, and concerns received on the site characterization activities discussed in Section 4.1 of the Deaf Smith County site EA. Because of the large number of comments received in this category and the variety of subjects that this category covers, it has been subdivided into several smaller sub-categories: field activities, exploratory shaft, other activities, and alternative activities. These subcategories have been selected to be closely aligned to specific sections of Chapter 4 of the EA.

Issues raised by commenters on this topic centered around the following:

- Damage to vegetation and topsoil erosion
- Conduct of activity in accordance with state regulations
- Need for a preactivity baseline
- Waste disposal
- Increased traffic
- Site characterization methods
- Water supply protection, both quality and quantity
- Safety of site characterization activities
- Disposition of site characterization shafts and boreholes.

C.4.2.1 Field Studies

Issue

A few commenters noted that the proposed seismic survey activities may cause damage to soil and vegetation and should be modified to reduce such impacts.

Response

The DOE has considered various methods of performing seismic surveys, as indicated in Section 4.1.1.1, that optimize data quality. Seismic surveys of the type proposed are commonly carried out in the area of the Texas Panhandle without significant impacts. For each investigation, the seismic survey method will be chosen to ensure adequate data quality consistent with acceptable environmental impacts.

Issue

One commenter stated that site drilling activities may result in a need for the siting and permitting of new injection wells for brine disposal.

Response

The DOE has indicated in Section 4.1.1 of the EA that an investigation has been completed which assesses the capability of existing regionally located and licensed brine injection wells to accommodate brines produced from drilling activities. The final EA states that existing regional brine wells have the capacity to dispose of the estimated quantities of brine.

Issue

Several commenters noted that the various field activities, the bases for the locations of these activities, and the resulting land needs are not adequately discussed. Specific concerns included the basis for the borehole and exploratory shaft facility (ESF) locations and the 25 test wells to be drilled outside the site.

Response

The DOE has modified EA Sections 4.1.1.1, 4.1.1.2, and 4.1.2 to present the basis for selection of the exploratory shaft and borehole locations. The final EA further describes the site area requirements. Proposed locations of boreholes outside the site area are illustrated in Figure 4-2, Proposed Locations of Drilling Activities in Deaf Smith County Site.

Issue

One commenter noted that the uncertainties involved in the determination of field activity requirements and the manner in which those uncertainties will be reflected are not addressed.

Response

The DOE has modified Chapter 4 of the EA to discuss uncertainties involved in planning the field activities. Revisions have been made to the EA to reflect increased understanding of the necessary field activities and, in some cases, reduced uncertainty in the site characterization program.

Issue

A few commenters noted that casing removal from small-diameter boreholes is prohibited by the Texas Railroad Commission.

Response

The DOE has examined the applicable State and local regulations on casing removal. Laws prohibiting casing removal are designed to prevent communication and mixing of subsurface fluids. Texas law allows casing to be removed from any well which penetrates only one aquifer (Railroad Commission of Texas, 1984). All exploratory boreholes will be drilled, completed, and plugged in a manner which meets or exceeds regulatory requirements. The final EA includes an additional discussion of expected sealing and plugging requirements in Section 4.1.1.

Issue

A few commenters believe that stripping of topsoil at the ESF will cause wind erosion.

Response

The DOE has recognized the potential for soil erosion at the exploratory shaft site and discussed it in Section 4.2.1.5.2. As described in that section, control measures will be used during site characterization to minimize such erosion.

Issue

One commenter noted that a "pre-characterization" ground-water sampling program should be performed to establish water quality conditions prior to the start of site characterization activities.

Response

One of the purposes of site characterization activities is to obtain additional data for a number of items in the site vicinity, including ground-water quality and ground-water levels. This information will be used to assess data obtained from monitoring during repository construction, operation, and after closure. As currently stated in the EA, at the outset of site characterization activities, selected wells in the area will be sampled to obtain information on water level and water quality data. The wells that will be drilled in and near the site and attendant ground-water quality sampling are described in Sections 4.1.1.1.1 to 4.1.1.1.3. If by "pre-characterization" the commenter means prior to exploratory shaft construction, these concerns have been addressed by the program outlined in Section 4.1.1.2.5. Near-shaft monitoring wells are scheduled to be drilled at the same time as the engineering design borehole, approximately 1 year prior to shaft construction. Numerous characterization wells will be converted to monitoring wells during the course of the site investigations.

Issue

One commenter stated that socioeconomic and environmental data collection activities should be outlined in Table 4-1 (Schedule of Proposed Geotechnical Field Activities, Deaf Smith County Site).

Response

Table 4-1 lists the geotechnical field activities discussed in Section 4.1.1. Socioeconomic and environmental data collection activities are discussed in Section 4.1.3.

C.4.2.2 Exploratory Shaft

Issue

Commenters had questions regarding the layout and design of site surface facilities during site characterization. Specific comments dealt with the size and the location of the Exploratory Shaft Facility (ESF) within the site boundaries.

Additional comments were directed towards the capacity of the wastewater treatment facility, the final disposition of the exploratory shaft facility, the amount of brine that can be expected and the potential for discharge of drainage from areas around the site.

Response

The DOE has reexamined the size and the location of the ESF site with respect to the surrounding region, and has revised Section 4.1.2 to reflect current design approach. Location of the ESF along with site acreages have been checked for consistency throughout the EA.

The capacity of the waste-water treatment facility was developed from application of Functional Design Criteria (ONWI, 1983, ONWI-455) and in accordance with other applicable requirements.

The DOE has reexamined Section 4.1.2.4, final disposition of the ESF facility and concluded that the discussion is adequate and no revisions to the EA text was required.

The DOE has several options available for disposition of the sewage treatment facility such as the sale of the facility, transport of the facility to a site where it can be adopted to different needs or to scrap it. The decision on the disposition of the sewage treatment facility will be made prior to decommissioning of the ESF site.

The configuration and capacity of the evaporation and retention pond will be studied further during final design and, if necessary, revised to produce a pond configuration that will be adequate to contain the amount of brine produced on site and that will maximize the available evaporation rates for the site area and will meet all the applicable requirements for permissible limits for drainage discharges from the site. A discussion of the evaporation pond is presented in Section 4.1.2.2.2 of the EA. Through sound engineering practices, the necessity for removing liquids from the evaporation and retention pond will be minimized or eliminated.

Issue

Commenters had questions regarding the storage and disposal of waste salt and the manner in which fugitive salt emissions would be controlled. Specific comments dealt with the potential impacts to drinking and irrigation water if the salt containment structure fails, the potential for the seepage of brine into the Ogallala and Santa Rosa aquifers and the potential impacts from contaminated runoff water. Concerns for alternative locations to dispose of the salt if existing land fills are not available were also raised.

Response

The mined salt pile will be exposed to the local weather conditions and, as a result of this exposure, a hard surface crust will form over the pile. According to the experience of the salt industry, stockpiled salt is not a major source of wind-blown particles since crusting begins to form in a few days either through saturation by rain water or deliberate wetting. If necessary, the build-up of the salt pile can be interrupted during high wind conditions to

further prevent fugitive emissions. It should be noted that deposition volumes will decrease with increasing distance from the site. However, the dust control measures discussed above are expected to prevent the contamination of the soil by salt.

Natural or synthetic liners will be used to prevent the leaching of brine from the salt pile into the ground. An additional layer of compacted backfill material will be placed on top of the liner so that heavy equipment can move across the liner without damaging it. The natural soils in the area also have characteristically low permeability and seepage rates that will impede any percolation of runoff from the piles and seepage from the collection ponds. The clay content of the soils will also neutralize percolation waters by absorption of ions.

Salt-contaminated rainfall runoff from the storage areas will be collected by lined ditches to an evaporation and retention pond. The pond will be sized for the necessary volume based on historic cumulative maximum monthly rainfall and minimum evaporation data. The ionic concentration in the salt pile runoff will vary with rainfall intensity since contact time and volume concentration. A comprehensive discussion of the evaporation and retention ponds and the system of lined drainage ditches is presented in Section 4.1.2.2.2 of the EA.

The mud pits are no longer required since the current ESF design calls for the construction of shafts using conventional drill and blast mining techniques ("ONWI Recommendations Relating to the ESF Shafts - Volumes 1 and 2"). In the absence of large hole drilling, drilling mud and the associated disposal area are not required.

If existing landfills and licensed disposal facilities are not available, the DOE will develop alternative facilities needed for waste disposal, or locate other landfills and licensed facilities capable of accepting the waste.

Issue

Commenters had questions regarding the increased number of vehicles on the farm-to-market (FM) roads. Specific concerns were directed towards the use of the roads by farm vehicles.

Response

All vehicles would have access to public roads including farm vehicles. The estimated increase in traffic for all of the roads except U.S. 385 from Hereford to FM 2587 will be within the road design limits. This section of U.S. 385 will occasionally exceed the design capacity. Any problems that occur from congestion or overuse will be mitigated, for example, by schedule adjustments to reduce traffic loads during peak periods.

Issue

Commenters had questions on the shaft construction methods and viability of successfully penetrating the aquifers with drilling method. There were specific concerns about the DOE's ability to correctly install shaft seals when using the large hole drilling method. It was suggested that the rationale for selecting the proposed construction methods be presented in the final EA. Comments were also directed to the lack of the incorporation of recent guidance on developing the ESF with two conventionally constructed shafts.

Response

The DOE has revised Section 4.1.2 of the EA to reflect the recent design changes concerning the shaft construction techniques and the shaft diameters. The EA text and tables of Chapter 4 have been revised to reflect two 12-foot-diameter conventionally mined shafts (ONWI, 1985, Recommendation relating to ESF shafts). Subsequent to the release of the draft EA, the DOE revised its plans for exploratory shaft construction from large hole drilling to conventional mining. This revision in plans was based on several considerations:

- Worker safety
- Flexibility to expand subsurface areas to collect additional stratigraphic information
- Demonstration of the freezing technology to be used to construct larger repository shafts
- Ability to prepare detailed shaft maps of over dome stratigraphy which will guide repository shaft-sealing design
- Lower cost, enhanced construction schedule.

Section 4.1.2 has been revised to reflect the new shaft construction plans.

Issue

Commenters were concerned that the worker health and safety analyses were not consistent between the EAs. Additional comments dealt with the inadequacy of the input used to calculate the potential for injuries and fatalities, and the different sources of input data used to prepare the EAs. Questions were also presented on the applicability of Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA) regulations to the DOE contractors.

Response

The DOE agrees with the commenters that different sources of predicting accident rates have been used in the EAs, however, the projections of

fatalities, accident rates, etc. are consistent between the EAs. The DOE has reexamined the sources of predicting accident rates and found that there is a direct correlation between sources.

From 1930 through 1977, MSHA's statistical measures for injuries experienced in mining used a basis which was somewhat different for the other industries. However, beginning with calendar year 1978, MSHA adopted measures for injury experience which compare closely with the measures used in the Office of Occupational Safety and Health Statistics, Bureau of Labor Statistics and the U.S. Department of Labor. Therefore, beginning with 1978 data, the mining industry can be compared on a standard basis with other U.S. industries.

MSHA requires all mine owners to report all accidents to the District Office on a prescribed form. Because of the modification in reporting and processing procedures that became effective January 1, 1978, injury rates as currently computed are not precisely comparable to those of the previous years. Fatality rates, however, in which the "incidence rate" (the term used after 1977) is one-fifth of the "frequency rate" (the term used before 1978) for otherwise similar groupings, remain comparable.

The statistical data in MSHA's report cover the work experience of all personnel engaged in exploration, development, production, maintenance, repair, and construction work, including supervisory and technical personnel, and onsite office workers. These activities cover the entire spectrum of the ESF activities and, as such, are a better tool for statistical projection of probable ESF injury experience. As compared to the reported accidents used in MSHA's report, the National Safety Council uses sampling techniques for projections of probable injury experience. The terminology used in MSHA reports is that generally used by the mineral extraction industries. The classification and extent of industries is in close general agreement with the Standard Industrial Classification.

DOE has reexamined Section 4.1.2.2.2 of the EA addressing the applicability of MSHA regulations and concluded that the text adequately addresses the issue.

Issue

Commenters questioned the use of the term "current plans" in the EA and suggested that the DOE could alter the final EA to include use of nuclear waste at the ESF site. Commenters also questioned the DOE's ability to test thermal effects on salt using heaters only, and the variations in the number, size, locations, and depth of the shafts at the proposed sites.

Response

The Nuclear Waste Policy Act Section 113(c)(2)(A) clearly states that the Secretary of Energy may not use any radioactive material at a candidate site unless NRC concurs that such use is necessary to provide data for the preparation of environmental reports and an application for a construction

authorization. Tests using electrical heaters to simulate the thermal effects of radioactive waste have been conducted at various sites in the United States and abroad. These tests have been shown to be an acceptable basis for understanding the thermal response of salt. Tests utilizing actual high-level waste (HLW) at a candidate site are not considered necessary.

The depth to the San Andres Unit 4 can be found in Section 3.2.3.2 of the EA. The ESF will be situated within this formation. Confirmation of the thickness and extent of the host rock will be accomplished through an extensive surface drilling program and a variety of geophysical methods, such as seismic surveys. Also, horizontal boreholes from the subsurface will provide additional data. Site characterization activities as proposed in EA Section 4.1.1 will provide sufficient information or data to confirm the thickness and extent of the host rock.

The number and size of shafts among the seven candidate salt sites are consistent. These shaft sizes are based on safety, flexibility, and subsurface support requirements, including salt production rates and ventilation requirements as estimated for the salt project. Similarly, the surface facility components are the same among the seven salt sites except for variations in layout.

Other projects (tuff and basalt) have different subsurface support requirements as well as different surface characteristics that are considered in the design; therefore, some differences in the design approach can be expected.

Issue

One commenter questioned the amount of topsoil being stockpiled for reclamation and whether enough topsoil would be available for reclamation purposes. Questions were also received regarding the source of acceptable material for backfilling and reclamation, and the time required for revegetation species to become established. Concerns on the use and type of fertilizers, irrigation, and methods of plugging the test wells were also presented.

Response

A considerable amount of data on local soils, vegetation, hydrology and meteorology suitable for the development of a preliminary reclamation plan have been collected and analyzed. Based on these data, the topsoil that will be stockpiled is considered sufficient to successfully reclaim the ESF site. The vegetation species that will be selected for reclamation will conform to the vegetative characteristics of the region. These species will be chosen on the basis of their ability to become successfully established in an acceptable period of time.

The material to be used for backfilling and reclamation is expected to come from the site itself. Because such materials increase in volume, or bulk, when disturbed from the natural state, some of the excavated material will need to be

disposed off site. None of the topsoil will be removed from the site, however. Quantities of topsoil in excess of those required to reclaim the site will be spread over the site to further improve soil productivity.

The resources to be devoted to each stage of the reclamation process are delineated in Section 4.1.2 of the EA. However, the quantities of the appropriate fertilizer and the specific amounts of water that will be required can only be specified after further study, and at such a time when the vegetation species for reclamation have been selected.

The wells for testing and drilling are similar to investigative wells that will be developed at the site. The well restoration will be carried out in accordance with the applicable established procedures by the regulatory agencies.

Issue

Commenters questioned the method of determining drawdown on pumping wells near the site and the impact that the ESF site water usage will have on local water supplies, especially the water supply for the city of Vega. Commenters also questioned the site water requirements stated in the EA, such as the identification of the aquifer that will supply the site facilities and the impacts to the aquifer from site water usage.

Response

Water withdrawals from the High Plains aquifer for the project will have a minor effect on adjacent landowners' wells. This effect will be significantly less than if the site were to remain irrigated. Drawdown in nearby wells from onsite pumping to supply water for the operational phase of the facility is estimated to be a small percentage of the drawdown that would result from pumping to irrigate the site. These drawdown estimates are accumulative to adjacent pumping. Therefore, the comparable effect of the project pumping would be much less than irrigation pumping. It should be noted, however, that the drawdown estimates are based on continuous pumping, whereas in reality the pumping rates may vary and subsequent observed drawdown effects will also vary. The fluctuations will likely decrease observed drawdown effects to adjacent wells since the onsite pumping wells will recharge during times of lower or discontinued pumping. Water usage for Deaf Smith County is detailed in EA Section 4.2.1.

The potential impact from the ESF labor force on the projected and established water requirements are minimal. Therefore, the projections of ground-water requirements are minimal. Additionally, the projections of ground-water requirements in the area are also expected to be reduced due to the trend towards dryland farming that was irrigated in the past.

Issue

Several commenters questioned the DOE's ability to construct the shafts through the freshwater zones and the impacts that shaft construction and sealing would have on the aquifers. Specific questions were directed at the viability of the freezing technology and the risks associated with the use of this technology. Additional concerns were raised about the permanence of the shafts, the effect of the freezing process on existing fractures, the life span of the casing, the number of freeze holes to establish the "ice wall," and the effects on the aquifer from the thawing of the freeze collar.

Response

The shaft construction details discussed in Section 4.1.2.2 of the EA provide an overview of the methodology and equipment for shaft sinking. The detailed shaft construction methodology and the shaft construction schedule will be tailored to the specific characteristics of the site, and engineered to provide safe shaft construction. The shaft construction contractor will be experienced in the methods necessary to construct the shaft successfully.

There is no known communication of fresh water with underlying salt or known communication of saltwater with fresh water at the proposed ESF site. The shaft penetration is designed to maintain this state by placing seals to prevent vertical migration of water.

The salt beds being penetrated by the ESF underground excavation do contain water, however, there is no free water in these highly impermeable salt beds except what may be contained in the nonsalt interbeds. The existence and location of water within the salt beds will be determined during site characterization.

During shaft construction, the Ogallala and Santa Rosa aquifers will be immobilized by freezing at the location of the shaft site. The only possible contamination would be from mud loss during freeze hole drilling or brine loss due to ruptured freeze pipes. Both are highly unlikely events in a quality controlled construction environment.

Construction materials that may contact the aquifer are concrete, grouts, steel and localized bitumen. None of these are recognized pollutants. Site characterization work from the shaft above and below the Santa Rosa and Ogallala aquifers does not employ polluting materials. The Santa Rosa and Ogallala aquifers are maintained in their integrity by bitumen seals which prevent fluid migration via the shaft penetration.

The first recorded application of artificial ground freezing was on a mini-shaft project near Swansea, South Wales, in 1862 (Jessberger, 1979). In 1883, F.J. Portscht in Germany patented the method which, with improvements, is still in use. The system consisted of vertical pipes evenly spaced along the perimeter of a circle. The vertical pipes used a feed-pipe which was inside the installed pipe. The feed-pipe fed chilled calcium chloride down the pipe which

was circulated back-up to the annulus created between the two pipes. The calcium chloride refrigerant was then sent back to the refrigeration plant. Many advances have been made in the technique, principally in the refrigeration systems, but the freeze-pipe configuration is still essentially the same.

Development and testing have been pursued in several countries, such as the United States, Japan, Germany, Sweden, Canada, and Russia. The majority of shaft freezing projects in North America have been completed for salt and potash mines. Other applications have included coal mining, gas storage projects, and civil projects such as subways.

A typical example of a shaft freezing project is the Thyssen Schachbau GmbH Boulby (Yorkshire, England) Mine's Shaft No. 1 where a shaft 5.5 meters (18 feet) in diameter was sunk through the Bunter sandstone (water-bearing sandstone with mudstone interbeds). Between 610 and 945 meters (2,000 and 3,100 feet), an ice wall was created around the ground to be excavated, and a steel lining was used to protect the shaft wall.

Freezing will be accomplished with freeze holes in conjunction with temperature control holes and a center pressure relief hole. The ice wall dimensions and the number of freeze holes required are in direct relation to the shaft diameter and the specific geotechnical characteristics of the site.

The artificial freezing of a very deep shaft is a well developed technology which is based on substantial experience with this type of construction. Critical activities during construction include the accurate drilling of the bore holes for the freeze pipes and careful monitoring of the deflection of the walls while the shaft is open. Creep, associated with the freezing of the unsupported height of the shaft wall, governs the design of the shaft. The concrete lining of the shaft is set during excavation activities to reduce the unsupported height and increase stability. In the design, allowance will be made for the wall deflection before the permanent lining is placed.

Freezing is an engineered process which uses site specific geotechnical characteristics. During construction, the input data for the freeze (ice-wall) design are monitored by instruments for verification of design and safety in operations. Temperature, soil creep, and interaction of the ice wall with the support placed in the shaft are the main parameters being monitored.

The strength characteristics of the frozen Ogallala soils will be the basis for the free standing unsupported height of shaft excavation. The unsupported height of shaft excavation will be varied in accordance with these frozen strength characteristics and in-shaft support time requirements. Support of the frozen shaft wall will consist of short rockbolts with wire mesh initially followed by cast-in-place concrete or precast concrete blocks.

Few problems have been encountered with the actual freezing of the soils. Frozen soils not only have significant compressive strength, they also have considerable tensile strength. However, during the thawing process, it has been shown that soils have reduced void ratio (overconsolidation) and increased vertical permeability. This has been shown to be highest in fine grained,

plastic clays. The geologic texture of the Ogallala is coarse to fine sands, silts, and some clays, and for the Dockum is siltstone and shales, with localized beds of sandstone. Reduced void ratio and increased vertical permeability is, therefore, expected to be minimal.

In addition, during the thawing process, the rate and distribution of thawing can be regulated to ensure that uniform thawing can be achieved to regulate the settling of the concrete lining. This regulation of the thawing will minimize the possibility of deforming the concrete lining.

To confine the disturbed zone created by the freeze process:

1. The freeze holes are terminated in a formation with low permeability and within sections confined by shaft seals.
2. The freeze holes are perforated and injected with cement grout to prevent unwanted water pathways.
3. The disturbed soil and rocks within an aquifer are contained vertically by strategic shaft seals, aquitards, and natural segregation by fluid density.
4. Horizontal permeability within the disturbed aquifer may have minute increases in flow velocities in the immediate shaft vicinity.
5. A continuous bitumen column in contact with the formation at strategic locations will prevent hydraulic communication between units, i.e., Ogallala, Santa Rosa, etc.

Issue

Commenters expressed concern over the land acquisition process and the potential for condemnation. Also, commentors disagreed with the EA conclusion that, with respect to condemnation, a potentially adverse condition does not exist.

Response

The DOE's position on purchasing surface and subsurface rights for the ESF remains as stated in Section 4.1.2.1 of the EA. The siting guideline position for site ownership and control is stated in Section 6.2.1.1 of the EA.

The Deaf Smith County site is located on privately owned land for which the DOE can negotiate voluntary purchase sell agreements. If negotiations of such agreements are unsuccessful, the DOE may obtain ownership by condemnation.

Issue

Several comments were assigned to this issue, including the following:

1. Commenters questioned the decision process that would be used to determine if the ESF is to be incorporated into the repository, if the site is chosen.
2. Commenters questioned the final disposition of the ESF if another site is selected for the repository.
3. Commenters questioned the permit strategy for the ESF.
4. Commenters identified inconsistencies, formatting problems and typos.

Response

1. A report is currently being developed which analyzes the impacts of the ESF on the repository. After the report has been finalized and data from site characterization is available, a decision will be made on the utilization of the ESF into the operational repository, if the site is selected as the repository.
2. If the site is found to be suitable for the first repository, but another site is found more favorable, the site will be maintained as a candidate for the second repository. If the site is found to be not suitable for the first repository, it will be decommissioned.
3. As stated in Section 4.1.2.5 of the EA, the DOE intends to seek and obtain all applicable Federal, State and local permits and approvals necessary for the construction of the exploratory shaft.
4. Inconsistencies have been identified and corrected throughout the EAs. Formatting problems and typos have been corrected where identified.

C.4.2.3 Other Activities

Issue

A few commenters stated that the impact analysis was inadequate in the description of the consequences of land acquisition for site characterization. Specifically, the commenters stated their belief that the DOE would have to acquire the entire 23-square-kilometer (9-square-mile) site (and occasional parcels outside the site) by condemnation, and that the process of condemnation is disruptive. Commenters also stated that uncertainty in future site plans is disruptive to current land holders. Neither impact is fully disclosed in the EA.

Response

The DOE recognizes that land acquisition by the Federal government is disruptive. Condemnation will occur only if voluntary purchase or lease negotiations are unsuccessful. The DOE has modified EA Section 4.1.3.3 to acknowledge that land acquisition and the uncertainties concerning the future of the site area will continue to be disruptive to area residents. There is additional discussion in Section C.6.2 of this Appendix.

Issue

A few commenters believe that the timing of data base development is inadequate to allow selection of the Deaf Smith County site. Specifically, they argued that the environmental and socioeconomic studies be conducted prior to evaluation of the impacts of the site characterization program. Should the site then be shown to be acceptable, they argued that the geotechnical program be conducted prior to initiation of the exploratory shaft facility (ESF).

Response

The DOE has evaluated the data base and has determined that the evidence is sufficient to meet the requirements of 10 CFR Part 960.3-1-4-2. The DOE has revised the text of EA Section 4.1 to clarify schedule relationships between the environmental, socioeconomic, geotechnical, and ESF field programs.

C.4.2.4 Alternative Activities

No comments were received.

C.4.3 THE REPOSITORY

This category addresses comments, questions, and concerns on the design, construction, operation, and decommissioning of a repository at the Deaf Smith County site. This category corresponds to comments received on Section 5.1 of the EA.

Issues raised by the commenters included the following:

- Adequacy of salt disposal plans
- Adequacy of a water supply
- Accuracy and level of detail of repository design
- Waste disposal
- Retrievability
- Postclosure monitoring

- Alternative repository designs
- Rock characteristics
- Traffic.

Issue

Many commenters stated that the EA is inadequate in analyzing the disposal of excess salt. Specifically, the following topics were identified:

- The choice of a salt disposal option, the location of the salt disposal site, and the authority to select these
- The effects on endangered species due to the transporting of excess salt
- The potential environmental damage that could result from accidents during salt shipment
- The behavior of the salt pile and drainage pond during high winds and heavy rainfall
- The performance of the salt pile liner over the repository lifetime
- The resources (including water) required to maintain the salt pile
- The potential risks (particularly to agriculture) associated with blowing salt
- The cost of salt disposal
- The formation and behavior of the salt crust under varying conditions, including low humidities
- Using salt as backfill during repository operation to avoid bringing all of the excavated salt to the surface
- The impact on the analysis of disposing of excess salt (presented on draft EA page 5-98) at the rate at which excess salt is mined, thus resulting in more than 5,000 rail cars per day
- The impacts of truck removal of excess salt
- Exploring the use of excess salt for generating electricity by means of salt-gradient solar pond technology being developed by the DOE and the Department of Interior
- Conflicting statements in the EA about the method of salt disposal to be selected

- The transfer of the authority to decide the commercial-market salt-disposal option to a contractor
- The use of all of the mined salt to backfill the repository.

Response

The DOE has examined the draft EA with respect to disposal of excess salt and has modified the executive summary (Section 5) to show that a preferred method of salt disposal has not been selected. The EA text in Section 5.1.3.4 has also been revised to include additional discussions on the handling and disposal of excess salt. Disposal in an existing mine has been selected as a representative salt disposal method. The present state of compaction methods does not allow all of the excess salt to be placed back into the repository. Other salt disposal techniques, such as solar ponds, will be considered if it can be shown if it is viable and cost effective. The authority to select whether the commercial market is a viable salt disposal option is with the DOE.

In order to respond to commenters, the DOE has conducted a study on the nature of the salt pile at Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) near Carlsbad, New Mexico. This study indicates the following:

1. Formation of the crust occurs very shortly (within a few days) after deposition of salt on the pile.
2. Thickness of the crust is significant and will support heavy loads.
3. The compressive strength of the salt crust approaches that of concrete.
4. The top of the crusted salt pile contains many hollow regions.
5. The crust is porous in nature and, thus, significant rainfall may be absorbed by the salt pile with little runoff. Much of the water is subsequently evaporated during drying periods.
6. In dry areas, where annual evaporation exceeds rainfall, very little brine leaches to the subsoil.

If a natural crust does not form, a water spray may be needed to simulate humidity levels. The water requirement would be minimal. The DOE has modified the EA to discuss the formation of a salt crust on the salt pile.

Based on the analysis related to the development and nature of the salt crust on the salt pile at WIPP (above), the process of breaking up the crust will be laborious and the bulk of the material would be moved as relatively large chunks of impure salt similar to rock salt. However, some fine salt would probably be dispersed in the area during handling and transport and some near the processing facilities and along roadways, even though the material would be transported in covered hopper cars.

Since any salt that is dispersed will not be expected to be transported very far from the salt pile, endangered species would be exposed to minimal quantities of salt and only in limited areas. In the event of an accident, spilled salt would be collected. This will likely result in high concentrations only at the specific location where the salt was deposited on the ground.

A tornado at the Deaf Smith County site is a possibility. As a result of the development and nature of the salt crust, the major impact of a tornado on the salt pile would be analogous to such a force striking a concrete building; very little structural damage is likely occur. However, for the recently excavated salt stored on the surface, a significant crust may not have been formed. This salt would be blown about and probably dispersed over a wide region as a very dilute brine solution.

Severe storms at the Deaf Smith County site are likely during operation of the repository. Wind damage would be similar to that of a tornado. However, rainfall could be expected to be heavy. The drainage pond is sized for the necessary volume, based on historic cumulative maximum monthly rainfall and minimum evaporation data. In addition, a secondary retention pond will be provided to contain the maximum 500-year rainstorm. These ponds should provide sufficient capacity to allow for evaporation of all rainfall. The EA has been modified to discuss the salt pile behavior.

The DOE has investigated salt pile liner performance and has concluded that few data are available upon which to base an analysis of liner performance over the lifetime of the repository. The current practice of firms using salt piles is to operate without the use of either polymeric or clay liners. Although any leakage of salt brine would be undesirable, it should be noted that materials classified as hazardous are being safely disposed of above clay or polymeric liners.

Detailed cost estimates of salt disposal are not available at this time but will be a factor in the selection of the preferred disposal method. As described in the EA, some of the salt will be placed back into the repository as backfill and the remainder will be disposed of off site.

The DOE has revised the EA to include an analysis of the number of railroad cars that would be required to dispose of the excess salt to be shipped off site. Approximately 3,000 rail cars per year are estimated to be needed. All excavated salt cannot be put back into the repository. The revised EA does not include an analysis of the impacts of shipping salt for disposal by truck because truck shipment is not practical due to the excessive number of trucks and individual shipments required.

Issue

Several commenters expressed the following concerns regarding repository water sources:

1. The discussions in the EA do not support the conclusion that adequate quantities of ground water are available to support repository construction, operation, and closure.
2. Estimation of required water quantities do not clearly indicate that requirements to control salt dispersion are included.
3. The viability of ground water beyond the year 2020 is not addressed.

Response

The analysis presented in Section 6.2.1.7.3 shows that in projections requiring a high water demand, regional water supplies are projected to be insufficient to meet regional demand for irrigation, but a sufficient supply for municipal and industrial uses is available. If the municipal and industrial supply were to prove inadequate, water supplies from the Dockum, which may be too deep or saline for agricultural use, can be pumped out and treated, if necessary, for repository use. The EA has been modified to note that the water estimates presented in Section 5.1 include water for salt and dust control. Projections of water use (and availability) are presented in Section 3.3.3, which has been modified to reflect the most recent information.

Issue

Two commenters noted that the EA is inadequate with regard to repository security in terms of the ability to construct signs or means to communicate with civilizations 10,000 years from now to prevent inadvertent exposure to radioactivity. The commenters were also concerned about the threat of terrorists.

Response

The DOE has reviewed the commenter's concern with regard to repository security and notes that markers can be expected to last for thousands of years. This expectation is based on historical evidence of the longevity of monuments remaining from past civilizations, which were constructed without the benefit of noble metals or exotic alloys. The pyramids of Egypt are a well known example of such monuments. Similarly, knowledge of past events has been passed on through thousands of years without the use of written documentation in some cases (Human Interference Task Force, 1984, BMI/ONWI-537; Sebeok, 1984, ONWI-532; Tannenbaum, 1984, BMI/ONWI-535; Berry, 1983, ONWI-474; Weitzberg, 1982, ONWI-379; Kaplan, 1982, ONWI-354).

From the viewpoint of terrorist attack, access to waste will be very difficult during the operational and decommissioning periods. The surface facility will be protected with fences and manned security. The massive waste containers and the need for remote handling make nuclear waste a poor and difficult target for terrorists. A decommissioned repository would require a major mining operation to provide access to buried waste, a cumbersome target at best. The DOE believes that no modification to the EA is necessary.

Issue

Two commenters stated that the EA is inadequate in the number of workers estimated and the description of repository work-force profiles and skills. Specifically, it was noted that more precise information on the work force is necessary to estimate the repository's impacts on the local labor force. Further concerns were expressed about the fact that the EA did not discuss a confidence interval for the work-force numbers presented, that the two-phase repository concept would increase the work-force data, and that insufficient analyses were performed to support the work-force numbers.

Response

The DOE has examined the EA with regard to repository work-force profiles and notes that repository work-force profiles for the construction phase are available in the Design Basis Report for Deaf Smith County (SCC, 1984). The DOE acknowledges that specific repository work-force profiles for the operations phase are not currently contained in the reference reports, because the level of design only permits these to be broadly classified according to the skills required. Additional information on the work force, necessary to estimate the impact on the local labor force, will be part of later more detailed design phases.

With regard to the magnitude of the work-force estimates presented, a confidence interval was not deemed necessary because the modeling efforts presented in Section 5.4 include a "conservative" scenario which, in effect, compensates for inaccuracies in the data used.

The revised EA presents work-force estimates for both the reference repository design and the current two-phase design in a new Table 5-1, Comparison of Alternative Repository Design Concepts. (As pointed out by one commenter, the work-force estimates for the two-phase repository concept are larger.) Table 5-1 also presents, in summary, the socioeconomic impacts due to differences in work-force estimates for the current two-phase repository.

The DOE believes that the work-force estimates provided in the EA are both reasonable and sufficient for purposes of comparison of the socioeconomic impacts of candidate repository sites. The DOE acknowledges that such estimates are preliminary, but are consistent with the preliminary nature of the repository design concepts themselves as stated in Section 5.1 of the EA.

Issue

One commenter stated that the level of detail of the repository design is inadequate and must be improved before site characterization can be justified.

Response

The DOE has examined the EA with regard to the adequacy of the repository design and concludes that the design information is adequate to conduct the analyses of impacts required in the environmental assessment.

Issue

One commenter stated that although the waste must be isolated from the biosphere for at least 10,000 years, the EA contains no discussion of plans to monitor the area to make sure that the repository is not leaking.

Response

The current NRC position regarding repository monitoring is contained in 10 CFR Part 60, Confirmation Program. This proposed regulation requires that selected waste packages will be monitored as long as practical up to the time of permanent closure. This monitoring period would be at least 50 years following the start of waste emplacement operations. A further monitoring program (after closure) is required by this proposed regulation; however, specifics of this program will only be defined after significant period of site study has occurred.

40 CFR Part 191 defines the environmental radiation protection standards for nuclear waste disposal. Section 191.14 states that "Disposal systems shall be monitored after disposal to detect any substantial and detrimental deviation from expected performance. This monitoring shall be done with techniques that do not jeopardize the isolation of the waste and shall be conducted until the implementing agency determines that there are no significant concerns to be addressed by further monitoring." This regulation is open-ended concerning the length of time that monitoring would be required.

Issue

Several commenters stated that the EA is inadequate in the discussions on shaft sealing. Specifically it was noted that the following concerns need to be addressed:

- The capability of shaft seals to prevent hydraulic connection between freshwater and saltwater aquifers
- The effects of subsidence on shaft seals

- The thermal effects on shaft seals
- The seismic effects on shaft seals
- The life expectancy of shaft liners and seals
- The need and mechanism for cleaning the clay from excavated salt prior to backfilling
- The potential problems and uncertainties associated with ground freezing and the effects on shaft liners and seals, water inflow, and dissolution
- The ability to penetrate saturated material with shafts and seal the aquifers
- The identification of reasonably available technology.

Response

The DOE has expanded Section 5.1 of the EA to show the current design concepts and to more clearly identify the technology to be used for sealing the subsurface openings, shafts, and boreholes. Data from site characterization will be used to finalize the design in areas such as location of bulkhead seals, seismic effects, thermal effects, disturbed zone extent, and effects of subsidence. The offset pillar design for the repository shafts was incorporated to remove the shafts from thermal effects, such as differential stresses. Seismic effects predominantly result in near-surface ground motions and that seal systems, particularly the postclosure seals, are effectively isolated from seismic effects due to their depth.

As noted in Chapter 4 of the final EA, both exploratory shafts will be sunk using conventional shaft-sinking techniques. This is the same technique to be used for the repository shafts. The information gained from constructing the exploratory shafts will be instrumental in the design of the repository shafts if the site is selected for a repository.

Piezometers installed behind the shaft liners will allow monitoring, during the operational phase, of the hydraulic heads in the various formations and allow detection of leaks behind the liner. If any leaks are detected, grout can be pumped through access holes in the liner to seal off the leaks before any significant hydraulic connection between aquifers occurs.

Ground freezing, as a method of sinking shafts through wet formations, is a well-proven technology (Djahanguiri, 1984) that has been demonstrated around the world. Effects of ground freezing on the site will be investigated during site characterization and the results will be presented in the license application if the site is selected for repository construction.

The liners and operational seals will be designed to have a lifetime, with maintenance, of more than 100 years. The seals installed at repository closure will have a lifetime of thousands of years.

The quality of excavated salt and the need for removal of clays prior to backfilling will be evaluated during detailed repository design when a backfilling concept is selected and specific information on the quality of excavated salt is available.

Issue

Some commenters stated that the EA does not provide an adequate discussion of treatment and disposal of repository-generated wastes. Specifically, it was noted that the following areas need to be addressed:

- The potential need for municipality treatment of repository generated wastes
- The treatment and disposal of other wastes such as toxic wastes, cask cleaning, and decontamination wastes
- The impacts of waste handling and disposal.

Response

The DOE has examined the draft EA with respect to repository-generated wastes and has revised the text of the EA Section 5.1.3.5, Treatment and Disposal of Other Repository Generated Wastes, to address these issues.

Issue

Several commenters noted inconsistencies in the EAs with regard to waste packaging, such as the following:

1. The total number of packages, receipt rates, and receiving facilities differ in each EA. This should be the same for all sites and consistent with the Mission Plan (DOE, 1985, DOE/RW-0005, Vol. I)
2. Assumptions regarding the emplacement of waste packages should be the same for all sites and consistent with the Mission Plan.
3. The EA notes that rod consolidation with 10-year-old fuel will be used in loading the canisters. It is not clear how this assumption relates to the DOE's obligation to accept 5-year-old fuel.
4. The number of fuel assemblies per canister differ among the EAs. Differences from a common base design should be explained.

5. Detailed discussions on the range and quantity of each waste type should be incorporated into the analysis of all EAs (see Yucca Mountain EA).
6. Although nearly 75 percent of the waste packages will be transuranic (TRU) waste, no TRU-package design information is presented. The DOE should consider presenting an analysis of waste package performance based on emplacement of TRU packages.
7. The DOE states incorrectly that this repository will be big enough for all of the wastes from all the nuclear plants for the next century.
8. The EA is incomplete in its discussion of the handling and storage of nuclear wastes on the surface. There are no indications of provisions for waste storage if the operation is interrupted for some unforeseen reason.

Response

The DOE has examined the EAs and finds that the total number of packages, receipt rate, receiving facilities, and assumptions regarding waste emplacement are consistent among the seven salt EAs, because a common design concept was used for the salt repository designs. A common design for all rock types is not expected or practical due to vastly differing properties of the rock types. The assumptions used for the draft EA reference designs are not consistent with the final Mission Plan (DOE, 1985, DOE/RW-0005, Vol. I). Table 5-1 presents a current two-phase concept which incorporates the current Mission Plan guidance.

The DOE has addressed the potential impacts of placing 5-year-old waste in the repository in Section 5.1 of the EA.

The waste package design is based on media-specific considerations and therefore may differ among the salt, basalt, and tuff EAs. The waste package designs for salt are consistent.

The DOE has revised the EA to include a description of contact-handled TRU waste packages (remote TRU packages are assumed to be DHLW packages). A final TRU waste package design is not available at this time.

The repository will not be initially designed for all of the waste from all of the nuclear plants for the next century. In accordance with the NWPA, the second repository is to be constructed before the time the first repository is loaded beyond 70,000 metric tons (77,000 tons).

Current requirements are established in the Generic Requirements for a Mined Geologic Disposal System (GRMGDS) (DOE, 1984, DOE/NE/44301-1) and provide for a temporary storage capacity equivalent of three months waste receipts in order to minimize the effects of scheduled or unscheduled interruptions in repository operations. This requirement will be re-evaluated if the monitored retrievable storage (MRS) is developed and will depend upon the role of the MRS in the disposal scheme, as discussed in the Mission Plan.

Issue

One commenter stated that Section 6.1.3.3 of the EA implies that the decision to backfill or not to backfill waste rooms is affected by the commitment to maintain retrievability. Other decisions related to thermal load limits, access drift support designs, maintenance, personnel radiological safety, etc., which will also be impacted by retrievability considerations, have not been addressed.

This commenter further stated that the greater creep tendency for Palo Duro salt at elevated temperature may influence retrieval operations by limiting the allowable thermal loading.

Response

The DOE concurs that the commitment to maintain the ability to retrieve previously emplaced waste packages, required by NWPA section 122 and 10 CFR 60.111, will influence design decisions other than to backfill waste rooms. Section 5.1 states that the ability to retrieve waste packages will be proven during the proof-of-principle demonstration period prior to licensing. The DOE has modified Section 5.1 of the EA to more specifically address retrievability.

The DOE agrees with the commenter that thermal loading affects creep rates. The DOE does not agree that the increased creep rate of salt at elevated temperatures will necessarily result in the reduction of the allowable thermal loading. According to Kendorski et al. (1984, NUREG/CR-3489), while repository designs must allow for retrievability, the requirement for retrievability must not dictate repository design. The effect of greater creep rate at elevated temperature will indeed make retrievable operations more costly and more difficult. This is not expected to affect the feasibility of the repository construction. No change in the EA is required.

Issue

One commenter stated that creeping salt will help to seal gaps and cracks when containers are deposited in the ground but this sealing trait will make it impossible to retrieve canisters at a later date.

Response

If waste packages are placed in open holes, either with or without crushed salt backfill, the creep of the in situ salt is expected to close the airgap around the hole shortly after emplacement. The waste package is designed to withstand any stress resulting from the closure, but removal of the package, in this case, may require overcoring or some other removal technique. This emplacement mode, however, is only the simplest of several contemplated by DOE which include, but are not limited to, horizontal emplacement of one or more

canisters in holes drilled into the pillar between rooms, the use of large holes without backfill, the use of sleeves to line emplacement holes, and combinations of these methods. The use of sleeves, for example, should eliminate concerns about the effect of creep closure on location and removal of waste packages in retrieval operations. A final emplacement technique will be selected during the development of more detailed repository designs.

Issue

One commenter stated that the analysis of the Rock Characteristics Section needs to be expanded to address the following retrievability problems:

- Reexcavation of rooms in the presence of heat
- Rapidly creeping openings
- High levels of radiation, steam, and possibly chlorine and hydrogen
- Thermally-elevated conditions that pose ventilation, mining, and radiological safety problems.

The commenter stated that these problems will require sophisticated remote mining, rock handling, and possibly roof support installation equipment with cooled and shielded enclosures for the operator and support personnel. This equipment needs to be developed and operators trained.

Response

The DOE concurs that retrieval conditions described in the comment present problems in retrievability and will require either remote control, shielded and cooled operator compartments, precooling of the waste room prior to retrieval, or some combination of these measures. The methods and equipment needed to conduct retrieval operations are presently under development by the DOE as part of the repository design process, and are to be developed and tested as part of the proof-of-principle demonstration period prior to licensing. The DOE's current position on retrievability has been added to Section 5.1.

Issue

Two commenters noted that the EA does not present an estimate of work hours which would allow specific numbers of injuries and fatalities to be calculated.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated the data regarding health and safety and has modified Section 5.1 of the EA to include work hours from which specific numbers of injuries and fatalities can be calculated.

Issue

One commenter stated that with the two-phase repository design introduced in Section 5.5 of the EA, the previous 150 pages discussing the reference design should not be included in the EA.

Response

The final repository design may differ from that described in the EA. At the current stage of design, repository concepts are still evolving and can be expected to continue to evolve through the Conceptual Design, and License Application Design and Final Procurement and Construction Design. When the design is being finalized, the public will have further input to the design through the environmental impact statement process. A new table (Table 5-1) has been added to provide a status of the current two-phase concept.

Issue

A single commenter is concerned that the number and sizes of the repository shafts are not consistent among the nine EAs. A further concern is that surface facility descriptions should also be the same among the nine EAs.

Response

The number and size of shafts among the seven candidate salt sites are consistent. These shaft sizes are based on subsurface support requirements, including salt production rates, ventilation, and nuclear waste handling requirements as estimated for the salt project. Similarly, the surface facility components are the same among the seven salt sites except for variations in layout, primarily due to the different topographies at each of the sites.

Other projects (tuff and basalt) have different subsurface support requirements as well as different surface characteristics; therefore, differences in design can be expected.

Issue

Several commenters stated that the draft EA inadequately addressed the impacts which would result from consideration of a larger, more complex, two-phase repository concept. Criticism was also expressed concerning the lack of detail presented on the two-phase concept itself.

Of specific concern were the following:

- The basis for assuming nongassy conditions for the reference concept and gassy conditions for the two-phase concept

- Impacts on the host rock due to the larger size and greater extraction ratio of the two-phase concept
- Impacts of increased ventilation requirements on the high-efficiency particulate air (HEPA) filter system
- Concerns about incorporation of the exploratory shaft facility (ESF) into the repository from the viewpoint of sealing of the ESF shafts
- Differences in salt-handling procedures, salt quantities, and salt-pile size
- Changes in site characterization activities due to increased areas for the surface and subsurface activities
- Differences in retrieval requirements for the large two-phase concept
- Concerns about simultaneous repository development and waste emplacement operations as they affect safety
- Changes in size of the restricted area
- Differences in the thermomechanical response of the two-phase design
- Differences in construction and operational scenarios which impact socioeconomic considerations
- Concerns that the repository does not account for defense waste.

Response

The EAs are not intended to address in detail all issues pertaining to repository designs, particularly since these designs are still evolving and are currently in an early design phase. The reference design is reasonably representative of what a repository may look like at each site and, as such, is adequate.

Since the draft EAs were issued, some additional detail on the two-phase concept has been produced. In addition, the Mission Plan (DOE, 1985, DOE/RW-0005, Vol. I) has been issued which gives additional direction pertinent to the phased concept, the types of wastes to be received, etc. Chapter 5 has been modified to include a new table, which presents a comparison of two repository concepts, along with estimates of changes in impacts due to concept differences, and suggested mitigation measures.

The purpose of Table 5-1 is to present an understanding that the repository designs are still evolving, illustrate differences which could occur as the

design process matures, and highlight differing impacts which follow changes in design approach.

The specific concerns stated by the commenters are addressed as follows:

1. The reference concept in the draft EA assumed nongassy conditions because the original non-site-specific designs upon which the reference concept is based (NWTs R-1 [Stearns-Roger, 1979], NWTs R-2 [Kaiser Engineers, 1978], and CRRD [BGI, 1981, ONWI-258]) were similarly designed to nongassy assumptions. These were the only repository designs available at the time the EAs were begun.

The DOE's current position is to ensure that gassy conditions can be accommodated by the design even though gassy conditions may not be present at any salt site.

2. The impacts on the host rock are expected to be greater for the two-phase concept due to the greater extraction ratio as noted by the commenter. The extent of these impacts will be evaluated during site characterization. The designs were based on accepted commercial design practice.
3. The full impacts of the increased ventilation requirements on the HEPA filtering system will be analyzed during the subsequent design phase. It is expected that the surface area of the HEPA filters will be increased in accordance with the higher airflows expected.
4. The DOE has not fully determined the extent to which the ESF will be incorporated into a repository. If the ESF is ultimately used as part of the repository, the ESF shaft seals and other components of the shaft must meet the same requirements imposed on other repository shafts.
5. Salt quantities shipped offsite, and the salt-pile size differ from the reference concept. The effects of these differences are presented as impacts in Table 5-1.
6. The site characterization activities presented in Chapter 4 have been revised to incorporate possible future differences in repository designs by incorporating pertinent aspects of the most recent available design information.
7. The current lack of engineering detail in regard to retrieval does not allow a differentiation to be made among the repository concepts.
8. The two concepts presented in Table 5-1 are based on the premise that waste emplacement and repository development will occur at the same time. The development areas and emplacement areas are separated by considerable distance (and rock thickness) and that separate ventilation systems are employed for each type of operation. Therefore, an accident in either the development (mining) area or emplacement area should not impact the safety of the other.

9. The restricted area will change in accordance with changes in surface areas and layout.
10. The thermomechanical response of the two-phase concept will be analyzed during subsequent design phases and during the site characterization stage.
11. The discussion regarding the difference in socioeconomic impacts in Table 5-1 is adequate and no further revision to the EA is considered necessary.
12. The "Current Two-Phase Concepts" column in Table 5-1 addresses defense waste according to the DOE Mission Plan (DOE, 1985, DOE/RW-0005, Vol. I).

The guideline findings are based on the reference concept because, as stated previously, the reference concept was the best repository design information available when the EAs were begun. Based on the material shown in Table 5-1, the DOE believes that the comparison among the salt sites and conclusions reached would not materially change due to variations in the repository design concepts analyzed.

Issue

Some commenters noted that the EA does not provide an adequate assessment of the scope of the controlled area. Specifically, it was noted that the size of the controlled area for a repository cannot be determined until considerable site characterization efforts are completed; the projected 23 square kilometers (9 square miles) could be greatly expanded with related effects on land acquisition.

Response

The DOE has examined the EA and notes that after detailed site characterization work and more detailed repository design are completed, a more accurate determination of the controlled area can be made. In addition, increased knowledge of geological response to the heat and radiation of a repository may permit a reduction of the controlled area.

The DOE has provided a more detailed map to distinguish between controlled area, subsurface area, and surface area within Section 5.1.

Issue

One commenter stated that Section 6.3.3.2 of the EA does not discuss the effect of clay interbeds, heat, and mining techniques on the amount of scaling required to maintain the excavation geometry.

Response

The effect of interbeds, heat, and mining methods on continued scaling are addressed in Section 6.3. The specific maintenance program of opening dimensions will require more detailed information that will come from the construction of the exploratory shaft and the accompanying in situ test program.

Issue

One commenter stated that the EA is inadequate in the analysis of rock mechanics. Specifically, it was noted that the following issues should be considered in evaluating uncertainties related to a repository's support requirements:

- Effect of induced thermal loading on roof and rib failures (slaking, spalling, etc.)
- Thermomechanical analysis of salt rock or rock bolt in regard to rock-bolt performance
- Repository support requirements for prevention of roof falls, spalling, slaking, heaving, etc.

Response

The DOE has addressed these concerns in the EA by discussing those activities which are planned during the site characterization, such as:

1. Effect of induced thermal loading on roof and rib failure can be carried out at this time only with numerical techniques. A thermomechanical study needs to be carried out in the laboratory and in the field to validate the numerical study.
2. A thermomechanical analysis of salt rock/rock bolt in regard to rock-bolt performance is also recommended. The rock-bolt performance needs to be investigated in the laboratory and field.
3. Repository support requirements are site-specific; therefore, during the exploration phase only support needs can be estimated, based on cored drill holes. During the excavation phase, a better estimate and prediction of roof and floor support requirements can be made.

Issue

A commenter stated that the EA should present a more detailed breakdown of the repository supply trips by truck such as the day of the week, time of day, projected routes, etc.

Response

The current level of repository design is not sufficiently developed to allow for the level of detail desired by the commenter, such as the time of day deliveries will be made, etc.

The DOE believes that no modification of the EA is necessary based on this comment.

C.4.4 CHAPTER C.4 REFERENCES

C.4.4.1 References Listed by Author

Acharya, H., 1985. Historical Seismicity of the Texas Panhandle From an Examination of Lubbock Station Records, Rev. 1, prepared by Stone & Webster Engineering Corporation for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH, in preparation.

Baumgardner, Robert W., Jr., 1983. "Terrace Stratigraphy and Erosional History of the Little Red River Basin, Texas Panhandle," in T. C. Gustavson et al., Geology and Geohydrology of the Palo Duro Basin, Texas Panhandle: A Report on the Progress of Nuclear Waste Isolation Feasibility Studies (1982), Geological Circular 83-4, prepared for U.S. Department of Energy by Bureau of Economic Geology, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX, pp. 138-141.

Bechtel Group, Inc., 1981. NWTS Conceptual Reference Repository Description (CRRD), Vol. I, Summary, ONWI-258, prepared for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

Berry, W. E., 1983. Durability of Marker Materials for Nuclear Waste Isolation Sites, ONWI-474, prepared by Battelle Columbus Laboratories for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

Budnik, Roy T., 1983. "Influence of Basement Structure on Distribution and Facies of Overlying Strata, Palo Duro Basin, Texas Panhandle," in Geology and Geohydrology of the Palo Duro Basin, Texas Panhandle, Geological Circular 83-4, prepared for U.S. Department of Energy by Bureau of Economic Geology, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX, pp. 14-24.

Djahanguiri, F., 1984. Memorandum from Djahanguiri to John Treadwell, both of Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH, about the history of shaft freezing and its application to the Salt Repository Project, June 1.

Dutton, Shirley P., Arthur G. Goldstein, and Stephen C. Ruppel, 1982. Petroleum Potential of the Palo Duro Basin, Texas Panhandle, Report of Investigations No. 123, prepared for U.S. Department of Energy by Bureau of Economic Geology, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX.

Fisher, R. Stephen, 1984c. Amount and Nature of Occluded Water in Bedded Salt, Palo Duro Basin, Texas, OF-WTWI-1984-50, prepared for U.S. Department of Energy by The Bureau of Economic Geology, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX.

Fisher, R. Stephen, 1984a. Geochemical Environment of the Evaporite Aquitard and Deep-Basin Brine Aquifer, Palo Duro Basin, Texas, OF-WTWI-1984-26, prepared for U.S. Department of Energy by Bureau of Economic Geology, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX.

Fisher, R. Stephen, 1984b. Host Rock Geochemistry of the Palo Duro Basin, Texas, OF-WTWI-1984-11, prepared for U.S. Department of Energy by Bureau of Economic Geology, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX.

Fukui, Larry M., 1984. Summary of Petrographic and Chemical Data for Palo Duro Basin Samples Examined by Bendix Field Engineering Corporation, Grand Junction, Colorado, as of April 29, 1983, BMI/ONWI-540, prepared by Bendix Field Engineering Corporation for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

Geiger, Luther C., Herbert E. Bruns, and Billy R. Chance, 1968. Soil Survey of Deaf Smith County, Texas, Soil Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC, with Texas Agricultural Experiment Station.

Girard, J. S., P. Mercado-Allinger, M. D. Freeman, and R. C. Fields, 1984. "Phase I Cultural Resource File Search for the U.S. Department of Energy National Waste Terminal Storage Program, Deaf Smith, Randall, Oldham, and Potter Counties, Texas," Appendix A in NUS Corporation, Cultural Resources: Deaf Smith and Swisher County Locations, Texas, BMI/ONWI-560, prepared for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

G. J. Long & Associates, Inc., 1983. Interpretation of Seismic Reflection Data - Central Palo Duro Basin, prepared for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH, in preparation.

Gray, W. H., 1984. "Gamma Radiolysis Effects on Grande Ronde Basalt Groundwater," Materials Research Society Symposium Proceedings, Vol. 26, pp. 147-152.

Gustavson, Thomas C., and Roy T. Budnik, 1985. "Structural Influences on Geomorphic Processes and Physiographic Features, Texas Panhandle: Technical Issues in Siting a Nuclear Waste Repository," Geology, Vol. 13, pp. 173-176.

Gustavson, Thomas C., Robert J. Finley, and Robert W. Baumgardner, Jr., 1980b. "Preliminary Rates of Slope Retreat and Salt Dissolution Along the Eastern Caprock Escarpment of the Southern High Plains and in the Canadian River Valley," in T. C. Gustavson et al., Geology and Geohydrology of the Palo Duro Basin, Texas Panhandle: A Report on the Progress of Nuclear Waste Isolation Feasibility Studies (1979), Geological Circular 80-7, prepared for U.S. Department of Energy by Bureau of Economic Geology, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX, pp. 76-82.

Gustavson, Thomas C., Robert J. Finley, and Kathy A. McGillis, 1980a. Regional Dissolution of Permian Salt in the Anadarko, Dalhart, and Palo Duro Basins of the Texas Panhandle, Report of Investigations No. 106, prepared for U.S. Department of Energy by Bureau of Economic Geology, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX.

Hovorka, Susan D., B. A. Luneau, and S. Thomas, 1985. Stratigraphy of Bedded Halite in the Permian San Andres Formation, Units 4 and 5, Palo Duro Basin, Texas (draft), OF-WTWI-1985-9, prepared for the U.S. Department of Energy by Bureau of Economic Geology, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX, Plates 2 and 10.

Hubbard, N., J. C. Laul, and R. W. Perkins, 1984. "The Use of Natural Radionuclides to Predict the Behavior of Radwaste Radionuclides in Far-Field Aquifers," in G. L. McVay, ed., Scientific Basis for Nuclear Waste Management VII, Vol. 26, Elsevier Scientific Publishing Company, New York, NY, pp. 891-897.

Human Interference Task Force, 1984. Reducing the Likelihood of Future Human Activities That Could Affect Geologic High-Level Waste Repositories, BMI/ONWI-537, Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

INTERA Environmental Consultants, Inc., 1983. EQ3/EQ6: A Geochemical Speciation and Reaction Path Code Package Suitable for Nuclear Waste Performance Assessment, ONWI-472, prepared for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

International City Management Association, 1979. The Practice of Local Government Planning, Washington, DC.

Jansen, George, 1985. Expected Waste Package Performance for Nuclear Waste Repositories in Three Salt Formations, Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH, in preparation.

Jessberger, Hans L., ed., 1979. Ground Freezing: Developments in Geotechnical Engineering, Vol. 26 (Proceedings of the First International Symposium on Ground Freezing, Bochum, German Federal Republic March 8-10, 1978), Elsevier Scientific Publishing Company, New York, NY, pp. 311-327.

Kaiser Engineers, 1978. A National Waste Terminal Storage Repository in a Bedded Salt Formation for Spent Unreprocessed Fuel, 26 vols., prepared for U.S. Department of Energy, Oak Ridge Operations Office, Oak Ridge, TN.

Kaplan, Maureen F., 1982. Archaeological Data as a Basis for Repository Marker Design, ONWI-354, prepared by The Analytic Sciences Corporation for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

Kendorski, F. S., D. F. Hambley, and P. L. Wilkey, 1984. Assessment of Retrieval Alternatives for the Geologic Disposal of Nuclear Waste, NUREG/CR-3489, prepared by Engineers International, Inc., for U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC., p. 21.

Knauth, L. Paul, and M. A. Beeunas, 1985. Origin of Fluid Inclusion Water in Bedded Salt Deposits, Palo Duro Basin, Texas, BMI/ONWI-569, prepared by Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ, for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

Laul, J. C., M. R. Smith, and N. Hubbard, 1985. "Behavior of Natural Uranium, Thorium and Radium Isotopes in the Wolfcamp Brine Aquifers, Palo Duro Basin, Texas," Materials Research Society Symposium Proceedings, Vol. 44, pp. 475-482.

Levy, P. W., and J. H. Kierstead, 1982. Very Rough Preliminary Estimate of the Sodium Metal Colloid Inducted in Natural Rock Salt by the Radiations from Waste Canisters, BNL-32004, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, NY.

Lind, Samuel C., 1961. Radiation Chemistry of Gases, American Chemical Society Monograph Series No. 151, Reinhold Publishing Corporation, New York, NY, pp. 99-106, 145-147, and 175-180.

McGowen, J. H., G. E. Granata, and S. J. Seni, 1979. Depositional Framework of the Lower Dockum Group (Triassic), Texas Panhandle, Report of Investigations No. 97, prepared for U.S. Department of Energy by Bureau of Economic Geology, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX.

Means, Jeffrey L., and Norman J. Hubbard, 1985. The Organic Geochemistry of Deep Ground Waters From the Palo Duro Basin, Texas: Implications for Radionuclide Complexation, Ground-Water Origin, and Petroleum Exploration, BMI/ONWI-578, prepared by Battelle's Columbus Laboratories and Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

NUS Corporation, 1984. Socioeconomic Data Base Report for the Permian Basin, ONWI-461, prepared for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

NUS Corporation, 1984. Soil Characteristics of Two Locations in Swisher and Deaf Smith Counties, Palo Duro Basin, Texas, BMI/ONWI-510, prepared for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

Nuttli, Otto W., and Robert B. Herrmann, 1981. Consequences of Earthquakes in the Mississippi Valley, American Society of Civil Engineers Preprint 81-519, Department of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, St. Louis University, St. Louis, MO.

Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, 1983. Functional Design Criteria for the Exploratory Shaft in Salt, ONWI-455, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, 1984. Performance Assessment Plans and Methods for the Salt Repository Project, BMI/ONWI-545, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, 1985. Shaft Locations for the Exploratory Shaft Facility and the Repository, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH, in preparation.

Panno, Samuel S., and Kenneth S. Czyscinski, 1984. "Expected Brine Chemistry in a Nuclear Waste Repository in Salt," Proceedings of the First Canadian/American Conference on Hydrogeology, Practical Applications of Ground Water Geochemistry (June 22-26, 1984, Banff, Alberta, Canada), National Water Well Association, Worthington, OH, pp. 201-209.

Panno, Samuel V., and Peter Soo, 1983. An Evaluation of Chemical Conditions Caused by Gamma Irradiation of Natural Rock Salt, prepared for U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission by Nuclear Waste Management Division, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, NY.

Pederson, L. R., D. E. Clark, F. N. Hodges, G. L. McVay, and D. Rai, 1984. "The Expected Environment for Waste Packages in a Salt Repository," Material Research Society Symposium Proceedings, Vol. 26, pp. 417-426.

Pennington, Wayne D., and Scott D. Davis, 1984. Historic Seismicity In and Around the Texas Panhandle, OF-WTWI-1984-14, prepared for U.S. Department of Energy by Bureau of Economic Geology, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX.

Railroad Commission of Texas, 1984. Coal Mining Regulations, Surface Mining and Reclamation Division, Austin, TX.

Regan, Terence R., and Philip J. Murphy, 1984. Structural Analysis of the Northern Palo Duro Basin, prepared by Stone & Webster Corporation for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH, Figure 3, in preparation.

Rose, Peter R., 1984a. Hydrocarbon Resources of the Palo Duro Basin, Texas Panhandle, prepared by Telegraph Exploration, Telegraph, TX, for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH, in preparation.

Rose, Peter R., 1984b. Petroleum Potential of the Palo Duro Basin, Texas Panhandle, prepared for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH, in preparation.

SCC, see Stearns Catalytic Corporation.

Schnabel, Per B., and H. Bolton Seed, 1973. "Accelerations in Rock for Earthquakes in the Western United States," Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America, Vol. 63, No. 2, pp. 501-516.

Sebeok, Thomas A., 1984. Communication Measures to Bridge Ten Millennia, BMI/ONWI-532, prepared by Research Center for Language and Semiotic Studies, Indiana University, for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

Seni, Steven J., 1980. Sand-Body Geometry and Depositional Systems, Ogallala Formation, Texas, Report of Investigations No. 105, prepared for U.S. Department of Energy by Bureau of Economic Geology, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX.

Sewell, M. J., 1984. Summary of Chemical and Isotopic Data Produced by Bendix Field Engineering Corporation for the Mansfield #1, Sawyer #1, Zeeck #1, and J. Friemel #1 Wells in the Texas Panhandle, prepared for the Salt Repository Project Office by Bendix Field Engineering Corporation, Grand Junction, CO.

Soil Conservation Service, 1965. Computer Program for Project Formulation - Hydrology, Technical Release 20, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC.

Soil Conservation Service, 1980. Soil Survey of Oldham County, Texas, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC.

Stearns Catalytic Corporation, 1984. Basic Repository EA Design Basis, Permian Basin, Deaf Smith County Site, prepared for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, Ohio, OH, in preparation.

Stearns-Roger Engineering Corporation, 1979, National Waste Terminal Storage Repository No. 1, 21 vols., prepared for U.S. Department of Energy, Oak Ridge Operations Office, Oak Ridge, TN.

Stumm, Werner, and James J. Morgan, 1970. Aquatic Chemistry: An Introduction Emphasizing Chemical Equilibria in Natural Waters, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, NY, pp. 172-194 and 500-507.

Tannenbaum, Percy H., 1984. Communication Across 300 Generations: Deterring Human Interference With Waste Deposit Sites, BMI/ONWI-535, prepared by Survey Research Center, University of California, Berkeley, for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

U.S. Department of Energy, 1981. NWTS Program Criteria for Mined Geologic Disposal of Nuclear Waste: Site Performance Criteria, DOE/NWTS-33(2), Office of NWTS Integration, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

U.S. Department of Energy, 1984. Generic Requirements for a Mined Geologic Disposal System, DOE/NE/44301-1, prepared by Roy F. Weston Inc. for Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management, Washington, DC.

U.S. Department of Energy, 1984. Identification of Sites Within the Palo Duro Basin: Volume 1 - Palo Duro Location A, DOE/CH-10(1), prepared for the Salt Repository Project Office by the Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Project Management Division, Columbus, OH.

U.S. Department of Energy, 1985. Mission Plan for the Civilian Radioactive Waste Management Program, Vol. I of III, DOE/RW-0005, Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management, Washington, DC.

U.S. Geological Survey and U.S. Bureau of Mines, 1980. Principles of a Resource/Reserve Classification for Minerals, U.S. Geological Survey Circular 831, U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, DC.

Weast, Robert C., ed., 1984. CRC Handbook of Chemistry and Physics, 1984-1985, 65th edn., Chemical Rubber Publishing Company, Boca Raton, FL, pp. B-84 and B-142.

Weitzberg, Abraham, 1982. Building on Existing Institutions to Perpetuate Knowledge of Waste Repositories, ONWI-379, prepared by NUS Corporation for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

Williams, J., 1984. Letter (including tables) from Williams, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, to S. Silvernale, NUS Corporation, about Deaf Smith and Oldham Counties soil characteristics, September 19.

Wyle Laboratories, 1971. Community Noise, prepared for Office of Noise Abatement and Control, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC, pp. 4, 6, 8, 12, 17-18, 20-24, 28, 33, 37, A-69, A-72, B-12, and B-13.

C.4.4.2 Federal Regulations and Statutes

10 CFR Part 60, Disposal of High-Level Radioactive Wastes in Geologic Repositories; Licensing Procedures.

10 CFR Part 960, Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982; General Guidelines for the Recommendation of Sites for the Nuclear Waste Repositories,; Final Siting Guidelines.

40 CFR Part 191, Environmental Standards for the Management and Disposal of Spent Nuclear Fuel, High-Level and Transuranic Radioactive Wastes; Final Rule, September 19, 1985.

Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, 42 USC Secs. 10101-10226.

C.5 POSTCLOSURE PERFORMANCE

This section addresses comments related to the postclosure characteristics of a nuclear waste repository which are intended to maintain waste isolation over an extended period. The object of postclosure performance of a repository, as delineated in the DOE's general siting guidelines (10 CFR 960.4-1) is to comply with EPA and NRC regulations intended to insure the health and safety of the public and the quality of the environment. This section corresponds to Chapters 3.2, 5.2, 6.3, and 7.2 of the EA concerning ground and rock characteristics of the immediate repository environment, the overall characteristics of the postclosure environment, and potential human interactions with the repository.

C.5.1 GEOHYDROLOGY

This category includes comments and questions which concern the effect of the repository on the hydrologic system during postclosure and the ability to isolate the waste from the hydrologic system. Several issues were also raised regarding the models used to predict performance.

Issue

Numerous commenters stated that alternate travel paths should be considered in evaluating the postclosure technical guideline for Geohydrology (10 CFR 960.4-2-1).

Response

The principal travel path identified in the draft EA is a downward flow from the host salt, followed by lateral flow in the Wolfcamp series to the accessible environment. The DOE has reviewed the text and has determined that while the most likely travel path is presented in the EA, alternative travel paths may exist. The DOE has therefore modified the EA (Section 6.3.1.1) to include additional analyses to determine alternate travel paths, and has recalculated travel times from the disturbed zone to the accessible environment according to these new travel paths.

Issue

Numerous commenters have expressed concern over contamination of potable water supplies at the site.

Response

Federal standards set by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency prohibit contamination of potable water supplies by radionuclides harmful to humans. The DOE is required to comply with such regulations for the high-level nuclear waste repository. Ground-water flow paths are not expected to be towards potable water supplies, rather they are expected to be predominantly downward or laterally from the repository to nonpotable brine aquifers. Alternative additional travel paths are included by the DOE in revising the EA (Section 6.3.1.1) as discussed in the preceding response.

Issue

Several commenters stated that hydrogeologic parameters were both uncertain and nonconservative.

Response

The principal parameters controlling the ground-water travel path from the disturbed zone to the accessible environment inherently have a degree of geologic uncertainty. Such parameters include horizontal and vertical gradient, permeability, porosity, salinity, and the continuity and thickness of each layer. To address the uncertainty in flow parameters, a system analysis approach was used to calculate travel paths and time for the EAs from multiple realizations based on the Latin Hypercube Sampling method (Iman and Conover, 1982, NUREG/CR-2350). The DOE has revised the EA (Section 6.3.1.1) to account for conservative and uncertain values by presenting a range of flow parameters used to calculate ground-water travel paths and times.

Issue

Several commenters were concerned over possible fracture flow, and secondary porosity in the subsurface.

Response

The DOE has reassessed the effect of fracture on ground-water flow at the Deaf Smith County site. A peer review group of hydrologists met to examine the importance and availability of fracture-controlled ground-water flow in bedded salt. This assessment concluded that there is no direct evidence, using current available information, that the regional ground-water flow in the Palo Duro Basin in the area of Deaf Smith County is significantly controlled by fractures. It was recommended that a range of travel times can be estimated adequately by stochastic pathway analysis using known or expected distributions of pressure, fluid density, permeability, and effective porosity. The DOE has modified the EA (Sections 6.3.1.1 and 6.4.3.2.5) in accordance with the recommendations of the review panel. Travel times in the revised EA are based on stochastic

pathways from Latin Hypercube Sampling (Iman and Conover, 1982) as described above.

C.5.2 GEOCHEMISTRY

Several commenters expressed concern that the DOE has not adequately considered the potential effects of geochemical conditions and processes on the high-level waste (HLW) disposal system. Areas of particular concern were the description of in situ conditions (including the uncertainty in that description) and the potential for adverse chemical and geochemical effects on the performance of the waste package and the overall system.

The comments were grouped into the following major issues: radionuclide mobility and migration, clay content and water availability in Palo Duro Basin host rock, geochemical evidence of post-depositional dissolution, shallow aquifer water quality and geochemistry, geochemical modeling, and host rock salt mineralogy and petrology. None of the EA revisions regarding radionuclide mobility and migration issues changes the outcome of the waste package performance calculations in Section 6.4.2.

Given that site-specific geochemical information is not available for the Deaf Smith County site, pertinent data are provided by rock and formation fluid samples obtained from drill holes near to the site. Expected chemical interactions in the host salt are (1) corrosion of the waste package by thermally-migrating brines from the salt and (2) in the event of waste package failure, leaching of radionuclides from the waste package. The unexpected condition of waste package corrosion by unlimited volumes of intrusive ground water has also been considered in the performance assessment calculations (Section 6.4.2).

Unit 4 salt contains brine in fluid inclusions, grain boundaries, and clay interbeds. The maximum volume of brine available for migration toward and corrosion of the waste package has been recalculated in the revised EA (Section 3.2.7.2) and is less than the 5.0 volume percent value used in the waste package performance calculations. A thermally migrating brine will likely have a relatively high-magnesium content (approximately 35,000 milligrams per liter) and an intrusion brine will likely be a low-magnesium (approximately 130 milligrams per liter) type (Pederson et al., 1984). Furthermore, the performance assessment calculations conservatively assume other input values that result in shorter projected lifetimes of the waste packages and greater radionuclide release than the expected values. The results of the performance assessments (Section 6.4.2), which demonstrate the presence of the qualifying condition (Sections 6.3.1.2.1 and 6.3.1.2.5), are summarized as follows:

1. Waste package corrosion by unlimited quantities of low-magnesium intrusion brine will not lead to waste package failure within 10,000 years after burial.
2. Thermally-induced brine migration will bring only a moderate quantity of high-magnesium brine in contact with the waste package, and this

amount of high-magnesium brine will not destroy the ability of the waste package to meet the requirements of 10 CFR 60.113.

3. A conservative analysis of expected conditions shows that less than 0.001 percent of the 1,000-year radionuclide inventory would dissolve per year.
4. There are no driving forces that would cause release of radionuclides from the repository. Should brine that contains dissolved radionuclides escape the repository, it must travel vertically more than 610 meters (2,000 feet) through low-permeability rocks below the repository, enter hydrostratigraphic unit C (HSU C), and flow laterally to the accessible environment.

Specific issues are discussed in greater detail below.

Issue

Commenters were concerned about radionuclide mobility and migration. It was noted that the calculations of radionuclide release presented in the EA may be in error.

Response

The DOE notes that the question of radionuclide mobility and migration can be broken down into four areas of specific concern: oxidation and reduction conditions, potential for colloids or organic complexes contributing to radionuclide transport, mineral sorption properties, and the data base used to calculate solubilities.

The DOE has reexamined the available evidence on oxidation and reduction conditions in the repository horizon and in the deep aquifers. This evidence shows that the at-depth chemical environment is sufficiently reducing for uranium and other actinide species to be in the less soluble, less mobile, reduced states (e.g., tetravalent uranium). The evidence, which has been summarized in Sections 3.3.2.1.3, 6.3.1.2.2, and 6.3.1.2.3 of the revised EA, consists of the following:

- Presence of organic carbon and pyrite in the sedimentary strata (Fisher, 1984a, b, c)
- Presence of methane and ethane in deep-basin brines (Sewell, 1984)
- Presence of short-chain aliphatic acid anions, which are anaerobic decomposition products of sedimentary organic matter, in deep basin brines (Means and Hubbard, 1985, BMI/ONWI-578)
- Uranium-234/thorium-230 ratios suggesting that naturally occurring uranium in 9 of 10 deep basin brines examined is present primarily in its tetravalent (reduced) state (Hubbard et al., 1984).

Gamma radiolysis may alter ground-water redox states through the production of species such as hydrogen peroxide, oxygen, hydrogen, chlorine, and possibly perchlorate (Panno and Czyscinski, 1984). Similar effects are predicted from alpha radiolysis of brine (Pederson et al., 1984), which will not occur until waste package failure. Brine radiolysis reactions have been experimentally documented at dose rates many orders of magnitude greater than that expected at the waste package surface, and will be localized to the near-field repository environment should they occur. If future research demonstrates significant brine radiolysis at expected repository dose rates, then engineering measures can be implemented to reduce radiation dose rates and to minimize any adverse effects.

The potential for transport of radionuclides as complexes with organic chemical species has been reevaluated. EA Sections 3.3.2.1.3 and 6.3.1.2.2 have been modified to include a summary of the available data on organic species in Palo Duro deep basin brines and a discussion on the potential for the formation of stable organic complexes with radionuclides. In Deaf Smith County, total organic carbon concentrations in deep ground-water samples are low and consist primarily of acetate and other short-chain aliphatic acid anions (Means and Hubbard, 1985, BMI/ONWI-578). Chemical equilibria calculations demonstrate that the organic compounds present have weak radionuclide complexation characteristics and are not expected to enhance radionuclide transport. The potential for generation of complex organic species by radiolysis of methane and other naturally occurring organic materials has also been reevaluated and found to produce degradation products such as formic acid, carbon dioxide, water, and polyethylene (Lind, 1961; Gray, 1984). These compounds are not expected to affect radionuclide mobility (Section 6.3.1.2.2).

Colloids may enhance the transport of radionuclides in ground water under some conditions. Sections 3.3.2.1.3 and 6.3.1.2.2 of the EA have been revised to clarify the available information on radiocolloid formation and stability. Brines promote the conversion of stable hydrophilic colloidal suspensions to unstable hydrophobic particles (Stumm and Morgan, 1970, pp. 500-507). The conversion process is accompanied by colloid growth and charge reversal, resulting in large, relatively immobile particles that can be more effectively filtered by geological substrates. The applicability of this phenomenon to radiocolloid transport in a salt repository needs to be further established. Laul et al. (1985) examined particle sizes of natural radium, thorium, and uranium isotopes in a Palo Duro Wolfcampian brine and concluded that colloidal transport was not occurring.

The draft EA briefly stated in Sections 3.3.2.1.3, 6.3.1.2.2, and 6.3.1.2.3 that, while sorption might occur in the host horizon, high salinity would minimize its effects. Considerable radionuclide sorption may occur in the clastic sedimentary units surrounding the Unit 4 host salt, although present data are insufficient to permit a quantitative assessment of this phenomenon. Because no credit for sorption is taken in the performance assessment calculations, no further adverse effects from repository-related processes are possible (see Section 6.3.1.2.3). Data collected during detailed site characterization will address the extent to which radionuclide sorption is expected to occur.

The solubility data used for calculation of postclosure system performance (Section 6.4.2.3.4) contain uncertainties and assumptions. There are inadequacies in any currently available data set. Because of the lack of measured values for various species in concentrated brines at elevated temperatures and pressures, the thermodynamic data base used for calculating radionuclide solubilities is not adequate for definitive calculations. The computer code, EQ3/EQ6, is currently being modified for use on repository conditions (INTERA, 1983, ONWI-472). The radionuclide release calculations in Sections 6.4.2.3 and 6.4.2.4 will continually be updated using state-of-the-art codes as new data and computation methods become available. The uncertainties in system performance calculations caused by the uncertainties in the thermodynamic data base are discussed in revised EA Section 6.4.2.3.4.

Issue

Commenters noted that the clay contents given in the EA are too low, and the discussions on clay dehydration and resulting effects are inadequate.

Response

Site-specific information on the clay content of Unit 4 salt at the Deaf Smith County site is not available, thus data from drill holes near the site must be used in its place. The DOE has reevaluated the available data on mudstone content and revised EA Sections 3.2.7.2, 6.3.1.2.2, and 6.3.1.2.3, accordingly. The clay content cited in the draft EA was found to be underestimated, and the conservatively recalculated value is now in good agreement with data from three independent investigations (Hovorka et al., 1985; Fisher, 1984b; Fukui, 1984, BMI/OWNI-540).

One of the most important aspects of the mudstone content in Palo Duro salt is the amount of water that might be liberated through thermal dehydration under repository conditions. The total amount of brine available for migration to the waste package environment has been recalculated based on conservative overestimates of the water content of "clay-free" halite (Fisher, 1984a, b), the maximum water content of Unit 4 mudstone (Fisher, 1984a, b), and the mean mudstone content of the Unit 4 host rock (Hovorka et al., 1985). An error in the draft EA regarding the conversion factor from weight percent water to volume percent brine has also been corrected. The detailed brine availability calculations are presented in EA Section 3.2.7.2 and summarized in EA Sections 6.3.1.2.2 and 6.4.2.3.2. The revised brine content value does not result in a modification to the 5.0 volume percent brine value used in the waste package performance calculations.

Recent studies of clay mineralogy in the Palo Duro Basin are summarized in Section 3.2.7.1 of the final EA. The analysis presented in Section 6.4.2.3.2 assumes the water held in clays is available for migration, so the thermal stability of clays is not in question. The reduction in volume that accompanies clay dehydration is not expected to create new pathways for ground-water movement of significance, as thermal dehydration is not expected beyond the disturbed zone, as defined in the EA Glossary (Appendix B).

Issue

Commenters stated that geochemical evidence of postdepositional dissolution should be discussed. Evidence of postdepositional dissolution may indicate poor stability and lack of isolation of the repository horizon from the accessible environment.

Response

The DOE has revised the EA to include a more complete summary of the chemical, mineralogic, and petrographic evidence of postdepositional salt dissolution (see Section 3.2.7.3). Numerous petrographic and isotopic signatures of the salts and fluid inclusions indicate the Unit 4 salts are unaltered and preserved since their deposition during Permian time (Knauth and Beeunas, 1985, BMI/ONWI-569). Stable isotopic signatures from fluid inclusions in solid salts from the Palo Duro Basin do not represent any of the following: modern meteoric water, connate sea water, connate marine evaporite brine, gypsum dehydration water, or subsurface formation water. However, isotopic data do suggest that fluid inclusion water represents the original highly evaporated Permian brines (Knauth and Beeunas, 1985, BMI/ONWI-569). The existence of primary textures, for example "chevron" structures, indicates that some of the halite has remained preserved since Permian time. Furthermore, the systematic differences between the mean bromide content of Unit 4 and Unit 5 salt in the area strongly reflect depositional and diagenetic processes, but not postdepositional dissolution (Fisher, 1984b).

Issue

Commenters noted that the quality of water available for use from shallow aquifers in the vicinity of the site needs to be identified and discussed in the EA.

Response

The discussion of ground-water quality in aquifers near the site has been expanded and documented by the DOE in the revised EA (Section 3.3.2.2). No new information was found that explains the nature and cause of salinity in the Dockum aquifer.

Issue

Commenters expressed concern that geochemical modeling was not used adequately as a tool for describing and predicting geochemical conditions and interactions with engineered materials.

Response

The DOE has an ongoing program, as part of performance assessment, in the development and application of geochemical models for various aspects of system performance. A repository in salt presents a chemical environment characterized primarily by an extremely high level of dissolved solids in any water present. Geochemical models currently available have been designed for use in dilute solutions and are not adequate predictors of geochemical interactions in brines. Also, the thermodynamic data base for various radionuclide solution species is subject to uncertainties and estimations and, therefore, is not adequate for definitive calculations. One computer code, EQ3/EQ6, is currently being modified for use on repository conditions (INTERA, 1983, ONWI-472). The radionuclide release calculations in Sections 6.4.2.3 and 6.4.2.4 will continually be updated using state-of-the-art codes as new data and computational methods become available. The uncertainties in system performance calculations caused by the uncertainties in the thermodynamic data base are discussed in revised EA Section 6.4.2.3.4. Plans for the application of the EQ3/EQ6 code for waste package, repository, site, and total system performance assessments are discussed in the performance assessment plan for the salt repository project (ONWI, 1984, BMI/ONWI-545).

Issue

Several commenters maintained that the quantitative description of the host salt unit was in error, and that the thermal and solubility behavior of the minerals was not thoroughly discussed or accounted for in performance calculations.

Response

The DOE has revised Section 3.2.7.1 to more thoroughly present the mineralogy and petrology of the host salt as sampled by drill holes near the site. Halite, anhydrite, and mudstone comprise the dominant mineralogy of the Unit 4 host horizon. The average Unit 4 mudstone content has been revised in light of recent data (Hovorka et al., 1985; Fisher, 1984b; Fukui, 1984). Hydrrous minerals such as carnallite, kieserite, and polyhalite have not been reported in Unit 4 salt at this time. Data on the physio-chemical form and volume of water present in the candidate host horizon have been summarized in Sections 3.2.7.2, 6.3.1.2.2, and 6.4.2.3.2 of the revised EA. The revised text on salt mineralogy and petrology and on maximum Unit 4 water content has not led to changes in the performance assessment calculations in Section 6.4.2.

Processes that might degrade rock strength include melting of host rock mineral phases, thermal dehydration accompanied by volume reduction, and radiolytic decomposition of mineral phases. EA Sections 6.3.1.2.2 and 6.3.1.2.3 have been revised to more thoroughly document expected repository effects on the host rock. Minerals present in the Unit 4 host horizon melt at temperatures far exceeding the maximum expected repository temperature of 250 C (482 F) (Weast, 1984), and eutectic phases with significantly lower melting points are not expected. Changes in the physical properties of the host rock from thermal

dehydration of the mudstone layers are expected to be small, and any volume reduction accompanying clay dehydration is expected to be completely offset by salt creep and expansion around the waste package. Gamma irradiation of halite can produce sodium metal and free chlorine; however, the effect is very localized and experimentally documented only for total doses exceeding 10^7 rads (Levy and Kierstead, 1982, BNL-32004; Panno and Soo, 1983). Also, if free chlorine does not evolve from the salt, the decomposition products may react back to form sodium chloride (Pederson et al., 1984). The radiolytic decomposition of halite has not been documented at expected dose rates of approximately 20 to 40 rads per hour at the waste package surface (Jansen, 1985). If future research suggests adverse radiolytic effects on halite stability at repository-relevant dose rates, then engineering measures can be adopted to minimize such effects.

C.5.3 ROCK CHARACTERISTICS

This category addresses those comments and questions concerning the behavior of salt and other rock under repository conditions at the Deaf Smith County site. This category corresponds to comments received on Section 6.3.1.3 and related sections. Issues raised by the commenters include:

- The need for more detailed modeling
- Effects of discontinuities and heterogeneities on the rock mass
- Representativeness of and uncertainties in rock property data
- Repository geoengineering-related design concerns
- Comprehensive discussion of in situ stress
- Ability to seal repository shafts
- Definition of the disturbed zone
- Effect of radiation on mechanical properties of salt
- Coupled effects.

Issue

A few commenters indicated that a more detailed discussion of the salt material model and its implications is required. In particular, causes of uncertainty in model parameters should be discussed, along with uncertainties related to the postclosure implications.

Response

The DOE has considered the issue and Section 3.2.6.1 of the EA has been modified to include a description of the salt material model. Uncertainties in model parameters are given when a sufficient number of tests have been performed to allow the uncertainties to be determined.

Section 6.3.1.3 has been modified to reflect the following. The total deformation of salt can be divided into three components: elastic deformation, thermal expansion, and inelastic deformation. The salt material model includes elastic deformation and thermal expansion through a classical generalization of Hooke's Law. These deformations are important for calculating thermal stresses following waste emplacement but are typically masked by the much larger inelastic deformations that result at the stresses, temperatures, and times of interest for a high-level nuclear waste repository. The inelastic deformation is primarily viscoplastic and is modeled by the exponential-time model. Uncertainty in the material model parameters results from both variability in the salt response measured in the laboratory and the lack of fit of the model.

Section 6.3.1.3 of the EA has been revised to state that the amount of remedial excavation that is required can be controlled by changing the extraction ratio or gross thermal loading. Because the creep of salt is highly stress and temperature dependent, decreasing the extraction ratio or gross thermal loading (or both) will reduce the requirement for maintenance of the underground openings. Therefore, although material model uncertainties do not permit precise determination of the maintenance requirements, the problem can be assessed through generic understanding of the stress and temperature dependence of the creep of salt.

Issue

Some commenters stated that the effects of discontinuities, heterogeneities, and impurities on rock mass behavior and rock mass characteristics need to be addressed. These discontinuities, heterogeneities, and impurities were categorized as follows: joints and fractures in rock units, interbeds, gas and brine pockets, rock mass property anisotropy, and impurities that significantly effect rock behavior.

Response

The DOE has clarified discussions on the presence and character of heterogeneities and discontinuities within the host rock in Section 3.2.6. Sections 6.3.3.2.1 and 6.3.1.3 has been expanded to explicitly consider the uncertainties related to the presence of heterogeneities and discontinuities as summarized below.

Open joints and fractures have not been identified in the host rock, and there is no known evidence to suggest that they will exist at the site. Healed fractures, filled with salt, have been found in the salt section, but their

effect on the overall rock mass properties is expected to be relatively small. Joints and fractures have also been identified in the upper rock units above the uppermost (Upper Seven Rivers) salt and without the uppermost salt. Within the salt unit, fractures are typically filled. The presence of such fractures needs to be considered in shaft design, but they are sufficiently far above the host rock to have negligible influence on the repository itself.

The effects of interbeds as they relate to requirements for artificial support, maintenance, and worker safety are discussed in Section 6.3.3.2, and result in the conclusion that several potentially adverse conditions are present. Because of the uncertainties associated with the presence of interbeds and inhomogeneities, a conservative position was adopted with respect to favorable and potentially adverse conditions related to flexibility in selecting depth and configuration of the repository, need for artificial support, maintenance of openings, difficulty in retrieval, and potential safety hazards.

Mined openings have been constructed in bedded salt, including the facilities at WIPP site, and the techniques used (which successfully excavated and maintained the openings) are by definition state-of-the-art. Elevated temperatures are not present in existing mines or at WIPP, but once waste is emplaced, stability can be enhanced, if necessary, by backfilling the rooms.

The impurity content in the LSA-4 salt is relatively small, so the effect on the behavior of the host rock as whole is likely to be small also. Locally, the effects of impurities could be significant, depending on the location of interbeds and impurities relative to the canisters and the storage rooms.

Gas and brine pockets have not been encountered in wells drilled to date, as noted in the EA, and there is no evidence to suggest that they are present at the site. Nevertheless, their presence cannot be completely ruled out with present data. It is unlikely that a brine or gas pocket large enough and close enough to the repository to be a significant problem will remain undetected.

The stratigraphy at the Deaf Smith County site is a relatively complex anisotropic rock mass, the degree of anisotropy being dependent on the scale considered. Anisotropy must be explicitly considered when three-dimensional effects are important, but in many cases two-dimensional or one-dimensional approximations involving layered or isotropic systems are adequate for analysis.

The following changes have been made to the draft EA:

1. Section 3.2.6 has been expanded to include further discussion of fractures and the potential for gas and brine pockets. Also, the discussions of the values used for percentages of clay and water in the host rock have been clarified.
2. The discussion of uncertainties in Section 6.3.1.3 has been expanded to more fully discuss uncertainties due to interbeds or impurities.
3. The section on evaluations in Section 6.3.1.3 has been expanded to include a more thorough discussion of the purpose and approach to the analyses presented in order to place them in proper perspective.

Issue

A few commenters indicated that the rock and soil properties measurements presented may vary in several ways and that these need to be discussed. These properties may vary between laboratory and in situ test behavior and rock mass behavior, or they may vary among various locations, even if general characteristics appear quite similar. The source of these variations may be variations from location to location due to natural spatial variation from place to place, lack of a statistically representative number of measurements, or technical uncertainties in making extrapolations.

Response

Section 6.3.1.3 has been modified to more clearly explain how the uncertainties related to variation in rock properties were considered in the evaluation as summarized below.

The EA clearly stated that no data are available from on site, and the closest data are from wells several miles away. Site conditions must be inferred by extrapolation, and are therefore uncertain.

While data are limited, and no testing has been done on the site, the available evidence strongly suggests that the engineering properties of materials encountered at the site will not differ significantly from those at other locations within the basin.

It is generally accepted that laboratory tests do not accurately predict rock mass behavior because truly representative samples of the rock mass cannot be obtained, except in rare cases where the rock mass is homogeneous and essentially intact. The salt units at the Deaf Smith County site are not homogeneous, so field tests are more appropriate to determine the behavior of a representative volume of rock. Despite their limitations, laboratory tests on core samples are useful in assessing how a rock mass will behave. Comparison between laboratory data obtained from at or near a specific site and published generic data indicate whether or not the rocks in question are anomalous. Such comparisons were done for rock property data, and test results from Palo Duro Basin salt compare well with published data.

Section 6.3.3.2 of the EA deals with repository design and safety during construction. Because of the lack of site-specific data, the absence of underground mining experience in the Palo Duro Basin, and the uncertainties inherent in predicting rock mass performance from laboratory tests on core, a conservative position is taken with respect to evaluating the guideline conditions. No rock characteristics which can reasonably be expected at the site and which would require mitigating measures beyond the state of the art have been identified.

The discussion in Section 6.3.3.2.1 has been expanded to address uncertainties in more detail and to describe the approach taken to guideline evaluations.

Issue

Some commenters noted that a number of repository geoengineering-related design concerns require further discussion. Broadly, these are constraints on the flexibility for construction due to limitations imposed by the lateral and vertical extent of the host horizon, the feasibility and effectiveness of roof support techniques in the bedded salt sites described, and maintenance of underground openings.

Response

The DOE has considered the issue indicated and clarified the related discussions in Section 3.2.6 of the EA. The DOE has modified Section 6.3.1.3 of the EA to reflect the following discussion.

The stratigraphy for the Deaf Smith County site is described in Sections 3.2.3.2 and 3.2.6.1.4 of the EA. The host salt sequence is essentially unlimited in horizontal extent. The vertical extent is about 48 meters (160 feet). Included in this horizon are interbeds of anhydrite, siltstone, and claystone. It is desirable for the waste package emplacement location to avoid interbeds as these anomalous zones complicate analysis. A homogeneous roof beam is also desirable as a monolithic roof is inherently stronger. In order to stay in the better (purest) salt regions, the repository level could be varied as development progresses. Such adjustments are not expected to place major constraints on repository design.

Slow, continual creep of salt is not directly a problem, although it may affect repository functions over a period of time. Salt creep may, however, create local instabilities. Some combination of roof bolts stress control mining, steel arch canopies, and other techniques should be successful in temporary control of local unstable conditions.

The underground openings will slowly close due to salt creep. Elevated temperatures due to the emplaced waste will result in higher than normal creep rates. Other than causing possible roof stability concerns as discussed above, this phenomenon does not seriously constrain design. Openings can either be overcut to allow for creep or they can be kept open by periodic rescaling.

Issue

A few commenters stated the performance of seals in the shaft during construction, operation, and decommissioning needs investigation and that this should be discussed. Comments included concerns about the expected nature of the disturbed zone around the shaft seal.

Response

The DOE has considered the issue and has clarified the related discussions in Section 3.2.6 of the EA, and modified the discussion of the postclosure implications in Section 6.3.1.3 accordingly.

Two types of shaft seals need to be recognized. One type will be installed during shaft construction to prevent the flooding of the underground workings by aquifers and also to prevent contamination of the aquifers themselves. A second type of seal will be installed during shaft decommissioning as the shaft is being backfilled. The purpose of this type of seal is to prevent access of surface and aquifer water to the repository level and vice versa. The first type (construction time frame) is a preclosure seal whereas the second type (backfill) is a postclosure seal.

Analyses of shaft seal performance were made assuming that main flow was through the seals only. Even if water flow short-circuited through a disturbed zone around the shaft seals in the overlying nonsalt units, flow would likely be blocked upon contact with the repository salt unit for many reasons. Most importantly, any salt dissolution through any available pathway will quickly stop without a mechanism to cycle fresh water in and out of the salt unit. Given the large distances that the sealed shafts will be located from any repository rooms containing waste, it is unlikely under expected site conditions, that massive amounts of dissolution could occur around the shafts to uncover any waste.

The thermal pulse from the repository has been estimated to be 1 C to 2 C (1.8 F to 3.6 F) at the base of the shaft after 1,000 years (Kelsall et al., 1985, BMI/ONWI-564). This small temperature change should have a negligible effect on the stability and deformation of the shaft, as well as minimal effect on the shaft seals. Accordingly, this issue is not considered a concern in the EA.

Issue

A few commenters indicated that a more comprehensive discussion of the in situ stresses needs to be provided. In particular, the interpretation of existing stress measurements needs to be discussed.

Response

The DOE has expanded the discussion in Sections 3.2.6 and 6.3.1.3 considering in situ stresses measured using the hydraulic fracturing technique. Results and interpretations of these measurements are summarized as follows:

1. Horizontal stresses in the thick nonsalt units are lower than the vertical stress (weight of overburden). The ratio of the two horizontal stresses is between 1.0 and 1.5

2. The stress state in salt is interpreted to be nearly lithostatic. Some uncertainty is present regarding the ratio of horizontal stresses, since the maximum horizontal stress cannot be determined in salt by the hydrofracture technique.

The stress data affects the evaluations in Chapter 6 in two ways. First, high horizontal stresses can cause a variety of rock mechanics problems in underground openings. The data indicates that such stresses are not present at the site. Secondly, mechanical and thermochemical analysis performed to date assume an initial lithostatic state of stress in the salt. The data suggest that this assumption is reasonable for the Palo Duro Basin.

Issue

Some commenters indicated that the extent of the disturbed zone needs to be defined more realistically, and that it may have significantly greater extent than reported in the EA.

Specifically, commenters mentioned mechanical responses due to disturbance consisting of: fracturing due to excavation or excessive deformation; deformation due to stress changes, subsidence, heave, creep and other forms of disturbance; salt decrepitation, if salt temperature exceeds a certain threshold; and expansion of the rock mass due to thermal load.

Response

Section 6.3.1.3 has been modified to reflect the following observations and to specifically discuss the uncertainties involved. As a result of reassessment, the estimated extent of the disturbed zone has been increased in the EA.

The DOE has reviewed the data and found in some cases some modifications are required. The DOE has clearly stated in the introduction that Appendix 6A gives only a preliminary and conservative description of the "disturbed zone."

It was suggested that uplift could cause significant fracturing of overburden, changes in flow paths that could greatly shorten estimated travel times of radionuclides, and possibly endanger surrounding aquifers and rivers. The DOE has reviewed the existing data and believes that previous uplift and subsidence calculations have overestimated potential effects. Consequently, the DOE plans no revisions regarding uplift and subsidence for the EAs.

The DOE has reviewed generic data for domal and bedded salts and has modified conclusions in the EA to increase the mechanically "disturbed zone" to about 15 meters (49.2 feet). The DOE has also revised the EA text for clarity and to include a review of available generic information.

Issue

Commenters questioned whether salt "heated by radioactivity" would retain its self-healing properties. The questions allude to thermal decrepitation and effects of irradiation on the mechanical properties of salt.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated the data and found no change of the EA is required, for two reasons. Thermal decrepitation of the tested salt samples occurred at a temperatures considerably higher than 250 C (482 F). There is no evidence to suggest that likely impurities in the salt in the vicinity of the waste packages would lower the temperature at which thermal decrepitation of the salt occurs to below 250 C (482 F). The DOE has reviewed the data and performed new calculations. The text of Section 6.3.1.3 has been rewritten for added clarity and the conclusions as to the extent of thermal disturbance have been modified.

Issue

Some commenters noted that a number of coupled-effects performance scenarios need to be addressed more extensively. Specifically, these are: thermochemical effects on the engineering properties of the rock mass; thermohydrologic effects on the engineering properties of the rock mass; thermomechanical effects on the engineering properties of the rock mass (e.g., fracture healing); and thermal decrepitation and thermal fracturing behavior, as well as brine migration behavior and mining subsidence versus uplift due to thermal expansion of the rock mass.

Response

The DOE has considered the issue and clarified related discussion in Section 3.2.6 of the EA. The postclosure implications of this issue have been considered in modifications to Section 6.3.1.3 based on the following.

Under thermochemical effects, concerns were raised over the possibility that brine inclusions might move away from the waste package; this was mentioned as a possible mechanism for radionuclide transport. Brine inclusions containing a vapor phase do indeed travel away from a heat source. However, once the intergranular boundary is reached, intergranular flow is expected to take over. Inclusions can actually cross crystal boundaries and continue to migrate as inclusions; however, this has been observed experimentally only under the influence of a large temperature gradient. The temperature gradients in a repository would be too small to drive this type of migration.

The use of the threshold gradient case as the expected condition was questioned. Reevaluation of this issue indicate that the conclusions drawn in the EA analyses were essentially unaffected by this approach. Strong theoretical arguments favor the existence of a threshold gradient; therefore, the EAs will continue to label the threshold gradient case as the expected condition.

The maximum amount of water (brine) that could be released from dehydration of mudstone was estimated using the data from two sources. The variations in reported mudstone (claystone) content do not cause any additional uncertainty in the calculations as these calculations used conservative bases.

Any water (brine) resulting from thermal dehydration of the mudstone will be near the waste package (the heat source) and hence potentially available for corrosion of the waste package. This brine is most likely to be a sodium chloride brine whose chemical composition is simply that resulting from dissolving the salt. These corrosion data have been used to calculate the amount of corrosion that is to be expected should the waste package be immersed in an unlimited amount of this brine.

The DOE has concluded that at the maximum salt design temperature of 250 C (482 F), and at the expected radiation levels, negligible amounts of new brines or chlorine gas will be generated.

The DOE reevaluated possible thermomechanical effects such as thermal decrepitation and fracture healing at the Deaf Smith County site. Thermal decrepitation of the tested salt samples occurred at a temperature of 350 C (662 F), which is considerably higher than the recommended design peak salt temperature of 250 C (482 F). There is no evidence to suggest that likely impurities in the salt in the vicinity of the waste packages would lower the temperature at which thermal decrepitation of the salt occurs to below 250 C (482 F).

Room-scale calculations performed using a viscoelastic constitutive model, indicated that vertical closure along the roof-floor centerline would approach 0.55 meters in three years for 5.5 x 5.5-meter (18 x 18-foot) rooms in Permian salt.

In existing salt mines, openings up to 9 meters (30 feet) wide generally stand unsupported. In general, the closure that is measured is due to the slow creep of the salt into the excavation resulting in heaving of the floor, sagging of the roof and convergence of the walls. These movements are generally predictable and are routinely handled in the mining process.

The effect of prolonged heating on the failure mechanism of salt tunnels is not well understood, because the empirical data base is limited. At Project Salt Vault, the floor area in Rooms 1 and 4 uplifted very rapidly when the heaters were turned on, but this uplift slowed to a nearly constant rate.

The DOE concludes that thermomechanical calculations can reasonably predict the amount of room closure and far-field behavior due to creep in the salt host rock. However, these thermomechanical calculations are not very reliable when predicting the response of underground tunnels in the early stages of heating.

There are two principal mechanisms affecting movements within the rock mass and elevation changes of the ground surface above the repository. These are:

1. Uplift caused by thermal expansion of the rock mass due to heating by the waste packages.

2. Subsidence caused by the creep of the salt into the underground working.

In the preclosure period, cooling provided by ventilation of the repository tunnels will have a limited mitigating affect on the heating caused by the waste packages. In the postclosure period, uplift caused by thermal expansion will reach a maximum of about 0.5 meter (1.6 feet) approximately 1,000 years after waste emplacement. After this time, cooling by ground surface convection and radiation will dominate and will act to return the ground surface to its original elevation.

Mining subsidence occurs in a time frame of tens of years (depending on salt characteristics, thermal load, room design and support system, and the amount and effectiveness of backfill), but its effects are relatively small and are masked by uplift due to thermal expansion. When the repository has cooled down, the subsidence effect will result in a small amount of overall permanent subsidence of less than 1 meter (3.2 feet).

C.5.4 CLIMATE CHANGES

This category is concerned with general changes in climate which might occur after repository closure at the Deaf Smith County site. This category corresponds to comments received on Section 6.3.1.3 and related sections.

Issues raised by the commenters include the following:

- Effects of carbon dioxide on future climate
- Effects of future climate on erosion
- Effects of future climate on ground-water recharge to hydrostratigraphic unit C.
- Effects of future climate on dissolution.

Issue

One commenter noted that the effects of carbon dioxide on future climate (postulated "super-interglacial" period) have not been adequately addressed.

Response

The DOE has examined the available data and the work of Imbrie and Imbrie (1979), as well as Broecker (1977), have been discussed in the EA in Section 3.2.2.3. Although it is not possible to determine specific effects of this postulated warming on local geologic processes, without reliable estimates of regional variations in temperature and rainfall, it is likely that the return of pluvial conditions in the Panhandle would be delayed by 1,000 to 2,000 years.

Issue

One commenter concluded that the effects of future climate on erosion have not been adequately addressed, since the significance and origin of High Plains playas are not fully understood.

Response

The DOE agrees that the process of playa development is incompletely understood at this time. The EA has been revised and has expanded its discussion of playa formation in Section 3.2.2.1; a thorough study of playas is planned during site characterization. Nevertheless, playas are relatively shallow features, and they do not represent evidence of adverse erosion under any climatic conditions. If it is conservatively assumed that the playas have formed since the close of the Pleistocene, and if the associated rates of surface erosion are projected into the future, it is clear that such erosion will have no impact on the integrity of a deep repository. Based on relationships established by Langbien and Schumm (1958), Gustavson et al. (1981) conclude that present rates of erosion by runoff are near maximum; a decrease in those rates would occur with either an increase or a reduction in precipitation. Therefore, the DOE believes that no modification of the EA conclusions is necessary.

Issue

One commenter indicated the effects of future climate on ground-water recharge to hydro-stratigraphic unit C (HSU C) have not been adequately addressed.

Response

The DOE has examined the data and found that recharge of the HSU C will diminish if the recharge zone becomes perennially frozen; however, recharge is likely to increase if the recharge zone remains unfrozen. Any possible maximum change in recharge at the outcrop area of HSU C (currently believed to be near the Pedernal Uplift, about 240 kilometers [150 miles] west of the Deaf Smith County site) would amount to a hydraulic head difference of approximately 100 meters (approximately 328 feet). This head change would increase pressure in the western part of the basin. However, even when these extreme conditions are assumed, the effect on HSU C gradient and travel times is insignificant because of the great distance between recharge area and site.

Issue

One commenter indicated that the effects of future climate on dissolution have not been adequately addressed in the EA, since the significance and origin of High Plains playas are not fully understood.

Response

The DOE has examined the rates of dissolution due to future climatic changes and believes that no modification of the EA conclusions is necessary. The origins of playas are uncertain, although the EA has been revised in Section 3.2.2.1 to include some of the hypotheses on playa development and significance that have been presented over the years. It is probable that playa development results from a combination of several of these hypothesized processes, which include wind deflation, caliche dissolution, and subsurface salt dissolution. However, even if the total depth of playas observed in the Southern High Plains were a result of dissolution of the uppermost salt during Quaternary climate extremes, this would represent relatively minor dissolution, given the shallowness of these features and the thickness of the underlying salt-bearing sequences.

C.5.5 EROSION

This category addresses general concerns related to erosion at the Deaf Smith County site. This category corresponds to comments received on Section 6.3.1.5. Issues raised by the commenters include the following:

- Debatable erosion rates
- Misquotes of the qualifying conditions for erosion.

Issue

A few commenters suggested that the erosion rates presented are debatable and not conservative in light of the expected return of pluvial conditions and steeper gradients for reentrants.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated the erosion rates given in the EA and believes that no modification to the conclusions presented in the EA is necessary, for the reasons presented below.

There are large variations in erosion rates locally and through time. This is true of both escarpment retreat and river incision. When long-term average rates are evaluated, there is no statistical or scientific justification for projecting short-term extremes into the distant future. Such extremes (including pluvial conditions) are incorporated in the long-term averages, by definition. The range of observed erosion rates has been discussed in the EA in Section 3.2.2.2. Although a reasonable case could be made for basing long-term escarpment retreat on the Palo Duro Canyon embayment, it can be seen from the equation that it has no effect on the time required for exhumation.

Issue

One commenter noted that the qualifying conditions for erosion were misquoted in the draft EA Section 6.3.1.5.

Response

The DOE has examined the qualifying conditions and the text has been corrected in the EA.

C.5.6 DISSOLUTION

This category addresses those comments and questions concerned with the effects of dissolution of salt, or potential dissolution, after repository closure at the Deaf Smith County site. This category corresponds to comments received on Section 6.3.1.6 and parts of Section 3.2. Issues raised by the commenters include the following:

- Controlling of interior dissolution
- Acceleration of dissolution
- Active interior dissolution
- Indicating dissolution
- Discussion of diagnostic features of dissolution.

Issue

Several commenters noted that interior dissolution may be controlled by faults, joints, fractures, and improperly sealed or unsealed boreholes.

Response

The DOE has examined the data and concluded that interior dissolution of the uppermost salt has occurred throughout the area and is most likely still active. It is not limited to areas of known structural control. Hypotheses have recently been reported by Gustavson and Budnik (1985) which link interior dissolution to unconfirmed basement structures. This report has been discussed in the final EA in Section 3.2.3.3.2. Using the most conservative assumptions consistent with the available data, the draft EA has demonstrated that dissolution of the uppermost salt does not represent a potentially adverse condition. Even if the difference between the present thickness of both the Seven Rivers and Salado salts at the site (20 meters [67 feet]) and the maximum combined thickness of these salts in the Palo Duro Basin (210 meters [690 feet]) were attributed entirely to dissolution, and this dissolution were assumed to occur only after deposition of the Ogallala, the dissolution rate would be only 2.1×10^{-4} foot per year. Cross references have been made in the final EA in Section 6.3.1.6.1 to Chapter 3 discussions regarding the uncertainties involved with interior dissolution.

Undiscovered deep wells will be searched for during site characterization. The types of methods which will be used to locate undiscovered deep wells are discussed in EA Section 4.1.1.1.14. In the final EA, Section 3.2.3.3.2 has been revised to summarize information from a study of the Hutchinson Salt Member of the Wellington Formation in Central Kansas, describing the effects of both modern and old boreholes on salt dissolution in that area.

Issue

A few commenters suggested that dissolution may be accelerated during pluvial climatic periods.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated the data and concluded that there is considerable uncertainty in projecting short-term dissolution rates. However, long-term averages are not known. As explained in the draft EA in Section 3.2.3.3.1, the DOE considers it reasonable and conservative to project dissolution based on the observed maximum short-term rates. Insofar as dissolution rates vary by four orders of magnitude and the highest rates are five times faster than escarpment retreat, it is expected that the short-term maximum will not be exceeded by the long-term average, even under more severe climates. There would be no basis for selecting a dissolution rate greater than those available from field observations.

Issue

Some commenters suggested that cases of interior dissolution reported to be Pleistocene in age may actually be younger or still active.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated its discussion of Pleistocene dissolution and it has been clarified in the final EA in Section 3.2.3.3.2.

Although there are no confirmed areas beneath the Southern High Plains where post-Pleistocene interior dissolution has taken place, the DOE has not concluded that there has been no post-Pleistocene interior dissolution. In fact, it is probably continuing slowly throughout the High Plains area. To more fully present theories of methods by which it can occur, more recent hypotheses of Gustavson and Budnik (1985) on preferential dissolution have been summarized and incorporated by reference in the final EA. The analyses under the guidelines have been based on the highly conservative assumption that all interior dissolution has been accomplished during the Quaternary (post-Ogallala).

Issue

One commenter suggested that dissolution may be indicated in the basin interior by anomalous thinning of the San Andres Formation.

Response

The DOE has examined the available data and has determined that there is a prominent pattern of thinning of the upper (salt-bearing) section of Lower San Andres Unit 4 along a northwest trend in northeastern Deaf Smith County, which coincides with thickening of the basal (nonsalt) section of Unit 4 (Hovorka et al., 1985, Figure 71). Although these are partly offsetting, there remains a pattern of net thinning of Unit 4 along this trend. Hovorka et al. (1985) conducted a detailed examination and correlation of core from seven DOE-sponsored wells in the Northern Palo Duro Basin. They observed (p. 46 and Figure 73) updip pinching out of anhydrite beds from the middle of the upper section of Unit 4 in this area. They also observed (Figure 79) low-salinity facies at the base of Unit 5, separated from missing and thin halite zones at the top of Unit 4 by anhydrite mudstone (interpreted as an insoluble residue). From this, Hovorka et al. (1985, p. 51) concluded that the transgression which initiated the deposition of Unit 5 was responsible for dissolution of salt from the top of Unit 4 in this area. Thus, the salt loss is interpreted as late Permian in age and is not a product of Quaternary interior dissolution beneath the High Plains. This discussion and three accompanying figures have been added to EA Section 3.2.3.3.2.

Issue

One commenter indicated that the evidence used to conclude that the host rock core and geophysical logs taken near the site exhibit no evidence of Quaternary dissolution should be presented. This presentation should include a discussion of both the diagnostic features of dissolution in cores and geophysical logs and whether or not these features have been observed at known occurrences of dissolution.

Response

The DOE agrees that such discussion should be provided and has done so in the final EA, as noted below. Studies by Hovorka et al. (1985) have indicated that dissolution of the host salt occurred during San Andres (late Permian) time. No evidence has been found for Quaternary dissolution of the host rock at or near the site. Dissolution of Lower San Andres Unit 4 salt and the evidence by which salt dissolution is recognized in cores and in geophysical logs is discussed in EA Section 3.2.3.3.2. These discussions are referenced in final EA Section 6.3.1.6.2.

C.5.7 TECTONICS

This category addresses those comments relating to seismicity, faulting, and other tectonics issues concerning the Deaf Smith County site after repository closure. This category corresponds to comments received on Section 6.3.1.7 and related sections. Issues raised by the commenters include the following:

- Misquotes on qualifying conditions for tectonics
- Differences on approach to tectonics analysis
- Seismic design requirements
- Tectonic structures
- Consideration of correlating seismicity
- Concern given to fault rupture
- Rates for seismic attenuation
- Underestimation of the maximum earthquake
- Short record of historical seismicity
- Peak-gravity estimates of ground motion
- Comparing surface accelerations to underground damage
- Description of historic seismicity
- Discrepancies between figures
- Incorrect statements about earthquakes
- More detailed descriptions of past earthquakes
- Seismicity monitoring
- More discussion given to the Amarillo Uplift.

Issue

One commenter stated that the postclosure qualifying condition for tectonics is quoted incorrectly in the EA, because certain statements were omitted.

Response

The DOE has reviewed the guidelines and has determined that they are quoted correctly. The second sentence, which is omitted in the EA, is explanatory rather than being part of the guideline. For clarity, the DOE has added the second explanatory sentence to the statement of the qualifying condition in Section 6.3.1.7.1.

Issue

One commenter noted that the approach to tectonics analysis differs from that of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

Response

The DOE will respond to an NRC approach to tectonic analysis when the NRC position paper is released. The DOE believes that no modification of the EA is required.

Issue

Some commenters noted that seismic design requirements for a repository should not be equated with those for nuclear power plants.

Response

The DOE has rewritten the text for clarity and has indicated that the expected levels of ground motion at the site are moderate in relation to design levels for other nuclear facilities. The DOE has revised the EA in response to these comments in Section 6.3.3.4.3.

Issue

One commenter stated that known tectonic structures are not necessarily representative of the geologic setting.

Response

The DOE has rewritten the text for clarity. The DOE has assembled an extensive data base on the tectonic structure in the region, and has presented this information in Section 3.2.5. The data within the geologic setting clearly are representative of the major structures. The DOE has revised the EA in response to this comment in Section 6.3.1.7.

Issue

Some commenters noted that further consideration should be given to correlating seismicity with features such as Oldham Nose, Amarillo Uplift, and the Meers Fault.

Response

The DOE has rewritten the text to include a description of the Meers Fault. The hazard analysis method for EA studies obviates the need for detailed tectonic analysis, by presuming that large earthquakes could occur on the larger faults along the Amarillo Uplift or the Oldham Nose. The presence and activity of the Meers Fault is consistent with the presumption. The events that have been recorded by the DOE seismic network appear to be randomly distributed in

the area and cannot be correlated with tectonic structure. The DOE has revised the EA in response to these comments in Section 6.3.1.7.

Issue

Some commenters noted that more concern should be given to fault rupture.

Response

The DOE has reviewed the text and believes that no modification of the EA is required by this comment. Fault rupture itself is a hazard only if the rupture is through the repository. The data evaluated to date indicate that no faults exist at the site that affect or have a potential for rupturing the repository horizon. Elsewhere, fault rupture can result in earthquakes, which have been carefully considered.

Issue

A few commenters noted that rates for seismic attenuation in the western United States are not appropriate for Texas.

Response

The DOE has rewritten the text for clarity and has indicated that the Nuttli and Herrmann (1981) attenuation relationship, developed from midwestern data, is used for estimating accelerations from shocks along the Amarillo Uplift. For local shocks, distance is not a factor, and western United States data or a Nuttli and Herrmann relationship for midwestern data can be used at this stage of studies. The EA now uses the Nuttli and Herrmann (1981) relationship for both local shocks and earthquakes along the Amarillo Uplift. Local attenuation relations will be developed during site characterization studies. The DOE has revised the EA in response to this comment in Section 3.2.5.3.

Issue

One commenter noted that the Meers Fault data and seismic activity along the Amarillo Uplift suggest that Nuttli and Herrmann (1978) may have underestimated the maximum earthquake for this tectonic feature.

Response

The DOE has reviewed the referenced work and believes that no modification of the EA is required by this comment. The Nuttli and Herrmann (1978) analysis assumed large shocks, up to a magnitude 6.3, could occur along the Amarillo

Uplift. The presence of such shocks also implies the presence of active fault processes and microseismic activity. Thus, the recent data showing seismicity along the Amarillo Uplift and young activity on the Meers Fault are consistent with the Nuttli and Herrmann analysis. There is not yet a consensus on the tectonic character and earthquake potential of the Meers Fault, and several studies are in progress. The Nuttli and Herrmann estimate for maximum earthquake is judged reasonable for the EA analysis in light of current data on the Texas Panhandle portion of the uplift. However, the maximum earthquake analysis and estimate will be reviewed and updated if necessary during site characterization studies to incorporate data then available.

Issue

Several commenters noted that the EA should not rely on the short record of historical seismicity.

Response

The DOE has rewritten the text for clarity and has indicated that other complementary data are also used, in addition to the historical seismicity. Geologic and tectonic data are used to help extrapolate the seismicity data to estimate maximum earthquakes much larger than any in the historic record. The DOE has revised the EA in response to this comment in Sections 3.2.5.3 and 6.3.3.4.

Issue

Some commenters noted that peak-gravity estimates of ground motion should be labeled as conservative and should be refined when more data are available. Furthermore, the EA should describe the effects of a worst case earthquake on construction and isolation, and indicate the intensity level that would disqualify a site.

Response

The DOE has rewritten the text for clarity and has indicated that the acceleration values are meant to be best estimates (mean value of maximum acceleration estimates). The analysis includes conservative assumptions about potential sources for earthquakes. Conservatism, to allow for other uncertainties, may require a larger value to eventually be used for design calculations. The DOE has revised the EA in response to this comment in Section 6.3.3.4.

The DOE believes that a specific discussion of impacts of the worst case earthquake is unnecessary, because the impacts will depend on design details and the worst case shock for the Deaf Smith County site is within design requirements generally allowable for important facilities elsewhere. Similarly, the earthquake intensity necessary to disqualify the site is not a required

value; instead, the estimated maximum earthquake is evaluated to see if reasonable engineering practice is adequate to mitigate the earthquake effects. The ultimate acceptability comes only from design review.

Issue

One commenter noted that data in the Richton Dome EA, comparing surface accelerations to underground damage in mines, should be added to this EA.

Response

The DOE has rewritten the text and has included a summary of the results in the paper by McClure (1981, DP-1623). The DOE has revised the EA in response to this comment in Sections 6.3.3.4 and 6.3.1.7.

Issue

Some commenters noted that the description of historic seismicity is incomplete and misleading because the observation period has been short and the area sparsely populated.

Response

The DOE has rewritten the text for clarity and has noted that although the historic record is brief, it gives a good indication of the level of seismic activity. The seismicity record is not used by itself, but is combined with geologic data for earthquake hazard analysis. The DOE has revised the EA in response to these comments in Sections 6.3.1.7, 6.3.3.4, and 3.2.5.3.

Issue

One commenter noted that describing the region as having "low seismicity" is an unsupported conclusion.

Response

The DOE has reviewed the data and considers "low seismicity" to be an accurate description of the regional seismicity. The term does not imply an absence of seismic activity. The rate is "low" when compared to most other regions in the United States. The DOE believes that no modification of the EA is necessary.

Issue

One commenter noted that there are discrepancies between the seismicity shown in Figure 3-37, Epicenters of Historical Earthquakes in the Texas Panhandle Area, and that shown in the Area Geological Characterization Report.

Response

The DOE has checked Figure 3-37 and found the comment to be valid. The seismicity shown in the EA figure is correct, having been updated from the previous documents, to show revised epicenters and data through 1984. The DOE believes that no modification of the EA is necessary.

Issue

A few commenters noted that statements about earthquakes nearest the site are incorrect, and these local shocks should be described and evaluated.

Response

The DOE has reviewed the text and has modified Section 6.3.1.7.1 to show that the nearest earthquake occurred in April 1985, about 25 kilometers (16 miles) north-northwest of the site; the magnitude was about 2-1/4. The few local shocks recorded by the seismographic network through May 1985 are described in terms of time, location, and size in Section 3.2.5.3, but they are not discussed further, because the earthquake analysis for EA purposes has assumed that small shocks can occur in the geologic setting and near the site.

Issue

A few commenters noted that more detail should be provided to describe each past earthquake, such as focal mechanism and faulting parameters.

Response

The DOE has reviewed the text in Section 3.2.5.3 and has determined that the level of detail presented is appropriate for EA purposes. The DOE believes that no modification of the EA is required.

Issue

One commenter stated that seismicity monitoring should have begun earlier in the program.

Response

The DOE has performed seismic monitoring in the vicinity of the Deaf Smith County site during previous site screening activities and this is presented in Section 3.2.5.3 of the EA. This information is consistent with the requirements of Section 10 CFR 960.3-1-4-2 which specifies the evidence required to support the nomination of a site as suitable for characterization. The DOE believes that no modification of the EA is required.

Issue

One commenter stated that not enough discussion is given to the Amarillo Uplift, past fault motions along the uplift, the Meers fault, and the relationship of the Uplift to near-site structures.

Response

The DOE has reviewed the tectonics discussion in Section 3.2.5 and has modified the text to include a description of the Meers fault. The text also now indicates that the earthquake hazard analysis for EA purposes has assumed that large earthquakes could originate along the Amarillo Uplift, and smaller shocks (up to magnitudes of 5.3) could occur throughout the geologic setting. The relationship of the Amarillo Uplift to near-site structures will be addressed in the future as additional site-specific data are recorded and analyzed.

Issue

One commenter stated that an earthquake with a 10^{-3} to 10^{-4} annual probability should not be called a "rare event" when the period of concern is 10,000 years.

Response

The DOE has revised the EA text in response to this comment and removed the phrase "rare event" in Section 3.2.5.3.

C.5.8 HUMAN INTERFERENCE

This category addresses problems of potential human interference, particularly related to exploitation of natural resources, raised in questions and comments on the EA, concerning a repository, after closure, at the Deaf Smith County site. This category corresponds to comments received on Section 6.3.1.8 and related sections. Issues raised by the commenters include the following:

- Mineral resource potential leading to human intrusion
- Estimates of the rate depletion of Ogallala aquifer
- Construction of marker systems
- Terrorist attacks on the repository.

Issue

Several commenters indicated that the mineral resource potential leading to human intrusion has not been adequately addressed and that the EA evaluation is insufficient to demonstrate the lack of potential for deep-well injection at or near the site.

Response

Uncertainties will always exist concerning the possibility of future human intrusion; however, the site provides no unusual incentive for such intrusion. The DOE has evaluated the evidence and concluded that consistently unsuccessful wildcat drilling throughout the Permian Basin strongly suggests that no large hydrocarbon reservoirs exist there. A new study of hydrocarbon potential in the Palo Duro Basin has been conducted and is summarized in EA Sections 3.2.8.1 and 6.3.1.8. The small potential for economic local discoveries continues to attract exploration activity in the Palo Duro Basin; however, the most recent wildcat wells near the site were unsuccessful. Extensive deep drilling during site characterization should substantially eliminate remaining uncertainties regarding hydrocarbons at or beneath the site.

Widespread drilling has also revealed no indication of economic deposits of evaporite or other minerals (such as potash). Salt as a resource is not unique to the site vicinity, and it could be mined more economically elsewhere in the basin, where it is shallower. Additional discussion of these resources is presented in the EA Section 3.2.8.2.

Subsurface injection of fluids is feasible across most of the Palo Duro Basin, into porous strata underlying the Permian evaporite section. However, there are no unique or unusual conditions at or near the site to attract such injection. Fluid injection wells to dispose of brines are normally drilled in oil and gas fields for economic reasons. With little potential for oil and gas resources near the site, there is equally small potential for deep injection.

As an additional guard against inadvertent human intrusion, permanent markers will be placed at the site and records widely disseminated to provide future generations with knowledge of the repository and its contents. A discussion of the requirements for site marking (10 CFR 60.2 and 60.51) is now presented in Section 6.3.1.8 of the EA.

Issue

A few commenters indicated that estimates of the rate of depletion of the Ogallala aquifer may be in error, based on more recent figures. One commenter noted that continued withdrawal from the Ogallala aquifer may result in disruption of the ground-water flow regimes important to waste isolation.

Response

The DOE estimates of the rate of depletion of the Ogallala aquifer have been reviewed. The hydrogeologic sections of Chapters 3 and 6 of the EA have been revised, as necessary, based on discussions with State and local authorities, and the most recent available records.

While additional data on depletion rates and projected future use of the shallow aquifer systems will be collected during site characterization, conservative modeling indicates that alternately higher or lower depletion rates have little effect on the potential integrity of the repository.

The DOE's investigations of the hydrogeology of the Permian area indicate that the ground-water flow conditions, "important to waste isolation," will not be changed due to pumping from the Ogallala aquifer (i.e., no amount of depletion of this aquifer will alter the existing flow potential within or across the Permian evaporite section in a time period important to waste isolation).

Issue

One commenter stated that the EA presents no evidence that the DOE can reasonably expect to construct marker systems that will warn future civilizations against inadvertent intrusion into a repository.

Response

A conceptual design of a marker system to be used at a repository site is required as part of the application for a license which the DOE must submit to the NRC before being allowed to begin construction. A detailed description of the measures to be employed to regulate or prevent inadvertent human intrusion after repository closure will be provided to the NRC as part of the application for a license to close the repository. At present, the DOE has examined several concepts for permanently marking a site and for disseminating records of

repository activities; no decisions on the approach to be adopted have been made. Section 6.3.1.8 of the EA has been expanded to describe the requirements for repository markers, and to provide reference to studies conducted by the DOE Human Interference Task Force.

Issue

One commenter stated that a terrorist attack on an operating repository would be a likely occurrence, with disastrous consequences.

Response

As part of the application to the NRC for a license to construct and operate a repository, the DOE will describe its security plan for assuring protection against radiological sabotage [10 CFR 60.21(b)(4)]. The DOE will provide at the geologic repository operations area such safeguards as are required at comparable surface facilities (of the DOE) to promote the common defense and security. In its review of the license application, the NRC will determine whether the DOE's proposed security plans offer adequate protection against threats such as a terrorist attack.

C.5.9 POSTCLOSURE SITE OWNERSHIP AND CONTROL

This category concerns issues relating to ownership and control of the site at Deaf Smith County, Texas, after it has been used as a repository. This category corresponds to comments received on Section 6.2.1.1 and related sections. Issues raised by the commenters include the following:

- Environmental and socioeconomic impacts
- Legal authority.

Issue

One commenter expressed the view that the DOE should consider control over lands beyond the controlled area as part of its evaluation of guideline 10 CFR 960.4-2-8-2, Site Ownership and Control, as required by 10 CFR 60.121(b). This provision requires that appropriate controls, including the acquisition of water rights, be established outside the controlled area. The commenter further states that the acquisition of additional land for the DOE control may have more environmental and socioeconomic impacts than currently addressed in the draft EAs.

Response

Under 10 CFR 60.121(b), the DOE is to exercise appropriate additional jurisdiction and control over surface and subsurface estates beyond the controlled areas "necessary to prevent adverse human actions that could significantly reduce the geologic repository's ability to achieve isolation." The DOE has not identified any current or reasonably probable necessity to exercise such additional control under the objective of this provision. The DOE concluded that in the Deaf Smith County EA, relative to postclosure guideline 10 CFR 960.4-2-8-2, Site Ownership and Control, it did not expect that postclosure performance would require the DOE to acquire additional land (see Section 6.2.1.1.1). The DOE, therefore, does not regard it as necessary or appropriate to speculate on the potential environmental impacts (including socioeconomic) that could result if additional controls proved necessary.

The DOE has added a phrase to its description of applicable DOE guideline 10 CFR 960.4-2-8-2 (Section 6.2.1.1 of the EA) to the effect that 10 CFR 60.121(b) requires the DOE to establish appropriate controls outside of the controlled area necessary to prevent adverse human actions that could significantly reduce the geologic repository's ability to achieve isolation.

Issue

One commenter requested that the DOE provide the legal authority for the position in Section 6.2.1.1 of the EAs that it can acquire privately owned land by condemnation for repository development purposes.

Response

The Federal government has the right of eminent domain as an incident of sovereignty [U.S. v. Jones, 109 U.S. 513 (1883)]. Both the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 [42 USC Section 2201 (g)] and the Department of Energy Act (42 USC Section 7257) confer express property acquisition and condemnation authority upon the DOE.

C.5.10 POSTCLOSURE SYSTEM GUIDELINE

This category addresses questions related to overall performance assessment for a repository at the Deaf Smith County site. Comments addressed Sections 6.3.2 (Postclosure System Guideline) and 6.4.2 (Preliminary Postclosure Performance Assessment). Issues raised by the commenters include providing long-term containment and isolation.

Issue

Many commenters questioned whether the engineered-barrier system and site can provide long-term containment and isolation that will adequately protect future generations.

Response

The DOE has reexamined the EA text and has revised section 6.4.2 to reflect the preliminary nature of the performance assessment calculations. In order to obtain a license to construct and operate a repository, the DOE will, at the time of license application, be required to demonstrate compliance with the applicable Federal regulations (10 CFR Part 60 and 40 CFR Part 191). These regulations deal specifically with the long term containment and isolation to adequately protect present and future generations from the hazards associated with nuclear waste disposal. This demonstration will include evaluations of the proposed isolation system (including natural containment characteristics of the site itself). The multiple barrier concept which includes the engineered-barrier system and associated components such as a metal waste package will give additional assurances that the repository system that is ultimately constructed will be safe. A repository cannot be constructed until that assurance is provided. Specific concerns related to long-term containment and isolation are addressed in Section C.5.11, Assessment of Postclosure Performance.

C.5.11 ASSESSMENT OF POSTCLOSURE PERFORMANCE

This category addresses questions on the waste package, the "disturbed zone," temperature gradients, brines, and other parameters used in modeling repository performance at the Deaf Smith County site. Comments are particularly related to Section 6.4.2 (Preliminary Postclosure Performance Assessments). Issues raised by the commenters include the following:

- Reliability of lifetime predictions
- Inconsistencies in tables
- Stress around the waste package
- Creep and thermal expansion influence
- Stress components caused by generated hydrogen
- Estimates of the disturbed zone
- Expanded discussion to cover comprehensive analysis
- Salt heated by radioactivity

- Moving of waste canisters
- Inconsistency regarding the closing and healing of fractures
- Reliability of the computed radiation fields
- Estimates of corrosion rates, leach rates, and solubilities
- Package performance during preclosure
- Analysis of various types of waste forms and packages
- Estimates of initial water content
- Ramifications of large brine pockets on waste package stability
- The size of brine inclusions
- Verification, validation, and documentation for all codes
- Applicability of the TEMPV5 code
- Uncertainties and assumptions regarding BRINEMIG
- Uncertainty in thermal conditions, data, and models
- Evidence that bedded salt conceptual models were calibrated
- Additional evaluation of the effect of travel paths
- Further clarification of the implications of Darcian flow
- Effects of perturbations
- Analysis of sensitivity and uncertainty
- Potential effects of earthquakes on waste isolation
- Concern about erosion, volcanic eruptions, and impacts of nuclear weapons
- Human intrusion
- Performance of shaft seals and liners
- Failures around salt mine shafts
- Leaking shaft seals.

Issue

A few commenters questioned whether the package lifetime predictions, using uniform corrosion and bounding calculations of releases and release rates, and considering uncertainty in input parameters, are sufficiently reliable to assure that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency limits and 10 CFR Part 60 guidelines will be met.

Response

The waste package predictions use the data currently available and are considered conservative. The text in Section 6.4.2.3.3 of the EA discusses non-uniform corrosion and the DOE has expanded this Section to further clarify use of uniform corrosion. The corrosion rates are sufficiently conservative for purposes of calculations made for the performance assessment analysis. The DOE will continue to conduct research on this question during site characterization to assure compliance with 10 CFR Part 60 and 40 CFR Part 191 prior to submitting a license application.

Issue

A few commenters stated that the tables showing radionuclide concentrations and release rates in Section 6.4.2.3.4 of the EA may have some inconsistencies which may lead to inaccurate conclusions regarding 10 CFR Part 60 and 40 CFR Part 191 requirements.

Response

The DOE has corrected errors noted by commenters in the tabulations and has included explanations of intermediate numbers to avoid misinterpretation of the results. There is a built-in 5 percent high bias in the radionuclide inventories because the original repository design was based on uninterrupted irradiation in the reactor while the nuclide inventory used in the comparisons used a more realistic radiation history. The DOE's review of the tables of tabulated radionuclides has found small numerical errors and these have been corrected. The update of the EA results to the final EPA regulation 40 CFR 191 has also affected the comparisons of amounts released with the regulations. It is easy to misinterpret the meaning of the release rates as presented in the draft EA because inventories at the maximum inventory were ratioed to brine rates at 300 years. This has now been avoided by supplying extra columns of data in the EA that show intermediate curie inventories and ratios at 1,000 years and 10,000 years in addition to 300 years.

Issue

Many commenters stated that stresses around the waste package may not have been adequately addressed.

Response

Appropriate EA text and figures have been changed to better address stresses around the waste package. The stress boundary conditions given in Figure 6-17, Stress Boundary Conditions at Waste Package Midplane, in Section 6.4.2.3.3 of the EA are conservative and are discussed in the text accompanying the figure. Since Loken et al. (1984) calculated normal stresses that were less, the figure has been revised downward in the final EA to conform to the assumptions stated there and to provide traceability from Loken's results. Furthermore, Loken et al. overestimated normal stresses when they incorrectly assumed that the waste package boundary stress equals lithostatic load at the time of contact between the waste package and salt after closure of waste-package emplacement holes.

The floor of the excavated room above the waste package is expected to rise somewhat due to stress relief. Therefore, the stresses redistribute around the waste package and fall below lithostatic stresses in less than a year after creep closure of the waste package emplacement hole (Dial et al., 1985). The purpose of the boundary normal stresses in Figure 6-17 in Section 6.4.2.3.3 is to show that the expected normal stresses peak before any significant corrosion has taken place. If future calculations show that the normal stresses may cause structural failure of the overpack, a number of measures could be taken, for example, the overpack thickness could be increased or internal package voids eliminated to add structural support. Finally, the appropriate figures and discussions have been changed to show variations in axial and radial stresses as a function of time. Figure 6-19, Effect of Brine Rate on Corrosion of the Containers, presents a comparison of corroded thickness with transient failure thickness of the overpack. The difference between lithostatic and maximum failure thicknesses has been normalized to equal the corrosion allowance to resolve the apparent inconsistencies.

Issue

One commenter doubted that the waste package could withstand applied stresses.

Response

The DOE has evaluated the relevant data and has concluded that no modification of the EA is required. Loken et al. (1984) concluded that current overpack designs may require additional thickness to withstand expected pressures. If future calculations show that stresses may cause failure of the overpack, the overpack thickness may be increased appropriately.

Issue

One commenter believes that Section 6.4.2.3.3 uses "verified" too strongly with respect to the creep law model when discussing the boundary stresses.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated the statement in Section 6.4.2.3.3 and changed it in the final EA to read "An analysis of similar behavior at the Asse salt dome in Germany showed the stresses to be always compressive and verified a creep law model for repository conditions in that salt" (Prijs and Vons, 1984).

Issue

One commenter felt that boundary stresses were not adequately considered in the analysis in Section 6.4.2.3.3 using the WAPPA code.

Response

The DOE agrees with the comment, but has not changed the EA because the mechanical model in WAPPA was not used, since this aspect of the waste package calculations was not expected to help differentiate among sites for EA purposes. Reported stresses only illustrated the combined effects of creep, thermal expansion, and lithostatic stresses. Loken et al. (1984) calculated the creep deformation from use of calculated deviatoric stresses in the salt surrounding the emplacement hole.

Issue

One commenter noted that the discussion of waste-package lifetime in EA Section 6.3.2.3.1 ignored the influence of creep and thermal expansion on external pressures on the waste package.

Response

The DOE has changed the text in Section 6.3.2.3.1 to note that there are other sources of external stress other than lithostatic load. In addition, the DOE has added a statement noting that the air gap around the waste package (Nelson and Fossum, 1985, p. 251) and the presence of room excavation (Dial et al., 1985) redistribute external stresses and reduce loads on the waste package.

Issue

Many commenters stated that stress components caused by generated hydrogen may not have been adequately addressed.

Response

Section 6.4.2.3.3 of the EA has been changed to include an analysis of the effects of hydrogen gas. During the period shortly after emplacement, generated hydrogen can escape from the emplacement hole which may or may not be promptly backfilled. Gas can continue to escape after backfilling and prior to consolidation of the backfilling material. If at a later time the reconsolidating salt begins to trap the gas, the increase in gas pressure will be limited by salt creep and stress redistribution (just as thermal stresses are relieved) and by diffusion of hydrogen gas through the salt matrix.

Issue

Several commenters questioned estimates of the disturbed zone.

Response

The DOE has reviewed the data and has modified the introduction to Appendix 6A to clearly state that (1) the EA presents a preliminary and conservative description of the "disturbed zone," (2) the DOE has revised the disturbed zone estimate to 15 meters (50 feet), and (3) in view of the limited thermal, mechanical, and hydrologic data existing on the host rock at the site, estimates of the disturbed zone may further be revised in the future. The extent of the disturbed zone depends on the interaction of thermal, mechanical, and hydrologic effects.

Issue

One commenter noted that other evidence supported estimates, of a disturbed zone due to excavation, ten times greater than that presented in the EA. The commenter also recommended that the EA discussion be expanded to cover a comprehensive analysis of available generic information related to damage to salt rock walls and ceilings, and that the EA conclusion be modified as necessary.

Response

The DOE has reviewed generic data for domal and bedded salts and has concluded that estimates of the mechanically "disturbed zone" should be increased to 15 meters (50 feet). The DOE has also revised the EA text of Appendix 6A for clarity, and included the review of available generic information.

Issue

One commenter asked whether the 10 meters (33 feet) for the thermal-hydrologic effects, presented in Appendix 6A of the draft EA, represent the

extra distance travelled in 10,000 years due to the effect of heat on flow, or the size of the thermal-hydrologic disturbed zone.

Response

The 10-meter (33-feet) result is the extent away from the heat source (the repository) within which ground-water flow in salt could conceivably be increased from normal as a result of increased thermal buoyancy from the waste heat (i.e., the extra distance ever traveled due to the effect of heat flow).

Issue

Another commenter stated that Appendix 6A of the EA should include an evaluation of the effects of "horizontal anomalous zones or brine pockets," "thermally induced creep and thermal stresses," and give more consideration to nonlinear effects. Also, the commenter stated that Barron and Toews (1963) had been cited incorrectly.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated the data and found that no modifications to the EA are required. First, current exploratory work and other data have indicated no reason to expect large brine pockets to exist at the potential salt sites. Second, thermally induced creep and thermal stresses (which can cause healing of fractures) should actually mitigate many of the deleterious effects of mechanical disturbance according to Tien et al. (1983, NUREG/CR-3129). Finally, the commenter incorrectly asserts that Barron and Toews (1963) do not refer to the depth of constant volume creep. Barron and Toews (1963, p. 122) state, "The fact that creep proceeds without change of volume between the 4-foot and 10-foot points indicates that during the period of observation, there is no significant change in material properties of the salt between these two depths."

Issue

Some commenters have questioned whether salt "heated by radioactivity" would retain its self-healing properties and one commenter asserts that salt temperatures may be as high as 1,500 F (815 C). These questions allude to thermal decrepitation and effects of irradiation on the mechanical properties of salt.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated the data and found no change of the EA is required for two reasons. First, laboratory testing (Bradshaw and McClain, 1971, ORNL-4555) indicates confined salt specimens start decrepitation (disaggregation) at temperatures ranging from 260 to 370 C (500 to 698 F). Maximum expected salt

temperatures will likely not exceed 300 C (572 F). Decrepitation reduces thermal conductivity of salt and may result in greater brine migration and corrosion of waste packages. Maximum salt temperatures among any of the seven potential salt sites will rise above 260 C (500 F) only within less than 0.5 meter (1.6 feet) of the surface of the waste package for a period of less than 20 years. Therefore, increased temperatures will disaggregate only a comparatively small volume of salt around the waste package. Second, Gevantman (1981, pp. 189-203) shows that irradiation of salt generally increases Young's modulus, reduces creep, increases hardness and ultimate tensile strength. Present evidence (Jansen, 1985; Reference Repository Conditions Interface Working Group, 1983, ONWI-483) indicates that radiation will affect only a small volume of salt within a few decimeters of the waste package and that this salt will only be affected to a small degree.

Issue

Some commenters alluded to the frequently stated contention that the canisters will move "and not stay put" as the salt heats up and becomes more "plastic" with salt melting at 200 C (392 F).

Response

The DOE has reevaluated the data and found that no changes to the EA are required.

Waste canisters will not move significantly, for three reasons. First, salt does not melt until temperatures reach 801 C (1,474 F) (Weast, 1984, B-84, B-142). Second, experimental evidence from Project Salt Vault (Bradshaw and McClain, 1971, ORNL-4555, Figure 11.74a) and Avery Island (Van Sambeek et al., 1983, ONWI-190(5), Figure 25) show this movement is small or nonexistent. Horizontal movement is essentially zero and vertical (uplift) movements are less than 0.13 meter (5 inches) (due mainly to thermal expansion and stress relief). Dissipation of thermal stresses with time and consolidation of room backfill will reduce the final vertical uplift. Third, laboratory tests show that the "shear strength" (Pfeifle et al., 1983, ONWI-314, pp. 30-35) of salt even under heated conditions would prevent the canisters from sinking. Pfeifle et al. (1983, ONWI-314, Figures A.2 through A.7) show that under nonzero confining pressures and temperatures the "shear strength" of salt may increase slightly with axial strain (i.e., strain hardening) under short-term loading conditions. Only under conditions of low confining pressure and low temperatures should strain-softening or brittle behavior reduce the "shear strength." Expected salt long-term conditions of lower temperatures and higher confining stresses will increase the resistance of salt to shear stresses and prevent significant settlements of the canisters due to gravity.

Issue

One commenter believed there was an inconsistency in the EA regarding the closing and healing of fractures, and regarding data that indicated that fracture and dehydration of shale beds within the host rock are likely.

Response

The DOE has reviewed the EA and concluded that there is no inconsistency. However, the DOE has found that Section 6.3.1.3.1 may mislead readers by stating that decreases in saturation may lead to delamination of clay-rich interbeds and overall weakening of the rock mass. Because the DOE has found no data to support such a conclusion, the DOE believes the statement is speculative and the sentence has been removed. Section 6.3.1.3.3 correctly states that no thermally induced fractures are expected because of a small percentage of clay minerals within the host rock. In addition, the larger creep rate of salt at higher temperature should close any gaps that develop between the salt and shale as a result of dehydration.

Temperatures of 100 C (212 F) or less will cause little dehydration if preliminary estimates of limited contents of clay (Hubbard et al., 1984) or other nonsalt materials (Hite, 1983, Figure 19; and Drumheller et al., 1982, ONWI-277, p. 32) in the host salt are reasonable. Also, see Sections C.4.1.1.7 and C.5.2 of this comment response document for other discussions of dehydration.

Issue

A few commenters questioned whether the computed radiation fields used in the EA are reliable enough and whether the effects are known well enough to support the conclusion in Section 6.4.2.3.3 of the EA of a small predicted effect of radiation on package lifetime.

Response

The DOE has corrected the radiation field figures (Figures 6-13 and 6-14) in Section 6.4.2.3.3, Radiation Fields at Waste Package Material Interface and Radiation Fields at Waste Form - Container Interface, to correspond with those in Jansen (1985), and reviewed the references noted by the commenters. The differences between investigators is discussed in Jansen (1985). There is no change in the conclusion that the radiation field effect is negligible under design conditions. The EA text in Section 6.4.2.3.3 has been modified to indicate the conditions under which radiation fields can become important. The computed radiation fields in the draft EA reference (Jansen, 1984) are 10 times too low. This error was corrected in the revised waste package topical report (Jansen, 1985) and the causative errors in source terms are explained there. The errors have now been corrected in the EA Section 6.4.2.3.3 and the correction resulted in no significant computed change in the waste package lifetimes.

The DOE anticipates that the package surface dose at burial will be 20 to 40 rads per hour for both commercial high-level waste (CHLW) and spent fuel from pressurized-water reactor (SFPWR) packages. These doses are so low that interpolation between the effects at no dose and much higher doses predict increases of less than 1 percent in the corrosion rate, which is too low to be measurable (Kreiter, 1984). Still, one cannot ignore all potential effects of radiation since appreciable uniform corrosion or local accelerated attack would reduce the shielding by the steel container and put the corroding fluid in contact with higher radiation fields. For the same average dose, Levy (1983) proposed that higher energy, more-penetrating radiation causes more damage than lower energy radiation. However, experimental evidence thus far does not show such an effect (Kreiter, 1984, PNL-4250-4).

Issue

Many commenters questioned whether (1) the environment immediately surrounding the waste package is sufficiently predictable to estimate the corrosion rates, leach rates, and solubilities for use in calculations, (2) the uncertainties in the available data at the assumed conditions make the conclusions drawn in the EA with respect to waste package performance invalid, and (3) waste package performance during the preclosure and immediately after closure periods can be ignored.

Response

The DOE has revised Section 6.4.2.3 of the EA to more clearly acknowledge the current uncertainty by stating that it may be necessary to modify (e.g., increase the thickness of the container wall) the design described in the EA to meet the regulation for package lifetime (10 CFR Part 60). This is described briefly in the next paragraphs.

It is not possible at this time to prove conclusively or to assure that the waste package performance will meet applicable regulations with respect to waste package corrosion and radionuclide release rate because the corrosion rates, leach rates, and solubilities in the brine to be encountered are too uncertain. One purpose of the EA is to show that a conceptual design exists that could meet the regulations with reasonable values of those parameters. As site characterization proceeds (if this site is chosen for characterization), the uncertainty will decrease, but the expected values or the uncertainties thereof may shift in a way that requires design changes to ensure that regulations are met.

For this site, the container wall thickness used in the calculations in Section 6.4.2.3.3 was only two times as thick as the predicted corrosion, taking into account the limitation on gross brine volume available at repository temperatures and at the expected upper limit of moisture content in the salt at this site. The quantity of brine available by thermal migration is insufficient by a factor of two to uniformly corrode through the corrosion allowance. Therefore, a factor of two, if introduced by (1) an increase in brine volume available, (2) a nonuniformity of brine distribution, or (3) a deviation from

uniform corrosion by, for example, accelerated attack near welds, could change the expected package lifetime from thousands of years to less than 300 years. This conclusion itself is valuable information obtained from the EA analysis and has been included by modified wording in the EA. The DOE agrees with the commenters that the uncertainty in the models themselves is currently too great to assure containment. However, it seems inappropriate to create and use more complex models while using hypothetical estimates of data. The models themselves must be refined as new site data and experimental data are gathered. However, assuming the conservative case of saturated brine, without taking into account that most of the water in the brine would be destroyed by reaction, all but the most highly soluble radionuclides would still meet the regulation for engineered subsystem release rates (10 CFR Part 60) with at least 10 times the increase in the estimates of the solubilities. This degree of uncertainty in solubilities is likely only for redox sensitive elements, for which the uncertainty is due to the lack of a specified emplacement procedure and a model for predicting the corrosion environment during preclosure and immediately following closure rather than the specific uncertainty in solubility measurements.

Issue

A few commenters stated that the EA should provide an analysis of the various types of waste forms and packages, including transuranic waste (TRU), that a repository might have.

Response

The DOE has reviewed the applicable data and has not modified the EA because the EA analyses are considered to be bounding. The EA provides analyses of only spent fuel and commercial high-level waste forms because they generate more thermal power, produce higher radiation fields, contain higher inventories of radionuclides than defense high-level waste or transuranic waste (TRU) and are, therefore, sufficient to discriminate between the suitability of different sites for waste repositories. The Mission Plan (DOE, 1985, DOE/RW-0005, Vol. I, pp. 8 and 22) describes our current understanding of the types of waste that may go into a repository, including defense high-level waste and other wastes (for example, perhaps TRU) determined by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to require permanent geologic disposal.

Issue

Some commenters noted that estimates in Section 6.4.2.3 of initial water content may be low rather than conservatively high, especially in a localized region, which could lead to overly optimistic estimates of waste package performance. A commenter also suggested that the EA be revised to include discussion on the ramifications of large brine pockets on waste package stability.

Response

The DOE did not change the EA text because, according to evidence presented in Section C.5.2 of this document, the average water content of 5 volume percent which was assumed for the site in waste package performance assessments is reasonable, based on preliminary core analyses from the site vicinity. Rather than try to characterize the local variability, for which there is insufficient information at this time, worst case estimates of waste package lifetime are presented in Section 6.4.2.3.3 of the EA assuming unlimited available brine. These analyses show that even for this unrealistic case a waste package can be designed to last for 300 years, by providing a sufficient corrosion allowance in the waste package design. (Results in both high- and low-magnesium brines are presented by Jansen [1985].)

If areas containing brine pockets are identified during repository development, they would be mined around. The DOE expects to be able to emplace waste proximate to localized brine pockets, if present, without significantly affecting the water content of the nearby salt in which the waste is emplaced. Without an effect on water content of nearby salt, the presence of large brine pockets would not affect waste package stability.

Issue

A few commenters noted that statements concerning the size of brine inclusions, their motion with respect to a thermal gradient, and the motion of the brine through and across crystal boundaries appear to be incorrect.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated the pertinent data and concluded that modification of the EA is not required. This evaluation is discussed in the following paragraphs.

The inclusions can actually cross crystal boundaries and continue to migrate as inclusions. This has been observed experimentally, but only under the influence of a large temperature gradient. Jenks (1979, ORNL-5526) concluded, on the basis of experimental and theoretical considerations, that the temperature gradients in a repository would be too small to drive this type of migration.

The DOE reviewed the concern that brine inclusions moving away from the waste package provide a possible mechanism for radionuclide transport. Brine inclusions containing a vapor phase do indeed travel away from a heat source. However, once the intergranular boundary is reached, intergranular flow is expected to take over, just as it does for all liquid migration. This mechanism is, therefore, not expected to contribute significantly to radionuclide release.

The DOE also considered that intercrystalline migration may be controlled by pressure gradients rather than temperature gradients, so that use of the Jenks (1979, ORNL-5526) equation may be inadequate. It is likely that pressure gradients are important to intergranular flow. Jenks originally proposed the use of his equation for both intergranular and intragranular flow based on the experimental observation that inclusions seem to become trapped at intercrystalline boundaries, thereby slowing the rate of brine migration to less than that predicted by the Jenks equation. Therefore, estimates of brine flow using the Jenks equation should be conservative. Attempts to validate this theory using data from the Salt Block II brine migration experiment, however, show that reasonable agreement of the Jenks equation with the data is obtained (McCauley and Raines, 1985), thus suggesting that retarding grain boundary influences may be minor.

The DOE reconsidered whether the threshold gradient case should not be used as the expected condition because of the controversy over the threshold gradient concept. Because the conclusions drawn in the EA analyses were essentially unaffected by this decision, and because of the strong theoretical arguments favoring the existence of a threshold gradient, the EA was not changed relative to its label in Section 6.4.2.3.2 of the threshold gradient case as the expected condition.

The DOE considered the concern that the Jenks equation is not sufficiently conservative, perhaps by as much as two orders of magnitude, and that calculations derived from theoretical considerations of the sodium chloride-water system are invalid for systems in which significant impurities are present in the inclusions (such as organic carbon). The main reason for using the Jenks equation was its ability to simulate the Salt Block II data. As for uncertainties, as the predictions of waste package lifetime in Section 6.4.2.3.3 indicate, a great deal of uncertainty can be tolerated in the predictions of brine accumulation at the waste package. Indeed, a waste package could even be designed to withstand unlimited quantities of high-magnesium brine, according to data available at present.

The DOE reconsidered three concerns pertaining to salt properties. One concern was that salt has void spaces, and whether they are interconnected. Another concern was that salt is not homogeneous and isotropic, as was assumed for the calculations of brine accumulation. A third concern was that the natural variability of naturally occurring salts makes them difficult candidates for experimental measurements. Void spaces in pure salt are not well understood. Movement of brine through the intergranular void spaces is also not well understood, but would be decreased by any lack of interconnectedness in the pore spaces. The natural variability of salt can be dealt with in modeling when better site-specific information becomes available. This natural variability requires that a large number of site-specific measurements be taken to properly characterize the salt, but in no way makes the measurements more difficult.

The analyses in Section 6.4.2.3.2 regarding brine inclusions do not consider or apply to "brine pockets." Brine pockets are relatively large volumes of entrapped brine which are found in some salt deposits and have accumulated in the intergranular spaces since the formation of the deposit.

Brine inclusions were entrapped inside the crystal (intragranular) at the time of formation of the deposit and are generally relatively small in size.

Issue

A few commenters stated that verification, validation, and documentation should be provided for all codes which support the decision-making process.

Response

Verification, validation, and documentation is intended to be provided for all codes which support the decision-making process.

Supporting documentation is available for performance assessment codes used in support of the final EA. This documentation includes, as a minimum, information about input data, sources of the input data, and model limitations. Documentation will be provided to the level of detail specified by NUREG-0856 (Silling, 1983, NUREG-0856) for any code used to support a license application before the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). The DOE recognizes that code verification and validation are needed before a code is used in support of a license application. Peer review is recognized to be an important part of establishing the validity of a particular modeling effort, and will be used as a part of code validation for codes used in support of licensing.

The DOE also recognizes that data requirements should not be established solely on the basis of the present modeling effort, because of the acknowledged need for a better understanding of many of the processes being modeled, and is establishing data needs accordingly.

A subsection on code status was inadvertently omitted from the Deaf Smith County draft EA, Section 6.4.2.1, Scope and Objective, and has been reinserted in the text.

Issue

A commenter questioned the applicability of the TEMPV5 code as discussed in Section 6.4.2.3.1 for heat transfer in salt.

Response

The DOE has examined the text in Section 6.4.2.3.1 and made no modification. The following discussion explains why TEMPV5 is appropriate.

The TEMPV5 code superposes contributions of a transformed temperature, not temperature itself. Carslaw and Jaeger (1959) discuss this so-called "Kirchhoff transformation" which, for steady state, reduces the equation to a linear differential equation for which superpositioning is valid. For transient heat

transfer, a simultaneous transformation* of time transforms the nonlinear effect of variable thermal diffusivity to a linear differential equation but the boundary condition for the transient heat source does not transform appropriately.** Thus, superpositioning of the transient contributions to the transformed temperature is not exact. However, subsequent benchmarking (McNulty, 1985) of the TEMPV5 code with accepted finite difference codes, using variable conductivity, indicates that the superpositioning error is negligible.

Issue

Some commenters stated that uncertainties and assumptions regarding BRINEMIG and the application of its results should be considered in more detail in Section 6.4.2.3.2 of the EA.

Response

The DOE has reviewed Section 6.4.2.3.2 and has concluded that no change in the text is required. However, the BRINEMIG code was developed using assumptions about brine movement which do not realistically describe the movement of brine in salt. These assumptions and other uncertainties regarding BRINEMIG are discussed in the following paragraphs.

The salt is not homogeneous and isotropic, and flow is not expected to be only thermally driven or only in the radial direction. A related issue in this section of this comment response document discusses statements relating to brine inclusion migration and the rationale behind them. Therefore, this issue focuses on the code BRINEMIG. McCauley and Raines (1985) discuss the BRINEMIG code and its application to high-level nuclear waste repositories in some detail. The principal rationale for developing the model was the observation made by Jenks (1979, ORNL-5526) that inclusions seem to become trapped at crystal boundaries, so predictions made with the Jenks equation should give conservatively high brine migration rates. Further justification was provided when the model was able to approximately predict brine migration rates in the Salt Block II experiment. How applicable the Salt Block II code runs are to a high-level nuclear waste repository at this site has yet to be established.

Predictions of waste package lifetime have shown that a tremendous amount of uncertainty in brine migration rates can be tolerated. Indeed, very long expected package lifetime could be achieved in unlimited high-magnesium brine by providing a sufficient corrosion allowance in the waste package by design.

* $\tau = \int_0^t dt$, where t = time, d = thermal diffusivity, and τ = the transformed variable.

**The heat source is a function of t , not τ . If the heat source were constant with time, the transformation would be exact.

McCauley and Raines (1985) present a study which shows how sensitive BRINEMIG code results are to the temperature and temperature gradient profiles assumed for the salt. The results indicate that the temperature gradients around the waste package have a more profound influence on brine movement in the range of interest than salt temperatures. The only other input parameter which describes the waste package surroundings in the BRINEMIG code is the initial moisture content of the salt. The amount of flow generated by BRINEMIG is directly proportional to the moisture content.

Issue

Several commenters noted that uncertainty in thermal conditions, data, and models may not have been adequately addressed, possibly leading to overstated confidence in calculated corrosion rates, etc.

Response

The DOE has made calculations regarding the verification of TEMPV5 and reviewed other pertinent information. The DOE believes only minor modification of the EA is required. The results of this review and analysis are described briefly in the following paragraphs.

The DOE reviewed the contention that TEMPV5 could not model heat transfer in salt because it used an analytical solution of finite line sources in a homogeneous, isotropic, and infinite medium to model individual waste packages. However, TEMPV5 does not assume a homogeneous medium (a medium whose properties are constant throughout) because it allows thermal conductivity to vary with temperature throughout the infinite, isotropic medium (a medium where properties do not vary with direction at a point). TEMPV5 cannot model a layered medium. The EA has been modified to clearly state that TEMPV5 allows thermal conductivity to vary with temperature.

TEMPV5 varies thermal conductivity with temperature by using a transformation technique described by Carslaw and Jaeger (1959, pp. 10-11). The transformation does not account for the temperature dependence in the thermal diffusivity. However, McNulty (1985) has shown that the variation in diffusivity over the expected temperature range has little effect on the calculated salt temperatures in the vicinity of the waste package. The following discussion provides justification for the conclusion that TEMPV5 adequately models the thermal conditions around a waste package.

To check the calculational algorithms used in TEMPV5, HEATING6 (Elrod et al., 1981, NUREG/CR-0200) and THAC-SIP-3D (Turner, 1978) were set up to simulate the infinite, isotropic medium used in TEMPV5. The results showed that TEMPV5 gives excellent agreement with HEATING6 and THAC-SIP-3D.

The TEMPV5 results were also compared with the STEALTH and SPECTROM-41 results. The STEALTH and SPECTROM-41 models included the repository opening and nonsalt stratigraphy where TEMPV5 does not. The TEMPV5 results agree to within

about 10 C (18 F) with the STEALTH and SPECTROM-41 temperature profiles. Sensitivity studies described in the following paragraphs show that the uncertainty in the thermal conductivity far outweighs the uncertainties in the thermal modeling described above.

The DOE reviewed the suggestion that uncertainty in thermal data, in particular the 40 percent increase in thermal conductivity, were not adequately addressed or conservative. The DOE has reevaluated the data and concluded that no changes are needed in the EA. The data used in the analysis in the EA consisted of thermal properties (Lagedrost and Capps, 1983, BMI/ONWI-522), waste package parameters (Westinghouse, 1983, ONWI-438, Tables 1-2 and 1-3), and baseline repository inventory and design parameters (SCC, 1984, Tables 5-1, 5-2, and 5-3). Uncertainty exists in thermal conductivities and ambient at-depth temperature, with the thermal conductivities having the largest uncertainty. Currently available data make it difficult to evaluate these uncertainties in thermal conductivity. Duffey (1980, SAND 79-7050 pp. 3 through 7, and 59) has observed lower thermal conductivities in the laboratory than in the field. Sampling disturbance of the kind reported by Lagedrost and Capps (1983, BMI/ONWI-522, p. 9) can reduce thermal conductivities measured in the laboratory. In addition, Sass et al. (1983, Table 1) report thermal conductivities about 50 percent higher than those found by Lagedrost and Capps (1983, BMI/ONWI-522,) for one group of salt specimens taken from the same borehole and salt horizon. Sass et al. (1983) used the needle probe technique while Lagedrost and Capps (1983, BMI/ONWI-522, p. 123) used a steady-state heat flow meter. Consequently, Loken et al. (1984, Figure D-3) have suggested a 40 percent correction in laboratory thermal conductivities. Any site-specific heterogeneities could also cause uncertainty in salt thermal conductivities. The use of thermal conductivities not corrected for sampling disturbance and testing technique (i.e., ignoring a 40 percent increase) could raise maximum predicted temperatures by an additional 120 C (216 F) for CHLW and 60 C (108 F) for SFPWR. These increases in temperatures would increase total brine flow and waste package corrosion significantly and might indicate the desirability of reducing individual package heat loads. However, given the experience that laboratory measurements underpredict thermal conductivity by 40 percent or more, the use of the adjustment suggested by Loken et al. (1984) seems entirely appropriate. The DOE has reviewed the concern about this correction and concluded that it would not necessarily be conservative to use the lower and uncorrected laboratory thermal conductivities. Uncorrected laboratory thermal conductivities of salt would certainly overpredict temperatures on the surface of the waste package. However, uncorrected thermal conductivities would also underpredict (hence, be nonconservative) the near-field and far-field temperatures used to calculate room closure, and the uplift/subsidence of overlying strata due to creep and thermal expansion. Consequently, the DOE used its best engineering judgment to select the most balanced thermal conductivities for use in the thermal analyses. Finally, uncertainty in the geothermal gradient for this site varied between 13 to 27 C (23 to 49 F) per kilometer depth with the result that the ambient at-depth temperature varied by about 3 C (5 F) (Dutton, 1980, Figure 39). Therefore, the uncertainty in ambient temperatures appears to have little effect on calculated temperatures. In summary, for the purposes of the environmental assessments the thermal conditions presented in Section 6.4.2.3.1 are appropriate.

The DOE has reviewed the concern that the melting temperature of salt is 200 C (392 F). The DOE concludes no change is needed to the EA because Weast (1984, pp. B-84, B-142) gives the melting temperature of pure salt as 801 C (1,474 F) which is far in excess of any maximum expected salt temperatures.

The DOE has reviewed the concern that nuclear waste will heat the salt and may cause brine flows that will convect contaminants to overlying and underlying aquifers. The DOE has reexamined relevant data and concluded that the EA needs no changes for three reasons. First, the extremely low permeability of salt (Tien et al., 1983, NUREG/CR-3129) will prevent convection from occurring within the salt. Second, the major movement of brine due to temperature gradients will likely be towards, not away, from the waste package (McCauley and Raines, 1985). Third, the vertical distance to the farthest extent of the 100 C (212 F) isotherm is calculated to be 20 meters (66 feet) for any bedded salt site, which is still short of reaching the nearest major nonsalt interbed. Therefore, the effects of heat on the overlying and underlying aquifers will likely be minimal.

The DOE has examined the concern that waste material will reach temperatures of 1,500 F (815 C) and whether this temperature would adversely affect the host salt. The DOE has reviewed the relevant data and concluded that no changes are required in the EA. Loken et al. (1984, Figure 6-1) show that maximum canister temperatures at the center of the waste package will not exceed about 420 C (788 F). In addition, Loken et al. show that temperatures rapidly decrease with distance from the centerline of the waste package. Finally, McNulty (1985) shows maximum expected salt temperatures will not exceed 300 C (572 F) at the surface of the waste package and will decrease to below 200 C (392 F) within 1 meter (3.3 feet) of the package. Consequently, thermal decrepitation (disaggregation) of salt which may begin between 260 and 320 C (500 and 608 F) (Bradshaw and McClain, 1971, ORNL-4555) will affect only a small volume of salt.

Issue

A commenter noted that in Section 6.4.2.3.5 of the EA the use of a free-surface ground-water boundary condition for the uppermost hydrostratigraphic unit was appropriate for bedded salt conceptual models. However, they expressed concern that the EA did not present evidence that the model was calibrated or that the modified version of SWENT was documented.

Response

The DOE examined references noted by the commenters and found that the recalibration of the free water surface model for the Palo Duro Basin is presented in the Second Status Report on Ground-Water Flow Modeling for the Palo Duro Basin, TX (Andrews et al. 1984). Documentation of the modified version of the SWENT code which simulates the free water surface accompanies publication of the final EA.

Issue

Many commenters stated that the effect of travel paths, other than the draft EA reference case presented in Section 6.4.2.3 on the ground-water calculations to the accessible environment, needs additional evaluation and discussion.

Response

The DOE reviewed alternate travel paths that should be considered in evaluating the geohydrology postclosure technical guideline (10 CFR 960.4-2-1). The principal travel path identified in the draft EA is a downward flow from the host salt, followed by lateral flow in the Wolfcamp to the accessible environment. The DOE reviewed the text and determined that, while the most likely travel path is presented in the EA, alternative travel paths may exist. The DOE has therefore modified the EA in Section 6.4.2.3.5 to include additional analyses to determine alternate travel paths and recalculated travel times from the disturbed zone to the accessible environment according to these new travel paths.

The DOE recognizes the concern over the potential for contamination of potable water supplies. EPA regulations and postclosure technical guidelines do not permit significant contamination of potable water supplies by radionuclides harmful to humans. The DOE will comply with such regulations for the high-level nuclear waste repository. Flow paths are not expected to be towards potable water supplies, rather, they are expected to be directed prominently downward from the repository to nonpotable deep brine aquifers. Recognizing that additional travel paths may exist, the DOE is revising the EA, as discussed in the preceding paragraph.

The DOE reviewed the contentions that flow parameters were both uncertain and nonconservative. The principal parameters controlling the ground-water travel path from the disturbed zone to the accessible environment have a degree of uncertainty. Such parameters include horizontal and vertical gradient, permeability, porosity, salinity, and the continuity and thickness of each layer. To address the uncertainty in flow parameters, a systems analysis approach is used to calculate travel paths and time for the EA from multiple simulations based on the Latin Hypercube Sampling (LHS) method. The DOE has revised the EA in Section 6.4.2.3.5 to account for conservative and uncertain values by presenting a range of flow parameters used to calculate ground-water travel paths and times.

The DOE also reviewed the concerns over possible fracture flow and secondary porosity in the subsurface. The DOE assessed the relative importance of, and availability of, data to evaluate the fracture contribution to ground-water flow at the Deaf Smith County site. In response to this, the DOE assembled a peer review group of ground-water hydrologists which concluded that there is no direct evidence that the regional ground-water flow in the Palo Duro Basin in the area of Deaf Smith County is significantly controlled by fractures. With currently available information, the report states that the most likely

ground-water pathway is a porous-media flow, through the bulk permeability and nonfractured, effective porosity of the stratigraphic units downward and laterally into the Wolfcamp series. It is further concluded that a range of travel times can be estimated adequately by stochastic pathway analysis, using known or expected distributions of pressure, fluid density, permeability, and effective porosity. The DOE has modified the EA in Section 6.4.2.3.5 in accordance with recommendations provided by the peer review group. Travel times in the revised EA are based on stochastic pathways from Latin Hypercube Sampling as described in the preceding paragraph.

Issue

Several commenters stated that the implications of Darcian flow in Chapter 6 need further clarification regarding claimed longer calculated ground-water travel times. The commenters added that the resulting calculated ground-water travel times in Chapter 6 are different from others in the draft EA and they questioned why there is a difference.

Response

The DOE examined the EA text and found that inconsistencies are present in ground-water flow travel times between Section 6.3.1.1.2, Analysis of Favorable Condition, and the subsection "Aquifer Ground-Water Flow" under Section 6.4.2.3.5, Geologic Subsystem Performance. These inconsistencies are thought to be due to editing error.

Specific changes in the EAs have been made within Sections 6.3.1.1, 6.4.2.3.5, and 3.3.2.1 to reconcile the presentation of ground-water travel times throughout the EA.

Issue

A few commenters stated that the effect of perturbations such as tectonics, and climatic and geomorphic changes on hydraulic properties needs to be addressed.

Response

The DOE has reviewed the pertinent data and believes no modification of the EA is required. This review is described in the following paragraph.

The probability of severe tectonic or geomorphic disturbances in this site area is relatively low. Consequently, such disturbances are not included in expected behavior and were not analyzed for the EA. The purpose of the EA was to provide a basis to determine if a site warranted further consideration in a site characterization phase. The DOE chose to use an "expected conditions" analysis for this with the assumption (to be confirmed during site

characterization) that severe disturbances would be of such probability (i.e., less than 1 chance in 10,000 of occurring in 10,000 years [40 CFR Part 191]) that they could be ignored. Regardless, the impact of several hypothesized perturbations including tectonic, climatic, geomorphic, and combinations of these processes have been examined (INTERA, 1984, ONWI-504), and results show little effect on the ground-water flow system.

Issue

Several commenters noted that more sensitivity and some uncertainty analyses should be included in the EA.

Response

Without site-specific data, more sensitivity analyses or uncertainty analysis would not provide additional confidence that the postclosure technical guidelines can be met. The purpose of the EA is to decide whether a site warrants further characterization. An "expected conditions" analysis is sufficient for this. Indeed, one commenter noted the use of conservative assumptions by the DOE and stated that actual repository performance at all sites could likely prove better than predicted in the EAs.

In the EA subsection, "Summary of Performance of Engineered Barriers," under Section 6.4.2.3.4, the statement that the results are insensitive to variations in parameters was removed.

Issue

Several commenters felt that the potential disruptive effects of earthquakes on waste isolation had not been addressed sufficiently.

Response

Earthquakes would be of consequence at a repository to the extent that they might increase the permeability of surrounding nonsalt rocks and crack water-proofing liners in shafts. These additional paths for water flow could conceivably allow transport of radionuclides during the postclosure phase of the nuclear waste repository. Evidence suggests that earthquakes should not compromise the postclosure isolation of nuclear waste in the proposed salt sites. Kanai et al. (1966) and Lysmer et al. (1975, EERC-75-30) indicate that earthquake accelerations and displacements decrease with depth below the ground surface. Stevens (1977), Dowding (1978), and Dowding and Rozen (1978) indicate that natural and engineered openings generally experience either no damage or only minor rock falls during seismic events. On occasion, however, because of a combination of severe ground motion and poor rock or marginal support, Dowding (1977) and Dowding and Rozen (1978) report that severe damage to open tunnels has occurred. However, it is unlikely that this level of damage would be possible in a salt repository after backfill has been placed.

Section 6.3.3.4 has been expanded to indicate that acceleration values from earthquakes are the mean value of maximum acceleration estimates. This section also includes conservative assumptions about potential sources of earthquakes.

Issue

Several commenters expressed the concern that processes such as erosion, volcanic eruptions, and the impacts of a meteorite or nuclear weapons could bring nuclear waste to the surface.

Response

The potential for exhumation of waste from a repository by erosion is discussed in Section 6.3.1.5; and volcanic activity in Section 6.3.1.7. Neither process has been found to have a likely significant impact on repository performance.

Comprehensive lists of Burkholder (1980) and Koplic et al. (1982) have examined many different features, processes, and events that can conceivably affect the operation of a nuclear waste repository. Burkholder (1980, Table 4-1) shows that the literature gives cumulative probabilities of 10^{-8} at 10,000 years for meteorite impact and rejects a scenario involving nuclear warfare. The release of radionuclides from a nuclear waste repository itself would be insignificant when compared to radioactivity generated by an explosion of a nuclear device.

Issue

Several commenters asked how the DOE will keep future generations from drilling for natural resources after location of the site has been forgotten or keep someone from deliberately excavating the sealed shaft.

Response

The DOE has expanded Section 6.3.1.8 to describe the requirements of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for marking the site and maintaining records of repository location and contents (10 CFR 60.2). Additionally, this Section presents an evaluation of the likelihood of mineral resources at the site which would attract inadvertent human interference.

The DOE (1980, DOE/NE-0007, p. 11-189) believes that "although this generation bears the responsibility for protecting future societies from the waste it creates, future societies must assume the responsibility for any risks which arise from deliberate and informed acts which they choose to perform." For example, the DOE cannot assume responsibility for future generations that deliberately excavate the sealed shaft if they have encountered markers and

understood that biohazardous waste is buried below. The NRC indicates (10 CFR 60.2, 1983) that such actions are not sufficiently credible to warrant consideration.

Issue

Several commenters expressed concern that a variety of human intrusion scenarios (notably borehole dissolution, solution mining, and a borehole U-tube pathway) could lead to unacceptable releases from a repository. One commenter suggested a numerical analysis of solution mining be done.

Response

The DOE has expanded Section 6.4.2.6 to evaluate these types of activities and their impacts on repository isolation. Several studies have been completed which are referenced in the EA (ONWI, 1981, ONWI-320; INTERA, 1985, BMI/ONWI-553; DOE, 1983, WIPP-DOE-161). These studies provide a calculational basis for demonstrating that when realistic conditions are assumed for groundwater flow and chemistry, waste solubility, and site geometry, then releases are well below EPA standards.

Further, the NRC's final rule (10 CFR 60.2) does not require the analysis of human intrusion activities at the site, e.g., solution mining, if appropriate markers are used to mark the site and future generations are made aware of the hazards that exist. The DOE plans to use such markers and therefore does not plan to model solution mining.

Issue

Several commenters stated that performance of shaft seals and liners may be inadequately discussed, and confidence in their effectiveness consequently overstated in Section 6.4.2.3.5 of the EA.

Response

The DOE has reviewed the EA and notes that site-specific performance assessments of shaft seal designs could not be presented in Section 6.4.2.3.5 because these designs will only be developed after detailed site characterization. Site-specific stratigraphy and geochemistry will significantly affect not only shaft seal designs but also the construction methods used. Consequently, no detailed assessments of shaft seal performance can be made until site-specific designs or construction techniques have been decided. While detailed site-specific shaft seal assessments will be performed when designs and construction methods become established, some generic quantitative and qualitative systems analyses can set bounds on how the shaft seal designs could affect isolation. Gureghian et al. (1983, ONWI-494) give an example of such an assessment. Detailed discussions that dealt with concerns about the disturbed

zone around the shaft, dissolution or failure of bond between seal and host rock, and effects on radionuclide transport have been addressed in various DOE reports. However, these reports speculate on designs, construction methods, and site properties. Consequently, no changes are made in the EA regarding this comment.

Issue

Commenters noted that Gureghian et al. (1983, ONWI-494), referenced in Section 6.4.2.3.5 of the EA, neglected the disturbed zone around the shaft seal system.

Response

It is true that Gureghian et al. (1983, ONWI-494) neglected the disturbed zone around the shaft seal system. However, previous schematic designs by Kelsall et al. (1982, ONWI-411; 1985, BMI/ONWI-564) and Parsons Brinckerhoff (1983, ONWI-498) have not ignored this issue. Gureghian et al. (1983, ONWI-494) assumed that the main flow was through the seals only because such analysis had not previously been performed.

Even if water flow short-circuited through a disturbed zone around the shaft seals in the overlying nonsalt units, flow would likely be blocked upon contact with the repository salt unit for three reasons. First, for example, Parsons Brinckerhoff (1983, ONWI-498) provides for a salt-saturated expanding cement placed at the top of the salt horizon with no gaps at the interface between the shaft and the surrounding salt. Second, any unexpected gaps at the interface between the shaft and surrounding rock will close rapidly due to the buildup of radial stresses from lithostatic stress. Kelsall et al. (1985, BMI/ONWI-564, Sec. A-7, p. A-35) used generic creep data to show that radial stresses will build up to 70 percent of initial lithostatic stress within 30 years for Lower San Andres Unit 4 in the Permian Basin at the base of the shaft. These radial stresses should be more than sufficient to close any possible pathways for water. Kelsall et al. (1985, BMI/ONWI-564, p. 123) reported similar creep rates for a shaft of a generic reference repository in bedded salt. Third, and most importantly, any salt dissolution through any available pathway will quickly stop without a mechanism to cycle fresh water in and out of the salt unit. The sealed shafts will be located large distances from any repository rooms containing waste and, therefore, it is unlikely under expected site condition, that the massive amounts of dissolution required to uncover any waste could occur around the shafts. For example, SCC (1984, Figure A-4) locates all of the shafts more than 762 meters (2,500 feet) from the closest TRU waste, 1,220 meters (4,000 feet) from the closest CHLW waste, and 1,829 meters (6,000 feet) from the closest spent fuel waste. All tunnels between the shafts and waste areas will be backfilled with crushed salt or other suitable material and have tunnel bulkheads made of concrete and salt bricks (Kelsall et al., 1982, ONWI-411, Figure 3-6). In addition, Monti and Gupta (1984) have shown that the maximum potential dissolution under natural conditions of fresh-water flow for an existing borehole at Cypress Creek could

only increase the borehole diameter from 0.34 meter (13-3/8 inches) to 2 meters (6.5 feet) before creep finally closed the borehole altogether in 30 to 70 years. Even with large flow rates, INTERA (1985, BMI/ONWI-553, Figure 5-14) has shown that for the worst case of a borehole cycling in fresh water at flows of 3,800 cubic meters (134,195 cubic feet) per day, the amount of dissolution will be small. If the sedimentation of impurities during any dissolution were considered, the base of the shaft seal system could likely plug and block a flow path that had been developed during dissolution.

In conclusion, expected flows through disturbed zones are not expected to persist. Consequently, no changes are made in the EA regarding this comment.

Issue

One commenter cited examples of failures around salt mine shafts and suggested that the environmental assessments discuss them.

Response

The examples of failures cited by the commenter do not involve stratigraphy, hydrology, seal designs, or construction methods similar to those intended for waste isolation in salt and described by Kelsall et al. (1985, BMI/ONWI-564) and Parsons Brinckerhoff (1983, ONWI-498). Consequently, the EA was not revised to include discussions of these cited failures.

Issue

One commenter noted that all shaft seals leak.

Response

It may possibly be true that all shaft seals leak. However, the issue is whether any radionuclide transport will occur if they do leak. The likelihood of any flow reaching the repository rooms and transporting radionuclides is small, for four reasons. First, the remoteness of the shaft seal systems with respect to the repository reduces the likelihood of flow reaching the repository. Second, expected creep closure of repository rooms (70 years as estimated by INTERA [1985, BMI/ONWI-553]) further reduces the likelihood of any flow from leaking shafts reaching the repository. Third, given the planned sequential emplacement of the waste canisters and backfilling the storage rooms with crushed salt after waste has been emplaced (SCC, pp. 4-25), creep closure of the repository rooms will have been well under way before engineered closure of the repository occurs with sealing of the shaft. Finally, the permeability of salt is effectively zero when the pressure is sufficient to deform the salt plastically and close off the passageways at crystal interfaces (Gevantman, 1981, p. 31). The in situ permeability of intact salt is very low and "probably nonexistent" according to Tien et al. (1983, NUREG/CR-3129, p. 211). The

permeabilities are often below the resolution of the testing apparatus (Tien et al., 1983, NUREG/CR-3129, p. 209). Similarly, Baar (1977, p. 88) asserts that "standard permeability tests on rock salt are usually of no use, for the cores are damaged when taken out of their triaxial in situ stress field." Therefore, observed permeability in rock samples at high confining pressures may be artifacts of laboratory techniques or due to the presence of impurities (Gevantman, p. 31).

In addition, given the plasticity of salt, cracks will likely not develop as connecting pathways for water flow into the repository. According to Tien et al. (1983, NUREG/CR-3129, p. 211), even transient permeability introduced into the salt around the repository should be eliminated rapidly by creep closure of the repository. Hence, given low salt permeability, sufficient flow will not occur through the intact salt to the repository before creep closes the voids in the crushed salt in about 70 years (INTERA, 1985, BMI/ONWI-553).

Since the consequences of leaking seals would be minimal, the EA was not revised to discuss this behavior.

C.5.12 CHAPTER C.5 REFERENCES

C.5.12.1 References Listed by Author

Andrews, Robert W., Douglas E. Metcalfe, and Cady L. Johnson, 1984. Second Status Report on Regional Ground-Water Flow Modeling for the Palo Duro Basin, Texas, prepared by INTERA Technologies, Inc., for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH, in preparation.

Baar, C. A., 1977. Applied Salt-Rock Mechanics, 1: The In-Situ Behavior of Salt Rocks, Developments in Geotechnical Engineering 16A, Elsevier Scientific Publishing Company, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

Barron, K., and N. A. Toews, 1963. "Deformation Around a Mine Shaft in Salt," Proceedings, Rock Mechanics Symposium (December 6-7, Queens University, Kingston, Ontario), pp. 115-136.

Bradshaw, R. L., and W. C. McClain, eds., 1971. Project Salt Vault: A Demonstration of the Disposal of High-Activity Solidified Wastes in Underground Salt Mines, ORNL-4555, prepared for U.S. Atomic Energy Commission by Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Union Carbide Corporation, Oak Ridge, TN.

Broecker, Wallace S., 1977. "The Hazards of Coal Dependence," Natural History, Vol. 86, No. 8, pp. 8-19.

Burkholder, H. C., 1980. "Waste Isolation Performance Assessment--A Status Report," in Vol. 2 of C.J.M. Northrup, ed., Scientific Basis for Nuclear Waste Management, Plenum Press, New York, NY, p. 689.

Carslaw, H. S., and J. C. Jaeger, 1959. Conduction of Heat in Solids, 2nd edn., Oxford University Press, New York, NY, pp. 10-11.

Dial, Barry W., Donald E. Maxwell, and William Yeung, 1985. Room and Canister Scale Thermal-Mechanical Benchmarks Between STEALTH 2D and SPECTROM-41/SPECTROM-21, prepared by Science Applications International Corporation for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH, in preparation.

Dowding, Charles H., 1977. "Seismic Stability of Underground Openings," Proceedings of the Rockstore Conference (September, 1977, Stockholm, Sweden).

Dowding, Charles H., 1978. "Response of Rock Tunnels to Earthquake Shaking," Earthquake Engineering and Soil Dynamics Conference Proceedings (June 19-21, 1978, Pasadena, California), American Society of Civil Engineers, New York, NY, pp. 1347-1351.

Dowding, Charles H., and Arnon Rozen, 1978. "Damage to Rock Tunnels From Earthquake Shaking," Journal of the Geotechnical Engineering Division, Proceedings of the American Society of Civil Engineers, Vol. 104, No. GT2, pp. 175-191.

Drumheller, J. C., S. I. Fuerst, B. P. Cavan, and J. A. Saunders, 1982. Petrographic and Geochemical Characteristics of the Richton Salt Core, ONWI-277, prepared by Law Engineering Testing Company for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

Duffey, T. A., 1980. Final Report: The Salt Block I Test: Experimental Details and Comparison with Theory, SAND79-7050, prepared for U.S. Department of Energy by Los Alamos Technical Associates, Inc., Los Alamos, NM.

Dutton, Shirley P., 1980. Petroleum Source Rock Potential and Thermal Maturity, Palo Duro Basin, Texas, Geological Circular 80-10, prepared for U.S. Department of Energy by Bureau of Economic Geology, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX.

Elrod, D. C., G. E. Giles, and W. D. Turner, 1981. HEATING6: A Multidimensional Heat Conduction Analysis With the Finite-Difference Formulation, NUREG/CR-0200, Vol. 2, TDMC Computer Code Collections, prepared for the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission by Union Carbide Corporation, Nuclear Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN.

Fisher, R. Stephen, 1984c. Amount and Nature of Occluded Water in Bedded Salt, Palo Duro Basin, Texas, OF-WTWI-1984-50, prepared for U.S. Department of Energy by The Bureau of Economic Geology, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX.

Fisher, R. Stephen, 1984a. Geochemical Environment of the Evaporite Aquitard and Deep-Basin Brine Aquifer, Palo Duro Basin, Texas, OF-WTWI-1984-26, prepared for U.S. Department of Energy by Bureau of Economic Geology, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX.

Fisher, R. Stephen, 1984b. Host Rock Geochemistry of the Palo Duro Basin, Texas, OF-WTWI-1984-11, prepared for U.S. Department of Energy by Bureau of Economic Geology, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX.

Fukui, Larry M., 1984. Summary of Petrographic and Chemical Data for Palo Duro Basin Samples Examined by Bendix Field Engineering Corporation, Grand Junction, Colorado, as of April 29, 1983, BMI/ONWI-540, prepared by Bendix Field Engineering Corporation for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

Gevantman, L. H., ed., 1981. Physical Properties Data for Rock Salt, National Bureau of Standards Monograph 167, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, DC.

Gray, W. H., 1984. "Gamma Radiolysis Effects on Grande Ronde Basalt Groundwater," Materials Research Society Symposium Proceedings, Vol. 26, pp. 147-152.

Gureghian, A. B., L. A. Scott, and G. E. Raines, 1983. Performance Assessment of a Shaft Seals System in an HLW Repository in the Gibson Dome Area, ONWI-494, Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

Gustavson, Thomas C., R. L. Bassett, R. J. Finley, A. G. Goldstein, C. R. Handford, J. H. McGowen, M. W. Presley, R. W. Baumgardner, Jr., M. E. Bentley, S. P. Dutton, J. A. Griffin, A. D. Hoadley, R. C. Howard, D. A. McGookey, K. A. McGillis, D. P. Palmer, P. J. Ramondetta, E. Roedder, W. W. Simpkins, and W. D. Wiggins, 1981. Geology and Geohydrology of the Palo Duro Basin, Texas Panhandle: A Report on the Progress of Nuclear Waste Isolation Feasibility Studies (1980), Geological Circular 81-3, prepared for U.S. Department of Energy by Bureau of Economic Geology, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX.

Gustavson, Thomas C., and Roy T. Budnik, 1985. "Structural Influences on Geomorphic Processes and Physiographic Features, Texas Panhandle: Technical Issues in Siting a Nuclear Waste Repository," Geology, Vol. 13, pp. 173-176.

Hite, Robert J., 1983. Preliminary Mineralogical and Geochemical Data From the DOE Gibson Dome Corehole No. 1, San Juan County, Utah, U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 83-780, U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, DC.

Hovorka, Susan D., B. A. Luneau, and S. Thomas, 1985. Stratigraphy of Bedded Halite in the Permian San Andres Formation, Units 4 and 5, Palo Duro Basin, Texas (draft), OF-WTWI-1985-9, prepared for the U.S. Department of Energy by Bureau of Economic Geology, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX, Plates 2 and 10.

Hubbard, N., J. C. Laul, and R. W. Perkins, 1984. "The Use of Natural Radionuclides to Predict the Behavior of Radwaste Radionuclides in Far-Field Aquifers," in G. L. McVay, ed., Scientific Basis for Nuclear Waste Management VII, Vol. 26, Elsevier Scientific Publishing Company, New York, NY, pp. 891-897.

Iman, R. L., and W. J. Conover, 1982. Sensitivity Analysis Techniques: Self-Teaching Curriculum, NUREG/CR-2350, prepared by Sandia National Laboratories for U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC.

Imbrie, John, and Katherine Palmer Imbrie, 1979. Ice Ages -Solving the Mystery, Enslow Publishers, Short Hills, NJ.

INTERA Environmental Consultants, Inc., 1983. EQ3/EQ6: A Geochemical Speciation and Reaction Path Code Package Suitable for Nuclear Waste Performance Assessment, ONWI-472, prepared for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

INTERA Environmental Consultants, Inc., 1984. First Status Report on Regional Ground-Water Flow Modeling for the Palo Duro Basin, Texas, ONWI-504, prepared for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

INTERA Technologies, Inc., 1985. Preliminary Analyses of Scenarios for Potential Future Human Interference for Repositories in Three Salt Formations, BMI/ONWI-553, prepared for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

Jansen, George, 1984. Expected Waste Package Performance for Nuclear Waste Repositories in Three Salt Formations, draft, Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

Jansen, George, 1985. Expected Waste Package Performance for Nuclear Waste Repositories in Three Salt Formations, Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH, in preparation.

Jenks, G. H., 1979. Effects of Temperature, Temperature Gradients, Stress and Irradiation on Migration of Brine Inclusions in a Salt Repository, ORNL-5526, prepared for U.S. Department of Energy by Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Union Carbide Corporation, Oak Ridge, TN.

Kanai, Kiyoshi, Teiji Tanaka, Shizuyo Yoshizawa, Toshizo Morishita, Kaio Osada, and Tomisaburo Suzuki, 1966. "Comparative Studies of Earthquake Motions on the Ground and Underground, II," Bulletin of the Earthquake Research Institute, Vol. 44, pp. 609-643.

Kelsall, P. C., J. B. Case, and C. R. Chabannes, 1982. A Preliminary Evaluation of the Rock Mass Disturbance Resulting From Shaft, Tunnel, or Borehole Excavation, ONWI-411, prepared by D'Appolonia Consulting Engineers, Inc., for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

Kelsall, P. C., J. B. Case, W. E. Coons, J. G. Franzone, and D. Meyer, 1985. Schematic Designs for Penetration Seals for a Repository in the Permian Basin, BMI/ONWI-564, prepared by IT Corporation for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

Knauth, L. Paul, and M. A. Beeunas, 1985. Origin of Fluid Inclusion Water in Bedded Salt Deposits, Palo Duro Basin, Texas, BMI/ONWI-569, prepared by Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ, for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

Koplik, Charles M., Maureen F. Kaplan, and Benjamin Ross, 1982. "The Safety of Repositories for Highly Radioactive Wastes," Reviews of Modern Physics, Vol. 54, No. 1, pp. 269-310.

Kreiter, M. R., 1984. "Waste Package Program," Section 3.1.1 in J. L. McElroy and J. A. Powell, compilers, Nuclear Waste Management Semiannual Progress Report, April 1983 through September 1983, PNL-4250-4, prepared for U.S. Department of Energy by Pacific Northwest Laboratory, Battelle Memorial Institute, Richland, WA, pp. 3.1-3.29.

Lagedrost, John F., and Webster Capps, 1983. Thermal Property and Density Measurements of Samples Taken From Drilling Cores From Potential Geologic Media, BMI/ONWI-522, prepared by Fiber Materials, Inc., for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

Langbein, W. B., and S. A. Schumm, 1958. "Yield of Sediment in Relation to Mean Annual Precipitation," Transactions of the American Geophysical Union, Vol. 39, No. 6, pp. 1076-1084.

Laul, J. C., M. R. Smith, and N. Hubbard, 1985. "Behavior of Natural Uranium, Thorium and Radium Isotopes in the Wolfcamp Brine Aquifers, Palo Duro Basin, Texas," Materials Research Society Symposium Proceedings, Vol. 44, pp. 475-482.

Levy, Paul W., 1983. "Radiation Damage Studies on Natural Rock Salt From Various Geological Localities of Interest to the Radioactive Waste Disposal Program," Nuclear Technology, Vol. 60, Feb., pp. 231-243.

Levy, P. W., and J. H. Kierstead, 1982. Very Rough Preliminary Estimate of the Sodium Metal Colloid Inducted in Natural Rock Salt by the Radiations from Waste Canisters, BNL-32004, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, NY.

Lind, Samuel C., 1961. Radiation Chemistry of Gases, American Chemical Society Monograph Series No. 151, Reinhold Publishing Corporation, New York, NY, pp. 99-106, 145-147, and 175-180.

Loken, Marc C., Gary D. Callahan, Darrell K. Svalstad, and Ralph A. Wagner, 1984. Thermomechanical Analyses of Conceptual Repository Designs for the Paradox and Permian Basins, prepared by RE/SPEC Inc. for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH, in preparation.

Lysmer, John, Takekazu Udaka, Chan-Feng Tsai, and H. Bolton Seed, 1975. FLUSH: A Computer Program for Approximate 3-D Analysis of Soil-Structure Interaction Problems, EERC-75-30, Earthquake Engineering Research Center, University of California, Berkeley, CA.

McCauley, V. S., and G. E. Raines, 1985. Expected Brine Movement at Potential Nuclear Waste Repository Salt Sites, Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH, in preparation.

McClure, Cole R., 1981. "Damage to Underground Structures During Earthquakes," in I. W. Marine, ed., Proceedings of Workshop on Seismic Performance of Underground Facilities, DP-1623, prepared for U.S. Department of Energy by E. I. du Pont de Nemours and Company, Savannah River Laboratory, Aiken, SC, pp. 75-106.

McNulty, E. G., 1985. Expected Near-Field Thermal Performance for Nuclear Waste Repositories at Potential Salt Sites, Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH, in preparation.

Means, Jeffrey L., and Norman J. Hubbard, 1985. The Organic Geochemistry of Deep Ground Waters From the Palo Duro Basin, Texas: Implications for Radionuclide Complexation, Ground-Water Origin, and Petroleum Exploration, BMI/ONWI-578, prepared by Battelle's Columbus Laboratories and Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

Monti, Amy M., and Sumant K. Gupta, 1984. Salt Dissolution Analysis in Existing Boreholes at Cypress Creek Dome, memorandum, Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Project Management Division, Columbus, OH.

Nelson, D. P., and A. F. Fossum, 1985. "Salt Pressures on Defense High-Level Waste Packages," in E. Ashworth, ed., Research & Engineering Applications in Rock Masses, Vol. 1, Proceedings of the 26th U.S. Symposium on Rock Mechanics (June 26-28, 1985, Rapid City, South Dakota), A. A. Balkema, Boston, MA, pp. 251-258.

Nuttli, Otto W., and Robert B. Herrmann, 1978. State-of-the-Art for Assessing Earthquake Hazards in the United States: Report 12, Credible Earthquakes for the Central United States, Miscellaneous Paper S-73-1, prepared by the Department of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, St. Louis University, for Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army, Washington, DC.

Nuttli, Otto W., and Robert B. Herrmann, 1981. Consequences of Earthquakes in the Mississippi Valley, American Society of Civil Engineers Preprint 81-519, Department of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, St. Louis University, St. Louis, MO.

Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, 1981. Preliminary Evaluation of Solution-Mining Intrusion Into a Salt Dome Repository, ONWI-320(1), Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, 1984. Performance Assessment Plans and Methods for the Salt Repository Project, BMI/ONWI-545, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

Panno, Samuel S., and Kenneth S. Czyscinski, 1984. "Expected Brine Chemistry in a Nuclear Waste Repository in Salt," Proceedings of the First Canadian/American Conference on Hydrogeology, Practical Applications of Ground Water Geochemistry (June 22-26, 1984, Banff, Alberta, Canada), National Water Well Association, Worthington, OH, pp. 201-209.

Panno, Samuel V., and Peter Soo, 1983. An Evaluation of Chemical Conditions Caused by Gamma Irradiation of Natural Rock Salt, prepared for U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission by Nuclear Waste Management Division, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, NY.

Parsons Brinckerhoff/PB-KBB, 1983. Exploratory Shaft Facility Preliminary Designs - Permian Basin, ONWI-498, prepared for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

Pederson, L. R., D. E. Clark, F. N. Hodges, G. L. McVay, and D. Rai, 1984. "The Expected Environment for Waste Packages in a Salt Repository," Materials Research Society Symposium Proceedings, Vol. 26, Elsevier Science Publishing Company, Inc., pp. 417-426.

Pfeifle, Tom W., Kirby D. Mellegard, and Paul E. Senseny, 1983. Constitutive Properties of Salt From Four Sites, ONWI-314, prepared by RE/SPEC Inc. for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

Prij, J., and L. H. Vons, 1984. "Numerical and Experimental Investigations on the Time-Dependent Behavior of a Salt Dome with a High-Level Waste Repository," in Gary L. McVay, ed., Scientific Basis for Nuclear Waste Management VII, Vol. 26, Elsevier Science Publishing Company, Inc., New York, NY, pp. 1-8.

Reference Repository Conditions Interface Working Group, 1983. Results of Repository Conditions Study for Commercial and Defense High-Level Nuclear Waste and Spent Fuel Repositories in Salt, ONWI-483, prepared for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

Sass, J. H., Arthur H. Lachenbruch, and E. P. Smith, 1983. Temperature Profiles From Salt Valley, Utah, Thermal Conductivity of 10 Samples From Drill Hole DOE 3, and Preliminary Estimates of Heat Flow, U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 83-455, U.S. Department of the Interior.

SCC, see Stearns Catalytic Corporation.

Sewell, M. J., 1984. Summary of Chemical and Isotopic Data Produced by Bendix Field Engineering Corporation for the Mansfield #1, Sawyer #1, Zeeck #1, and J. Friemel #1 Wells in the Texas Panhandle, prepared for the Salt Repository Project Office by Bendix Field Engineering Corporation, Grand Junction, CO.

Silling, S. A., Compiler, 1983. Final Technical Position on Documentation of Computer Codes for High-Level Waste Management, NUREG-0856, Division of Waste Management, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC.

Stearns Catalytic Corporation, 1984. Basic Repository EA Design Basis, Permian Basin, Deaf Smith County Site, prepared for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH, in preparation.

Stevens, Peter R., 1977. A Review of the Effects of Earthquakes on Underground Mines, U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 77-313, U.S. Department of the Interior, Reston, VA.

Stumm, Werner, and James J. Morgan, 1970. Aquatic Chemistry: An Introduction Emphasizing Chemical Equilibria in Natural Waters, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, NY, pp. 172-194 and 500-507.

Tien, Pei-lin, F. B. Nimick, A. B. Muller, P. A. Davis, R. V. Guzowski, L. E. Duda, and R. L. Hunter, 1983. Repository Site Data and Information in Bedded Salt: Palo Duro Basin, Texas, NUREG/CR-3129, SAND82-2223, prepared for Office of Nuclear Materials Safety and Safeguards, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, by Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM.

Turner, W. D., 1978. THAC-SIP-3D, A Three-Dimensional, Transient Heat Analysis Code Using the Strongly Implicit Procedure, K/CSD/TM-24, prepared for U.S. Department of Energy by Computer Sciences Division, Union Carbide Corporation, Oak Ridge, TN.

United States v. Jones, 109 U.S. 513 (1883).

U.S. Department of Energy, 1983. Summary of the Results of the Evaluation of the WIPP Site and Preliminary Design Validation Program, WIPP-DOE-161, Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, Albuquerque, NM.

U.S. Department of Energy, 1985. Mission Plan for the Civilian Radioactive Waste Management Program, Vol. I of III, DOE/RW-0005, Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management, Washington, DC.

Van Sambeek, Leo L., Randall G. Stickney, and Keith B. DeJong, 1983. Avery Island Heater Tests: Measured Data for 1,000 Days of Heating, ONWI-190(5), prepared by RE/SPEC Inc. for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

Weast, Robert C., ed., 1984. CRC Handbook of Chemistry and Physics, 1984-1985, 65th edn., Chemical Rubber Publishing Company, Boca Raton, FL, pp. B-84 and B-142.

Westinghouse Electric Corporation, 1983. Engineered Waste Package Conceptual Design: Defense High-Level Waste (Form 1), Commercial High-Level Waste (Form 1), and Spent Fuel (Form 2) Disposal in Salt, ONWI-438, prepared for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

C.5.12.1 Federal Regulations and Statutes

10 CFR Part 60, Disposal of High-Level Radioactive Wastes in Geologic Repositories; Technical Criteria.

10 CFR Part 960, Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982; General Guidelines for the Recommendation of Sites for the Nuclear Waste Repositories; Final Siting Guidelines.

40 CFR Part 191, Environmental Standards for the Management and Disposal of Spent Nuclear Fuel, High-Level and Transuranic Radioactive Wastes; Final Rule, September 19, 1985.

Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, 42 USC Secs. 2011 et seq.

Department of Energy Act; Acquisition, construction, etc. of laboratories, research and testing sites, etc., 42 USC Sec. 7257.

C.6 PRECLOSURE RADIOLOGICAL SAFETY

Several individuals, agencies, and organizations sought further information about a number of issues concerning the radiological safety of an operating repository. Further information was sought on topics discussed in Section 7.3.1 of the EA which provides the basis for comparing sites on radiological safety-related criteria. Information from Chapters 3, 4, 5, and 6 was utilized in responding to many of the questions.

C.6.1 POPULATION DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION

This guideline's objective is to ensure the selection of a repository site that will minimize risk to the public and permit compliance with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) regulations. Issues raised by commenters include the following:

- Adequate radiological analysis
- Proximity of site to the communities.

Issue

A few commenters stated that specific onsite data are necessary for an adequate radiological analysis.

Response

The DOE has reviewed the use of the population density data in both the radiological analyses and the distance from highly populated area qualifying condition and has concluded that no changes to the EA are warranted. Two types of radiological analyses are used in the guideline evaluation:

1. Releases of radionuclides at the point of release are compared to 10 CFR Part 20 requirements for maximum permissible concentrations in unrestricted areas.
2. A calculation is made of the annual dose to a hypothetical individual who is presumed to be continuously at the point of maximum exposure in the unrestricted area.

The distance from the site to highly populated areas (population of 2,500 or more) is also a consideration in this guideline. Specific site area data and calculations were used and are described in EA Sections 6.2.1.2 and 3.6. Thus, the DOE believes the data are adequate and no revision to the guideline analysis is required.

Issue

One commenter stated that proximity of the site to the communities of Amarillo and Vega should be given greater consideration.

Response

The distance of the site from a "highly populated area" is considered in the qualifying condition, the favorable conditions, the adverse conditions, and the disqualifying conditions of the guideline. As described in Section 6.2.1.2 of the EA, the Deaf Smith County site meets all of these conditions. The DOE analysis is based on a thorough evaluation of "distance from a highly populated area."

Issue

A few commenters questioned the use of the word "adjacent" in the guideline.

Response

The use of the word "adjacent" is discussed in the preamble of the DOE's siting guidelines, 10 CFR Part 960 (Federal Register, Vol. 49, No. 236, Dec. 6, 1984; p. 47741, population density and distribution).

C.6.2 SITE OWNERSHIP AND CONTROL

This category responds to questions and concerns expressed about the ownership and control of the site at Deaf Smith County, Texas. The category corresponds to comments received on Section 6.2.1.1 and related sections in the draft EA. Issues raised by commenters include the following:

- Federal condemnation to acquire land
- Environmental and socioeconomic impacts of land acquisition.

Issue

Some commenters have expressed the opinion that the DOE has overlooked the fact that the use of Federal condemnation to acquire land for repository development will entail extended legal proceedings and has neglected the potential need to condemn railroad and road access.

Response

The DOE intends to minimize the need to resort to Federal condemnation to acquire land at either the site characterization or repository development stage. Federal condemnation, however, is a recognized avenue for Federal acquisition of private property to accomplish Federal program objectives, such as this. If land necessary for site characterization (see EA Section 4.1.3.3) cannot be leased or purchased, or land needed for repository development (see EA Section 5.1.5) cannot be purchased, the DOE will institute condemnation proceedings. In this regard, pursuant to the Declaration of Taking Act (40 USC Section 258a) the Federal government is empowered, through the submission of a declaration of taking with the presiding Federal district court and monetary deposit, to take immediate title of the required land in fee simple absolute. The purpose of the Declaration of Taking Act is to allow the government immediate possession and use of land for Federal use without awaiting the termination of protracted litigation. The DOE estimates that about 90 days would be required for condemnation. Therefore, concerns about unwarranted delay in Federal land acquisition by condemnation are unwarranted.

With regard to land requirements for railroad and road access, the EA recognizes that the land requirements at the site characterization phase include an access roadway and roadway right-of-way (see Section 4.1.3.3). The nature and extent of repository phase roadway (Section 5.3.2.1) and railroad (Section 5.3.2.2) access requirements are also addressed.

Issue

A number of Deaf Smith County area residents have indicated their objection to being compelled to sell their homes and farmland to site a repository.

Response

The DOE estimates that as many as 27 people (8 households) may require relocation at the repository development phase (see EA Section 5.4.1.4). This conclusion is based on the requirement in 10 CFR 60.121 that the DOE control land being used for a repository. It is the DOE's intent to minimize this necessity and to make just and fair compensation to existing residents forced to move if they occupy land finally chosen as a repository site. The Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Act of 1970 (42 USC Section 4601 et seq.) will be followed in determining proper compensation.

Issue

One commenter expressed the view that the DOE should consider control over lands beyond the controlled area as part of its evaluation of postclosure guideline 10 CFR 960.4-2-8-2, Site Ownership and Control, as required by 10 CFR 60.121(b). The commenter further states that the acquisition of additional land for the DOE control may have more environmental and socioeconomic impacts than currently addressed in the draft EAs.

Response

Under 10 CFR 60.121(b), the DOE is to exercise appropriate additional jurisdiction and control over surface and subsurface estates beyond the controlled areas "necessary to prevent adverse human actions that could significantly reduce the geologic repository's ability to achieve isolation." The DOE concluded in the Deaf Smith County EA, relative to preclosure guideline 10 CFR 960.4-2-8-2 (Site Ownership and Control), that it did not expect that postclosure performance would require the DOE to acquire additional land (see EA Section 6.2.1.1.1).

The DOE has added a phrase to its description of applicable DOE postclosure guideline 10 CFR 960.4-2-8-2, Site Ownership and Control, in Section 6.2.1.1 of the EA to the effect that 10 CFR 60.121(b) of the NRC regulations requires the DOE to establish appropriate controls outside of the controlled area necessary to prevent adverse human actions that could significantly reduce the geologic repository's ability to achieve isolation.

C.6.3 METEOROLOGY

This category addresses concerns about the adequacy and content of the meteorological analysis of the site at Deaf Smith County, Texas. This category corresponds to comments received on Section 7.3.1.1.3 and related sections. Issues raised by the commenters include:

- Inadequate meteorological analysis.

Issue

Most of the commenters stated that the meteorological analysis of the site was inadequate. Specifically, it was noted that components of the existing data base are being ignored (i.e., the Texas Panhandle experiences tornadoes, severe weather, and winds).

Response

The DOE has reviewed the issue of severe weather in Section 3.4.3.4 and the DOE added to the existing data base related to tornadoes, severe weather, and winds in the Texas Panhandle.

C.6.4 OFFSITE INSTALLATIONS AND OPERATIONS

This category corresponds to questions regarding Section 7.3.1.1.4 and related sections of the Deaf Smith County site EA. Issues raised by the commenters include:

- Additional information on offsite installations and operations.

Issue

Some commenters requested additional information on offsite installations and operations. Several commenters requested additional information on the 10-centimeter (4-inch) natural gas pipeline that crosses the site. Concerns included a discrepancy in the distance of the pipeline from the proposed surface facilities.

Response

The DOE has rechecked the distance from the pipeline to the proposed surface facilities and has evaluated what hazard the pipeline may pose. Revised EA Section 6.2.1.5 provides an analysis that indicates that the gas pipeline does not pose a significant hazard to the repository.

C.6.5 SYSTEM GUIDELINE - PRECLOSURE RADIOLOGICAL SAFETY

This category responds to concerns regarding overall radiological safety during repository operation at the Deaf Smith County site. These concerns were expressed after review of Section 7.3.1.2 and related sections. Issues raised by commenters include the following:

- Concern about risk from radiation
- Emissions kept to acceptable limits
- Exposure to outdoor workers
- Accidents, emergency protection plans, and follow-up studies.

Issue

Some commenters were concerned with the risk from radiation. The comments included the following:

1. It was noted that there is a public perception of risk from a repository (derived from a telephone poll conducted in the Texas Panhandle).
2. Reference was made to the danger posed by disposal of radioactive materials. The risks were suggested to be too great considering how dangerous these materials are.

3. It was noted that if a repository will be safe, why is the DOE trying to locate it away from highly populated areas.
4. It was suggested that radiological limits are too high because "there is intense disagreement on the health risks of low-level exposure."
5. Reference was made to the presence of uncertainty in the data and results presented in the draft EA. These ranged from expressions of concern to distrust.

Response

The DOE acknowledges the receipt of the results of the telephone poll, which is indicated by the comment which states that there is a public perception of risk from a repository.

Federal radiation safety standards (40 CFR Part 191) exist to protect the health and safety of the public from undue risk. The DOE has outlined repository operations in Section 5.1 of the EA and there it describes very small quantities of radionuclides being released on a continuous basis rather than at distinct time intervals. This is based on the assumption that fuel disassembly and packaging will be done at the repository. The DOE has proposed, in the June 1985 Mission Plan, to establish a monitored retrievable storage (MRS) facility at a site away from the repository. In this case, emissions at the repository would be limited to radon releases from the salt mined during construction, and from handling accidents, since waste preparation would occur at the MRS. A low population density is an added measure of conservatism to help reduce the risks to "as low as reasonably achievable," which is more stringent than required by the safety regulations.

Existing data on the health risks of low level exposure is quite consistent and predicts approximately 200 health effects per million person-rem.

Population is only one factor in the determination of repository safety, along with, for example, regional land uses, radionuclide release rates, and site meteorology. However, consistent with the defense-in-depth radiation protection philosophy, all such factors are considered in siting to minimize the risk.

The DOE recognizes that at the present time there are uncertainties in the data and results presented in the EA. The analyses in the EA attempt to account for the uncertainties by making very conservative assumptions regarding expected performance.

Issue

Several commenters suggested topics that they felt should receive additional attention. These suggestions include:

1. How emissions would be kept within acceptable limits during operation and decommissioning.
2. Outdoor workers may be the critical exposure population for the Texas Panhandle due to participation in harvesting activities. Rural residents and people traveling on the road should also be considered.
3. How accidents, emergency protection plans, and follow-up studies would be handled.

Response

General characteristics of engineered facilities, based on existing repository design, are discussed in Section 5.1 of the draft EA. A number of options for reducing emissions are discussed in the EA reference by Kaiser Engineers (1978, NWTs-R2). More detailed designs will be prepared for later use in the appropriate licensing documents. Expected emissions of radionuclides from a repository are far less than those allowed under Federal regulations, and pose no health threat to workers and travellers in rural areas.

The DOE defines the maximum exposed individual and critical population group generally as those who would be (1) out-of-doors workers, (2) located at the surface facility fenceline, or (3) downwind of the waste handling building. The out-of-door workers may be the largest subgroup of individuals that must be considered in making dose calculations and the specific identity of subgroups for calculations can become more specific after a site is chosen for characterization.

Section 6.2.1.2 discusses the guideline on population density and distribution. A factor that was considered and discussed in the evaluation of this preclosure radiological safety systems guideline, was the preparation of an emergency preparedness program. No specific requirement for an emergency preparedness plan will exist until the licensing phase of the repository. The DOE does not believe that a modification to the EA is warranted.

C.6.6 ASSESSMENT OF PRECLOSURE PERFORMANCE

This category responds to questions about preclosure radiological assessment of the Deaf Smith County site. This information corresponds to Section 6.4.1 and related sections. Issues raised by the commenters include the following:

- Waste handling accident scenarios and source terms
- Incomplete operational source terms
- Accident calculations
- Consistent operational source terms for failed fuel rods.

Issue

Several commenters stated that waste handling accident scenarios and source terms analyzed were not shown to be bounding, complete, or conservative.

Response

Previous work is summarized in the EA to provide a more complete picture of the potential impacts of a repository. The five waste handling scenarios and their associated source terms described in Section 6.4.1.4 were originally chosen for analysis because of their bounding and conservative attributes as seen in the context of very early designs. Complete analyses cannot be done until site specific designs of repository facilities are available, therefore additional analyses were not done for the final EA. However, some text modifications were added to Section 6.4.1.4 more clearly acknowledging the bounding, completeness and conservatism concerns.

Issue

Several commenters stated that normal operational source terms were incomplete and not conservative.

Response

The DOE has reexamined the source terms, and the effects of suggested changes on the reported results have been discussed in Section 6.4.1 of the EA. For routine operational analyses, changes in the radiological calculations have been made to ensure Section 6.4.1 is in agreement with repository operations described in Section 5.1.1. The source terms used in the EA are consistent with the level of design of the repository facility and are considered conservative.

Issue

One commenter stated that because of the use of conservative assumptions, it should be emphasized that actual repository performance would "likely prove better than predicted."

Response

The DOE has added the suggested wording to Section 6.4.1 of the revised EA.

Issue

One commenter stated that accident calculations accomplished in accordance with U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Regulatory Guide 1.4 (NRC, 1974) should be done in accordance with Regulatory Guide 1.25 (NRC, 1972).

Response

The DOE has reviewed the accident calculations and the differences in results that recalculation according to Regulatory Guide 1.25 (NRC, 1972) guidance would cause. These results have been included in the discussion of Section 6.4.1.

Issue

A commenter stated that conditional statements should be replaced with estimates of the probability of occurrence or an appropriate "risk assessment."

Response

The DOE has examined the text of the EA for opportunities to use probabilistic analyses and we find that the probabilistic data required are not available, nor are they required for the analyses in the EA. The DOE therefore has not revised the EA text to include additional estimates of probability or "risk assessments."

Issue

A commenter stated that operational source terms for failed fuel rods should be consistent among the three repository projects.

Response

The DOE has revised the EA and has adopted the Hanford fuel rod failure rate estimate of 0.5 percent as suggested by the commenter to bring the source terms into consistency with repository operations. The recalculated routine operational impacts are presented in Section 6.4.1.

C.6.7 CHAPTER C.6 REFERENCES

C.6.7.1 References Listed By Author

Kaiser Engineers, 1978. A National Waste Terminal Storage Repository in a Bedded Salt Formation for Spent Unreprocessed Fuel, 26 vols., prepared for U.S. Department of Energy, Oak Ridge Operations Office, Oak Ridge, TN.

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 1972. "Assumptions Used for Evaluating the Potential Radiological Consequences of a Fuel Handling Accident in the Fuel Handling and Storage Facility for Boiling and Pressurized Water Reactors," Regulatory Guide 1.25, Washington, DC.

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 1974. "Assumptions Used for Evaluating the Potential Radiological Consequences of a Loss of Coolant Accident for Pressurized Water Reactors," Regulatory Guide 1.4, Washington, DC, June.

C.6.7.2 Federal Regulations and Statutes

10 CFR Part 20, Standards for Protection Against Radiation.

10 CFR Part 60, Disposal of High-Level Radioactive Wastes in Geologic Repositories; Technical Criteria.

10 CFR Part 960, Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982; General Guidelines for the Recommendation of Sites for the Nuclear Waste Repositories;; Final Siting Guidelines.

40 CFR Part 191, Environmental Standards for the Management and Disposal of Spent Nuclear Fuel, High-Level and Transuranic Radioactive Wastes; Final Rule, September 19, 1985.

Declaration of Taking Act, 40 USC 258a.

Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, 42 USC Secs. 4601 et seq.

C.7 ENVIRONMENT, SOCIOECONOMICS, AND TRANSPORTATION

Many of those who reviewed the draft EA had questions relating to a variety of issues concerned with the environment, socioeconomics, and transportation at a repository. These preclosure issues are considered in Section 7.3.2. Many of these issues also are addressed in Section 4.2 which deals with site characterization before the decision is made to build a repository.

C.7.1 EXPECTED EFFECTS OF SITE CHARACTERIZATION

Commenters expressed concerns over a wide variety of site characterization effects. These effects include those associated with the physical environment at the site as well as effects on socioeconomic conditions. These concerns are related to individual parts of Section 4.2. Issues raised by the commenters include the following:

- Measures to reduce effects of the loss of prime farmland
- Impact of windblown salt on vegetation and engineered structures
- Reevaluation of the ESF water requirement
- Compliance with State and local environmental requirements
- Effects of expanding the control zone
- Impacts of site characterization on the physical environment
- Effects of salt contamination on the environment
- Salt handling and storage technology
- Prime farmland impacts
- Water use and quality
- Ecosystem impacts
- EA adequacy
- Estimates of the amount of land required
- Mineral resource impacts
- Protected plant and wildlife species
- Status of playa wetlands
- Loss of habitat due to site characterization activities
- Suspended particulate concentrations
- Visual impact of exploratory shaft construction
- Clarification of noise analysis
- Potential vandalism
- High level waste used during site characterization
- Ground-water loss and cross-contamination of aquifers
- Role of playa during site characterization
- Inconsistencies in figures and tables
- Effects of seismic surveys on underground pipelines
- Impacts from electrical power usage
- Impacts from meteorological tower on low-flying aircraft
- Insufficient transportation studies
- Impacts on surrounding communities
- Local hires

- Mitigation measures
- Land values.

Issue

One commenter noted that no mitigating measures have been proposed to reduce the effects of the loss of prime farmland.

Response

The DOE recognizes that the loss of prime farmland is not capable of being mitigated and is a residual impact. The results of consultations with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and the Soil Conservation Service, under the Farmland Protection Policy Act (7 USC Sections 4201-4209) have been included in the EA (Section 4.2.1.1.1).

Issue

Several commenters felt that the DOE understated the impact of windblown salt on vegetation and engineered structures. If productivity is affected, the impact of the salt could be severe.

Response

The DOE has addressed salt impacts as a result of site characterization activities within Section 4.3 of the EA. This new section has consolidated the impact assessment discussions currently presented in the land use, air, ecological, water quality, and similar EA sections. Results in the EA indicate that very small amounts of salt will be dispersed off site. The salt levels off site are expected to be too small to affect productivity.

Issue

Commenters requested a reevaluation of the effects of the ESF water requirements on the source aquifer.

Response

The DOE has reviewed the comments and has added a discussion on water source and exploratory shaft facility water requirements in Chapter 4 of the EA.

Issue

Commenters questioned the DOE's ability to comply with State and local environmental requirements.

Response

The DOE has provided an analysis of its ability to comply with Federally mandated State regulations within Chapter 6 of the EA. As stated in the EA, the DOE will consult with State and local agency officials to discuss compliance with other State and local requirements.

Issue

Commenters requested an evaluation of the effects of expanding the control zone beyond the 23-square-kilometer (9-square-mile) area.

Response

The DOE has reviewed the data and believes no revision is required. The potential ESF land requirements, as well as those outside the 23-square-kilometer (9-square-mile) area, are defined in EA Section 4.1. Potential environmental impacts are discussed in Section 4.2.

C.7.1.1.1 Effects on the Physical Environment

Issue

Commenters raised several issues relating to the impacts of site characterization on the physical environment of the region. Specific issues included potential effects of salt contamination, salt handling and storage technology, farmland impacts, water use and quality, and other environmental impacts. General comments were also made about the adequacy of the EA. These issues are summarized below. A more detailed discussion of these and other related issues occurs in the following CRD subsections: C.7.1.1.1, C.7.1.1.2, C.7.1.1.4, C.7.1.1.5, C.7.1.1.8, and C.7.1.1.9.

Salt Contamination: Many commenters were concerned with the potentially adverse impacts of fugitive dust and salt emissions. Commenters felt that salt stored on land surface would be blown into the air or leach into the soil and ground water. Commenters requested further analyses of the impacts of salt contamination of aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems.

Salt Handling and Storage Technology: Comments centered on the confinement of salt and saline water to the site, the functional integrity of the salt pile liner, and the adequacy of the descriptions of the environmental conditions and methodologies associated with salt mining and storage activities that would occur during site characterization.

Prime Farmland Impacts: Several comments focused on the impacts of the removal of prime farmland and other lands for site characterization activities. The comments were concerned with the loss of crop productivity, soil effects, land reclamation, and the mitigative measures presented in the EA.

Water Use and Quality: Many comments centered on the quality and amount of water that would be required during site characterization activities. Commenters were concerned with the impacts of these activities on area surface or ground-water supplies.

Ecosystem Impacts: Commenters disagreed with, or requested further analyses and descriptions of, area habitats, wildlife populations, and playa wetlands. The comments concerned the potential impacts of site characterization upon such local or regional ecological resources.

Other Impacts: The following issues centered on the impacts of site characterization on the aesthetic conditions, air quality, noise levels, archaeological and cultural resources, and transportation or utility needs of the area:

1. Commenters believed that construction activities would be incompatible with the aesthetic and air quality character of the area.
2. Commenters requested further analyses of the effects of noise created by drilling or other repository activities.

3. Commenters noted that the EA lacked any discussion of the potential vandalism of archaeological or cultural resources resulting from site characterization activities.
4. Commenters requested more information concerning the impacts of site characterization upon area traffic or utility needs.

EA Adequacy: Several commenters questioned the general adequacy of the EA. It was noted that techniques used to arrive at conclusions, mitigative measures, and definitions of significant impacts were not fully explained in the EA. In addition, indirect, secondary, or cumulative impacts were not included. Some commenters expressed concern that measures to mitigate impacts cannot be adequately planned prior to onsite disturbances if environmental studies occur concurrently with the site characterization activities.

C.7.1.1.1 Land Use

Issue

Several commenters questioned the data used to support the discussion of the salt impacts that will arise during site characterization activities. The effects of wind-blown salt on crop productivity were questioned as was the effectiveness of the mitigation measures presented in the EA and the effects of salt transport.

Response

Under expected climatic conditions, salt deposition is expected to be minimal and any loss in productivity will be confined to the site. The discussion of salt impacts is now addressed in a new EA section (Section 4.4) which also discusses land use impacts resulting from salt transport.

Impacts from salt transportation are not expected to be significant because mitigative measures will be used to control salt drift during handling. The effectiveness of mitigative measures has been verified, in part by examination of salt handling operations at salt mining facilities, and is included in Section 4.4.

Issue

Commenters questioned EA estimates concerning the amount of land required for site characterization activities and the effect of removing the land from its current use, particularly agricultural production. The effect of site characterization activities on adjacent farmlands and management practices was also a concern. Commenters stated that the importance of prime farmland needed to be clarified.

Response

The DOE has recalculated the amount of land required for site characterization activities. The land use requirements for the various activities to be conducted during site characterization is provided in Table 4-2, Summary of Geotechnical Field Activity Requirements, Deaf Smith County Site. The land requirement estimate for the exploratory shaft facility (ESF) is less than that presented in the draft EA because it is based on a new ESF design. However, the estimated total amount of land required for site characterization activities has increased, based on a more extensive site characterization program.

Section 4.2.1.1 of the EA currently addresses the impact of removing farmland from production during ESF activities. The impact of removing crop production land in the site vicinity is not expected to be significant; less than 1 percent of available cropland in the vicinity would be involved during site characterization. The DOE has, however, expanded the discussion on agricultural production to include impacts on commercial seed production and the amount of acreage required. In addition, the impact analysis on agricultural practices at the site and vicinity has been expanded. A discussion of prime farmland has been added to Section 4.2.1.1. In addition, Section 4.2.1.5 (Soils) discusses the measures to be taken during site characterization to minimize impacts on soil resources (e.g., erosion control and topsoil storage and protection) which could affect land productivity. The discussion of reclamation activities within EA Section 4.2.1.1 has been expanded.

Section 4.2.1.1 has been expanded to include a discussion of DOE's consultations with the U.S. Soil Conservation Service (USDA) in compliance with the Farmland Protection Policy Act (7 USC Sections 4201-4209). The DOE has considered the impacts on prime farmland of the site characterization project.

Issue

Commenters stated that there was an inadequate basis for the discussion of mineral resource impacts which would arise from site characterization.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated the data which indicate that no known unique mineral resources exist near the Deaf Smith County site. No resource other than ground water is indicated to have a potential for future development at the site. No mineral resource impacts are expected during site characterization.

C.7.1.1.2 Ecosystems

Issue

One commenter noted that the statement that there are no known populations of protected plant or wildlife species within the site is inconsistent with

Section 3.4.2.3, which indicates that the natural range of several protected species includes the Deaf Smith County site and that these species may occur on site.

Response

Section 2.4.2.3 indicates that several protected species may occur in the site vicinity if relatively natural habitat is available in sufficient quantity. However, based on extensive literature review, consultation with Federal, State, and local experts, review of aerial photographs, and reconnaissance level field surveys, habitat for such species is extremely limited. The occurrence of transient species such as the bald eagle or peregrine falcon is considered to be a rare event. Given present land use practices which have almost eliminated the extensive natural habitat required by most protected species, these and endemic species like the Texas horned lizard and the Central Plains milk snake are not expected to have viable populations within the vicinity of the site. These analyses are discussed in Section 4.2.1.2 of the EA.

Issue

It was suggested that the status of all playa wetlands, whether natural or modified, should be analyzed prior to assessing the impacts of site characterization. Natural playas and playas being used as fisheries resources that are at risk from site activities, including site access development, should be identified and described to form a realistic assessment of the impact potential.

Response

The DOE has extensively revised EA Sections 4.1.1 and 4.2.1.2.4, to discuss the impacts of site characterization activities on playa wetlands. Section 4.1.1 describes proposed and alternative playa investigations. Proposed activities include drilling nine boreholes at each of three playas, a well access road and two deep boreholes at a fourth playa, and vibratory seismic surveys. Alternatives discussed include angled drilling from outside the playas and completely bypassing any playas during the seismic surveys.

Section 4.2.1.2.4 assesses the impacts of the proposed investigations. The assessment is based on consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and with several recognized specialists in playa wetland ecology and is supported by documentation cited in the EA. Research indicates that over 80 percent of the playas in the Texas Panhandle have been modified by plowing, grazing, or dredging. Both playas within the site have been excavated, as have 12 of the 17 playas within the site vicinity. However, it has been noted that the presence of drill rigs, whether within or beside any playa, will disrupt the majority of wildlife utilization for the duration of the activity. Site access roads have been located to avoid playa wetlands altogether.

Issue

It was suggested that habitats and their associated wildlife populations be analyzed in the EA as to whether they are common or unique. Emphasis should be placed on loss of habitat due to site characterization activities, any subsequent loss of biota, and whether such losses represent a significant portion of the local or regional ecological resources.

Response

The DOE has determined that the descriptions of ecosystems and their associated biota are sufficient for purposes of assessing potential impacts due to site characterization activities. As shown on the site maps in Section 4.1, the entire exploratory shaft facility (ESF) as well as the majority of the geo-hydrologic field studies will be located on cropland, and there should be relatively little associated loss of biota. Impacts to species utilizing cropland habitat are assessed in Section 4.2.1.2. Impacts to playa wetlands have been addressed above; such impacts, however, do not result in permanent habitat loss.

Issue

It was expressed that both short- and long-term ecological effects of windborne salt and saline water runoff from salt management activities should be considered in detail, particularly in the event of catastrophic meteorologic phenomena.

Response

The DOE has revised Section 4.2.1.11 to discuss the potential sources and associated impacts of waste salt in the environment. Evidence that the DOE has accumulated on salt handling and disposal indicates the following:

Potential Salt Sources and Areas of Deposition of Salt

1. The probability of a tornado striking any point in the site area is small (Section 3.4.3.4). However, should a tornado strike the salt pile, maximum deposition may occur anywhere from 10 to 60 kilometers (about 6 to 37 miles) downwind of the site (BPNL, 1979, DOE/ET-0029). Point deposition values within this area may be significantly greater than the maximum annual deposition rate reported for normal meteorological conditions in Section 5.2.5.3.3.
2. Due to the use of runoff retention ponds designed for infrequent 100-year storm events, saline water will remain onsite.
3. Airborne salt will be generated only from ventilation exhaust stacks, from the evaporation and recrystallization of salt-contaminated runoff in the retention ponds, the working face of the salt pile, and

any conveyor drops. Salt deposition modeling and studies of projects with analogous salt deposition issues suggest that airborne salt attenuates (falls out) so rapidly that it cannot be accurately measured more than 1.6 kilometers (1 mile) from its point of discharge.

As stated in Section 3.4.3, prevailing winds are from the south and southwest. There are no playas within 1.6 kilometers (1 mile) of the planned site facilities in these or any other directions. Therefore, impacts to playas from airborne salt would probably be unmeasurable.

In determining impacts to biota, the DOE has reviewed the literature on (1) tolerance level of vegetation types in the site vicinity, (2) impacts of entrained salt in cooling tower drift, and (3) impacts of blowing salt at WIPP and Project Gnome sites. The DOE believes that impacts to vegetation from salt handling and storage will not be measurable in offsite areas and minimal on site.

The DOE has also indicated in Section 4.2.1.11 that the evidence suggests that indigenous vegetation is relatively tolerant to long-term salt exposure. Grasses, which are the dominant vegetation, have been shown to be tolerant to elevated salt concentrations. These grasses have also shown no apparent effects of having been exposed to over 40 years of fertilization and irrigation water (including tailwater) application, which in combination have increased soil salt concentrations (Section 4.2.1.11).

Issue

One commenter was concerned that engineering measures designed to mitigate or prevent impacts to wildlife would not be implemented, since discussions of these did not appear to be in the appropriate facility design sections. Specific areas of concern included spacing of power lines to avoid electrocution of large birds and lack of specific protective measures to reduce impacts of the meteorological tower on migrating birds.

Response

Section 4.1.2.2.1, Site Preparation, describes a typical electrical transmission pole, which will provide sufficient protection for large birds. This design is also discussed in Section 4.2.1.2. Sections 4.2.1.2.2 and 4.2.1.2.3 discuss potential impacts of the meteorological tower and other tall structures on flying birds. Mitigation measures, such as flashing lights, are presented. Additional mitigation measures will be developed in consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.

C.7.1.1.3 Air Quality

Issue

Several commenters noted that total suspended particulate concentrations exceed the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). This is not consistent with the Chapter 6 conclusion that "The DOE projects the ability to meet environmental requirements applicable to the site and support facilities..."

Response

As a result of design changes to the project, including the control of fugitive dust, new source terms and emission rates have been derived, followed by a reanalysis of air quality impacts. Results are presented in EA Section 4.2.1.3. Air quality impacts in the form of estimated maximum concentrations of TSP and NO₂ from project emissions during site characterization are presented in Table 4-19 of the EA. As shown, concentrations are expected to be less than the NAAQS.

C.7.1.1.4 Aesthetic Conditions

Issue

A few commenters stated that the visual impact of exploratory shaft construction will not be compatible with the character of the area. They note that the area is flat and lacks similar mining-related visual impacts (i.e., oil and gas exploration activities).

Response

The DOE has reviewed the discussion of visual impact and believes that no modification to the EA is required. The EA acknowledges the character of the area as flat with limited oil and gas exploration. As explained in EA Section 4.2.1.7, the visual effect of exploratory shaft construction will be noticeable, but not much greater than the visual effect of existing oil rigs, wind mills, communication microwave dishes, and other industrial facilities in the region.

C.7.1.1.5 Noise

Issue

Several commenters stated that the noise analysis needs to be clarified in terms of duration of noise impacts from drilling operations, levels of annoyance caused by noise, and cumulative effects of different levels of noise.

Response

The noise analysis has been revised by the DOE to incorporate changes in noise source locations, inventories, and scheduling (Section 4.2.1.6). The revision provides predictions of the magnitude and duration of noise impacts. These predictions recognize the simultaneous operation of the exploratory shaft construction equipment and borehole drilling. Impacts are presented in terms of residents both "highly annoyed" by the noise as well as those with a potential for annoyance due to ESF activities. In addition to continuous noise from the exploratory shaft and borehole activities, the evaluation considered the effects of blasting noise.

C.7.1.1.6 Archaeological, Cultural, and Historical Resources

Issue

One commenter noted that there was no discussion in the impact analysis section of the EA of potential vandalism and looting for archaeological, cultural, and historic resources. Specifically, it was stated that impacts due to vandalism and looting will increase as a result of increased repository activity in the area, and will constitute an adverse effect on significant resources.

Response

The DOE has several repository-related activities planned to assist in the prevention of vandalism and looting. The DOE will enter into a Programmatic Memorandum of Agreement (PMOA) with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the Texas State Historical Preservation Officer. An education program will be developed to inform workers about their responsibilities to protect archaeological resources, and the procedures to be followed if cultural resource artifacts are disturbed.

In addition to these educational activities, access to the site would be controlled and the exact locations of any recorded or newly discovered resource will be kept in confidence by the State Historic Preservation Office, the DOE, and essential subcontractor personnel. A qualified archaeologist will monitor construction activities to ensure that no unexpected resources are disturbed until a determination of significance can be made.

C.7.1.1.7 Radiological

Issue

One commenter noted that it was not explicitly stated that high-level waste will not be used during site characterization.

Response

The DOE has listed the sources of radioactivity which will be used at the site during site characterization in Section 4.2.1.9. It is also stated explicitly in the text that "No radioactive wastes will be used for testing; their thermal effect will be simulated using electric heaters."

C.7.1.1.8 Water Quality

Issue

Many commenters expressed concern over potential salt contamination of the surface and ground-water resources near the Deaf Smith County site. Specific concerns included the following:

1. Salt impacts are projected to have an insignificant effect on ground-water quality on one draft EA page, yet are projected to have a potentially adverse effect on ground-water quality on another page.
2. Windblown salt and the onsite storage of salt and brine are unacceptable pollution threats.
3. There is a potential for evaporation pond and salt-storage pile liners to be breached, and impact assessment assumptions are questionable.
4. Deep-well injection is unacceptable because Ogallala water should not be used for brine development, and disposal in a sanitary landfill is unacceptable because of salt-water leachate.
5. The discussion of salt in playa lakes and ephemeral streams was considered inappropriate.

Response

The statements in Section 4.2.1.4.2 concerning the magnitude of projected salt impacts to ground-water quality are not contradictory. The statement on draft EA page 4-96 introduced the possibility of impacts in general, whereas the statement on draft EA page 4-94 presented the conclusion that impacts were insignificant. The final EA has been modified to reduce the possibility of misinterpretation.

The DOE recognizes the minimal potential for the contamination of surface and ground water by excavated, windblown, and stored salt and brine. However, the DOE has proposed engineering and management techniques that will prevent or minimize these potential impacts. Section 4.2.1.4 has been revised to provide a discussion of these techniques and a more detailed analysis of projected impacts. Based on this analysis, it is projected that the impacts will be insignificant.

Monitoring will be performed to detect leaks from breached liners (see Section 4.1.2.2). As discussed in Section 4.2.1.4, small leaks will be collected by the leachate collection system. However, large leaks may require the removal of the stored salt or contaminated water. This material will be disposed of in a State-licensed landfill while the liner is being repaired. These monitoring and repairing practices are expected to prevent or minimize groundwater contamination from leaks.

The qualitative assessment of the saline leachate from a breached liner has been revised to incorporate local infiltration data. The revised assessment has shown that the possibility of a significant salt plume reaching the Ogallala and Santa Rosa aquifers is unlikely with the proposed engineering and mitigating measures.

Excess salt will be disposed of in a State-licensed hazardous waste landfill. Landfills of this classification utilize a double-liner and leachate collection system. Consequently, potential ground-water impacts will be prevented or minimized. The use of Ogallala water for brine development or for deep well injection is not being considered as a salt disposal method. Section 4.3.4.2 includes a discussion on the disposal of excess salt.

The discussion of salt in playa lakes and ephemeral streams in Section 4.2.1.4.2 is considered appropriate. The paragraph provides a discussion of both water quality and quantity. This discussion has been expanded in the final EA, but the conclusions remain the same as those stated in the draft EA.

Issue

The commenters were critical of the volume of Ogallala water to be used during site characterization activities. Concern was expressed that the water to be used would reduce the local water supply, especially since current Ogallala withdrawals greatly exceed natural recharge. It was suggested that the comparison of the annual average water use of the exploratory shaft to that needed to irrigate farmland be deleted. One commenter suggested that water for the project be obtained from offsite surface-water sources.

In addition, the water requirements that are provided in Table 4-3 (Exploratory Shaft Project Characteristics: 10-Foot Drilled and 22-Foot Conventionally Mined Shafts) were described as being unclear. Figure 3-59, Wells Near the Deaf Smith County Site (Figure 3-72 in the final EA) and Table 3-22, Wells Within 4.5 Miles of the Center of Surface Facilities of the Deaf Smith County Site (Table 3-25 in the final EA), which identify existing

onsite and offsite wells, were criticized as being incomplete. It was also suggested that the drawdown calculation in Section 4.2.1.4.2 should include the effects of offsite pumping wells and that the conclusion in the Executive Summary regarding maximum drawdown be qualified.

Response

Projected average annual water requirements for the exploratory shaft facilities have been reevaluated in the EA and were reduced because of revisions made in the engineering designs. The shallow borehole-characterization tests will require only a few acre-feet over an 18-month period. The DOE concludes that these volumes of water are insignificant when compared to the 1980 Deaf Smith County water use of 398 million cubic meters (322,000 acre-feet).

The comparison in the EA of exploratory shaft water use to irrigated acreage used Texas Department of Water Resource data for irrigated farmland in Deaf Smith County. Given that irrigated farming is a typical land use of the area, the comparison remains valid and was used again in the final EA.

No unappropriated surface water exists in the Canadian River Basin so this was not considered as an option for site characterization water needs. The final EA has been modified to clarify site characterization water requirements. The wells identified in draft EA Figure 3-59, Wells Near the Deaf Smith County Site (Figure 3-72 in the final EA) and Table 3-22, Wells Within 4.5 Miles of the Center of Surface Facilities of the Deaf Smith County Site (Table 3-25 in the final EA) were not intended to imply that all wells within 7.2 kilometers (4.5 miles) of the center of the site had been identified. The figure and the table show wells identified in the most recent TDWR published literature. As a result of this comment, well logs have been requested and obtained from the TDWR. Several additional wells were identified by reviewing these well logs, and this information has been included in the final EA. The DOE acknowledges that other wells likely exist on site and off site, but the final EA reflects best information at the time of its preparation.

The drawdown calculations do not include offsite pumping wells because the variations in time and rate of pumping for these wells were not available to the DOE. These values are required to complete the requested drawdown calculations. However, the additive drawdown impact that would be created by onsite pumping wells is discussed in Section 4.2.1.4.2. The additive drawdown of these onsite wells was found to be minimal, and consequently should not significantly affect offsite wells. The Executive Summary was modified accordingly.

Issue

Concern was expressed over the DOE's ability to prevent ground-water loss and cross-contamination of aquifers during the construction of the exploratory shafts. The Lyons, Kansas project was identified as an example of potential impacts that may occur.

Response

Many shafts have been successfully constructed with conventional mining techniques through strata similar to the High Plains aquifer. An example would be the approximately 10 mines that operate or have operated in Saskatchewan, Canada. These shafts pass through the Blairmore aquifer at depths greater than 980 meters (3,000 feet).

The DOE has expanded Sections 4.1.2.2 and 4.2.1.4 to discuss the conventional mining and ground freezing techniques to be utilized at the Deaf Smith County site during shaft construction. These techniques are expected to prevent or minimize ground-water loss and movement between aquifers.

Issue

Several comments were received concerning runoff from the site. One commenter identified an apparent inconsistency in runoff values provided for the Deaf Smith County site. Another commenter suggested that increases in runoff due to increases in impermeable surface areas should be discussed in Section 4.2.1.4.2.

Response

The DOE has revised the discussion in Section 4.2.1.4.2 in order to resolve the apparent inconsistency in runoff values. The runoff value that was suggested in draft EA Section 4.2.1.4.2 was indicative of localized runoff that occurs during a single storm event. The runoff value provided in the draft EA Executive Summary and in Section 3.3.1.1 was for average annual runoff that occurs basin-wide.

Section 4.2.1.4.2 has been revised to discuss the changes in runoff due to site characterization activities and facilities. As previously discussed in the draft EA, site runoff will be collected in onsite ponds, minimizing its discharge off site. Site grading will minimize changes to the natural drainage and prevent concentration of runoff on adjacent properties.

Issue

Several commenters expressed confusion over the role of playas during site characterization. Inconsistencies were identified between draft EA Sections 4.2.1.4.1 and 4.2.1.4.2 in regard to construction, and whether construction activities will occur in playas.

Response

The DOE has revised Section 4.2.1.4.1 in order to resolve this inconsistency. The trenching activities that were discussed in the draft EA Section 4.2.1.4.1 are no longer being proposed as part of the geologic field studies program. Some limited drilling and other work will occur, however, as environmental monitoring equipment (e.g., stage and discharge gages, and sampling devices) is installed in a few select playas, and a few wells are drilled in or near three playas.

Issue

Several commenters identified errors or inconsistencies in the draft EA figures and tables.

Response

The errors identified in the draft EA figures and tables have been corrected. These corrections include:

1. In Section 4.2.1.4.2, the references to Figure 3-60, Irrigated Farmland in the Seven-County Area (Figure 3-73 in the final EA) and Table 3-35, Projected Water Requirements and Supply for Deaf Smith County, Texas, have been deleted because they are not required for the analysis.
2. In Section 4.2.1.4.2, the reference to Table 4-19 (Maximum Emissions From Geologic Field Studies and Exploratory Shaft Construction) has been deleted since it is no longer required for the analysis.
3. The figure titled "Approximate Altitude of Water Levels in the High Plains Aquifer, Winter 1979-80, Deaf Smith County, Texas" has been deleted. Water table elevation values in the final EA were obtained from Figure 3-57, Elevation of 1981 Ogallala Water Levels (Figure 3-70 in the final EA).
4. The figure titled "Approximate Saturated Thickness of the High Plains Aquifer, 1980, Deaf Smith County, Texas" has been deleted. Saturated thickness values in the final EA were obtained from Figure 3-68 (Ogallala Aquifer Saturated Thickness).

C.7.1.1.9 Transportation and Utilities

Issue

Commenters were concerned about the impacts of site characterization-related traffic increases on regional roads, specifically congestion and

accident rates. It was stated that traffic problems and congestion were understated and therefore not enough discussion of mitigation was included. Because the details of linear regression analysis were not shown, the finding of a lack of correlation between increased traffic and accident rates was viewed as suspicious.

Response

The DOE has determined that the data base is sufficient for analysis of transportation impacts. Anticipated traffic increases have been recalculated to reflect updated personnel requirements for various project activities. Analysis for this section will still be described on a conservative basis which means all workers are assumed to take the most direct route as described in Section 4.2.1.10.2. Though it is recognized that some percentage of workers will use variations of the most direct route, it is impossible to predict at this time the increase in traffic on all the roads in the area and the analysis will continue to use the most direct route. However, Section 4.2.1.10 has been expanded to include potential mitigation measures to decrease traffic problems in the vicinity of the site.

Issue

One commenter felt that the final EA should address effects of seismic surveys on underground pipelines.

Response

The seismic surveys will be conducted using truck-mounted vibrator units as described in Sections 4.1.1.1.10 and 4.1.1.1.11. The DOE has determined that these will not cause destruction of underground pipelines. In the event that explosives are required for seismic studies, care will be taken in their location and use to ensure that there is no disruption of underground pipelines.

Issue

One commenter was concerned about the impacts from electric power usage during ESF activities.

Response

The following additional information has been added to Section 4.2.1.10 of the final EA. Commercial power will be obtained from the substations located at the intersection of U.S. 385 and FM 2587. The transmission lines will be sited along the FM 2587 right-of-way to minimize impacts to land use and to minimize problems associated with land acquisition. The power requirements during ESF and site characterization activities will not affect the amount of power available to the local or regional area.

Issue

One commenter wished to know the impacts from the meteorological tower on low-flying aircraft.

Response

There are no anticipated impacts from the meteorological tower on low-flying aircraft. The tower is below the 61-meter (200-foot) height for which the FAA requires standard warning features. The tower will be painted with highly contrasting colors and will have warning lights attached to it as described in Section 4.1.3.

Issue

One commenter indicated that planned transportation studies are insufficient.

Response

A number of additional transportation studies have been proposed and described in Section 4.1.3.1.10 of the final EA. These include an in-depth assessment of the existing transportation infrastructure, a study of State and local emergency response capability, an overflight hazards assessment, and a series of studies to site access corridors connecting the site with existing transport routes.

C.7.1.2 Effects on Socioeconomics Conditions

Issue

A few commenters indicated that site characterization impacts on surrounding communities need to be examined more closely.

Response

The DOE has evaluated the data and has determined that no modifications to the EA are required. Socioeconomic impacts of site characterization are evaluated using an in-migration model and a population allocation model. These models are described in Section 5.4.4. Demographic, economic, community-service, fiscal, and social impacts of site characterization are discussed in Section 4.2.2 for communities that are expected to receive project-related population increases. Based on current work force estimates for this phase, changes in any of these areas to any community are not expected to be significant in comparison to projected baseline conditions.

Issue

A few commenters noted that additional detail on the assumptions about local hires should be provided and that a conservative assumption should have assumed zero local hires.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated the EA and has determined that no modification is required. The 10 to 25 percent range of local hires is an estimate provided by project engineers, based on experience at other facilities, including the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant. The 10 percent estimate was used as the conservative estimate of local hires for site characterization at the Deaf Smith County site. The 10 percent local hire assumption is felt to be a conservative, but realistic, estimate for analyzing impacts. There are no data to support the assumption that local hiring would not occur. A listing of required project skills appears in Section 4.2.2. A listing of workers by employment categories for the study area appears in Section 3.6.2.

Issue

A few commenters indicated that mitigation measures are not discussed in enough detail.

Response

The DOE has made some revisions to clarify Section 4.2.2 of the EA. Additional information on the grants-equal-to-tax payments and grants for community planning and impact monitoring was included in Section 4.2.2. Other forms of financial assistance provided for in the NWPA are not available during the site characterization phase. Based on current project work-force requirements during this phase, impacts to communities are expected to be minimal.

Issue

A few commenters indicated that a discussion of negative impacts on agricultural activities needs to be included in this section.

Response

An evaluation of impacts on the agricultural sector of the economy was added to Section 4.2.2. This discussion is related to water and land requirements associated with site characterization activities. There are fewer agricultural impacts during characterization than during repository development. Because less than one-tenth of one percent of land in Deaf Smith County would be

used during site characterization, water requirements are much lower during site characterization than for repository development as shown in Section 4.2.2 and 5.4.2.4.1. Perceptions of agricultural marketability are addressed in Section 5.4.2.4.2.

C.7.2 ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Preclosure repository issues relating to environmental quality, going beyond those issues considered in site characterization, are also related to the discussion of Technical Guidelines in Chapter 7, specifically to Section 7.3.2.1.1. Environmental concerns for the Deaf Smith County site were expressed on the topics of land use; ecosystems; impacts to biota; noise; archaeological, cultural and historical resources; radiological effects; and water quality. Issues raised by the commenters include the following:

- Salt contamination
- Salt handling and storage technology
- Prime farmland impacts
- Water use and quality
- Ecosystem effects
- EA adequacy
- Lack of discussion about land-use impacts
- Impacts to playas during repository development
- Protection of waterfowl
- Impacts to natural resources
- Expansion of noise analysis
- Discussion of Resource Protection Planning Process for Texas
- Radiation levels
- Transportation and handling analysis
- The effects of physical phenomenon on waste containment
- Expected time of settlement
- Technology used to construct the shaft
- Uses and sources of repository water
- Compliance with the Texas Water Quality Act
- Additional information on the Dockum.

Issue

Several issues were raised which questioned the potential effects of repository construction and operation on the environmental quality of the region. Specific issues included the effects of salt contamination, salt handling and storage technology, prime farmland impacts, water use and quality, ecosystem effects and other environmental impacts. General comments were also made about the adequacy of the EA. These issues are summarized below. A more detailed discussion of these, and other related issues, occurs in the following CRD subsections: C.7.2.1, C.7.2.2, C.7.2.3, C.7.2.6, and C.7.2.8.

Salt Contamination: Many commenters were concerned with the potentially adverse impacts of fugitive dust and salt emissions and their dispersion into the air or water, or onto land. Commenters felt that salt stored on the land surface would be blown into the air or leach into the soil and ground water. Commenters requested further analyses of the impacts of salt contamination on aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems.

Salt Handling and Storage Technology: Comments centered on the confinement of salt and saline water to the site, the functional integrity of the salt pile liner, and the adequacy of the descriptions of the environmental conditions and methodologies associated with salt mining and storage activities.

Prime Farmland Impacts: Many comments pertained to the impacts of the use of prime farmland and other lands for repository construction and operation. The comments were concerned with the loss of crop productivity, land reclamation, and mitigative measures, the effects on local seed-producing industries and the economic damage to the local natural food-producing industries.

Water Use and Quality: Many comments focused on the quality and amount of water that would be necessary for repository construction and operation. Commenters were concerned with the impacts of these repository activities on area surface- and ground-water supplies, such as the Ogallalla aquifer.

Ecosystem Effects: Commenters requested further analyses of the long- and short-term impacts of repository development to the area playas and biota.

Other Impacts: Commenters requested the inclusion of a specific reference in the discussion of repository impacts on cultural resources.

EA Adequacy: Several commenters questioned the general adequacy of the EA. It was noted that techniques used to arrive at conclusions, mitigative measures, and definitions of significant impacts were not fully explained in the EA. In addition, indirect, secondary, or cumulative impacts were not included. Conclusions did not appear to be based upon local environmental or climatological factors.

C.7.2.1 Land Use

Issue

Many commenters were concerned about the long-term effects of salt emissions from repository activities. Specifically, commenters were concerned about salt deposition on prime farmlands.

Response

Under normal climatic conditions, salt deposition will be minimal and will be confined to the site. The DOE has added a new section (Section 5.2.10) to

the EA, which expands the discussion of salt impacts on the environment, including prime farmland. The effectiveness of mitigation measures has been verified and included in the text in this section of the EA. The DOE has found no new data that contradict the conclusions drawn in the draft EA (Section 5.2.3). The DOE does not expect any long-term increases in salt deposition on prime farmland. Thus, no change was made to the final EA.

Issue

Many commenters felt that the impacts on the agricultural industry in Deaf Smith County were understated, particularly the loss of prime farmland productivity and the effects on the local seed production industry.

Response

The DOE has recalculated the amount of prime farmland which would be required for repository activities, and has included these larger estimates in Section 5.2.3 of the EA. The impacts to agricultural production in Deaf Smith County are similar to those reported in the draft EA, and the impacts to prime farmland in the region will be minimal. The impact on agricultural productivity has been reevaluated. The land to be withdrawn represents less land than is the normal variation in year-to-year plantings. Any impacts in productivity will be limited to the site and should not affect adjacent farmers.

The DOE has consulted with the U.S. Soil Conservation Service regarding the Farmland Protection Policy Act and has considered the effects on prime farmland in planning the repository program.

Issue

Commenters noted a lack of discussion about the land-use impacts associated with the "phased repository" design.

Response

The DOE has added Table 5-1, Comparison of Alternative Repository Design Concepts, Deaf Smith County Site, which presents the environmental impacts arising from a two-phased repository design, including agricultural land use impacts. The DOE has evaluated the impacts. Although the land requirements would be greater for a phased repository, they would still be expected to be similar to those for a single-phase repository and will be within the normal variation in year-to-year agricultural plantings.

C.7.2.2 Ecosystems

Issue

One commenter expressed the opinion that the EA was vague in its description of most items of significance and very specific in its discussion of items which would be of limited significance. In particular, the commenter noted that specific spacing of transmission lines for the protection of migrating eagles were given when it is highly unlikely that migrating eagles will fly through Deaf Smith County.

Response

The DOE has stated in Section 3.4.2.3 and in documentation used to support the EA, that bald eagles may occur in the region as a winter resident and that golden eagles are considered permanent residents. The use of specific spacing requirements for transmission lines is based on generally applied practices in areas where eagles may be present and thus susceptible to electrocution.

The DOE has reviewed the above comment and has added information to Section 3.4.2.

Issue

Several commenters expressed concern that long-term, as well as short-term, tolerances to elevated salt concentrations was not considered in adequate detail for the plant species likely to be affected by repository salt management activities. Concern was also expressed about the build up of salt in playas.

Response

The DOE has revised Section 5.2.10 to contain the potential sources and associated impacts of waste salt in the environment. Evidence that the DOE has accumulated on salt handling and disposal indicates the following:

Potential Salt Sources and Areas of Deposition of Salt

1. Even in arid environments, natural crusting of stockpiled salt will occur within days, depending on its moisture content. It is not likely that high winds, including tornadoes, would be successful in dislodging significant amounts of crusted salt. (The probability of tornado strike has been calculated in Section 3.4.3.4).
2. Due to the use of runoff retention ponds designed for a 100-year storm event, saline water will remain on site.

3. Airborne salt will be generated only from ventilation exhaust stacks, the evaporation and recrystallization of salt-contaminated runoff in the retention ponds, the working face of the salt pile, and any use of conveyor systems.

Impacts to Playas

As stated in Section 5.2.10, prevailing winds are from the south and southwest. There are no playas within 1.6 kilometers (1 mile) north or northwest of the site. Salt deposition modeling suggests that airborne salt attenuates (falls out) rapidly so that it cannot be accurately measured one mile from its point of discharge. Therefore, DOE is reasonably certain that impacts to playas from airborne salt would probably be unmeasurable.

Impacts to Biota

In determining impacts to biota, the DOE has reviewed the literature on (1) tolerance levels of vegetation types in the site vicinity, (2) impacts of entrained salt in cooling tower drift, and (3) impacts of blowing salt at WIPP and Project Gnome Sites. DOE believes that impacts to vegetation from salt handling and storage will not be measurable in offsite areas and minimal on site.

The DOE has also indicated in Section 5.2.10 that evidence suggests that indigenous vegetation is relatively tolerant to long-term salt exposure. Grasses, which are the dominant vegetation, have been shown to be tolerant to elevated salt concentrations. These grasses have also shown no apparent effects of having been exposed to over 40 years of fertilizer and irrigation water (including tailwater) application, which have combined to increase soil salt concentrations.

Issue

One commenter suggested that impacts to playas during repository development, particularly with respect to access- and utility-corridor development, be reassessed in the final EA.

Response

A review of the site location maps provided in Section 3.4.2 indicates that the repository surface facilities will not be located within 1.6 kilometers (1 mile) of a playa wetland. The DOE has revised Sections 5.1.2.2. and 5.3.2.2. to assess the impacts of various access- and utility-corridor development alternatives. Sections 5.1.2.2 and 5.3.2.2 now include descriptions of 5 representative rail access corridors and an assessment of impacts for each.

These corridors were sited to avoid as much as possible surface hydrological features and sensitive ecosystems as well as other important land uses.

Playas were considered to be a constraint in the siting process and were avoided. Although no permanent streams were crossed, construction across drainage areas during precipitation and runoff events could result in an additional silt load. Commonly used settling ponds and similar engineering techniques are expected to mitigate most potential siltation impacts.

Issue

One commenter indicated that some of the retention ponds would be attractive to waterfowl and that the EA does not discuss how the waterfowl would be protected from contaminants which may be present in the ponds.

Response

Section 5.2.4.2 of the draft EA discussed the potential for attracting waterfowl to the various retention ponds. This was indicated to be very low due to the lack of food and shelter and the intensity of project activities. Since the ponds will collect only surface runoff or runoff from the salt pile, no concentrations of potentially toxic substances are expected, since these substances will not be generated onsite by the project.

Issue

One commenter states that the EA does not mention the proximity of the repository site or access corridors to protected natural areas, such as Palo Duro Canyon State Park and Buffalo Lake National Wildlife Refuge, nor does it discuss impacts to these resources.

Response

Because of the distance to these areas (discussed in Section 3.4.2.5), the DOE has determined that only potential secondary impacts caused by increased demand for recreation by repository workers would occur.

C.7.2.3 Air Quality

No comments were received.

C.7.2.4 Aesthetic Conditions

No comments were received.

C.7.2.5 Noise

Issue

A few commenters stated that the noise analysis needs expansion and clarification.

Response

The DOE has revised the noise analysis and discussion to clarify blasting and transportation impacts in Section 5.2.7. Supporting documentation for source-term information and analyses is cited in Section 5.2.7 of the EA. The duration and frequency of the noise impacts cited for repository construction and operation are described in Section 5.2.7 as well.

C.7.2.6 Archaeological, Cultural, and Historical Resources

Issue

One commenter noted that the impact analysis section for archaeological, cultural, and historical resources (Section 5.2.8) did not discuss the Texas Historical Commission's Resource Protection Planning Process for Texas (Brown et al., 1982). This document, according to the commenter, serves as a basis for the development of regional study units, and a regional research design should be considered to deal with regional problems.

Response

The DOE will continue consultation with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the State Historic Preservation Officer to develop and implement a comprehensive research design to guide archaeological survey and data recovery during repository development.

The DOE will use the document Resource Protection Planning Process for Texas (Brown et al., 1982) and other materials as deemed appropriate in preparing the plans required by the PMOA.

C.7.2.7 Radiological

Issue

Some commenters suggested that discussion of radiation levels should consider specifically the potential effects on hybrid seed crops and on Lake Meredith.

Response

The DOE has added a statement to the end of Section 6.4.1.3 comparing radiation effects on seeds and plants to those on animals. The radiation dose from repository releases is orders of magnitude less than doses that would adversely affect plant and animal life. Atmospheric dispersion characteristics of the Texas Panhandle and the distance that Lake Meredith lies from the Deaf Smith County site are such that airborne deposition of radionuclides in Lake Meredith will be below measurable quantities. Therefore, the DOE concludes that there are no radiological effects of deposition in Lake Meredith. The DOE believes no modification of the EA is necessary.

Issue

Commenters expressed concern that, although normal operations would have minimal radiological impact, the potential for accidental exposures, particularly related to transportation and handling, may require additional analyses before final decisions are made.

Response

The DOE's evaluation of radiological accident impacts is consistent with the siting guidelines and the intent of this EA section was to provide an over-view statement. Transportation-related impacts are discussed in Sections 4.2.1.10 and 5.3.3 of the EA. The DOE believes that no modification of the EA is required.

Issue

A commenter asked why physical phenomena, such as changes in density, compressibility, and crystal structure are not expected to have any effect on waste containment.

Response

Changes in density and crystal structure are expected to be very minor and will have a negligible effect on the physical and mechanical properties of the rock. Significant changes in compressibility are not expected, but thermal effects will likely increase ductility in the salt. Increased ductility in the salt promotes fracture healing, a favorable effect.

Issue

A commenter questioned the effect of moist atmospheric conditions on the host rock where it is exposed following excavation of the shaft.

Response

Depending on relative humidity and air temperature, it is possible that some atmospheric moisture may condense on the salt, forming brine droplets. This will have no effect on long-term isolation. Its effect during operation will be minimal.

Issue

A commenter asked what period of time the 0.73 meter (2.4 feet) of settlement is expected, and what impact this will have on ground-water travel times due to induced fracturing of the strata surrounding the rock.

Response

Subsidence (settlement) is caused by closure of subsurface openings and propagation of this effect to the ground surface. The closure of repository openings is due mainly to creep, and several years will be required before creep closure becomes significant. Propagation of closure effects to the ground surface also takes time, several years at least, and may not occur at all if the intervening rocks can adjust sufficiently. Induced fracturing due to subsidence sufficient to affect ground-water travel time is not expected, because induced strains will be small. Any fractures formed in overlying salt are expected to heal themselves.

C.7.2.8 Water Quality

Issue

Many commenters voiced concern over potential salt contamination of the surface and ground-water resources in the vicinity of the Deaf Smith County site. Specific concerns included the following:

1. Several comments expressed concern that windblown salt from repository activities would contaminate surface water supplies such as Lake Meredith, and ground water via playa recharge.
2. Commenters voiced concern that the DOE did not identify measures to prevent or minimize the infiltration of windblown salt into the ground water.
3. Several commenters expressed concern that the EA inadequately discusses the extent and impact of ground-water contamination as a result of the failure of the stockpile liner, and onsite and offsite salt spill during packaging and transportation.

4. One commenter expressed concern that salt contamination in playa lakes and ephemeral streams had not been discussed.
5. Comments were received concerning the failure of the stockpile liner and the effect of such an incident on the City of Vega's water supply.
6. One commenter requested the DOE provide a discussion of the water quality of the holding ponds.
7. One commenter requested the DOE discuss the impacts of a 10-parts-per-million increase in the total dissolved solids (TDS) of ground water as a result of salt contamination.
8. A discussion was requested regarding the flow of leachate from salt contaminated areas.

Response

The DOE has expanded several EA sections to discuss windblown salt in greater detail. Engineering methods that will be used to control salt during transport and handling are discussed in Sections 5.1.2 and 5.1.3. Measures that will be used to mitigate surface and ground water impact are discussed in Sections 5.2.2.1 and 5.2.2.2. The DOE expects to prevent or minimize the impacts of windblown salt with these engineering and mitigative measures.

The DOE has revised Section 5.2.2.2 to identify measures to mitigate the ground-water impacts from the infiltration of windblown salt. The DOE expects that these mitigative measures will prevent or minimize ground-water contamination.

Section 5.2.2.2 has been expanded by the DOE to discuss in greater detail the mitigative measures utilized in the event of a salt spill or breached liner. With these measures, the DOE expects to prevent or minimize ground-water contamination.

Section 5.2.2.1 has been expanded by the DOE to discuss salt contamination of playa lakes and ephemeral streams. However, the DOE expects to prevent or minimize salt contamination with the engineering and mitigative measures proposed for use during repository operation and construction, thus resulting in minimal impacts to playa lakes and ephemeral streams.

Section 5.2.2.2 has been expanded to discuss the impact of breached stockpile liners. The DOE expects that ground-water contamination, including the city of Vega's water supply, can be prevented or minimized with engineering and mitigative measures, proposed in Section 5.2.2.2.

The DOE has not determined the quality of water to be expected in holding ponds. If discharges are made from these ponds, the quality of the discharge will be within State and Federal standards. In the event of a breached liner, the DOE expects to prevent or minimize ground-water contamination. A discussion

of mitigative measures and an assessment of impacts is provided in Section 5.2.2.2.

A 10-parts-per-million increase in TDS would be equivalent to a 3 percent increase. The DOE concludes that such an increase in TDS would be insignificant.

Section 5.2.2.2 of the EA was revised to include an assessment of impacts that potentially could result from a liner failure. The assessment has shown that the potential of a significant salt plume reaching the Ogallala aquifer is extremely unlikely with the proposed engineering and mitigative measures. The DOE has expanded Sections 5.1.2 and 5.1.3 to discuss the engineering measures. Section 5.2.2.2 has been expanded to include a discussion of the mitigative measures.

Issue

Many comments were received concerning the construction of the repository shafts and the potential impacts to the Ogallala aquifer. The commenters were critical or questioned the technology that will be used to mine the shafts while preventing ground-water loss and movement between aquifers. Other commenters questioned the effectiveness of shaft sealing during and after construction.

Response

Many shafts have been successfully constructed with conventional mining techniques through strata similar to the High Plains aquifer, for example, numerous mines in Saskatchewan, Canada. These shafts pass through the Blairmore aquifer at depths greater than 980 meters (3,000 feet).

Section 5.2.2.2.1 has been revised to include an assessment of leakage through the shaft lining and sealing systems. The DOE has expanded Section 4.1.2.2 to discuss in greater detail the conventional and ground freezing techniques to be utilized at the Deaf Smith County site during shaft construction. This discussion also applies to freezing techniques that will be used during shaft sinking for the repository. These techniques are expected to minimize or prevent ground-water movement between aquifers and ground-water loss. Consequently, the DOE reaffirms its conclusion that impacts to the Ogallala aquifer should be minimal.

Issue

Several comments were received concerning repository water use and the source of that water:

1. The comparison of average annual repository water use to that used for irrigated acreages is not valid.

2. The water required to cool the spent fuel rods (2 to 3 million gallons per day) will have an impact on the local water supply.
3. Drawdown calculations should include pumping from offsite wells.
4. The discussion of water use under the two-phased repository concept was criticized as inadequate.
5. Contradictions exist in the EA concerning the identified source of water for the repository.

Response

The DOE maintains that the comparison of repository water use to irrigated acreage is valid with the projected water requirements of the repository. The average annual water use value used for irrigated farming in Deaf Smith County, 1.1 acre-feet per year, was obtained from the Texas Department of Water Resources (TDWR). The DOE recognizes that the volume of water used varies with the irrigation methods employed by individual farmers as well as seasonal and annual rainfall conditions and the type of crop grown; however numbers used in the EA reflect common local practices.

The average annual water requirement for repository operations has been projected as 289 acre-feet per year. This volume of water is insignificant when compared to the 1980 Deaf Smith County water use of approximately 322,000 acre-feet. The DOE maintains that the impacts of repository water use on local water supplies will be minimal.

The drawdown calculations do not include offsite pumping wells because the variations in time and rate of pumping from these wells were not available to the DOE at the time of EA preparation. However, the additive drawdown impact that would be created by onsite pumping wells is discussed in Section 4.2.1.4.2, and was shown to be inconsequential.

The DOE has expanded the discussions of the two-phased repository concept in Section 5.1.1. This discussion includes the environmental impacts associated with the construction and operation of the repository under the base case and two-phased designs.

The DOE has corrected the contradiction throughout the draft EA concerning the sole source of water for the repository. The DOE has selected ground water as the sole source of repository water and this is reflected in the final EA. Although there currently exists no unappropriated water in the Canadian River Basin, the DOE cannot rule out the potential for future use of the surface water resources.

Issue

Two comments were received regarding the DOE's ability to comply with the requirements of the Texas Water Quality Act and Section 28.001 et seq. of the Texas Water Code (Water Wells and Drilled or Mined Shafts Act).

Response

The DOE has revised the discussions of the Texas Water Quality Act (Texas Code Ann. Secs. 26.001 et seq.) in EA Table 6-2, Statutory/Regulatory Authorities and Requirements: Deaf Smith County. The DOE projects that compliance with this statute will be achieved. The Water Wells and Drilled or Mined Shafts Act (Section 28.001 et seq.) of the Texas Water Code is a State statute. The DOE intends to comply with all State and local requirements not inconsistent with its responsibilities under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982.

Issue

One commenter identified an incorrectly referenced table in Section 5.2.2.2.2. One commenter questioned a conclusion in Section 5.2.2.2 that the effects of repository operations are expected to be on the same order as the effects expected during construction. Another commenter requested additional information on the Dockum Group.

Response

The incorrect reference to Table 3-31, Potential Natural Habitat within the Deaf Smith Site and Vicinity (Table 3-41 in the final EA), has been removed from Section 5.2.2.2.2. The DOE has added two new tables to Section 3.3.3 of the final EA. Tables 3-36 and 3-33 (Projected Annual Municipal Water Use [High Growth Rate] for the Seven County Area, Texas, in Acre-Feet and Projected Annual Municipal Water Use [Low Growth Rate] for the Seven County Area, Texas, in Acre-Feet) were developed from new data obtained from TDWR.

Section 5.2.2.2.2 has been modified to include a revised assessment of repository operations. However, the DOE's conclusion that the effects of repository operation are expected to be on the same order as the effects expected during construction has remained the same.

An extensive review of published literature regarding the Dockum Group was conducted by the DOE. The data provided in the EA represent the current data base available for the Dockum Group at the time of EA preparation.

C.7.3 EXPECTED EFFECTS OF TRANSPORTATION

Preclosure repository issues relating to transportation for the Deaf Smith County site are discussed in this section. Issues raised by the commenters include the following:

- Additional study of railroad access route alternatives
- Additional traffic studies
- Inaccurate gravity model
- Radiological consequences of nuclear waste transportation accidents.

The DOE has divided the numerous transportation comments received into two categories: general and site-specific. General comments have been judged to be applicable to all sites, and responses are presented in Section C.2.4.1 of this appendix. Since the sorting of general versus site-specific comments is somewhat subject to individual viewpoints, the reader is encouraged to review Section C.2.4.1 before reviewing site-specific responses. The DOE believes that, collectively, the general and site-specific response sections adequately respond to the transportation-related comments received.

Discussions of site-specific comments dealing with transportation appear in several sections of this appendix. Comments relating to baseline conditions (the characteristics of the existing transportation network) are discussed in Section C.4.1.4. Comments relating to the impacts of site characterization and the plans for studies during site characterization are discussed in Section C.7.1.1.9. Comments relating to repository access route construction, the transportation impacts of repository operation on local transportation environment, and assessment of the site against the transportation guideline are discussed below.

In addition to the sorting described above, the numerous site-specific comments on repository-related transportation have been categorized under the six issues listed below for response. Again, the reader will find frequent reference to the general response in Section C.2.4.1 because of the similarity of the issue topics in the general and site-specific response sections.

Issue

A number of commenters cited the need for more study of railroad access route alternatives and related data. They felt that the "representative route" identified for the environmental assessment creates adverse impacts on farmland use, irrigation systems, and residences. In addition, farmland cost was not considered in cost estimates. Several commenters cited use of the abandoned right-of-way of the old Chicago Rock Island and Pacific (CRIP) Railroad as a better alternative.

Response

The DOE has conducted an additional environmental analysis of railroad access route alternatives to the site and Sections 5.1.2.2. and 5.3.2 of the final EA have been expanded to include a description and comparison of these alternatives. Of the number of alternatives considered, five viable routes are identified along with their respective attractive features, land use costs, and less desirable characteristics. The concept of a "representative route" has been dropped in favor of the description and comparison of alternatives. However, the preferred route has not been selected. This does not compromise the siting process because the availability of acceptable access routes that satisfy the qualifying condition in the siting guidelines has been established.

Issue

Several commenters cited the need for more description of roads to be used and related data on road conditions and current and projected usage, especially truck traffic, traffic congestion points, accident rates, etc. Cost and source of funding for additional traffic controls, mitigation measures and road maintenance were also requested. It was also noted that the needed airport improvements should be included. One commenter suggested the need for study of auto and truck collision experience from similar large projects.

Response

The DOE believes that the existing transportation network has been sufficiently studied for this stage in the siting process and is adequate to support repository operations with minor improvements to be developed, in cooperation with local officials, during site characterization. Traffic patterns, incremental increases in traffic volume, traffic controls and other impact mitigation measures will be studied in more detail, particularly in the Hereford and Vega area.

Based on the comments concerning airport improvements, the DOE evaluated the statements made in the EA regarding this transport mode. The current description of air transport in the area was inadvertently left out of Section 3.5. Discussion of this transport mode has been added to the final EA. Based on the current traffic at local airports, no major improvements are expected to be needed at local airports as a result of repository related operations. This statement was made in Section 5.3.3 of the draft EA and has been retained. It is expected that the cost and source of funding for local network improvements and maintenance to support repository operations will be a subject of negotiations with State and local officials within the consultation and cooperation process.

Issue

Several commenters stated that the gravity model used to establish population distribution and then, indirectly, the traffic patterns and volumes traveling to and from the site is inaccurate. Also, the rationale for establishing population density along highway and railroad routes to the site was cited as lacking consideration of the fact that the people tend to live closer to roads than evenly distributed over a given land area. It was also noted that the accident rate used on U.S. 385 was unusually high and needed explanation.

Response

The DOE has reviewed the local transportation analyses in the draft EA and made some minor revisions. In general, the gravity model, traffic patterns, traffic volumes and population densities used in the final EA are considered sufficiently accurate for this stage in the siting process. However, as stated in Section 4.1.3.1.10 of the EA, detailed studies of projected traffic patterns and volumes and compatibility with local transportation plans will be made during the site characterization phase.

Issue

Many commenters indicated direct or indirect concern over the radiological consequences of various types of nuclear waste transportation accidents. The EA was cited as being deficient in that long-term health effects of possible radiation exposure of people and contamination of land and water resources was not addressed nor was exposure through food chain ingestion pathways. A few commenters noted that maximum individual exposure of both workers and members of the public under various normal and accident conditions should be analyzed and included in the EA. Several commenters simply stated that the Texas site is unacceptably far from sources of the waste and that nuclear waste transportation through or on beltways around urban centers such as Dallas and Amarillo is too risky. Other commenters cited deficiencies such as the lack of consideration of weather on accident rates, fraction of accidents which will involve nuclear waste, changing location of the sources of waste, emergency response plans, decontamination and clean-up capabilities and costs. One commenter also cited inadequacy of cask testing to assure safety.

Response

The DOE recognizes that many of the concerns relate to the amount of aggregation that results when the effects of all accidents are expressed by a single risk number as done in the draft EA. Accordingly, the DOE has modified Appendix A to provide additional details on various types of accidents and the consequences of such accidents. With respect to the overall transportation risk assessment, the DOE has updated the analysis given in the draft EA to include additional scenarios and more recent data. This is discussed in Section C.2.4.1 of this appendix and results are included in Appendix A.

Also, it is expected that the NRC studies now underway evaluating accidents that have actually occurred will provide relevant information to address site-specific accident concerns. As such information becomes available, it will be incorporated in the transportation assessments to be performed during detailed site characterization. If, as a result of such studies, the NRC promulgates new safety standards, such cask standards will be used by the DOE. However, until the results of NRC studies are available, the DOE has no evidence to indicate that cask safety standards are inadequate. No changes were made to the EA in response to the concern over the adequacy of transport safety.

Emergency response plans are the responsibility of State and local officials. The DOE will work with responsible Federal agencies and local officials to ensure that adequate response capability will be in place and be maintained during the period of waste receipt. Further information on emergency response is provided in Section C.2.4.1, Appendix A, and Section 6.2.1.8 of the final EA.

Issue

A few commenters indicated that the DOE's evaluation of the site against the siting guidelines and related findings was not clear and was lacking in supporting data and information. Also, it was pointed out that presence of only one of the access-route characteristics in favorable condition one is not sufficient justification for a favorable finding on the entire condition.

Response

The DOE has revised Section 6.2.1.8 in the final EA to include a discussion following each condition covering the intent and application of the guideline condition as well as supporting information for the finding given. Where the guideline requires comparison with other sites, reference to Chapter 7 is made. The siting guideline (10 CFR Part 960.5-2-7) provides for a finding of the presence of the favorable condition if "any of the following characteristics" is present in favorable condition 1.

Issue

A number of commenters cited lack of adequate analysis of the impacts of transportation of excess salt to offsite disposal locations. In particular, concern was expressed over the possibility of an accident that would involve blowing or spillage of truck and railcar loads of salt over prime farmland. In general, it was noted that the minor or modest impacts identified were not substantiated. Furthermore, it was not clear whether conditions at the destination had been considered.

Response

The consideration of all aspects of excess salt management and disposal, including transportation, has now been included in Sections 5.2.10 and 5.3.3 of the final EA.

C.7.4 EXPECTED EFFECTS ON SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS

Preclosure repository issues relating to socioeconomic conditions, going beyond those issues considered in site characterization, are also related to the discussion of Technical Guidelines in Chapter 7, specifically to Section 7.3.2.1.2. Socioeconomic concerns for the Deaf Smith County site were expressed on the topics of population density and distribution; economic conditions; community services; social conditions; and fiscal conditions and government structure. There was also discussion of the system guideline relating to environment, socioeconomics, and transportation (7.3.2.2). Issues raised by the commenters include the following:

- Guideline conclusions not supported in the socioeconomic analysis
- Out-migration of residents
- Lack of water due to repository development
- Unreliable in-migration model projections
- Land values
- Economic impacts
- Impacts on the seed industry
- Out-migration of business
- Debatable projections of economic boost
- Additional information on mitigation measures
- Endangering of water supply for irrigated agriculture
- Contamination of the water supply
- Long-term and short-term effects of contamination
- Additional community services needed
- Alternative water sources
- Psychological impacts
- Changes in lifestyle
- Fiscal impacts on local governments
- Payment of taxes on the abandoned structures.

Issue

Many commenters stated that guideline conclusions regarding water quality and supply, increased government revenues, and impacts on the agricultural sector of the economy are not supported in the socioeconomic analysis.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated the EA text and has updated and expanded the water demand and supply data. Additional data on projected water supply and demand scenarios were obtained from the Texas Department of Water Resources and incorporated into the analysis in EA Section 6.2.1.7. In addition, the analysis of increased government revenues has been expanded to incorporate data presented in the Chapter 5 analysis of fiscal impacts. For the agricultural sector analysis, additional data on the seed industry have been sought from State and business sources. A more detailed discussion of the effects on the primary sectors of the economy has been presented. The DOE does not believe that any revisions to the guideline conclusions are required.

Issue

A few commenters stated that the guideline analysis should be done on a community basis, rather than on a regional basis.

Response

The favorable condition for the socioeconomic guideline is evaluated on a regional basis (the "affected area"), instead of on a community basis, in order to evaluate total impacts to the socioeconomic study area. This study area includes multiple counties and multiple communities, which supply services to the study area. For the potentially adverse condition of this guideline, affected communities are analyzed. Specific impacts to affected communities are also presented in Section 5.4 of the EA. The DOE believe that this approach is required by the siting guidelines, 10 CFR Part 960.5-2-6.

C.7.4.1 Population Density and Distribution

Issue

A few commenters indicated that out-migration of residents as a result of their perception of contamination dangers should have been considered.

Response

The EA does not include an analysis of out-migration due to fear of the project. Fear of the project is not an evaluation criterion under the siting guidelines, and no evidence is available to indicate the extent, if any, of out-migration associated with a repository project. The DOE believes that no modification of the EA is required.

Some natural out-migration would be expected in the Texas Panhandle, just as it would occur in other regions. This is a phenomenon which occurs to some

extent in all areas as people make different choices regarding employment and location preferences. The baseline population projections estimated by the Texas Department of Water Resources (NUS, 1984, ONWI-461) indicate a net increase in population to Potter, Randall, Deaf Smith, and Oldham Counties. These projections are based on historic population trends in the area, which indicate population growth in these counties. Project-related population changes are intended to show the number of new residents who will be relocating to the area as a result of direct and indirect jobs.

Issue

One commenter indicated that lack of water due to repository development will force out-migration.

Response

The DOE has reviewed the analysis of water requirements for repository development, and the associated in-migration to the area, as discussed in Section 5.4.3.3.4 and has added an analysis of projected baseline water use. The current analysis indicates that project-related water use in Deaf Smith County would represent a small fraction of the baseline water requirements from the Ogallala aquifer in Deaf Smith County. The additional analysis does not alter the conclusions in this section. The present depletion of the Ogallala aquifer, however, is recognized as a problem in this region. Changes in irrigation practices and other water usage will be necessary in the future even without the repository project.

Issue

Many commenters noted that in-migration model and gravity model projections are unreliable. Commenters indicated that the in-migration model lacks credibility because of (1) the limited documentation provided in the text, (2) the lack of adequate support for the multipliers, (3) the lack of documentation on the sensitivity analysis and historical replication, and (4) the use of the "realistic worst case" scenario.

Response

The in-migration model was developed to estimate the number of new residents who will relocate to an area as a result of a nuclear waste repository site. A realistic conservative scenario was used to estimate population in-migration at each of the salt sites. As with any projection model, there is some uncertainty in the accuracy of the projections. The model multipliers and inputs in Table 5-25, Inputs and Multipliers for the ONWI In-Migration Model (Table 5-30 in the final EA), have been thoroughly researched and the basis for each is provided in the table. The references include the Murdock and Leistritz (1979); TVA, Yellow Creek (1980); Halstead and Leistritz (1983); DOE (1978);

Bureau of the Census (1982); and Bureau of Labor Statistics (1980). This research material provided a range of multipliers from which a range of high and low multipliers was established. The high case was selected as the "realistic worst case" for use in the draft EAs. The realistic worst case scenario is used in the analysis so that the possibility of underestimating impacts is minimized.

The historical replication did not include the indirect in-migration because there is no case study data available to validate the model. This is a weak point for all models that project population in-migration due to specific projects. This variable requires additional empirical research and this problem has been recognized in the technical literature. The in-migration model indirect multipliers were based on local economic multipliers as research by Murdock and Leistritz (1979) and Goldsmith (1984) references in the documentation.

The Phipps Bend and Hartsville projects were used to validate the model (see Goldsmith, 1984). These projects were selected because adequate detail was provided in the TVA monitoring reports to support the validation process. As part of the validation effort, a sensitivity analysis was conducted. The purpose of a sensitivity analysis is to test (1) whether a positive change in each variable would result in a hypothesized change in total in-migration and (2) the magnitude of the change. The process followed is consistent with model validation procedures. Some simultaneous changes were automatically considered because the internal structure of the model adjusts related variables (such as married and single workers). Further sensitivity analysis of simultaneous changes was not evaluated because of the linear structure of the model (see Figure 5-25, In-Migration Model Logic of Calculations). In response to commenters' concerns, the DOE has modified the EA to include additional documentation of the multipliers used in the model, as well as the basis for model assumptions, in Section 5.4 of the EA.

The gravity model is used to allocate new residents to communities near the site area at all of the salt sites. It is one of several allocation models that can be used to estimate the distribution of in-migrants to an area. The gravity model distributes new residents on the basis of community size and distance from the site. Community size is considered a surrogate measure of other factors which influence location decisions. The gravity model was selected because it considers the critical factors in location decisions, and does not require subjective judgments about community attractiveness. Other allocation models, which do consider attractiveness, have not been shown to be more accurate. The DOE believes that no modifications to the gravity model are required.

C.7.4.2 Economic Conditions

Issue

Many commenters indicated that the EA understates economic impacts, specifically that a repository would ruin farmland values and destroy agricultural markets. Commenters indicated agricultural production value was underestimated

because the analysis did not account for indirect effects of lost production and because site-specific information about what is actually grown on the site was not included. Commenters also indicated that perceived contamination would affect agricultural sales and that the EA should acknowledge this as an adverse effect.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated the data and has determined that no modification of the EA is required. Economic impacts on the agricultural sector are evaluated on the basis of project requirements for water, land, and work force. The analysis in Section 5.4.2.4 indicates that these requirements do not significantly affect agricultural production in the area. Direct effects of lost crop and livestock production are discussed in Chapter 5 of the EA. Specific crop production on the site was not used because verified data were not available and crop mix varies each year. An average crop value was determined by evaluating crop mix and value for a two-year period. Livestock losses were also evaluated by analyzing receipts for a two-year period. Deaf Smith County statistics were proportioned to the site in Tables 5-35, Estimated Annual Value of Lost Crop Production Due to Repository and In-Migrant Land Requirements, Deaf Smith County Site (Table 5-41 in the final EA) and 5-38, Projected Loss of Livestock Receipts Due to Repository and In-Migrant Land Requirements, Deaf Smith County Site (Table 5-44 in the final EA). Indirect effects of lost production were analyzed in pp. 5-131 and 5-134. The indirect multiplier was derived from the Texas Department of Water Resources model for the High Plains area.

The effects of perceived contamination on agricultural sales are also discussed in this section. While data on market effects related to this type of facility are not conclusive, the data gathered to date do not suggest that there will be significant impacts on agricultural sales in the region.

An analysis of the Three Mile Island incident was prepared by the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture. It stated that the limited decline in agricultural sales in the area was limited to the week following the accident (Flynn and Chalmers, 1979, NUREG/CR-1215, p. 60). The only other food-related decline was in recreational fishing in the Susquehanna River. Fishing was restricted for a period by the NRC, but the decline did not affect total year fish catch (Hickey, 1981, NUREG-0754).

Thus, even under a worst case accident scenario, effects on agricultural sales were extremely limited. Under normal operating conditions, the data gathered do not suggest that there would be significant impacts to agricultural sales in the region.

Issue

Many commenters indicated that land values have already declined as a result of the proposed repository.

Response

The DOE has considered the concern of the commenters, and has modified sections of the EA. U.S. Department of Agriculture data on farmland values in Texas, between 1975 and 1984, have been added to Section 3.6.2.4 of the EA. A discussion of these trends has been added to the existing discussion on land values, in Section 5.4.2. This information provides no basis for a conclusion that land values have declined as a result of the repository.

Issue

Many commenters indicated that impacts on the seed industry and the difficulty in relocating a nearby seed farm should be evaluated in the EA. Commenters also indicated that the agricultural production was undervalued because seed production was not considered.

Response

The DOE has considered the suggestions of the commenters, and has modified the EA. Some analysis of the seed industry was contained in the draft EA. Seed production was factored into the crop values. Additional data on seed production has been obtained from the Texas Department of Agriculture. Impacts on the seed industry are discussed under agricultural effects, Section 5.4.2.4 of the EA. The analysis discusses impacts on the seed industry resulting from repository requirements for water and land, as well as impacts related to perceived contamination. The comparison of seed values to other crop values (Section 3.6.2.4) indicates that the seed values are within the range of other crop values. The potential difficulty of relocating land engaged in seed production is described in Section 5.4.2 under the economic displacement discussion. The Federal Relocation Assistance Act addresses the issue of relocation.

Issue

A few commenters indicated that out-migration of businesses should be considered.

Response

The DOE has considered commenters' suggestions and has determined that no modification of the EA is required. Out-migration of businesses related to the effects of perceived contamination on sales is not anticipated, based on an analysis of perceived contamination impacts which is included in Section 5.4.2.4. This analysis indicates that the majority of agricultural sales are not likely to be affected by a repository site because most products are exported from the area and are not identified with the region.

Issue

One commenter noted that the projected economic boost from this project is debatable since many of the jobs will be very short term.

Response

The DOE has evaluated the data and has determined that no modification of the EA is required. The economic impacts of repository development are evaluated largely on the basis of work-force size, required skills, and project expenditures. The number of new jobs and additional spending in the region are influenced by these factors. Duration of employment is also an important consideration in determining impacts, and there will be some short-term jobs. However, for most of the work force, employment will be long term, extending for several years.

Issue

A few commenters noted that additional information on mitigation measures needs to be added.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated the EA and believes that some modification is required. A general discussion on mitigation measures for repository impacts is presented in Section 5.4. Additional information on planned monitoring and mitigation activities has been added to Sections 4.1.3.2 and 5.4.

Issue

A few commenters indicated that use of water for the repository will endanger the water supply for irrigated agriculture.

Response

The DOE has expanded Section 6.2.1.7 of the EA to include the projected water supply for the guideline consideration. The DOE believes that no other modification to the EA is required. An analysis of project-related water requirements is presented in Section 5.4.3.3.4. The additional water requirements represent a very small percentage of the existing water demands in the area. Changes in irrigation practices will be necessary in the future because depletion of the Ogallala aquifer is a significant problem even without the repository.

Issue

A few commenters indicated that contamination of the water supply could ruin the seed industry and other agricultural activities.

Response

The DOE has evaluated the data and believes that no modification of the EA is required. Potential radiological contamination is analyzed in Section 6.4.1 for normal repository operations and for accident scenarios. This analysis indicates that repository releases in areas where agricultural products are grown are much below natural background radiation levels normally found in such products.

Issue

A few commenters noted that the EA indicates that perceived contamination impacts may have a short-term effect, lasting from one to thirteen years. This is not short term for businesses.

Response

The DOE has considered the concern of the commenters, and modifications to the EA have been made. The analysis in EA Section 5.4.2.4 has been clarified. The reference to the number of years is related to the project start date and the year in which nuclear waste would actually be disposed of on site. Perceived contamination should not be a consideration until waste is actually accepted. Thus, the time frame discussed in the EA has been revised.

C.7.4.3 Community Services

Issue

A few commenters indicated Vega, Adrian, Wildorado, Hereford, and the Llano Estacado Water District will need additional community services to accommodate repository-related growth. Information on needed services and legislative requirements for services were provided by commenters.

Response

The DOE has reviewed the analysis and believes that no modification of the EA is required. Section 5.4.3 of the EA includes an assessment of community service needs for Hereford, Vega, Amarillo, and Canyon. It is projected that these communities will receive the majority of repository-related in-migrants. While some new residents may locate in Adrian, Wildorado, or other small

communities in the area, the total amount of in-migration to these communities is expected to be very low.

Issue

A few commenters indicated that the effects of taking Vega's future water sources supplied by the Richardson Well, should be evaluated.

Response

The DOE has reviewed the material and has determined that no modification of the EA is required. This issue relates to the use of the well for Vega's future water and the compensation of owners of property to be acquired. It is possible that land containing the well leased to Vega would be acquired by the DOE, and if acquired, a new water source for Vega may need to be found. Land-owners whose property has been acquired by the DOE for site characterization and repository development will be compensated under the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisitions Act of 1970 (42 USC Secs. 1271-1278).

Issue

One commenter noted that the EA indicates that water sources other than the Ogallala aquifer might be used for the repository. These sources should be identified.

Response

The DOE believes that no modification of the EA is required. An analysis of repository water sources other than the Ogallala aquifer have been examined and some possibility exists for using the Dockum aquifer.

C.7.4.4 Social Conditions

Issue

A few commenters noted that there are psychological impacts associated with the repository (e.g. people will want to leave the area and will be separated from family and friends).

Response

The DOE has reviewed the comments and has determined that no modification of the EA is required. Fear of the project is not an evaluation criterion under the siting guidelines (10 CFR Part 960). Although impacts related to the

disruption of the physical environment do require analysis, voluntary relocation resulting from fear of the project is not considered in the EA.

Issue

A few commenters noted that the Texas Department of Agriculture survey indicates that people do not want the repository, and that it would hurt the agricultural economy.

Response

The DOE has revised Section 3.6.4 of the EA in response to these comments. Results of the Texas Department of Agriculture survey have been obtained and a summary of the survey methodology and results was included in Section 3.6.4 of the EA. This survey reflects the attitudes of many Panhandle residents and is considered one of the social conditions in the area.

Issue

A few commenters indicated that changes in lifestyle will be disruptive to small communities. Drugs and increased crime will be associated with transients.

Response

The DOE has considered the comments and has modified the EA. Social changes, such as changes in lifestyle, are likely to occur in small communities. This is discussed briefly in Section 5.4.4 of the EA, as it relates to the percentage increase in a community's population base. Some increase in crime, drug abuse, and other social problems can be associated with project-related growth. The DOE has added a discussion of these problems to Section 5.4.4 of the EA.

C.7.4.5 Fiscal Conditions and Government Structure

Issue

Some commenters indicated that the fiscal impacts on local governments should be analyzed in more detail.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated the EA and believes that no modifications are required. The fiscal impact analysis in Section 5.4.5 discusses the types of

new revenues and expenditures that would accompany project-related in-migration to particular communities. A discussion of impact mitigation funds, available through the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 USC Sections 10101-10226) for repository development, is also provided.

Issue

One commenter questioned who will pay taxes on the abandoned structures, built to accommodate growth, once the repository is decommissioned.

Response

The DOE believes that no modification of the EA is required. The repository is a long-term project, lasting approximately 50 years. The work force over this period of time is relatively stable. There will be workers on site during the caretaker and decommissioning phases, but the size of the work force will be smaller during this period. During the 50-year repository development activities, indirect business development and job opportunities will be created in the area. With the long duration of the project, indirect business development, and the size of the area's population base, boom-bust impacts, including a rapid decline in the tax base, usually associated with energy developments are not likely to occur.

Issue

A few commenters indicated that fiscal impact mitigation measures need to be discussed in more detail.

Response

Fiscal impact mitigation measures and mitigation funds are discussed in Section 5.4.5. The DOE has included a discussion on grants-equal-to-tax payments to Section 4.2.2 in response to commenters concerns. The DOE has also added information on planned monitoring and mitigation activities to Section 5.4.5.

C.7.5 SYSTEM GUIDELINE

The purpose of the preclosure system guideline on environment, socioeconomics, and transportation is to establish the overall objectives to be met by a repository during the preclosure phase. Following is a summary of the issue raised regarding this guideline for the Deaf Smith County site.

Issue

The DOE received a number of comments on its evaluation of the preclosure Environment, Socioeconomics, and Transportation System Guideline and the analyses supporting the system guideline evaluation. Commenters also challenged the accuracy and adequacy of evaluations and data which support the DOE findings for the Environmental Quality Technical Guideline 960.5-2-5 (EA Section 6.2.1.6), Socioeconomic Impact Guideline 960.5-1-6 (EA Section 6.2.1.7), and Transportation Guideline 960.5-2-7 (EA Section 6.2.1.8). Specific issues that were expressed which relate to this system guideline finding for the Deaf Smith County site were the assumed mitigation of repository effects without presenting mitigation plans; and, a lack of a composite assessment of socioeconomic and environmental changes from that of an existing predominantly agricultural nature to that of a nuclear industrial facility, resulting from site characterization and repository development.

Commenters were also concerned that exploratory shaft seal leakage and borehole drillings will lead to groundwater contamination and that the practical engineering measures on which the assessment relies to mitigate impacts from salt storage should be discussed. Many commenters stated that conclusions regarding water quality and supply and impacts on the agricultural sector of the economy are not supported in the socioeconomic analysis.

Response

The specific issues raised for these technical guidelines were presented previously in CRD Sections C.7.1, C.7.2, C.7.3, and C.7.4.

The conceptual engineering designs presented in Chapter 5 and the proposed site characterization activities in Chapter 4 of the final EA have been expanded to include various types of possible control and mitigative measures which, from a technological prospective, have previously been proven effective in lessening or essentially eliminating various significant adverse environmental impacts. These measures form the basis for realistically but conservatively estimating the mitigation of impacts as discussed in Section 6.2.2.2 of the final EA.

With respect to the lack of a composite assessment of impacts, an assessment of the cumulative effects on the natural environment has been added to the Section 6.2.2.2 text of the final EA. The preclosure Environment, Socioeconomics and Transportation System Guideline essentially concludes that there are adequate measures to protect the public and environment from hazards posed by radioactive waste disposal. Direct and secondary development impacts projected from site characterization activities and repository development are also specifically addressed by the socioeconomic impact technical guideline (EA Section 6.2.1.7) and considered from a system perspective in Section 6.2.2.2.

EA Section 4.2.1.4 has been revised to include a more detailed analysis of project impacts on ground-water quality. Engineering measures to mitigate salt impacts are discussed in EA Sections 4.1.2 and 5.1.3.4. Impacts from salt based upon effective application of these measures is discussed in Sections 4.4 and

5.3.5. The DOE has also reevaluated the EA text and has updated and expanded the water quality and supply data based on information from the Texas Department of Water Resources. For the agricultural sector analysis, additional data on the seed industry has been obtained from State and business sources, and a more detailed analysis of effects on the primary sectors of the economy is presented in the final EA.

The DOE has determined that this additional data and analyses did not change the system guideline conclusion that the evidence does not support a finding that the site is not likely to meet the qualifying condition.

C.7.6 CHAPTER C.7 REFERENCES

C.7.6.1 References Listed by Author

Battelle's Pacific Northwest Laboratories, 1979. Environmental Aspects of Commercial Radioactive Waste Management, Vol. 1, DOE/ET-0029, prepared for U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, DC.

BPNL, see Battelle's Pacific Northwest Laboratories.

Brown, Theodore M., Kay L. Killen, Helen Simons, and Virginia Wulfkuhle, 1982. Resource Protection Planning Process for Texas, RP3, Texas Historical Commission, Austin, TX.

Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1980. Handbook of Labor Statistics, Bulletin 2070, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, DC, pp. 108-109.

Bureau of the Census, 1982. Statistical Abstract of the United States 1982-83, 103d edn., U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, DC, pp. 26, 43, 147, and 383.

Flynn, C. B., and J. A. Chalmers, 1979. The Social and Economic Effects of the Accident at Three Mile Island, NUREG/CR-1215, prepared by Mountain West Research, Inc., and Social Impact Research, Inc. for U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC, pp. 59-60.

Goldsmith, Stanley, 1984. ONWI Population In-Migration Model (attachment for inclusion in salt site statutory environmental assessment documents), letter report from Goldsmith, Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, to T. J. Taylor, Salt Repository Project Office, U.S. Department of Energy, Columbus, OH, May 30.

Halstead, John M., and F. Larry Leistritz, 1983. Impacts of Energy Development on Secondary Labor Markets: A Study of Seven Western Counties, Agricultural Economics Report No. 178, North Dakota State University, Fargo, ND.

Hickey, C. R., Jr., 1981. Impact of the 1979 Accident at Three Mile Island Nuclear Station on Recreational Fishing in the Susquehanna River, NUREG-0754, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC, pp. iii and 23-26.

Murdock, Steve H., and F. Larry Leistritz, 1979. Energy Development in the Western United States, Impact on Rural Areas, Praeger Special Studies, Praeger Scientific, New York, NY, pp. 93-100 and 109-111.

NUS Corporation, 1984. Socioeconomic Data Base Report for the Permian Basin, ONWI-461, prepared for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

Tennessee Valley Authority, 1980. Yellow Creek Nuclear Plant Socioeconomic Monitoring and Mitigation Report, YCNP-SMR 4, Knoxville, TN.

U.S. Department of Energy, 1978. Socioeconomic Impact Assessment: A Methodology Applied to Synthetic Fuels, HCP/L2516-01, Washington, DC, pp. 15-21.

C.7.6.2 Federal Regulations and Statutes

10 CFR Part 60, Disposal of High-Level Radioactive Wastes in Geologic Repositories; Technical Criteria.

10 CFR Part 960, Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982; General Guidelines for the Recommendation of Sites for the Nuclear Waste Repositories,; Final Siting Guidelines.

40 CFR Part 191, Environmental Standards for the Management and Disposal of Spent Nuclear Fuel, High-Level and Transuranic Radioactive Wastes; Final Rule, September 19, 1985.

Farmland Protection Policy Act, 7 USC Secs. 4201-4209.

Migratory Bird Treaty Act, as amended, 16 USC Secs. 703-711.

Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, 42 USC Secs. 10101-10226.

Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, 42 USC Secs. 4601 et seq.

C.7.6.3 State of Texas Laws

Water Quality Act of Texas, Tex. (Water) Code Ann. Secs. 26.001 et seq. (Vernon 1976 & Supp. 1984).

Water Wells and Drilled or Mined Shafts Act, Tex. (Water) Code Ann. Secs. 28.001 et seq. (Vernon Supp. 1984).

C.8 EASE AND COST OF SITING, CONSTRUCTION, OPERATION, AND CLOSURE

A number of reviewers of the draft EA requested additional information on criteria which make the Deaf Smith County site conceptually suitable for locating a nuclear waste repository when factors are considered which assess the ultimate cost of the repository. These factors are discussed in the EA section comparing the sites on the basis of preclosure guidelines which discuss the ease and cost of siting, construction, operation, and closure (Section 7.3.3).

C.8.1 SURFACE CHARACTERISTICS

No comments were received.

C.8.2 ROCK CHARACTERISTICS

Commenters expressed concern about rock characteristics which could affect the constructability of a repository. Further information on factors which could affect constructability is developed in parts of EA Chapters 3 and 6, which deal with rock characteristics at the site. Issues raised by the commenters include the following:

- More detailed discussion of the salt material model
- Effects of discontinuities, heterogeneities, and impurities
- Representativeness of and uncertainties of rock properties data
- Repository geoengineering-related design concerns
- Retrievability of waste canisters
- Construction, operation, and decommissioning of the shafts
- Thermomechanical effects on the engineering properties of the rock mass
- Definition of the disturbed zone.

Issue

A few commenters stated that a more detailed discussion of the salt material model and its implications is required. The model's limitations should be discussed.

Response

The DOE has considered the issue and Section 3.2.6.1 of the EA has been modified to include a description of the salt material model. Uncertainties in model parameters are given when a sufficient number of tests have been performed to allow the uncertainties to be determined. Section 6.3.3.2 has been modified to reflect the following.

The total deformation of salt can be divided into three components: elastic deformation, thermal expansion, and inelastic deformation. The salt material model includes elastic deformation and thermal expansion through a classical generalization of Hook's Law. These deformations are important for calculating thermal stresses following waste emplacement but are typically masked by the much larger inelastic deformations that result at the stresses, temperatures, and times of interest for a high-level nuclear waste repository. The inelastic deformation is primarily viscoelastic and is modeled by the exponential-time model. Uncertainty in the material model parameters result from both variability in the salt response measured in the laboratory and the lack of fit of the model.

Section 6.3.3.2 of the EA has been revised to state that the amount of remedial excavation that is required can be controlled by changing the extraction ratio or gross thermal loading. Because the creep of salt is highly stress and temperature dependent, decreasing the extraction ratio or gross thermal loading (or both) will reduce the requirement for maintenance of the underground openings. Therefore, although material model uncertainties do not permit precise determination of the maintenance requirements, the problem can be assessed through generic understanding of the stress and temperature dependence of the creep of salt.

Issue

Some commenters noted that the effects of discontinuities, heterogeneities, and impurities on rock mass behavior and rock mass characteristics need to be addressed. These discontinuities, heterogeneities, and impurities can be categorized as follows: joints and fractures in rock units; interbeds, gas and brine pockets; rock mass property anisotropy; and impurities that significantly effect rock behavior.

Response

The DOE has clarified discussions on the presence and character of heterogeneities and discontinuities within the host rock in Section 3.2.6. Section 6.3.3.2.1 has been expanded to explicitly consider the uncertainties related to the presence of heterogeneities and discontinuities as summarized below.

Open joints and fractures have not been identified in the host rock, and there is no known evidence to suggest that they will exist at the site. Healed

fractures, filled with salt, have been found in the salt section, but their effect on the overall rock mass properties is expected to be relatively small. Joints and fractures have also been identified in the upper rock units above the uppermost (Upper Seven Rivers) salt and within the uppermost salt. Within the salt unit, fractures are typically filled. The presence of such fractures needs to be considered in shaft design, but they are sufficiently far above the host rock to have negligible influence on the repository itself.

The effects of interbeds as they relate to requirements for artificial support, maintenance, and worker safety are discussed in Section 6.3.3.2, and result in the conclusion that several potentially adverse conditions are present. Because of the uncertainties associated with the presence of interbeds and inhomogeneities, a conservative position was adopted with respect to favorable and potentially adverse conditions related to flexibility in selected depth and configuration of the repository, need for artificial support, maintenance of openings, difficulty in retrieval, and potential safety hazards.

Mined openings have been constructed in bedded salt, including the facilities at WIPP site, and the techniques used are by definition within the state of the art. Elevated temperatures are not present in existing mines or at WIPP, but once waste is emplaced, stability can be assured, if necessary, by backfilling the rooms.

The impurity content in the LSA-4 salt is relatively small, so the effect on the behavior of the host rock as a whole is likely to be small also. Locally, the effects of impurities could be significant, depending on the location of interbeds and impurities relative to the canisters and the storage rooms.

Gas and brine pockets have not been encountered in wells drilled to date, as noted in the EA, and there is no evidence to suggest that they are present at the site. Nevertheless, the presence cannot be completely ruled out with present data. It is unlikely that a brine or gas pocket large enough and close enough to the repository to be a significant problem will remain undetected.

The stratigraphy at the Deaf Smith County site is a relatively complex anisotropic rock mass, the degree of anisotropy being dependent on the scale considered. Anisotropy must be explicitly considered when three-dimensional effects are important, but in many cases two-dimensional or one-dimensional approximations involving layered or isotropic systems are adequate for analysis.

The following changes have been made to the draft EA:

1. Section 3.2.6 has been expanded to include further discussion of fractures and the potential for gas and brine pockets. Also, the discussions of the values used for percentages of clay and water in the host rock have been clarified.
2. The discussion of uncertainties in Section 6.3.3.2.1 has been expanded to discuss more fully uncertainties due to interbeds or impurities.

3. The section on evaluations in Section 6.3.3.2.1 has been expanded to include a more thorough discussion of the purpose and approach to the analyses presented, in order to place them in proper perspective.

Issue

A few commenters indicated that the rock and soil properties measurements presented may vary in several ways and that these need to be discussed. These properties may vary between laboratory and in situ test behavior and rock mass behavior, or may vary among various locations, even if general characteristics appear quite similar. The source of these variations may be variations from location to location due to natural spatial variation from place to place, lack of a statistically representative number of measurements, or technical uncertainties in making extrapolations.

Response

Section 6.3.3.2 has been modified to more clearly explain how the uncertainties related to variation in rock properties were considered in the evaluation, as summarized below.

The EA clearly states that no data is available from on site, and the closest data is from wells several miles away. Thus, site conditions are inferred by extrapolation, and are therefore uncertain.

While data are limited, and no testing has been done on the site, the available evidence strongly suggests that the engineering properties of materials encountered at the site will not differ significantly from those at other locations.

It is generally accepted that laboratory tests do not accurately predict rock mass behavior because truly representative samples of the rock mass cannot be obtained, except in rare cases where the rock mass is homogeneous and essentially intact. The salt units at the Deaf Smith County site are not homogeneous, so field tests are more appropriate to determine the behavior of a representative volume of rock.

Despite their limitations, laboratory tests on core samples are useful in assessing how a rock mass will behave. Comparison between laboratory data obtained from or near a specific site and published generic data indicate whether or not the rocks in question are anomalous. Such comparisons were done from rock property data, and test results from Palo Duro Basin salt compare well with published data.

Section 6.3.3.2 of the EA deals with repository design and safety during construction. Because of the lack of site-specific data, the absence of underground mining experience in the Palo Duro Basin, and the uncertainties inherent in predicting rock mass performance from laboratory tests on core, a conservative position is taken with respect to evaluating the guideline conditions. No

rock characteristics which can reasonably be expected at the site and which would require mitigating measures beyond the state of the art have been identified.

The discussion in Section 6.3.3.2.1 has been expanded to address uncertainties in more detail and to describe the approach taken to guideline evaluations.

Issue

Some commenters noted that a number of repository geoengineering-related design concerns require further discussion. Broadly, these are constraints on the flexibility for construction due to limitations imposed by the lateral and vertical extent of the host horizon, the feasibility and effectiveness of roof support techniques in the bedded salt sites described, and maintenance of underground openings.

Response

The DOE has considered the issue indicated and clarified the related discussion in Section 3.2.6 of the EA. The DOE has modified Section 6.3.3.2 of the EA to reflect the following discussion.

The stratigraphy for the Deaf Smith County site is described in Section 3.2.3.2 of the EA. The host salt sequence is essentially unlimited in horizontal extent. The vertical extent is about 48 meters (160 feet). Included in this horizon are interbeds of anhydrite, siltstone, and claystone. It is desirable for the waste package emplacement location to avoid interbeds, as these anomalous zones complicate analysis. A homogeneous roof beam is also desirable, as a monolithic roof is inherently stronger. In order to stay in the better (purest) salt regions, the repository level could be varied as development progresses. Such height adjustments are not expected to place major constraints on repository design.

Slow, continual creep of salt is not directly a problem, although it may affect repository functions over a period of time. Salt creep may, however, create local instabilities. Some combination of roof bolts, stress control mining, steel arch canopies, and other techniques should be successful in temporary control of local unstable conditions.

The underground openings will slowly close due to salt creep. Elevated temperatures from the emplaced waste will result in higher than normal creep rates. Other than causing possible roof stability concerns as discussed above, this phenomenon does not seriously constrain design. Openings can either be overcut to allow for creep or they can be kept open by periodic rescaling.

Issue

A few commenters stated that the retrievability of waste canisters from a backfilled room in salt poses a number of questions which need to be addressed. The main questions relate to creep of salt, excavation technology required to excavate consolidated salt backfill without damaging waste canisters, and the method of determining the locations of canisters within consolidated salt.

Response

The DOE has modified Section 6.3.3.2 to reflect the following discussions.

Creep of salt applies to two retrievability issues, reexcavation of waste rooms and removal of canisters from emplacement holes. Even with early backfilling, substantial closure of waste rooms prior to retrieval operations is likely. In order to provide the room height needed for overcoring (if needed, see below) or for lifting waste packages from the holes, remining will be needed to remove some in situ salt, mostly from the roof, in addition to the consolidated backfill. Remining of backfill and in situ salt can be accomplished by the same techniques as original waste room excavation with the addition of needed cooling and, more intensive ground support measures.

If waste packages are placed in open holes, either with or without crushed salt backfill, the creep of the in situ salt is expected to close the airgap around the hole shortly after emplacement. The waste package is designed to withstand any stress resulting from the closure, but removal of the package, in this case, may require overcoring. This emplacement mode, however, is only the simplest of several contemplated by the DOE which include, but are not limited to, horizontal emplacement of one or more canisters in holes drilled into the pillar between rooms, the use of large holes without backfill, the use of steel or concrete sleeves to line emplacement holes, and combinations of these methods. The use of sleeves, for example, should eliminate concerns about the effect of creep closure on location and removal of waste packages in retrieval operations.

The EA describes only the simplest scheme for waste emplacement, i.e., a single row of vertical holes in the floor of the storage room with each hole containing a single vertically placed waste package surrounded by crushed salt. Creep of the in situ salt at elevated temperature surrounding the canister will reconsolidate the crushed salt and put a compressive stress on the waste package surface. This clamping action will prevent the retrieval of the waste form without either opening the waste package overpack or overcoring or reexcavating the waste package.

A variety of location techniques are available including surveying from permanent monuments located outside the high temperature area, metal detectors, radioactivity detectors, and earth penetrating radar, which, when used by themselves or the combination, can provide sufficiently accurate position data.

Notwithstanding the preceding discussion, the potential for deleterious rock mass response to higher-than-ambient temperature during repository operation is uncertain. It is not possible at present to estimate support requirements for retrieval, which is considered part of repository operation as defined in 10 CFR 960.2. It is for this reason that the finding for the second favorable condition of the rock characteristics guideline (10 CFR 960.5-2-9[b][2]) has been evaluated to indicate that "the evidence indicates that the favorable condition is not present."

Issue

Some commenters noted that a number of performance concerns with respect to the construction, operation, and decommissioning of the shafts need investigation and should be discussed. Broadly, these are the performance of seals in the shaft during construction, operation, and decommissioning; a site-specific evaluation of the feasibility and effectiveness of the freezing operations required for shaft construction; and the stability and deformation of the shaft with time as it undergoes thermal loading.

Response

The DOE has considered the issue indicated and has modified and clarified the related discussions in Section 3.2.6 of the EA. Section 6.3.3.2 has been modified to reflect the following discussion.

The use of ground freezing technology for shaft sinking is a well understood and viable technique for sinking shafts through well-consolidated or poorly-consolidated ground that is partially or fully saturated with water.

Shaft sinking by the freezing method has been accomplished for salt mines. However, the strict sealing requirements for repository shafts would require a slightly different approach than used in the past.

The freezing method appears to have minimal impact on mechanical properties, although clay partings may deform when frozen. If the freezing and thawing cycle results in increased permeability immediately adjacent to the shaft, the potential downward flow can be controlled with installation of a grout curtain or an impermeable keyway below the freeze region.

In general, the techniques of ground freezing, aquifer dewatering, and formation grouting are existing technology that have had extensive use in sinking shafts.

Two types of shaft seals need to be recognized. One type will be installed during shaft construction to prevent the flooding of the underground workings by aquifers and also to prevent contamination of the aquifers themselves. A second type of seal will be installed during shaft decommissioning as the shaft is being backfilled. The purpose of this type of seal is to prevent access of surface and aquifer water to the repository level and vice versa. The first

type (construction timeframe) is a preclosure seal whereas the second type (backfill) is a postclosure seal.

Commenters were concerned that the disturbed zone around the shaft seal system had been neglected. Analyses of Gureghian et al. (1983, ONWI-494) were made assuming that main flow was through the seals only. However, any salt dissolution through any available pathway would quickly stop without a mechanism to cycle fresh water in and out of the salt, and given the large distances that the sealed shafts will be located from any repository rooms containing waste, it is unlikely under expected site conditions, that massive amounts of dissolution could occur around the shafts to uncover any waste.

The thermal pulse from the repository has been estimated to be 1 C to 2 C (17 F to 35 F) at the base of the shaft after 1,000 years (Kelsall et al., 1985, BMI/ONWI-564). This small temperature changes should have a negligible effect on the stability and deformation of the shaft, as well as minimal effect on the shaft seals. Accordingly, this issue is not identified as a concern in the EA.

C.8.3 PRECLOSURE HYDROLOGY

Issues relating to preclosure hydrology, particularly to shaft sealing, were raised by a number of commenters. These issues are addressed in sections of the EA which discuss repository design at the site. Issues raised by the commenters include the following:

- Inadequate evidence to support water quantity conclusions
- Local site flooding.

Issue

A few commenters noted that the discussions in the EA do not adequately support the conclusion that adequate quantities of ground water are available to support repository construction, operation, and closure.

Also, one commenter notes that the data presented in Table 5-1 (Comparison of Alternative Repository Design Concepts, Deaf Smith County Site) appears to be inconsistent, in that, based on daily average construction usage, the total average construction usage appears to be low by an order of magnitude.

Response

The water consumption requirements have been re-analyzed and the updated results presented in Table 5-1 of the EA. The DOE has reviewed the evidence regarding water quantities and has concluded that the evidence meets the requirements of 10 CFR Part 960.3-1-4-2 for the nomination of a site as suitable for characterization. The text has been modified in the EA to reflect these comments.

Issue

A commenter is concerned that local site flooding is inadequately addressed in the EA, particularly with regard to the playas on the site.

Response

The DOE has reviewed the preclosure guideline findings with respect to Hydrology (10 CFR 960.5-2-10) and the potential for surface flooding at the site. The DOE has taken a strict interpretation of the favorable condition for the guideline, wherein if any portion of the restricted area lies within the probable maximum flood (PMF), then the favorable condition shall not be present.

Small portions of the restricted area of the site lie within the PMF of an unnamed tributary of north Palo Duro Creek. Therefore, the guideline finding (10 CFR 960.5-2-10) has been changed to reflect a "not present" for the favorable condition.

C.8.4 PRECLOSURE TECTONICS

The potential for induced seismicity at the site was discussed and questioned by several commenters. Seismic issues are related to discussions in Chapters 3 and 6 of the EA. Issues raised by the commenters include the following:

- Active tectonic faults in the region
- Contradictions between table and the text
- Consideration of soil-column influence
- Confusing discussion of postulated seismic events and acceleration
- Inappropriate seismic-design parameters
- Potential for induced seismicity.

Issue

A few commenters stated that it is incorrect to say there are no active tectonic faults in the region; the Meers Fault is an example.

Response

The DOE has rewritten the text for clarity and has used the term "geologic setting" rather than "region" in this instance. The Meers Fault is about 320 kilometers (200 miles) from the site, lying along the north edge of the Amarillo Uplift. The southern boundary of the uplift forms a boundary of the geologic setting. The DOE has revised the EA in response to these comments in Sections 6.3.3.4.1 and 6.3.1.7.

Issue

A few commenters stated that the finding for part (c)(1) of preclosure guideline 10 CFR 960.5-2-11, Tectonics, in Section 6.3.3.4 in Table 6-12, Preclosure Technical Guidelines Requiring Site Characterization, Deaf Smith County Site, contradicts the data and the text.

Response

The DOE has checked Table 6-12, Preclosure Technical Guidelines Requiring Site Characterization, Deaf Smith County Site, and corrected the entry for part (c)(1) in Section 6.3.3.4 to agree with the data and the text.

Issue

Several commenters stated that soil-column influence should be considered in predicting ground motions and their effects on shafts, seals, and critical facilities.

Response

The DOE has modified the EA to indicate that soil-column influence is a modifying factor and not expected to greatly affect the estimated ground motion. In general, the site-specific effects would modify the ground motions in a way that is important for engineering calculations, but not enough to cause difficult safety problems. The DOE has revised the EA in response to these comments in Section 6.3.3.4.3.

Issue

One commenter stated that discussion of postulated seismic events and accelerations is unnecessarily confusing.

Response

The DOE has rewritten the text for clarity and has emphasized two points. First, several hypothetical earthquake sources were analyzed. Second, a conservative case from the analyses was taken as the maximum credible earthquake at the site. The DOE has revised the EA in response to these comments in Sections 6.3.3.4 and 3.2.5.3.

Issue

Some commenters stated that the potential for seismicity induced by repository construction should be addressed.

Response

The DOE has modified the text to indicate that the Deaf Smith County site has very low potential for induced seismicity. There are no known examples of induced seismicity in the geologic setting. The low rate of natural seismicity in the geologic setting suggests the absence of significant tectonism that could establish the conditions suitable for induced seismicity. Although not in the geologic setting, there is induced seismicity near Kermit, Texas, on the Central Platform of the Midland Basin. Seismicity there is apparently related to secondary recovery operations for petroleum production. The Kermit example is a single exception among a very large number of oil fields in the Permian Basin that do not have any known associated seismic events. Any large underground excavation can cause seismic events, if caving or subsidence are allowed to occur. Analysis for induced seismicity potential and design for excavation will require site-specific data on stress fields and rock properties. The DOE has modified the EA in Section 6.3.3.4 in response to this comment.

Issue

Several commenters stated that seismic-design parameters used for nuclear power plants are not appropriate for repositories.

Response

The DOE has rewritten the text for clarity and has noted that it is correct and appropriate to state that the estimates for maximum earthquakes are comparable to, or lower than, design levels used for other nuclear facilities. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has not specified the methodology and criteria for seismic analysis for repositories. However, the NRC Regulatory Guide 4.17 (NRC, 1985) in draft versions indicates that the methodology and approach will be quite similar to those used for other nuclear facilities. The DOE has revised the EA in response to this comment in Section 6.3.3.4.

C.8.5 SYSTEM GUIDELINE

Questions relating to the performance of a repository at the Deaf Smith County site as an integrated system were considered as part of the preclosure siting guidelines. Performance issues are related particularly to sections of Chapters 5 and 6 of the EA. Issues raised by the commenters include the following:

- Inadequacy of the EA with regard to sealing descriptions
- Gathering of in situ characteristics data
- Lack of in situ data
- Uncertainties associated with the rock mechanics of retrieval.

Issue

One commenter noted that the EA is inadequate with regard to sealing descriptions. Specifically, it was noted that sealing uncertainties associated with freezing and then thawing of the ground during shaft construction and the resulting seal integrity for repository closure should be discussed in Section 6.3.3.2.3 of the EA.

Response

The DOE has examined the EA with regard to sealing and notes that ground freezing, as a method for sinking shafts through wet formations, is a well-proven technology that has been demonstrated around the world (Djahanguiri, 1984). Effects of ground freezing on the site will be further investigated during site characterization and results will be presented in the license application if the site is selected for repository construction.

It should be noted that the postclosure sealing system will not necessarily rely on the initial shaft seals as the postclosure seal barrier below the Ogallala and Dockum aquifers. Much work remains to be done to design and test postclosure shaft seals.

The DOE has modified Sections 5.1 and 5.1.4.2 to clarify current uncertainties associated with the freeze and thaw cycle and to distinguish between post and preclosure sealing.

Issue

One commenter has stated that the EA is inadequate with regard to site characterization. Specifically, the following concerns were noted: No in-situ characteristics data have been gathered to indicate potentially adverse conditions. Assumption of nonexistence of geologic anomalies at repository site is invalid due to lack of in situ data. Site-specific exploration activity that would indicate whether that site is suitable for a repository.

Response

The DOE has examined the EA with regard to site characterization and notes the following:

1. As field exploration expands, the design process evolves, and additional in situ data became available, confidence in the selection of a suitable site for the repository will be improved. However, data will be added during the preparation of the site characterization plan and environmental impact statement.
2. Even after detailed field exploration activities, it will be difficult to prove that any chosen repository site will be completely free of

geologic anomalies, but the level of confidence in regard to selection of a site will increase as a result of site characterization activities.

3. The DOE concurs that in situ characterization will assist in better understanding of in situ stresses, strength properties, and physical properties of salt and other overlaying and underlaying beds. In situ characterization will also enhance information which is needed for design, operation, backfilling, and retrievability of the repository.

The DOE has modified EA Section 6.3.3.2.3 for clarification of these issues.

Issue

One commenter noted that the EA has not adequately discussed uncertainties associated with the rock mechanics of retrieval. The commenter expressed concern that retrieval operations could be significantly impacted by adverse conditions created by elevated temperatures, especially in a heterogeneous host rock.

Specifically, the commenter is concerned with the following:

- Lack of discussion which addresses the response of a potentially heterogeneous host rock mass to variations in the areal heat loading density and uncertainties related to drift opening maintenance and room stability
- Insufficient discussions of retrievability with respect to the potentially adverse effects associated with heterogeneities of the rock mass and elevated temperatures such as reduced rock strength, accelerated creep, pressurized gases surrounding the waste canisters, and hot brine flow
- Reexcavation in areas of heterogeneities (clay interbeds and muddy salt units)
- Maintaining room stability
- Locating and removing canisters.

Response

The DOE does not agree that the EA is inadequate in addressing the effects of the response of heterogeneous host rock and variations in heat loading on reexcavation of backfilled waste rooms. Reexcavation will, as noted, be primarily in reconsolidated backfill which will be homogeneous and should contain no clay interbeds or muddy salt units. Backfill characteristics will be evaluated as part of the proof-of-principle demonstration period prior to license application.

Closure of the host rock after backfilling will be under relatively stable conditions since deformations will be potentially resisted by the plastic flow of the recompacting fill. The amount of closure will be approximately by the in-place porosity of the emplaced fill which will be determined during proof-of-principle testing of backfilling methods.

The DOE concurs with concerns expressed about room stability during re-excavation and retrieval operations to the extent that additional care must be taken during remining. The extent and degree of room stability problems are presently under study as part of the design process. Methods and materials for room stabilization will be designed and tested as required as part of the proof-of-principle program.

The DOE concurs with the commenter that high temperatures coupled with inhomogeneities in the in situ salt of the borehole wall could cause some problems in removing the canisters.

It is noted that while the EA describes only the simplest scheme for waste emplacement (i.e., a single row of holes in the floor of the storage room), each containing a single, vertically placed canister surrounded by 2.5 or 2.75 centimeters (1 or 1.1 inches) of crushed salt, or other emplacement methods include, but are not limited to, horizontal emplacement of one or more canisters in holes drilled into the pillars between rooms, the use of large holes without salt backfill, and the use of steel or concrete sleeves to line emplacement holes.

Some of these methods, especially those involving the use of heavy sleeves, obviously improve conditions for both location and retrieval of waste packages. These emplacement methods are being evaluated during the design process and precicensing retrievability proof-of-concept period with a final selection to be made prior to license application.

Section 5.1 of the EA has been modified to clarify the DOE's current position and status on the retrieval issue.

C.8.6 CHAPTER C.8 REFERENCES

C.8.6.1 References Listed by Author

Djahanguiri, F., 1984. Memorandum from Djahanguiri to John Treadwell, both of Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH, about the history of shaft freezing and its application to the Salt Repository Project, June 1.

Gureghian, A. B., L. A. Scott, and G. E. Raines, 1983. Performance Assessment of a Shaft Seals System in an HLW Repository in the Gibson Dome Area, ONWI-494, Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

Kelsall, P. C., J. B. Case, W. E. Coons, J. G. Franzone, and D. Meyer, 1985. Schematic Designs for Penetration Seals for a Repository in the Permian Basin, BMI/ONWI-564, prepared by IT Corporation for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 1985. "Standard Format and Content of Site Characterization Plans for High-Level-Waste Geologic Repositories," Regulatory Guide 4.17, Proposed Revision 1, Washington, DC, February.

C.8.6.2 Federal Regulations and Statutes

10 CFR Part 960, Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982; General Guidelines for the Recommendation of Sites for the Nuclear Waste Repositories;; Final Siting Guidelines.

C.9 COMMENT-RESPONSE INDEX

In its Federal Register notice of December 20, 1984, announcing the availability of the draft EAs, the DOE requested that interested parties review the documents and send their comments to the DOE in Washington, D.C. for the comment record. In addition, the DOE held a series of public hearings in the six first-repository States and one adjacent State. The written and oral testimony from these hearings was also included in the formal comment record.

Each letter and the testimony of each hearing participant were assigned a number. The letters and testimony were then reviewed to identify comments, and the comments in each letter were numbered sequentially. Copies of the comments and letters can be seen at the DOE reading rooms in Washington, D.C.; Columbus, Ohio; Las Vegas, Nevada; and Richland, Washington. The individual comments were assigned a classification code that corresponds to a subject area in the comment-response document (CRD). In some cases, a comment was addressed in more than one subject area in the CRD, and these comments were assigned more than one classification code.

This index lists all of the comments that apply to the draft EAs for the salt sites (Davis Canyon, Deaf Smith and Richton). By using this index, the commenter can find the section of the CRD that discusses the issues raised in his or her comment letter or testimony at a public hearing. The commenters are listed by State. The index lists the commenters alphabetically by their last name, their organizational affiliation where applicable, the number assigned to the letter or testimony, the comment numbers, the specific EA (the site column lists DC for the Davis Canyon EA, DS for the Deaf Smith EA, and RN for the Richton EA) and the classification number for that comment. If the issues raised by the comment are discussed in more than one section of the CRD, additional classification numbers were assigned and are listed in the second, third, and fourth classification columns. Up to four classifications can be listed for each comment.

Thus, to see how the DOE classified the comments and responded to the issues raised in your comment letter or hearing testimony, look up your name under the listing from your State. Under the comment column number you will find a list of the comments the DOE identified in your letter. In the site column, find the specific CRD where your comments are addressed. In the classification column find the classification number(s) assigned to that comment. The classification numbers refer to the sections of the CRD, and the CRD Table of Contents will show the page numbers for the section that discusses the issues raised by your comments.

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Alabama</u>									
	Graham, Gary	NPCA	00155	00001	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00155	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00155	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00155	00004	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00155	00005A	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Leonard, R. Michael		00155	00005B	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			02077	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02077	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02077	00003	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--	--
			02077	00004	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			02077	00005	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			<u>Alaska</u>						
Matz, Mike Wilkinson, Robert L.		00306	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
		00154	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--	
<u>Arkansas</u>									
	Schmidt, John & Adeline		00054	00001	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
<u>Arizona</u>									
	Campugano, Elizabeth	Friends Southwest Center	00175	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00175	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Ciaramitano, Mr. & Mrs. Joseph		00041	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00041	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Connolly, Marjorie		02675	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02675	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	C.7.2.5	--	--
			02675	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Corkett, David		00227	00001	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			00227	00002	DC	C.5.7	--	--	--
			00227	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Coxhead, Richard A. Dankwort, Rudolf		00409	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00413	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00413	00002	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
			00413	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00104	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Arizona</u> (continued)									
			00104	00002A	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00104	00002B	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			00104	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Evans, Arthur H.		00096	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00096	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Fathe, Fred C.		00259	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00259	00002	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00259	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Findlay, III, Robert S.		00253	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00253	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Freitag, Clarence & Iris		00678	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00678	00002	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
	Gallagher, Jim and Delphine		00395	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Hill, Richard C.		01347	00001	DC	C.7.1.2	C.7.1.1.2	--	--
			01347	00002	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01347	00003	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01347	00004	DC	C.7.4	C.7.2	--	--
			01347	00005	DC	C.5.1	C.7.2.6	--	--
			01347	00006	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Hirsh, Sidney M.		00233	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00233	00002	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
	Hodous, Dr. Robert	Inscription House Health Center	00435	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00435	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Hubley, F. K.		00050	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Hulmes, Doug	Prescott College	00272	00001	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
			00272	00002	DC	C.4.1.2.1	--	--	--
			00272	00003	DC	C.4.1.1	--	--	--
			00272	00004	DC	C.4.1.4	--	--	--
			00272	00005	DC	C.6.5	--	--	--
	Jefferson, Mark		00280	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Kissock, Kelly	Verde Valley School, Math Dept.	01533	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01533	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01533	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Lawson, Duane		01313	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01313	00002	DC	C.7.4	C.7.2.4	--	--
			01313	00003	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01313	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01313	00005	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Arizona</u> (continued)									
	Lundquist, Evelyn		01084	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Lundstrom, Kristen		00067	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00067	00002	DC	C.4.1.2.3	--	--	--
	McCarty, Doug		00223	00001	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00223	00002	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00223	00003A	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
			00223	00003B	DS	C.6.5	--	--	--
			00223	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			00223	00005	DS	C.6.4	--	--	--
			00223	00006	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
			00223	00007	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
	McClelland, Brian K		01353	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01353	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01353	00003	DC	C.7.2.4	C.7.2.5	--	--
			01353	00004	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
	O'Neill, Colleen		00329	00001	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00329	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00329	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Pamperin, John F.		00170	00001	DC	C.6.5	--	--	--
	Vicini, Linda M.		00244	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00244	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Waldo, Matthew		00546	00001	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00546	00002	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			00546	00003	DC	C.4.1.3.5	--	--	--
			00546	00004	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Winter, John T.		00310	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00310	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00310	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
<u>California</u>									
	Anonymous		00106	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Augenbraun, Bernice		00256	00001	DC	C.7.1.1	C.7.2	--	--
			00256	00002	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
	Bacher Jr., Mrs. Frederick A.		00101	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00101	00002	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.1.1.4	--	--
			00101	00003	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.1.1.4	--	--
			00101	00004	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
California (continued)									
Ballsun, C.			00101	00005	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00075	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00075	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
Berke, Eleanor			00075	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00351	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00351	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00351	00003	DC	C.7.2.4	C.7.2.5	--	--
Bock, A.J.	American Rock Art Research Assc.		00351	00004	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
			01056	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01056	00002	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
			01056	00003	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
Bridenbecker, Robert H.	Southern CA Edison Co.		01056	00004	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			01351	00001	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			01351	00002	RN,DC,DS	C.4.1	C.2.7	--	--
			01351	00003	RN,DC,DS	C.4.3	C.4.3	--	--
			01351	00004	RN,DC,DS	C.4.3	C.4.3	--	--
			01351	00005	-----	C.2.8.3	C.4.3	--	--
			01351	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
Cameron, Lillian S.		00115	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
		00115	00002A	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--	
		00115	00002B	DC	C.6.5	--	--	--	
		00115	00002C	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--	
		00115	00003	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--	
		00115	00004	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--	
		00115	00005	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
		00267	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
Campbell, Todd		00267	00002	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--	
		00267	00003	DC	C.4.1.3	C.7.2	C.7.4	C.4.1.5	
		00267	00004	DC	C.4.1.5	--	--	--	
		00267	00005	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--	
		00294	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--	
Carey, Patrick F. Clothier, Julia		02104	00001	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--	
		02104	00002	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.2.4	
		02104	00003	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--	--	
		02104	00004	DC	C.7.1.1.6	C.7.2.6	--	--	
		02104	00005	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--	
		02104	00006	DC	C.7.1.1.3	C.7.2.3	--	--	
		02104	00007	DC	C.7.1.1.2	C.7.2.2	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>California</u> (continued)									
	Durbin, Emily	Sierra Club	02104	00008	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
	Eggleston, Cathy		01221	00009	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Fahlen, Dorothy		00491	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
	Foch, Jr., James D.		00389	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			01396	00001	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--	--
			01396	00002	DC	C.7.2.5	C.7.1.1.5	--	--
			01396	00003	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--	--
			01396	00004	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--	--
			01396	00005	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			01396	00006	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01396	00007	DC	C.4.1.3.4	--	--	--
			01396	00008	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01396	00009	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01396	00010	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01396	00011	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01396	00012	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--	--
			01396	00013	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01396	00014	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			01396	00015	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01396	00016	DC	C.4.1.5	--	--	--
			01396	00017	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--	--
			01396	00018	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--	--
			01396	00019	DC	C.4.1.3.4	--	--	--
			01396	00020	DC	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01396	00021	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01396	00022	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01396	00023	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01396	00024	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01396	00025	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01396	00026	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01396	00027	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01396	00028	DC	C.7.2.5	C.7.1.1.5	--	--
			01396	00029	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--	--
			01396	00030	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--	--
			01396	00031	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			01396	00032	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			01396	00033	DC	C.7.2.5	C.7.1.1.5	--	--
	Frey, Jean Ann		00229	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
California (continued)									
	Geisler, Dorothy		00073	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00073	00002	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			00073	00003	DC	C.4.2.1	--	--	--
			00073	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00073	00005	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
	Gill, Cathy M.		01158	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Goodman, Michael		00222	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00222	00002	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
	Gross, Caroline		00225	00001	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
			00225	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00225	00003	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
	Gunsky, Frederic R.		00068	00001	-----	C.3.3.1	--	--	--
			00068	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Hershenhorn, Joanne		00334	00001	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			00334	00002	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			00334	00003	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
	Holladay, Kevin		01060	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01060	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01060	00003	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01060	00004	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01060	00005	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
	Jett, Dr. Stephen C.	Univ. Cal. Geog. Dept	00016	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00016	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Jones-Johnson, Ola Mae		00027	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Jones-Smith, Aree		00023	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Jones-Smith, Willie Lou		00032	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Lundholm, Mrs. A. N.		02108	00001	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
	Martin, Frankie and Bob		00107	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00107	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	McCreery, Scott		01133	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Mitchell, Mrs. Barbara A.		00179	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00179	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00179	00003	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00179	00004	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00179	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Moore, Carey		00019	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Moore, Willie		00025	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Moore, Kelvin		00033	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

C.9-9

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
California (continued)									
	Moore, Sr., Albert B.		00018	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Moore-Loud, Gloria D.		00039	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Moore-Parker, Laura		00024	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Moore-Robinson, Annie		00026	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Olson, Angela L.		00323	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00323	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Oman, Barbara		02704	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02704	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Parkins, Cheryl		01062	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Patterson, Wendy Bents		02610	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02610	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Poland, Roscoe A.	Conservation Call	00198	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00198	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Preyer, Bernard		02700	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02700	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Ramsey, Rande		01194	00001	DC	C.7.1.1.3	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.1.1.5	--
			01194	00002	DC	C.7.4	C.7.2.4	--	--
			01194	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01194	00004	-----	C.7.1	--	--	--
			01194	00005	DC	C.7.4	C.7.2.4	--	--
	Ready, James P.	The James P. Ready Co.	01577	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Rittenhouse, Jan		00328	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00328	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Rivers, Walter		00361	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Robertson, Marilyn		01579	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01579	00002	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			01579	00003	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			01579	00004	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
	Ryall, Marjorie M.		00117	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00117	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00117	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00117	00004	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00117	00005	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00117	00006	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Saretsky, Richard D.		00279	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00279	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Sawyer, Benjamin		02701	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02701	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION				
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	
<u>California</u> (continued)										
C.9-10	Schuster, Megan H.	Ecology Ctr. of So. California	02701	00003	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--	
			00439	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--	
			00439	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
	Senn, Dick		00100	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--	
			Skews, Geoff	00133	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
				00133	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	00133			00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--	
	00133		00004	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--		
	Spotts, Richard		00133	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
			Stansfield, Elaine	00184	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
				Ecology Ctr. of So. California	00059	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--
	00059				00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	00059		00003A		-----	C.2.7	--	--	--	
	00059		00003B	-----	C.3.4.2.1	--	--	--		
	Swanson, John R.		00059	00038	-----	C.2.8.1	C.2.8.2	--	--	
			Uhlar, Daniel J.	00446	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
				00399	00001	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
	00399			00002A	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--	
	00399		00002B	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--		
	00399		00003	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--		
	00399		00004	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--		
	Wasson, Glenn E.		00399	00005	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--	
			Ecology Ctr. of So. California	00254	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
				00254	00004	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
	00254			00005	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--	
	00254		00006	-----	C.2.8	--	--	--		
	00254		00007	-----	C.2.1	--	--	--		
	00254		00008	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--		
	00254		00011	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--		
	00254		00012	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--		
	Weatherwax, Robert K.		00254	00013	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--	
			Sierra Energy & Risk Assessment	01366	00001	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--
				01366	00002	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
	01366	00003		-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--		
	01366	00004	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--			
	01366	00005	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--			
	01366	00006	-----	C.3.4.2	--	--	--			
	01366	00007	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--			

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>California</u> (continued)									
Webster, Donald B. Woods, Nancy Yasuda, Don	01366	00008	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--		
	01366	00009	-----	C.3.3	--	--	--		
	01366	00010	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--		
	01366	00011	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--		
	00613	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--		
	00095	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--		
	00443	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--		
	00443	00002A	DC	C.4.1.1	--	--	--		
	00443	00002B	DC	C.4.2.3	--	--	--		
	00443	00002C	DC	C.3.2	--	--	--		
	00443	00003	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--		
	00443	00004	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--		
	00443	00005	DC	C.4.2.3	--	--	--		
	00443	00006	DC	C.4.2.3	--	--	--		
	00443	00007	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--		
	York, Jennifer	00060	00001	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--	
00060		00001A	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
00060		00001B	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--		
00060		00002A	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--		
00060		00002B	DC	C.6.5	--	--	--		
<u>Colorado</u>									
Dowell, Bill, Marcia & Ryan	01546	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
	01546	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
Adams, Cass	01178	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--		
	01178	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--		
Adams, Craig	01304	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
	01304	00002	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--		
Anderson, John and Leanna	00527	00001	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--		
	00527	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--		
	00527	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
Anderson, Virginia S.	00581	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
	00581	00002	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--		
	00581	00003	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--		
	00581	00004	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--		
	00318	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
Anderst, Daryl	00562	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--		
Andy, Charles									

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Colorado</u> (continued)									
	Anonymous		01184	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01184	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			01184	00003	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
	Armstrong, Jack		00680	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	C.7.2.5	--	--
	Auerlah, Catherine E.		00601	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00601	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Bailey, L. Reed		00263	00001	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
	Baker, Ellen F.		00641	00001	DC	C.6.5	C.7.2.4	--	--
	Bartley, Ben		00565	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Bedwell, Jackie		00636	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00636	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Below, Joan A.		00594	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00594	00002	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
	Benjamin, Laurie		00350	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00350	00002	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00350	00003	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
	Benjamin, Robert P.		00359	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Benjamin, Albert C.		00595	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Bennett, Sandy		01049	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Berg, Ken		00331	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Bernard, Joan		00307	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Bertram, Diane		00410	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Biggers, John		01371	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			01371	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Binkowski, David J.		00634	00001	DC	C.7.1	--	--	--
			00634	00002	-----	C.7.1	--	--	--
	Blair, Marrette		01190	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	C.7.4	--	--
	Bloom, Claudia		00260	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00260	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Bly, Karel S.		01141	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Bomer, Frances		00559	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00559	00002	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
	Borkovec, Rick		01256	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01256	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Borowski, Ann		01377	00001	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01377	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Borton, Perry		01334	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01334	00002	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Colorado</u> (continued)									
C.9-13	Boss, Roger		01336	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01336	00002	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
	Boyce, Cheryl		00584	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Brainerd, Alice		00346	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00346	00002	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
	Breazzano, Debra		00558	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Bretter, Anna		00585	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00585	00002	DC	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
			00585	00003	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			00585	00004	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00585	00005	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00585	00006	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
	Brown, Keri		00596	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Bundquist, Todd		00583	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Burns, Larry and Susan		00381	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
	Burpee, Elizabeth		00586	00001	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
			00586	00002	DC	C.7.2	C.7.3	--	--
			00586	00003	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
	Byerly, Alan		00398	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00398	00002	DC	C.6.5	--	--	--
			00549	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Byerly, Gay Porter		01303	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01303	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01303	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Carney, Jerry & Jennifer S.		00078	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00078	00002	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00078	00003A	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			00078	00003B	DC	C.5.2	--	--	--
			00078	00004	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00078	00005	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00078	00006	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00078	00007	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00078	00008	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			00078	00009	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Cawthon, Karl		00563	00001	DC	C.3.2	--	--	--
	Clark, Caroline		00563	00002	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
	Cline, Andy		01349	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01175	00001	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

C.9-14

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Colorado (continued)									
	Coburn, Russell		00657	00001	DC	C.7.2.6	C.7.2.4	--	--
			00657	00002	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
	Coff, Harry E.		01182	00001	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
			01182	00002	DC	C.5.10	--	--	--
			01182	00003	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Coffee, Dr. George		00283	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Cole, Sally J.		01138	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01138	00002	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01138	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Cole, Nancy		02676	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			02676	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
	Conrod, William & Cheryl		01290	00001A	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			01290	00001B	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01290	00002	DC	C.5.1	C.5.11	--	--
	Cook, Jane M.		00607	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00607	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Cooper, Sandra H.		00660	00001	DC	C.7.1.1.9	--	--	--
			00660	00002	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			00660	00003	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00660	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Cowley, Tara		00573	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Cunningham, Hartley, Timothy & Janice		00385	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00385	00002	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00385	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Dailey, Carolyn J.	Fort Lewis College	00655	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00655	00002	DC	C.7.1.1	C.7.2	--	--
			00655	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00655	00004	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
	Denenberg, Diane		00635	00001	DC	C.7.2	C.7.4	--	--
			00635	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
	Dobben, Talie		01046	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Dyson, Rick		01064	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Eafanti, Donna		01183	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			01183	00002	DC	C.7.2.3	C.7.2.5	--	--
	Ells, Janis B.		01552	00001	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
	Engman, Shelley		00572	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00572	00002	DC	C.6.1	--	--	--
	Ewert, Daniel,Alex & Krista		01559	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

C.9-15

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Colorado (continued)									
	Farley, Paul J.		00128	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Farnsworth, Pam		00441	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00441	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00441	00003A	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00441	00003B	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
	Fay, Thomas		01223	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01223	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Fay, Janet M.		02255	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Ferst, F.		01185	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			01185	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01185	00003	-----	C.2.3	--	--	--
			01185	00004	-----	C.2.3	--	--	--
	Fitzpatrick,Jr., Joseph W.		01309	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01309	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Flohr, Ramona P.		00261	00001A	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			00261	00001B	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			00261	00002	DC	C.4.1.5	--	--	--
			00261	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Fogarty, Steven		00569	00001A	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00569	00001B	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00569	00001C	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00569	00001D	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Fogg, Peter L.		01123	00001	-----	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			01123	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01123	00003	-----	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01123	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01123	00005	-----	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01123	00006	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01123	00007	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01123	00008	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01123	00009	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			01123	00010	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01123	00011	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Fowler, Catherine		00566	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Fowler, Jessica		00606	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00606	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Fox, Genevieve		00577	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00577	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Colorado</u> (continued)									
C.9-16	Frankel, Miriam	Telluride Times	01345	00002	DC	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.2.4	--	--
			01345	00003	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			01345	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01345	00005	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
			01345	00006	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
	Friedman, Margaret		00615	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Friedman, Jonathan		01089	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01089	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			01089	00003	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
	Gardner, Heather		00588	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Geraghty, Matt		00428	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Gibbons, Mary Jo & John		01561	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Gobhardt, Larry		01375	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			01375	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Goeman, Mitchell J.		00539	00001	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
	Goodtimes, Art		02186	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02186	00002	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
	Goswick, Jeffrey		00603	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00603	00002	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Gray, Douglas E.		01179	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01179	00002	DC	C.7.1.2	C.7.2.4	--	--
	Grayson, Marie		00085	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00085	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00085	00003	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			00085	00004	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
	Green, Douglas J.		00654	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			00654	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Gregory, Lee		00215	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Griffiths, Dana		00591	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Gronwall, Raymond J.		00348	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00348	00002	DC	C.7.2	C.3.2	C.3.1.3	--
			00348	00003	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			00348	00004	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			00348	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			00348	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Groth, Mark and Kathy		00414	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00414	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Groves, Anthony		01176	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Colorado</u> (continued)									
			01176	00002	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01176	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Gruer, Mary K.		01177	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Gudavski, LeCindra		00545	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Hackl, Diane		00602	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Hamilton, Penny		00321	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Hands, Kathy		00478	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Hannegan,Jr., David W.		01159	00001	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01159	00002	DC	C.5.6	--	--	--
			01159	00003	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01159	00004	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			01159	00005	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			01159	00006	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
	Hart, Robert L. & Linda P.		00289	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Hartman, Julie		00241	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Hassan, Peter C.		00637	00001	DC	C.7.1	--	--	--
			00637	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Hauser, Dena		00580	00001	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
	Hautzinger, Andrew B.		01095	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Hazen, David		01181	00001	DC	C.7.1	--	--	--
			01181	00002	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
	Heitzer, Mark		01330	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01330	00002	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
	Hempel, Paul		01189	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Hinchman, John S.	Bent, St Vrain Partners Inc.	01310	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01310	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01310	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Hines, LeAnne		00444	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Huber, Katherine		01144	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Humphrey, Peter		02075	00001	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--	--
			02075	00002	DC	C.7.1.1.3	C.7.2.3	--	--
			02075	00003	DC	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.2.4	--	--
			02075	00004	DC	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.2.4	--	--
			02075	00005	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Hutchinson, Ian		00570	00001A	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00570	00001B	DC	C.5.10	--	--	--
	Jackson, Cathy		01332	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01332	00002	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Colorado</u> (continued)									
	Jernigan, Richard	Allied Bendix Aerospace	01257	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01257	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Johnson, Nina		00371	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Johnson, Misti		01255	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01255	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Jones, Charles A.		02660	00001	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
	Kaempfer, Suzanne H.		00013	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00013	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00013	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00013	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Kapushion, Nettie		01376	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			01376	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Keiser, Elizabeth		00293	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Kelly, Allen L.		02078	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Kiklevich, Roark, Eric & Abby	01548	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
		01548	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
	Kinnear, Sharyl A.	01137	00001	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--	
		01137	00002	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--	
		01137	00003	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--	
		01137	00004	DC	C.4.1.3.4	C.7.2.5	--	--	
		01137	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		01137	00006	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--	
	Kirk, Allison	01059	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
		01059	00002	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--	
		01059	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
		01059	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
	Kornreich, Scott K.	01225	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--	
		01225	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
	Kovanic, Ronald	01374	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--	
		01374	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
	Kurtz, Frederick W.	01254	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
		01254	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
	Kurtz, Robyn	01378	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--	
		01378	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
	Lamm, Governor Richard	State of Colorado	01398	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01398	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01398	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01398	00004	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--

61-6.3

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Colorado</u> (continued)									
			01398	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01398	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
			01398	00007	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01398	00008	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01398	00009	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01398	00010	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Landing, Sharon A.		00415	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Larsen, Suzanne		01204	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01204	00002	DC	C.7.4	C.7.2	--	--
			01204	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Lauer, Gregg		00633	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00633	00002	DC	C.7.2.3	C.7.2.5	--	--
	Lehman, Dale E.	Fort Lewis College	00118	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00118	00002A	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			00118	00002B	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00118	00002C	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00118	00003	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			00118	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00118	00005	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			00118	00006	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
	Lehmann, Scott K.	Univ. of Colorado, Boulder	00118	00007	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
			00503	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00503	00002	DC	C.3.2	--	--	--
			00503	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00503	00004	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00503	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00503	00006	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Lindheimer, Philippe		00582	00001	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			00582	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Lucas, David		00405	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00405	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00405	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Lucas, Emil J. & Dorothy		00623	00001	DC	C.7.1.1.3	C.7.2.3	--	--
			00623	00002	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--	--
			00623	00003	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00623	00004	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00623	00005	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
	Lucas, Ken		02227	00001	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Colorado</u> (continued)									
C.9-20	M., D. Magyar, John and Mike		02227	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			02227	00003	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			02227	00004	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
			02227	00005	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			02227	00006	DC	C.7.1.1	C.7.2	--	--
			00639	00001	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
			02661	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02661	00002	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			02661	00003	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			02661	00004	DC	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.4	C.7.2.5
	Major, Robert J. Margolis, Barbara E.		02661	00005	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02661	00006	DC	C.7.2.2	C.7.1.1.2	--	--
			02661	00007	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00599	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00082	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00082	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00571	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00571	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00548	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			Marsh, Tobin Marshall, Katherine J. Martin, James B. Environmental Defense Fund		01259	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--
	01259	00002			-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	01259	00003			-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	01259	00004			-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	01259	00005			-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	01259	00006			-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	01259	00007			-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	01259	00008			-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	01259	00009			-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	01259	00010			-----	C.5.7	--	--	--
	01259	00011			-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	01259	00012			-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	01259	00013			-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	01259	00014			-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	01259	00015			-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	01259	00016			-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	01259	00017			-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	01259	00018			-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	01259	00019	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--		

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Colorado</u> (continued)									
			01259	00020	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01259	00021	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01259	00022	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Mattina, Carol		01047	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Mattox, John		00587	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Mattox, Paul		00638	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00638	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
	May, Jeffrey		00311	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00311	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00311	00003	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--
	Maynard, Andrea G.		00153	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	McCool, Susan Garrison		02180	00001	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			02180	00002	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			02180	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	McCool, Lewis		02182	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02182	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			02182	00003	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			02182	00004	DC	C.7.1.1.6	--	--	--
			02182	00005	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			02182	00006	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			02182	00007	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			02182	00008	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			02182	00009	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			02182	00010	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
			02182	00011	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
			02182	00012	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
	McFarland, Kristy		01287	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	McNabb, Donald		01145	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	McLellan, Rosalind		01331	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01331	00002	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
	Mears, Mike and Marilyn		00472	00001	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
	Mears, Mike		01547	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01547	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Menefie, Christine		00590	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Miller, Annaliese		00593	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Miller, Kathy		01063	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Monash, Jessica		02611	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02611	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Colorado</u> (continued)									
			02611	00019	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--
	Montfredo, Steven		01373	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			01373	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Morehouse, Don		01312	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01312	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Muhlbeim, Robert John		00319	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00319	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Muller, Fred R.		01180	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01180	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	C.7.2.3	C.7.3	--
	Mullhauser, Amy		00658	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00658	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	C.6.5	--	--
	Nabil, David		01572	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01572	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Nailling, Elizabeth		02257	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02257	00002	DC	C.7.2.2	C.7.4.4	--	--
			02257	00003	DC	C.5.10	--	--	--
			02257	00004	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			02257	00005	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
	Najaft, Melinda		00561	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Nall, Chris		00354	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00354	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00354	00003	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--	--
	Nichell, David		00568	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Nowlin, Dawn		01329	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01329	00002	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
	Oberling, Bill		01562	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Olson, Florence J.		00337	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00337	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00337	00003	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00337	00004	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Pach, David		01372	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
	Palmer, Alice G. & Mark F.		01318	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01318	00002	DC	C.7.1.1.2	C.7.1	--	--
			01318	00003	-----	3.1	--	--	--
	Papp, Lawrence A.		00557	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00557	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00557	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00557	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Colorado</u> (continued)									
	Pearson, Mark D.		00557	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01337	00001	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01337	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01337	00003	DC	C.7.2.4	C.7.1.1.4	--	--
			01337	00004	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			01337	00005	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			01337	00006	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01337	00007	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Peck, Claudia		00525	00001	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
	Pehowski, Paula		00412	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Peineiaro, John		01191	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Pena, Mayor Frederico	City and County of Denver	02115	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02115	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02115	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02115	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02115	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Petersen, Paul		01201	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01201	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01201	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Petition		01088	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Petition		01187	00001	DC	C.7.1.1	C.7.2	C.7.4	--
	Pettit, Stephen		00564	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Pettit, S.		00598	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Phillips, Sue		00604	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00604	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Phillips, Jeff		01188	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Pond, Timothy C.		00578	00001A	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00578	00001B	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
	Redgenty, Robert D.		00600	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Richardson, Susan		00597	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Robnett, Douglas B.		02071	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Rogath, Vincent A.		00537	00001	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
	Rolphe, Timothy M.		01560	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Roof, Steven R.		00236	00001	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			00236	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00236	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Rose, Dr. Brian		00369	00001	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
	Ruckel, H. Anthony	Sierra Club Legal Defense Fund	01358	00001	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Colorado (continued)									
			01358	00002	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01358	00003	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01358	00004	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01358	00005	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01358	00006	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01358	00007	DC	C.5.2	--	--	--
			01358	00008	DC	C.5.4	--	--	--
			01358	00009	DC	C.5.5	--	--	--
			01358	00010	DC	C.5.6	--	--	--
			01358	00011	DC	C.5.6	--	--	--
			01358	00012	DC	C.5.7	--	--	--
			01358	00013	DC	C.5.8	--	--	--
			01358	00014	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01358	00015	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01358	00016	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01358	00017	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01358	00018	DC	C.3.2	--	--	--
			01358	00019	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01358	00020	DC	C.5.10	C.3.1.3	--	--
			01358	00021	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			01358	00022	DC	C.4.1.1	--	--	--
			01358	00023	DC	C.3.3.2	--	--	--
			01051	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00560	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00384	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
		Dept. Geological Sciences	00528	00001	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00528	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00528	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00304	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00605	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00605	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00605	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00400	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			01300	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01300	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01300	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01300	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00406	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Salek, P.								
	Salk, Joy L.								
	Saunders, C.								
	Savoy, Lauret								
	Scott, Steven K.								
	Shaw, Karyl L.								
	Shineovich, Jan								
	Shinn, Joyce A.								
	Slater, Mark								

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Colorado</u> (continued)									
C-9-25	Snyder, Harold and Roberta		00406	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00406	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00490	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
	Somrak, Mary Jo & Michael		00490	00002	DC	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
			00490	00003	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			01379	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
	Spence, Robin E.		01379	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01564	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00012	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Spezia, John W.		00012	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00012	00003	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			00012	00004	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Spivak, Paul		00012	00005	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			00012	00006	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00579	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Stansberry, Donna		00579	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01192	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00589	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Stevenson, Angeline G.		00589	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00592	00001	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00592	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Stewart, Carrie		00592	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00284	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00284	00002	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
	Stokes, Wendy L.		01050	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00534	00001	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00534	00002	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
	Street, Marianna		00534	00003	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00534	00004	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00534	00005	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Strunk, Michael B.		00147	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00575	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00575	00002	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
	Sucherman, Kathy		00575	00003	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			01045	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00576	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Sutton, Carolyn		00576	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02105	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Sweeney, Chris								
	Tausehn, Guy								
	Taylor, Larry M.	Interior Graphic Design							

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION				
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	
<u>Colorado</u> (continued)										
C.9-26			02105	00002	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--	--	
			02105	00003	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--	
			02105	00004	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--	--	
			02105	00005	DC	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.2.4	--	--	
			02105	00006	DC	C.7.1.1.6	C.7.2.6	--	--	
			02105	00007	DC	C.7.1.1.6	C.7.2.6	--	--	
			02105	00008	DC	C.7.1.1.8	C.7.2.8	--	--	
			02105	00009	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--	
			02105	00010	DC	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.2.4	--	--	
			02105	00011	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--	
			02105	00012	DC	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.2.4	--	--	
			02105	00013	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--	
			02105	00014	DC	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.2.4	--	--	
			02105	00015	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--	
			02105	00016	DC	C.5.10	C.5.8	--	--	
			02105	00017	DC	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.2.4	--	--	
		Thomas, Timothy J.		00567	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
		Thomas, Jan		01277	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
		Tuchyna, DeeAnn R.		00661	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
				00661	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
		Tyzzer, Andrew		01563	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
		Vanderbeek, Gerard J.		00352	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
				00352	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
				00352	00003	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
				00352	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
		Vick, Ronald E.		00609	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
				00609	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
		Vogler, Harry W.		00420	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
				00420	00002	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			Central Motive Power, Inc.	00498	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
		Vosley, M.		01048	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
		Wackewitz, Frances A.		00282	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
				00282	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
		Walker, Robin		00640	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
				00640	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
		Walker, Jeannette		01220	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
				01220	00002	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--
		Weiner, Kathleen		01087	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION					
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH		
<u>Colorado</u> (continued)											
C.9-27	Welch, Thomas E.		01087	00002	DC	C.7.1	--	--	--		
			01258	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
			01258	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
	West, David		00630	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
			Wiederrich, Chrystiane	00526	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--	
				Wiggans, Tamara	02181	00001	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
	02181				00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--	
	Will, Dale		02181		00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
			02181	00004	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--		
			02181	00005	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--		
			Williams, David R.	00458	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
				Worthington, Michael	00458	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	00458				00003	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--	
	Wurtz, Tom		00538		00001	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--	
			Yanz, John & Bonnie	01105	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
				01105	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
	Zinn, Sonya			02116	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
			Zinn, Lennard	01308	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
				01308	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
				01106	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
			01106	00002	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--		
			01106	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
			01174	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
			01174	00002	DC	C.7.4	C.7.2.4	--	--		
	<u>Connecticut</u>										
			Campbell, David	Yale Env. Litigation Program	00087	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
00523		00001			-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
Ceraso/Huang, Jane/William		00523	00006		-----	C.2.2	--	--	--		
		00523	00009		DS	C.7.4	--	--	--		
		00523	00010		DS	C.4.1.1.8	--	--	--		
		00523	00011		DS	C.3.1.3	--	--	--		
		00523	00012		-----	C.2.7	--	--	--		
		00523	00013		DS	C.7.4	--	--	--		
		00523	00017		-----	C.2.7	--	--	--		
		00523	00018		-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--		
Girdler, Barbara K.		00051	00001		DC	C.7.2	--	--	--		

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Connecticut (continued)</u>									
	Hughes, Mrs. John Farrel		00069	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Shesler, Alysia		00220	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00220	00002	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
			00220	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00220	00004	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00220	00008	DC	C.4.1.2.2	C.5.1	--	--
<u>Washington, D.C.</u>									
		U.S. Nuclear Reg. Commission	02679	00024	DC	C.5.7	C.8.4	--	--
			02679	00025	DC	C.5.7	C.8.4	--	--
			02679	00026	DC	C.5.7	C.8.4	--	--
			02679	00027	DC	C.5.7	C.8.4	--	--
			02679	00028	DC	C.5.6	--	--	--
			02679	00029	DC	C.5.2	C.5.3	--	--
			02679	00030	DC	C.5.3	C.8.2	--	--
			02679	00031	DC	C.5.7	--	--	--
			02679	00032	DC	C.5.8	--	--	--
			02679	00033	DC	C.6.6	--	--	--
			02679	00034	DC	C.4.1.1.2	--	--	--
			02679	00035	DC	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			02679	00036	DC	C.4.1.1.7	C.4.1.1.8	--	--
			02679	00037	RN	C.5.1	C.5.3	C.8.2	C.5.6
			02679	00038	RN	C.5.6	--	--	--
			02679	00039	RN	C.5.6	--	--	--
			02679	00040	RN	C.5.7	--	--	--
			02679	00041	RN	C.5.6	--	--	--
			02679	00042	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			02679	00046	RN	C.5.8	--	--	--
			02679	00058	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02679	00089	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Bedker, Ervin	Department of the Air Force	01074	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	C.6.4	--	--
	Bentsen, Senator Lloyd	U.S. Senate Comm on Environment	01399	00001	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01399	00002	DS	C.4.1	--	--	--
			01399	00003	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01399	00004	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01399	00005	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01399	00006	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
			01399	00007	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01399	00008	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01399	00009	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01399	00010	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01399	00011	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			01399	00012	DS	C.4.1	--	--	--
			01399	00013	DS	C.4.1.5	--	--	--
			01399	00014A	DS	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			01399	00014B	DS	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			01399	00014C	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01399	00015	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01399	00016	DS	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
			01399	00017	DS	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01399	00018	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01399	00019	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01399	00020	DS	C.7.4	C.7.1.2	--	--
			01399	00021	DS	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01399	00022	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01399	00023	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01399	00024	DS	C.7.1.1	C.7.2	--	--
			01399	00025	DS	C.7.4	C.7.1.2	--	--
			01399	00026	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
Berick, David		Environmental Policy Institute	01385	00001	-----	C.3.3.2	--	--	--
			01385	00005	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01385	00006	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			01385	00007	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--
			01385	00008A	-----	C.2.7.1	--	--	--
			01385	00008B	-----	C.2.7.1	--	--	--
			01385	00009A	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01385	00009B	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			01385	00010	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01385	00011	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			01385	00012A	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			01385	00012B	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01385	00012C	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			01385	00012D	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			01385	00012E	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01385	00012F	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
C.9-30	Berick, David	Environmental Policy Institute	01385	00013	-----	C.3.3	--	--	--
			01385	00014	-----	C.3.3	--	--	--
			01385	00015	-----	C.3.3	--	--	--
			01385	00016A	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01385	00016B	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01385	00016C	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01385	00016D	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01385	00017	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			01385	00018	-----	C.3.4.3	C.7.3	--	--
			01385	00019	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01385	00020	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01385	00021	-----	C.3.4.2.2	C.3.4.3	--	--
			01385	00022A	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			01385	00022B	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01385	00023A	-----	C.2.5.1	--	--	--
			01385	00023B	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01385	00024	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01385	00025	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01387	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01387	00005	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01387	00006	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			01387	00007	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--
			01387	00008A	-----	C.2.7.1	--	--	--
			01387	00008B	-----	C.2.7.1	--	--	--
			01387	00009	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			01387	00010	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01387	00011	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			01387	00012A	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			01387	00012B	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			01387	00012C	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			01387	00012D	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			01387	00012E	-----	C.3.3	--	--	--
			01387	00012F	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			01387	00013	-----	C.3.3	--	--	--
			01387	00014	-----	C.3.3	--	--	--
			01387	00015	-----	C.3.3	--	--	--
			01387	00016A	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01387	00016B	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
C.9-31	Berick, David	Environmental Policy Institute	01387	00016C	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01387	00016D	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01387	00017	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			01387	00018	-----	C.3.4.3	C.7.3	--	--
			01387	00019	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01387	00020	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01387	00021	-----	C.2.4.1	C.3.4.3	--	--
			01387	00022A	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			01387	00022B	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01387	00023A	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01387	00023B	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01387	00024	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01387	00025	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01388	00001	-----	C.3.3	--	--	--
			01388	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01388	00005	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01388	00006	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			01388	00007	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--
			01388	00008A	-----	C.2.7.1	--	--	--
			01388	00008B	-----	C.2.7.1	--	--	--
			01388	00009	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			01388	00010	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01388	00011	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			01388	00012A	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			01388	00012B	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			01388	00012C	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			01388	00012D	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			01388	00012E	-----	C.3.3	--	--	--
			01388	00012F	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			01388	00013	-----	C.3.3	--	--	--
			01388	00014	-----	C.3.3	--	--	--
			01388	00015	-----	C.3.3	--	--	--
			01388	00016A	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01388	00016B	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01388	00016C	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01388	00016D	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01388	00017	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			01388	00018	-----	C.3.4.3	C.7.3	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
C.9-32	Berick, David	Environmental Policy Institute	01388	00019	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01388	00020	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01388	00021	-----	C.2.4.1	C.3.4.3	--	--
			01388	00022A	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			01388	00022B	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01388	00023A	-----	C.2.5.1	--	--	--
			01388	00023B	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01388	00024	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01388	00025	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01389	00001	-----	C.3.3	--	--	--
			01389	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01389	00005	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01389	00006	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			01389	00007	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--
			01389	00008A	-----	C.2.7.1	--	--	--
			01389	00008B	-----	C.2.7.1	--	--	--
			01389	00009	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			01389	00010	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01389	00011	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			01389	00012A	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			01389	00012B	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			01389	00012C	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			01389	00012D	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			01389	00012E	-----	C.3.3	--	--	--
			01389	00012F	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			01389	00013	-----	C.3.3	--	--	--
			01389	00014	-----	C.3.3	--	--	--
			01389	00015	-----	C.3.3	--	--	--
			01389	00016A	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01389	00016B	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01389	00016C	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01389	00016D	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01389	00017	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			01389	00018	-----	C.3.4.3	C.7.3	--	--
			01389	00019	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01389	00020	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01389	00021	-----	C.2.4.1	C.3.4.3	--	--
			01389	00022A	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
C. 9-33	Berick, Director, David	Environmental Policy Institute	01389	00022B	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01389	00023A	-----	C.2.5.1	--	--	--
			01389	00023B	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01389	00024	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01389	00025	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01386	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01386	00005	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01386	00006	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			01386	00007	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--
			01386	00008A	-----	C.2.7.1	--	--	--
			01386	00008B	-----	C.2.7.1	--	--	--
			01386	00009	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			01386	00010	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01386	00011	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			01386	00012A	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			01386	00012B	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			01386	00012C	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			01386	00012D	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			01386	00012E	-----	C.3.3	--	--	--
			01386	00012F	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			01386	00013	-----	C.3.3	--	--	--
			01386	00014	-----	C.3.3	--	--	--
			01386	00015	-----	C.3.3	--	--	--
			01386	00016A	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01386	00016B	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01386	00016C	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01386	00016D	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01386	00017	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			01386	00018	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01386	00019	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01386	00020	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01386	00021	-----	C.2.4.1	C.3.4.3	--	--
			01386	00022A	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			01386	00022B	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01386	00023A	-----	C.2.5.1	--	--	--
			01386	00023B	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01386	00024	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01386	00025	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

C 9-36

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
Blakey, L. H.		Department of Army	02061	00001	RN	C.7.2.1	C.7.1.1	C.4.1.3.1	--
			02061	00002	RN	C.7.3	C.4.1.3.1	C.6.2	C.7.1.1
Blakey, L. H.		Department of Army Plan. Div.	02061	00003	RN	C.6.4	--	--	--
			02065	00026	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02065	00027	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			02065	00028	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			02065	00033	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02065	00034	-----	C.3.3	--	--	--
			02065	00045	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			02065	00066A	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			02065	00077	-----	C.3.1.1	C.8.2	--	--
			02123	00001	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02123	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02123	00003	DS	C.4.1.1	C.4.1.2	--	--
Blanchard, Bruce		U.S. Dept. of Interior	02123	00004	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			02123	00005	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02123	00006	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02123	00007	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02123	00008	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02123	00009	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02123	00010	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			02123	00011	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			02123	00012	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			02123	00013	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02123	00014	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			02123	00015	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			02123	00016	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02123	00017	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			02123	00018	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			02123	00019	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			02123	00020	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			02123	00021	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			02123	00022	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02123	00023	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			02123	00024	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			02123	00025	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			02123	00026	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			02123	00027	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
			02123	00028	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			02123	00029	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			02123	00030	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			02123	00031	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			02123	00032	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			02123	00033	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			02123	00034	-----	C.3.4.2.1	--	--	--
			02123	00035	-----	C.3.4.2.1	--	--	--
			02123	00036	-----	C.3.4.2	--	--	--
			02123	00037	-----	C.3.4.2.3	--	--	--
			02123	00039	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02123	00040	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02123	00041	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02123	00042	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			02123	00043	DS	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			02123	00044	RN	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			02123	00045	RN	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			02123	00046	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			02123	00047A	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02123	00047B	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02123	00048	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			02123	00049	DS	C.4.1.3	--	--	--
			02123	00050	DS	C.7.4	C.7.2.8	--	--
			02123	00051	DS	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			02123	00052	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			02123	00053	DS	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
			02123	00054	DS	C.7.1.1.2	--	--	--
			02123	00055	DS	C.7.1.1.2	--	--	--
			02123	00056	DS	C.7.1.1.2	--	--	--
			02123	00057	DS	C.7.1.1.8	--	--	--
			02123	00058	DS	C.7.1.1.8	--	--	--
			02123	00059	DS	C.7.1.1.8	--	--	--
			02123	00060	DS	C.7.1.1.8	--	--	--
			02123	00061	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			02123	00062	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			02123	00063	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			02123	00064	DS	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
			02123	00065	DS	C.7.2.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
C.9-36	Blanchard, Bruce	U.S. Dept. of Interior	02123	00066	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
			02123	00067	DS	C.6.1	--	--	--
			02123	00068	-----	C.3.3.2	--	--	--
			01598	00001	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01598	00003	DC	C.4.1.1	C.4.1.2	--	--
			01598	00004	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			01598	00005	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01598	00006	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01598	00007	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01598	00008	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01598	00009	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01598	00010	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01598	00011	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01598	00012	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01598	00013	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01598	00014	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01598	00015	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01598	00016	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01598	00017	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01598	00018	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01598	00019	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01598	00020	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01598	00021	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01598	00022	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01598	00023	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01598	00024	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01598	00025	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01598	00026	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01598	00027	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01598	00028	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01598	00029	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01598	00030	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01598	00031	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01598	00032	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01598	00033	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01598	00034	-----	C.3.4.2.1	--	--	--
			01598	00035	-----	C.3.4.2.1	--	--	--
			01598	00036	-----	C.3.4.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

C-9-37

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
			01598	00037	-----	C.3.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01598	00039	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01598	00040	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01598	00041	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01598	00042A	DC	C.4.1.2.2	C.4.2.1	--	--
			01598	00042B	DC	C.4.2.1	--	--	--
			01598	00042C	DC	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01598	00042D	DC	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01598	00042E	DC	C.4.1.5	--	--	--
			01598	00042F	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01598	00043	-----	C.4.1.4	--	--	--
			01598	00044	DC	C.4.1.2.2	C.5.1	--	--
			01598	00045	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01598	00046	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01598	00047A	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01598	00047B	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01598	00047C	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01598	00048	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01598	00049	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01598	00050	DC	C.5.1	C.4.1.2.2	--	--
			01598	00051	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01598	00052	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01598	00053	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01598	00054A	DC	C.3.2	--	--	--
			01598	00054B	DC	C.4.1.1.5	C.7.2.8	--	--
			01598	00055A	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01598	00055B	DC	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
			01598	00055C	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01598	00056	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01598	00057	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01598	00058	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01598	00059	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01598	00060	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01598	00061	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			01598	00062	DC	C.3.2	C.4.3	C.8.2	--
			01598	00063	DC	C.5.9	--	--	--
			01598	00064	DC	C.3.3	--	--	--
			01598	00065	DC	C.3.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
			01598	00066	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01598	00067	DC	C.4.1.1.5	C.5.7	--	--
			01598	00068	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01598	00069	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01598	00070	DC	C.4.1.1.7	--	--	--
			01598	00071	DC	C.4.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01598	00072	DC	C.4.1.1.9	--	--	--
			01598	00073	DC	C.4.1.2.1	--	--	--
			01598	00074	DC	C.4.1.2.1	--	--	--
			01598	00075	DC	C.4.1.2.1	--	--	--
			01598	00076	DC	C.4.1.2.1	--	--	--
			01598	00077	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01598	00078	DC	C.4.1.2.1	--	--	--
			01598	00079	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01598	00080	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01598	00081	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01598	00082	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01598	00083	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01598	00084	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01598	00085	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01598	00086	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01598	00087	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01598	00088	DC	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
			01598	00089	DC	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
			01598	00090	DC	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
			01598	00091	DC	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
			01598	00092	DC	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
			01598	00093	DC	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
			01598	00094	DC	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
			01598	00095	DC	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
			01598	00096	DC	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
			01598	00097	DC	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
			01598	00098	DC	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
			01598	00099	DC	C.4.1.3.4	--	--	--
			01598	00100	DC	C.4.1.3.5	--	--	--
			01598	00101	DC	C.4.1.3.6	--	--	--
			01598	00102	DC	C.4.1.3.6	--	--	--
			01598	00103	DC	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

C. 9-39

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
			01598	00104	DC	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			01598	00105	DC	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	--
			01598	00106A	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01598	00106B	DC	C.3.2	--	--	--
			01598	00107	DC	C.4.2.1	--	--	--
			01598	00108	DC	C.4.2.1	--	--	--
			01598	00109	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01598	00110	DC	C.4.2.2	C.7.1.1.8	--	--
			01598	00111	DC	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01598	00112	DC	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01598	00113	DC	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01598	00114	DC	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01598	00115	DC	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01598	00116	DC	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01598	00117	DC	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01598	00118	DC	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01598	00119	DC	C.7.1.1.1	--	--	--
			01598	00120	DC	C.7.1.1.1	--	--	--
			01598	00121	DC	C.7.1.1.1	--	--	--
			01598	00122	DC	C.7.1.1.2	--	--	--
			01598	00123	DC	C.7.1.1.2	--	--	--
			01598	00124	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01598	00125	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01598	00126	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01598	00127	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01598	00128	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01598	00129	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01598	00130	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			01598	00131	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			01598	00132	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01598	00133	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01598	00134	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01598	00135	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01598	00136	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			01598	00137	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			01598	00138	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			01598	00139	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			01598	00140	DC	C.7.1.1.6	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
			01598	00141	DC	C.7.1.1.6	--	--	--
			01598	00142	DC	C.7.1.1.6	--	--	--
			01598	00143	DC	C.7.1.1.9	--	--	--
			01598	00144	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			01598	00145	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			01598	00146	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			01598	00147	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01598	00148	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01598	00149	DC	C.6.2	--	--	--
			01598	00150	DC	C.4.2	--	--	--
			01598	00151	DC	C.7.1.1.6	--	--	--
			01598	00152	DC	C.7.1.1.6	--	--	--
			01598	00153	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01598	00154	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01598	00155	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01598	00156	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01598	00157	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01598	00158	DC	C.4.1.3.3	C.4.3	--	--
			01598	00159	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01598	00160	DC	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
			01598	00161	DC	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
			01598	00162	DC	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
			01598	00163	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
			01598	00164	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
			01598	00165	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			01598	00166	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			01598	00167	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			01598	00168	DC	C.7.2.2	C.7.2.3	--	--
			01598	00169	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			01598	00170	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			01598	00171	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			01598	00172	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			01598	00173	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
			01598	00174	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
			01598	00175	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01598	00176	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			01598	00177	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01598	00178	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

17-6 J

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
			01598	00179	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01598	00180A	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01598	00180B	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
			01598	00180C	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01598	00180D	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
			01598	00181	DC	C.5.1	C.7.2.8	--	--
			01598	00182	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			01598	00183A	DC	C.7.2.4	C.7.2.3	--	--
			01598	00183B	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
			01598	00184	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			01598	00185	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01598	00186	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01598	00187	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01598	00188	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01598	00189	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01598	00190	DC	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
			01598	00191	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01598	00192	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01598	00193	DC	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			01598	00194	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01598	00195	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01598	00196	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01598	00198A	DC	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
			01598	00198B	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01598	00199	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01598	00200	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			01598	00201	DC	C.5.9	--	--	--
			01598	00202	DC	C.5.9	--	--	--
			01598	00203	DC	C.5.9	--	--	--
			01598	00204	DC	C.6.1	--	--	--
			01598	00205	DC	C.5.9	--	--	--
			01598	00206	DC	C.5.9	--	--	--
			01598	00207	DC	C.6.3	--	--	--
			01598	00208	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01598	00209	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01598	00210	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			01598	00211	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			01598	00212	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
C.9-42	Blanchard, Bruce		01598	00213	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			01598	00214	DC	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
			01598	00215	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
			01598	00216A	DC	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
			01598	00216B	DC	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
			01598	00217	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01598	00218	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			01598	00219	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01598	00220	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
			01598	00221	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01598	00222	DC	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
			01598	00223	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01598	00224	DC	C.7.5	--	--	--
			01598	00225	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01598	00226	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01598	00227	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01598	00228	DC	C.5.2	--	--	--
			01598	00229	DC	C.5.2	--	--	--
			01598	00230	DC	C.5.3	--	--	--
			01598	00231	DC	C.5.3	--	--	--
			01598	00232	DC	C.5.4	--	--	--
			01598	00233	DC	C.5.6	--	--	--
			01598	00234	DC	C.5.6	--	--	--
			01598	00235	DC	C.5.8	--	--	--
			01598	00236	DC	C.5.2	--	--	--
			01598	00237	DC	C.8.1	--	--	--
			01598	00238	DC	C.8.2	--	--	--
			01598	00239	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01598	00240	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01598	00241	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01598	00242	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01598	00243	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01598	00244	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01598	00245	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01598	00246	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01598	00247	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01598	00248	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01598	00249	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
			01598	00250	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01598	00251	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01598	00252	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01598	00253	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01598	00254	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01598	00255	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01598	00256	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01598	00257	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01598	00258	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01598	00259	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01598	00260	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01598	00261	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01598	00262	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01598	00263	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01598	00264	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01598	00266	DC	C.5.8	--	--	--
			01598	00274	DC	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
			01598	00277	DC	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
			01598	00279	DC	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
			01598	00280	DC	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
			01598	00282	DC	C.4.1.3.5	--	--	--
			01598	00283	DC	C.4.1.3.5	--	--	--
			01598	00284	DC	C.4.1.3.7	--	--	--
			01598	00285	DC	C.4.1.4	--	--	--
			01598	00286	DC	C.4.1.4	--	--	--
			01598	00287	DC	C.4.1.5.1	--	--	--
			01598	00288	DC	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			01598	00289	DC	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	--
			01598	00290	DC	C.4.1.5.4	--	--	--
			01598	00295	DC	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01598	00296	DC	C.7.1.1.2	--	--	--
			01598	00297	DC	C.7.1.1.2	--	--	--
			01598	00298	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01598	00299	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01598	00300	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			01598	00301	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			01598	00302	DC	C.7.1.1.6	--	--	--
			01598	00303	DC	C.7.1.1.6	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
			01598	00304	DC	C.7.1.1.6	--	--	--
			01598	00305	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01598	00306	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
			01598	00307	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
			01598	00308	DC	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
			01598	00309	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
			01598	00310	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01598	00311	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01598	00312	DC	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			01598	00313	DC	C.7.4.1	C.7.4.4	--	--
			01598	00315	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01598	00316	DC	C.4.1.1.6	--	--	--
			01598	00317	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01598	00318	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01598	00319	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01598	00320	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01598	00321	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01598	00322A	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01598	00322B	DC	C.5.6	--	--	--
			01598	00322C	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01598	00323A	DC	C.4.1.2.1	--	--	--
			01598	00323B	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01598	00323C	DC	C.4.1.5	--	--	--
			01598	00323D	DC	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			01598	00323E	DC	C.4.1.5.2	C.7.2.8	--	--
			01598	00323F	DC	C.7.2.8	C.7.4.2	--	--
			01598	00323G	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01598	00324	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01598	00325	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01598	00326	-----	C.3.1.2	C.2.2.2	--	--
			01598	00327	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01598	00328	DC	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
			01598	00328A	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01598	00329	DC	C.4.1.3.6	C.7.1.1.6	C.7.2.6	--
			01598	00330	DC	C.4.1.3.5	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.2.4	--
			01598	00331	DC	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.2.4	--	--
			01598	00332	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--	--
			01598	00333	DC	C.7.1.2	C.7.4	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
Blanchard, Bruce	U.S. Dept. of Interior	01598	00334	DC	C.7.5	--	--	--	
		01598	00335	-----	C.3.3.1	--	--	--	
		01598	00336	DC	C.5.1	C.7.2.8	--	--	
		01598	00337	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--	
		01598	00342A	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--	
		01598	00342B	DC	C.4.2.1	--	--	--	
		01598	00342C	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--	
		02122	00001	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--	
		02122	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--	
		02122	00004	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--	
		02122	00005	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
		02122	00006	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
		02122	00007	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
		02122	00008	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
		02122	00009	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
		02122	00010	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
		02122	00011	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
		02122	00012	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
		02122	00013	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
		02122	00014	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
		02122	00015	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
		02122	00016	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
		02122	00017	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
		02122	00018	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
		02122	00019	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
		02122	00020	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
		02122	00021	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
		02122	00022	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
		02122	00023	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
		02122	00024	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
		02122	00025	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
		02122	00026	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
02122	00027	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--			
02122	00028	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--			
02122	00029	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--			
02122	00030	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--			
02122	00031	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--			
02122	00032	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--			

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
			02122	00033	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			02122	00034	-----	C.3.4.2.1	--	--	--
			02122	00035	-----	C.3.4.2.1	--	--	--
			02122	00036	-----	C.3.4.2	--	--	--
			02122	00037	-----	C.3.4.2.3	--	--	--
			02122	00039	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02122	00040	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02122	00041	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02122	00046	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02122	00047	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
Blanchard, Bruce	U.S. Dept. of Interior		01565	00001	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01565	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01565	00004	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			01565	00005	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01565	00006	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01565	00007	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01565	00008	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01565	00009	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01565	00010	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01565	00011	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01565	00012	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01565	00013	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01565	00014	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01565	00015	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01565	00016	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01565	00017	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01565	00018	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01565	00019	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01565	00020	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01565	00021	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01565	00022	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01565	00023	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01565	00024	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01565	00025	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01565	00026	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01565	00027	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01565	00028	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01565	00029	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
			01565	00030	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01565	00031	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01565	00032	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01565	00033	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01565	00034	-----	C.3.4.2	--	--	--
			01565	00035	-----	C.3.4.2.1	--	--	--
			01565	00036	-----	C.3.4.2	--	--	--
			01565	00037	-----	C.3.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01565	00039	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01565	00040	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01565	00041	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01565	00043	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
Blanchard, Bruce	U.S. Dept. of Interior		01599	00001	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01599	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01599	00004	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			01599	00005	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01599	00006	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01599	00007	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01599	00008	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01599	00009	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--
			01599	00010	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01599	00011	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01599	00012	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01599	00013	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--
			01599	00014	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01599	00015	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01599	00016	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01599	00017	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01599	00018	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01599	00019	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01599	00020	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01599	00021	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01599	00022	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01599	00023	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01599	00024	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01599	00025	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01599	00026	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01599	00027	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
			01599	00028	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01599	00029	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01599	00030	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01599	00031	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01599	00032	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01599	00033	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01599	00034	-----	C.3.4.2.1	--	--	--
			01599	00035	-----	C.3.4.2.1	--	--	--
			01599	00036	-----	C.3.4.2	--	--	--
			01599	00037	-----	C.3.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01599	00039	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01599	00040	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01599	00041	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01599	00047B	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01599	00047C	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01599	00048	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01599	00053	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01599	00054	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01599	00062	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			01599	00066	-----	C.4.1.4	C.7.3	--	--
			01599	00068	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			01599	00069	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01599	00070A	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01599	00070B	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01599	00070C	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01599	00071	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01599	00072	-----	C.3.4.2.1	--	--	--
			01599	00076	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01599	00078	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01599	00078C	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01599	00079	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01599	00081	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01599	00082	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01599	00083	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01599	00085	DC	C.3.2	C.4.3	C.8.2	--
			01599	00208	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			01599	00209	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			01599	00216	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
			01599	00217	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01599	00226	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01599	00246	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01599	00247	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01599	00248	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01599	00249	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01599	00250	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01599	00251	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01599	00252	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01599	00252B	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01599	00264	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
Blanchard, Bruce	U.S. Dept. of Interior		01566	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
		01566	00003	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--	
		01566	00004	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--	
		01566	00005	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
		01566	00006	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
		01566	00007	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
		01566	00008	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
		01566	00009	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--	
		01566	00010	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
		01566	00011	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
		01566	00012	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
		01566	00013	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--	
		01566	00014	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
		01566	00015	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
		01566	00016	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
		01566	00017	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
		01566	00018	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
		01566	00019	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
		01566	00020	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
		01566	00021	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
		01566	00022	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
		01566	00023	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
		01566	00024	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
		01566	00025	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
		01566	00026	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
		01566	00027	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
		01566	00028	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
			01566	00029	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01566	00030	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01566	00031	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01566	00032	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01566	00033	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01566	00034	-----	C.3.4.2.1	--	--	--
			01566	00035	-----	C.3.4.2.1	--	--	--
			01566	00036	-----	C.3.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01566	00037	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
			01566	00038	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01566	00039	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01566	00040	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01566	00123	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--
			01566	00124	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--
			01566	00125	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--
			01566	00126	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--
			01566	00127	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--
			01566	00128	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--
			01566	00129	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--
			01566	00130	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--
			01566	00131	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--
			01566	00132	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--
			01566	00133	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--
			01566	00134	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--
Blanchard, Bruce	U.S. Dept. of Interior		01567	00001	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01567	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01567	00003	RN	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01567	00004	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			01567	00005	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01567	00006	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01567	00007	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01567	00008	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01567	00009	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01567	00010	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01567	00011	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01567	00012	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01567	00013	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01567	00014	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
			01567	00015	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01567	00016	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01567	00017	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01567	00018	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01567	00019	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01567	00020	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01567	00021	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01567	00022	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01567	00023	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01567	00024	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01567	00025	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01567	00026	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01567	00027	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01567	00028	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01567	00029	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01567	00030	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01567	00031	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01567	00032	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01567	00033	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01567	00034	-----	C.3.4.2.1	--	--	--
			01567	00035	-----	C.3.4.2.1	--	--	--
			01567	00036	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01567	00037	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
			01567	00038	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01567	00039	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01567	00040	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01567	00041	RN	C.4.1.2	--	--	--
			01567	00042	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01567	00043	RN	C.4.1.1.3	C.4.1.2.2	--	--
			01567	00044	RN	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01567	00045	RN	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
			01567	00046	RN	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01567	00047	RN	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01567	00048	RN	C.6.1	--	--	--
			01567	00049	RN	C.4.1.1.1	--	--	--
			01567	00050	RN	C.4.1.1.1	--	--	--
			01567	00051	RN	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01567	00052	RN	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
Buren, Mindy A.	LeBoeuf, Lamb, Leiby, & MacRae	01567	00053	RN	C.4.2.1	--	--	--	
		01567	00054	RN	C.4.4.2	--	--	--	
		01567	00055	RN	C.5.1	--	--	--	
		01567	00056	RN	C.5.2	--	--	--	
		01567	00057	RN	C.5.10	--	--	--	
		02252	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		02252	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		02252	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		02252	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		02252	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		02252	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		02252	00007	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		02252	00008	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		02252	00009	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		02252	00010	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		02252	00011	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		02252	00012	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		02252	00013	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		02252	00014	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		02252	00015	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		02252	00016	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		02252	00017	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		02252	00018	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		02252	00019	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		02252	00020	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		02252	00021	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		02252	00022	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		02252	00023	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		02252	00024	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		02252	00025	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		02252	00026	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		02252	00027	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		02252	00028	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		02252	00029	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		02252	00030	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		02252	00031	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		02252	00032	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		02252	00033	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
			02252	00034	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02252	00035	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02252	00036	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02252	00037	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02252	00038	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02252	00039	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02252	00040	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02252	00041	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02252	00042	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02252	00043	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02252	00044	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02252	00045	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02252	00046	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02252	00047	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02252	00048	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02252	00049	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
Davis, John G.		U.S. Nuclear Reg. Commission	01037	00008	-----	C.3.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01037	00137	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
Davis, John G.		U.S. Nuclear Reg. Commission	01037	00139	-----	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01038	00009	-----	C.3.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01038	00010	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01038	00015	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01038	00017	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01038	00018	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01038	00084	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01038	00085	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01038	00087	-----	C.2.1.2	C.7.4	--	--
Davis, John G.		U.S. Nuclear Reg. Commission	01039	00011	-----	C.3.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01039	00012	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01039	00015	-----	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01039	00199	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
Davis, John G.		U.S. Nuclear Reg. Commission	01039	00200	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01040	00001	RN	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01040	00002	RN	C.5.6	C.4.1.1.5	--	--
			01040	00003	RN	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01040	00004	RN	C.5.2	--	--	--
			01040	00005	RN	C.5.3	C.8.2	--	--
			01040	00006	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
			01040	00007	RN	C.8.2	C.4.3	--	--
			01040	00008	RN	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01040	00009	RN	C.7.4	C.5.9	C.5.8	--
			01040	00010	-----	C.3.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01040	00011	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01040	00012	RN	C.4.1.1.8	C.5.8	--	--
			01040	00013	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01040	00014	RN	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01040	00015	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01040	00016	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01040	00017	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01040	00018	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01040	00019	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01040	00020	RN	C.5.3	C.8.2	--	--
			01040	00021	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01040	00022	RN	C.4.1.1.6	--	--	--
			01040	00023	RN	C.4.1.1.6	--	--	--
			01040	00024	RN	C.4.1.1.6	--	--	--
			01040	00025	RN	C.4.1.1.6	--	--	--
			01040	00026	RN	C.4.1.1.6	--	--	--
			01040	00027	RN	C.4.1.1.6	--	--	--
			01040	00028	RN	C.4.1.1.6	--	--	--
			01040	00029	RN	C.4.1.1.7	--	--	--
			01040	00030	RN	C.4.1.2.1	--	--	--
			01040	00031	RN	C.4.1.2.1	--	--	--
			01040	00032	RN	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01040	00033	RN	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01040	00034	RN	C.4.1.2.3	--	--	--
			01040	00035	RN	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
			01040	00036	RN	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
			01040	00037	RN	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
			01040	00038	RN	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01040	00039	RN	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01040	00040	RN	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01040	00041	RN	C.4.2.2	C.7.1.1	--	--
			01040	00042	RN	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01040	00043	RN	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01040	00044	RN	C.7.1.1.8	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
			01040	00045	RN	C.7.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01040	00046	RN	C.7.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01040	00047	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01040	00048	RN	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01040	00049	RN	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01040	00050	RN	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01040	00051	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01040	00052	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01040	00053	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01040	00054	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01040	00055	RN	C.4.3	C.8.2	--	--
			01040	00056	RN	C.5.7	--	--	--
			01040	00057	RN	C.5.3	--	--	--
			01040	00058	RN	C.5.3	--	--	--
			01040	00059	RN	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01040	00060	RN	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01040	00061	RN	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01040	00062	RN	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01040	00063	RN	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			01040	00064	RN	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			01040	00065	RN	C.7.4.5	--	--	--
			01040	00066	RN	C.4.3	C.5.11	C.5.1	--
			01040	00067	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01040	00068	RN	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01040	00069	RN	C.5.9	--	--	--
			01040	00070	RN	C.5.9	--	--	--
			01040	00071	RN	C.6.3	--	--	--
			01040	00072	RN	C.6.4	--	--	--
			01040	00073	RN	C.7.2.3	C.7.1.1.3	--	--
			01040	00074	RN	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01040	00075	RN	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01040	00076	RN	C.7.2.7	--	--	--
			01040	00077	RN	C.7.1.1.8	C.5.11	--	--
			01040	00078	RN	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01040	00079	RN	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01040	00080	RN	C.5.1	C.5.11	--	--
			01040	00081	RN	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01040	00082	RN	C.5.1	C.5.11	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
			01040	00083	RN	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01040	00084	RN	C.5.1	C.5.11	--	--
			01040	00085	RN	C.5.2	--	--	--
			01040	00086	RN	C.5.2	--	--	--
			01040	00087	RN	C.5.2	--	--	--
			01040	00088	RN	C.5.2	--	--	--
			01040	00089	RN	C.5.3	--	--	--
			01040	00090	RN	C.5.3	--	--	--
			01040	00091	RN	C.5.3	--	--	--
			01040	00092	RN	C.5.3	--	--	--
			01040	00093	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01040	00094	RN	C.5.3	--	--	--
			01040	00095	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01040	00096	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01040	00097	RN	C.8.5	--	--	--
			01040	00098	RN	C.5.3	--	--	--
			01040	00099	RN	C.5.3	--	--	--
			01040	00100	RN	C.5.3	--	--	--
			01040	00101	RN	C.5.3	C.4.3	--	--
			01040	00102	RN	C.5.6	C.4.1.1.5	--	--
			01040	00103	RN	C.5.6	--	--	--
			01040	00104	RN	C.5.6	C.4.1.1.5	--	--
			01040	00105	RN	C.5.6	C.4.1.1.5	--	--
			01040	00106	RN	C.5.7	--	--	--
			01040	00107	RN	C.5.7	C.4.2	C.4.1.1.2	--
			01040	00108	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01040	00109	RN	C.5.8	--	--	--
			01040	00110	RN	C.5.8	C.4.1.1.8	--	--
			01040	00111	RN	C.5.8	--	--	--
			01040	00112	RN	C.5.3	--	--	--
			01040	00113	RN	C.8.3	--	--	--
			01040	00114	RN	C.8.2	--	--	--
			01040	00115	RN	C.8.2	--	--	--
			01040	00116	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01040	00117	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01040	00118	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01040	00119	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01040	00120	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

C-9-57

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
			01040	00121	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01040	00122	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01040	00123	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01040	00124	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01040	00125	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01040	00126	RN	C.4.3	C.8.2	C.8.5	--
			01040	00127	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01040	00128	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01040	00129	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01040	00130	RN	C.8.3	--	--	--
			01040	00131	RN	C.5.3	C.5.11	--	--
			01040	00132	RN	C.8.4	--	--	--
			01040	00133	RN	C.6.6	--	--	--
			01040	00134	RN	C.6.6	--	--	--
			01040	00135	RN	C.6.6	--	--	--
			01040	00136	RN	C.6.6	--	--	--
			01040	00137	RN	C.6.6	--	--	--
			01040	00138	RN	C.6.6	--	--	--
			01040	00139	RN	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01040	00140	RN	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01040	00141	RN	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01040	00142	RN	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01040	00143	RN	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01040	00144	RN	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01040	00145	RN	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01040	00146	RN	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01040	00147	RN	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01040	00148	RN	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01040	00149	RN	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01040	00150	RN	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01040	00151	RN	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01040	00152	RN	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01040	00153	RN	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01040	00154	RN	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01040	00155	RN	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01040	00156	RN	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01040	00157	RN	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01040	00158	RN	C.5.11	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION					
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH		
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)											
C.9-58	Davis, John G.	U.S. Nuclear Reg. Commission	01040	00159	RN	C.5.11	--	--	--		
			01040	00160	RN	C.5.11	--	--	--		
			01040	00161	RN	C.5.11	--	--	--		
			01040	00162	RN	C.5.11	--	--	--		
			01040	00163	RN	C.5.11	--	--	--		
			01040	00164	RN	C.5.11	--	--	--		
			01040	00165	RN	C.5.11	C.8.5	--	--		
			01040	00166	RN	C.5.3	--	--	--		
			01040	00167	RN	C.5.3	--	--	--		
			01040	00168	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--		
	Davis, John G.	U.S. Nuclear Reg. Commission	01040	00169	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--		
			01040	00170	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--		
			01041	00014	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--		
			01041	00015	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
			01041	00018	-----	C.7.3	--	--	--		
			01041	00214	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--		
			01041	00215	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--		
			01042	00009	-----	C.8.3	C.3.4.2.3	--	--		
			01042	00011	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--		
			01042	00012	-----	C.3.1	C.2.7	--	--		
	Davis, John G.	U.S. Nuclear Reg. Commission	01042	00013	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--		
			01042	00014	-----	C.3.1	C.2.7	--	--		
			01042	00015	-----	C.4.1.3.1	C.2.7	--	--		
			01042	00076	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--		
			01042	00077	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--		
			01042	00094	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--		
			01042	00192	-----	C.2.8.3	C.6.5	--	--		
			01042	00207	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--		
			Davis, John G.	U.S. Nuclear Reg. Commission	01043	00001	DC	C.5.7	C.8.4	--	--
					01043	00002	DC	C.5.6	--	--	--
	01043	00003			DC	C.5.1	--	--	--		
	01043	00004			DC	C.5.1	--	--	--		
	01043	00005			DC	C.5.2	--	--	--		
	01043	00006			DC	C.5.2	--	--	--		
	01043	00007			DC	C.5.3	C.8.2	--	--		
	01043	00008			DC	C.8.2	C.4.3	--	--		
	01043	00009			DC	C.5.3	C.4.3	--	--		
	01043	00010			DC	C.5.10	--	--	--		

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
			01043	00011	DC	C.5.8	C.4.3	--	--
			01043	00012	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01043	00013	-----	C.3.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01043	00014	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01043	00015	DC	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01043	00016	DC	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01043	00017	DC	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01043	00018	DC	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01043	00019	DC	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01043	00020	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01043	00021	DC	C.4.1.1.2	--	--	--
			01043	00022	DC	C.4.1.1.3	C.4.1.1.5	--	--
			01043	00023	DC	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01043	00024	DC	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01043	00025A	DC	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01043	00025B	DC	C.5.10	--	--	--
			01043	00026	DC	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01043	00027	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01043	00028	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01043	00029	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01043	00030	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01043	00031	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01043	00032	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01043	00033	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01043	00034	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01043	00035	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01043	00036	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01043	00037	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01043	00038	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01043	00039	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01043	00040	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01043	00041	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01043	00042	DC	C.4.1.1.6	--	--	--
			01043	00043	DC	C.4.1.1.8	C.4.1.1.7	--	--
			01043	00044A	DC	C.4.1.1.7	--	--	--
			01043	00044B	-----	C.5.10	--	--	--
			01043	00045	DC	C.4.1.1.7	--	--	--
			01043	00046	DC	C.4.1.1.7	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
			01043	00047	DC	C.4.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01043	00048	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01043	00049	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01043	00050	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01043	00051	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01043	00052	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01043	00053	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01043	00054	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01043	00055	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01043	00056	DC	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
			01043	00057	DC	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
			01043	00058	DC	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
			01043	00059	DC	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
			01043	00060	DC	C.4.2.1	--	--	--
			01043	00061	DC	C.4.2.1	--	--	--
			01043	00062	DC	C.4.2.1	--	--	--
			01043	00063	DC	C.4.2.1	--	--	--
			01043	00064	DC	C.4.2.1	--	--	--
			01043	00065	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01043	00066	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01043	00067	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01043	00068	DC	C.7.1.1.1	--	--	--
			01043	00069	DC	C.7.1.1.2	--	--	--
			01043	00070	DC	C.7.1.1.2	--	--	--
			01043	00071	DC	C.7.1.1.2	--	--	--
			01043	00072	DC	C.7.1.1.2	--	--	--
			01043	00073	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01043	00074	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01043	00075	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01043	00076	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01043	00077	DC	C.7.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01043	00078	DC	C.7.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01043	00079	DC	C.4.2.1	--	--	--
			01043	00080	DC	C.7.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01043	00081	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01043	00082	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
			01043	00083	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01043	00084	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
			01043	00085	DC	C.7.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01043	00086	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01043	00087	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01043	00088	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01043	00089	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
			01043	00090	DC	C.4.3	C.7.2.3	--	--
			01043	00091	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01043	00092	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01043	00093	DC	C.4.3	C.8.2	--	--
			01043	00094	DC	C.5.3	--	--	--
			01043	00095	DC	C.5.7	--	--	--
			01043	00096	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			01043	00097	DC	C.4.1.3.3	C.7.2	--	--
			01043	00098	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01043	00099	DC	C.8.3	C.5.11	--	--
			01043	00100	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			01043	00101	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			01043	00102	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01043	00103	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01043	00104	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01043	00105	DC	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01043	00106	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01043	00107	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01043	00108	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01043	00109	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01043	00110	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01043	00111	DC	C.7.4.5	--	--	--
			01043	00112	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01043	00113	DC	C.7.3	C.7.2.2	--	--
			01043	00114	DC	C.5.9	--	--	--
			01043	00115	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01043	00116	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01043	00117	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01043	00118	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01043	00119	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01043	00120	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01043	00121	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01043	00122	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

C.9-62

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
			01043	00123	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01043	00124	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01043	00125	DC	C.5.2	--	--	--
			01043	00126	DC	C.5.2	--	--	--
			01043	00127	DC	C.5.2	--	--	--
			01043	00128	DC	C.5.2	--	--	--
			01043	00129	DC	C.5.2	--	--	--
			01043	00130	DC	C.5.2	--	--	--
			01043	00131	DC	C.5.2	--	--	--
			01043	00132	DC	C.5.2	--	--	--
			01043	00133	DC	C.5.2	--	--	--
			01043	00134	DC	C.5.2	--	--	--
			01043	00135	DC	C.5.2	--	--	--
			01043	00136	DC	C.5.2	--	--	--
			01043	00137	DC	C.5.2	--	--	--
			01043	00138	DC	C.5.3	--	--	--
			01043	00139	DC	C.5.3	--	--	--
			01043	00140	DC	C.5.3	--	--	--
			01043	00141	DC	C.5.3	--	--	--
			01043	00142	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01043	00143	DC	C.5.3	--	--	--
			01043	00144	DC	C.8.5	--	--	--
			01043	00145	DC	C.5.3	--	--	--
			01043	00146	DC	C.5.3	--	--	--
			01043	00147	DC	C.5.3	--	--	--
			01043	00148	DC	C.5.3	--	--	--
			01043	00149	DC	C.5.4	--	--	--
			01043	00150	DC	C.5.5	--	--	--
			01043	00151	DC	C.5.6	--	--	--
			01043	00152	DC	C.5.6	--	--	--
			01043	00153	DC	C.5.6	--	--	--
			01043	00154	DC	C.5.7	--	--	--
			01043	00155	DC	C.5.7	--	--	--
			01043	00156	DC	C.5.7	--	--	--
			01043	00157	DC	C.5.7	--	--	--
			01043	00158	DC	C.5.7	--	--	--
			01043	00159	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01043	00160	DC	C.5.8	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
			01043	00161	DC	C.5.8	--	--	--
			01043	00162	DC	C.8.2	--	--	--
			01043	00163	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01043	00164	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01043	00165	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01043	00166	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01043	00167	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01043	00168	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01043	00169	DC	C.8.2	--	--	--
			01043	00170	DC	C.8.3	--	--	--
			01043	00171	DC	C.8.4	--	--	--
			01043	00172	DC	C.8.4	--	--	--
			01043	00173	DC	C.8.4	--	--	--
			01043	00174	DC	C.6.6	--	--	--
			01043	00175	DC	C.6.6	--	--	--
			01043	00176	DC	C.6.6	--	--	--
			01043	00177	DC	C.6.6	--	--	--
			01043	00178	DC	C.6.6	--	--	--
			01043	00179	DC	C.6.6	--	--	--
			01043	00180	DC	C.6.6	--	--	--
			01043	00181	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01043	00182	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01043	00183	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01043	00184	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01043	00185	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01043	00186	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01043	00187	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01043	00189	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01043	00190	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01043	00191	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01043	00192	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01043	00193	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01043	00194	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01043	00195	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01043	00196	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01043	00197	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01043	00198	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01043	00199	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
			01043	00200	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01043	00201	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01043	00202	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01043	00203	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01043	00204	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01043	00205	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01043	00206	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01043	00207	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01043	00208	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01043	00209	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01043	00210	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01043	00211	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01043	00212	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01043	00213	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01043	00214	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01043	00215	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01043	00216	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01043	00217	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01043	00218	-----	C.3.4.1	C.5.11	--	--
			01043	00219	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
Davis, John G.		U.S. Nuclear Reg. Commission	01044	00001	DS	C.5.1	C.5.6	C.8.2	--
			01044	00002	DS	C.5.6	--	--	--
			01044	00003	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01044	00004	DS	C.5.2	--	--	--
			01044	00005	DS	C.5.2	--	--	--
			01044	00006	DS	C.5.3	C.8.2	--	--
			01044	00007	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01044	00008	DS	C.5.3	C.8.2	--	--
			01044	00009	DS	C.5.10	--	--	--
			01044	00010	DS	C.5.9	C.7.2	--	--
			01044	00011	-----	C.3.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01044	00012	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01044	00013	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01044	00014	-----	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01044	00015	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01044	00016	DS	C.4.1.1	--	--	--
			01044	00017	DS	C.4.1.1	--	--	--
			01044	00018	DS	C.4.1.1.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
			01044	00019	DS	C.4.1.1.2	--	--	--
			01044	00020	DS	C.5.4	--	--	--
			01044	00021A	DS	C.4.1.1.1	--	--	--
			01044	00021B	DS	C.4.1.1.1	--	--	--
			01044	00022	DS	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01044	00023	DS	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01044	00024	DS	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01044	00025	DS	C.4.1.1.2	--	--	--
			01044	00026	DS	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01044	00027	DS	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01044	00028	DS	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01044	00029	DS	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01044	00030	DS	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01044	00031	DS	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01044	00032	DS	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01044	00033	DS	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01044	00034	DS	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01044	00035	DS	C.4.1.1.6	--	--	--
			01044	00036	DS	C.4.1.1.6	--	--	--
			01044	00037	DS	C.4.1.1.6	--	--	--
			01044	00038	DS	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01044	00039	DS	C.4.1.1.7	--	--	--
			01044	00040	DS	C.4.1.1.7	--	--	--
			01044	00041	DS	C.4.1.1.7	--	--	--
			01044	00042	DS	C.4.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01044	00043	DS	C.4.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01044	00044	DS	C.4.1.2.1	--	--	--
			01044	00045	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01044	00046	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01044	00047	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01044	00048	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01044	00049	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01044	00050	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01044	00051	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01044	00052	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01044	00053	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01044	00054	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01044	00055	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
			01044	00056	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01044	00057	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01044	00058	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01044	00059	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01044	00060	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01044	00061	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01044	00062	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01044	00063	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01044	00064	DS	C.4.1.2.7	--	--	--
			01044	00065	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01044	00066	DS	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
			01044	00067	DS	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
			01044	00068	DS	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
			01044	00069	DS	C.4.2.1	--	--	--
			01044	00070	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01044	00071	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01044	00072	DS	C.7.1.1.1	--	--	--
			01044	00073	DS	C.7.1.1.2	--	--	--
			01044	00074	DS	C.7.1.1.2	--	--	--
			01044	00075	DS	C.7.1.1.2	--	--	--
			01044	00076	DS	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01044	00077	DS	C.7.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01044	00078	DS	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01044	00079	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01044	00080	DS	C.4.3	C.5.11	--	--
			01044	00081	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01044	00082	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01044	00083	DS	C.5.3	--	--	--
			01044	00084	DS	C.4.3	C.5.7	--	--
			01044	00085	DS	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
			01044	00086	DS	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
			01044	00087	DS	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
			01044	00088	DS	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
			01044	00089	DS	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			01044	00090	DS	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			01044	00091	DS	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			01044	00092	DS	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01044	00093	DS	C.7.3	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
			01044	00094	DS	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01044	00095	DS	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01044	00096	DS	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01044	00097	DS	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01044	00098	DS	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			01044	00099	DS	C.7.2	C.4.3	--	--
			01044	00100	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01044	00101	DS	C.5.9	--	--	--
			01044	00102	DS	C.5.9	--	--	--
			01044	00103	DS	C.5.9	--	--	--
			01044	00104	DS	C.6.3	--	--	--
			01044	00105	DS	C.6.3	--	--	--
			01044	00106	DS	C.6.4	--	--	--
			01044	00107	DS	C.7.1.1.3	C.7.2.3	--	--
			01044	00108	DS	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01044	00109	DS	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01044	00110	DS	C.6.3	--	--	--
			01044	00111	DS	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01044	00112	DS	C.5.11	C.7.1.1.8	--	--
			01044	00113	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01044	00114	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01044	00115	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01044	00116	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01044	00117	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01044	00118	DS	C.5.1	C.5.3	--	--
			01044	00119	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01044	00120	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01044	00121	DS	C.5.2	--	--	--
			01044	00122	DS	C.5.2	--	--	--
			01044	00123	DS	C.5.2	--	--	--
			01044	00124	DS	C.5.2	--	--	--
			01044	00125	DS	C.5.2	--	--	--
			01044	00126	DS	C.5.2	--	--	--
			01044	00127	DS	C.5.2	--	--	--
			01044	00128	DS	C.5.3	--	--	--
			01044	00129	DS	C.5.3	--	--	--
			01044	00130	DS	C.5.3	--	--	--
			01044	00131	DS	C.5.3	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
			01044	00132	DS	C.5.3	--	--	--
			01044	00133	DS	C.5.3	--	--	--
			01044	00134	DS	C.5.3	--	--	--
			01044	00135	DS	C.5.3	--	--	--
			01044	00136	DS	C.5.3	--	--	--
			01044	00137	DS	C.5.4	--	--	--
			01044	00138	DS	C.5.4	--	--	--
			01044	00139	DS	C.5.5	--	--	--
			01044	00140	DS	C.5.7	--	--	--
			01044	00141	DS	C.5.7	--	--	--
			01044	00142	DS	C.5.8	--	--	--
			01044	00143	DS	C.8.2	--	--	--
			01044	00144	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01044	00145	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01044	00146	DS	C.8.2	--	--	--
			01044	00147	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01044	00148	DS	C.8.2	--	--	--
			01044	00149	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01044	00150	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01044	00151	DS	C.8.2	--	--	--
			01044	00152	DS	C.8.3	--	--	--
			01044	00153	DS	C.8.3	--	--	--
			01044	00154	DS	C.8.4	--	--	--
			01044	00155	DS	C.8.4	--	--	--
			01044	00156	DS	C.8.4	--	--	--
			01044	00157	DS	C.6.6	--	--	--
			01044	00158	DS	C.6.6	--	--	--
			01044	00159	DS	C.6.6	--	--	--
			01044	00160	DS	C.6.6	--	--	--
			01044	00161	DS	C.6.6	--	--	--
			01044	00162	DS	C.6.6	--	--	--
			01044	00163	DS	C.6.3	--	--	--
			01044	00164	DS	C.6.6	--	--	--
			01044	00165	DS	C.6.6	--	--	--
			01044	00166	DS	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01044	00167	DS	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01044	00168	DS	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01044	00169	DS	C.5.11	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
			01044	00170	DS	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01044	00171	DS	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01044	00172	DS	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01044	00173	DS	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01044	00174	DS	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01044	00175	DS	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01044	00176	DS	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01044	00177	DS	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01044	00178	DS	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01044	00179	DS	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01044	00180	DS	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01044	00181	DS	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01044	00182	DS	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01044	00183	DS	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01044	00184	DS	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01044	00185	DS	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01044	00186	DS	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01044	00187	DS	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01044	00188	DS	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01044	00189	DS	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01044	00190	DS	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01044	00191	DS	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01044	00192	DS	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01044	00193	DS	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01044	00194	DS	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01044	00195	DS	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01044	00196	DS	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01044	00197	DS	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01044	00198	DS	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01044	00199	DS	C.8.2	--	--	--
			01044	00200	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01044	00201	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
Davis, John G.		U.S. Nuclear Reg. Commission	01036	00157	-----	C.3.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01036	00158	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
Finamore, Barbara		Natural Res. Defense Council	01244	00001	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			01244	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01244	00003	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			01244	00004	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
			01244	00005	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			01244	00006	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			01244	00007	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			01244	00008	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01244	00009	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01244	00010	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01244	00011	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01244	00012	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01244	00013	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01244	00014	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			01244	00015	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01244	00016	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
Garrison, Roy F. Hirsch, Allan		U.S. Dept. of Energy	01677	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
		U.S. Env. Protection Agency	01397	00001	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01397	00002	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01397	00003	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01397	00004	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01397	00005	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01397	00006	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01397	00007	-----	C.7.3	C.2.4.1	--	--
			01397	00008	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01397	00009	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01397	00010	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			01397	00011	DC	C.4.1.3.3	C.7.2.3	C.7.1.1.3	--
			01397	00012	DC	C.4.1.2.2	C.4.1.2.1	C.7.2.8	--
			01397	00013	DC	C.4.1.3.4	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--
			01397	00014	DC	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.2.4	--	--
			01397	00015	DC	C.7.1.1.8	C.7.1.1.3	--	--
			01397	00016	DC	C.4.2.2	C.7.3	--	--
			01397	00017	DC	C.4.1.3	C.7.1.1	--	--
			01397	00018	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			01397	00019	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			01397	00020	DC	C.7.2.4	C.7.1.1.4	--	--
			01397	00021	DC	C.7.1.1.8	C.7.2.8	--	--
			01397	00022	DC	C.7.2.8	C.7.2.2	--	--
			01397	00023	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01397	00024	DC	C.7.2.3	C.7.2.4	--	--
		01397	00025	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--	--	

Garrison, Roy F.
Hirsch, Allan

U.S. Dept. of Energy
U.S. Env. Protection Agency

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
			01397	00026	DC	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.2.4	--	--
			01397	00027	DC	C.7.1.1.8	C.7.1.1.2	C.7.2.2	C.7.2.8
			01397	00028	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01397	00029	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01397	00030	DC	C.3.3	C.8.2	--	--
			01397	00031	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01397	00032	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01397	00033	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01397	00034	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01397	00035	DC	C.4.1.1.6	--	--	--
			01397	00036	DC	C.4.1.1.7	--	--	--
			01397	00037	DC	C.4.1.1.7	--	--	--
			01397	00038	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01397	00039	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01397	00040	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01397	00041	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01397	00042	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01397	00043	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01397	00044	DC	C.4.2.1	--	--	--
			01397	00045	DC	C.4.2.1	--	--	--
			01397	00046	DC	C.4.2.1	--	--	--
			01397	00047	DC	C.4.2.1	--	--	--
			01397	00048	DC	C.4.2.1	--	--	--
			01397	00049	DC	C.4.2.1	--	--	--
			01397	00050	DC	C.4.2.1	--	--	--
			01397	00051	DC	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01397	00052	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01397	00053	DC	C.5.3	--	--	--
			01397	00054	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01397	00055	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01397	00056	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01397	00057	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01397	00058	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01397	00059	DC	C.5.6	--	--	--
			01397	00060	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01397	00061	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01397	00062	DC	C.3.1.3	C.4.3	C.4.2.2	--
			01397	00063	DC	C.4.2.3	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
			01397	00064	DC	C.5.9	--	--	--
			01397	00065	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01397	00066A	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01397	00066B	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01397	00066C	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			01397	00067	DC	C.4.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01397	00068	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01397	00068A	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01397	00068B	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01397	00068C	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			01397	00068D	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01397	00069	DS	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			01397	00070	DS	C.4.1.2	--	--	--
			01397	00071	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01397	00072	DS	C.7.2.8	C.7.1.1.8	--	--
			01397	00073	DS	C.7.2.8	C.7.2.7	--	--
			01397	00074	DS	C.5.3	--	--	--
			01397	00075	DS	C.4.1.1.3	C.5.6	--	--
			01397	00076A	DS	C.4.1.1.5	C.4.3	--	--
			01397	00076B	DS	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01397	00077	DS	C.4.3	C.4.1.2.1	--	--
			01397	00088	RN	C.4.1.1	--	--	--
			01397	00089	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01397	00090	RN	C.4.1.2.2	C.5.1	--	--
			01397	00091	RN	C.5.8	--	--	--
			01397	00092A	RN	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01397	00092B	RN	C.4.1.3.4	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--
			01397	00093	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01397	00097	-----	C.2.7.1	C.4.1.3	--	--
			01716	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			01275	00001	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			01275	00002	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01275	00003	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01275	00004	-----	C.3.3.2	--	--	--
			01275	00005	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01275	00006	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01275	00007	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01275	00008	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
	Hodel, Secretary Donald Kearney, John J.	U.S. Dept of Energy Edison Electric Institute							

Hodel, Secretary Donald
Kearney, John J.

U.S. Dept of Energy
Edison Electric Institute

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
			01275	00009	DC,DS,RN	C.6.6	C.5.11	C.5.11	C.3.4.4
			01275	00010	DS	C.5.1	C.5.11	C.3.4.4	--
			01275	00011	DS	C.7.4.1	C.6.1	C.2.7	--
			01275	00012	DC,DS,RN	C.4.3	C.2.8	--	--
			01275	000121	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01275	00013	DC,DS,RN	C.4.2.2	C.4.3	--	--
			01275	00014	DC,DS,RN	C.4.1.1.6	--	--	--
			01275	00015	DC	C.8.2	C.2.7	--	--
			01275	00016	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01275	00017	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01275	00026	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01275	00034	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01275	00038	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01275	00049	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01275	00051	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01275	00052	DC	C.7.4.1	C.4.1.5.1	--	--
			01275	00053	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01275	00054	DC	C.4.1	--	--	--
			01275	00055	DC	C.4.1	--	--	--
			01275	00056	DC	C.7.2.3	C.4.1.3.3	--	--
			01275	00057	DC	C.5.1	C.5.11	--	--
			01275	00058	DC	C.6.1	C.6.3	--	--
			01275	00059	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01275	00060	DC	C.4.1.1	C.4.1.2.2	--	--
			01275	00061	DC	C.4.1.1	C.4.1.2.1	--	--
			01275	00062	DC	C.5.1	C.4.1.1	C.4.1.2.2	--
			01275	00063	DC	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01275	00064	DC	C.5.6	C.5.1	C.4.1.2.2	--
			01275	00065	DC	C.5.6	--	--	--
			01275	00066	DC	C.4.1.1.3	C.5.1	C.8.2	--
			01275	00067	DC	C.5.3	--	--	--
			01275	00068	DC	C.5.4	--	--	--
			01275	00069	DC	C.5.7	C.8.4	--	--
			01275	00070	DC	C.5.7	C.4.1.1.5	--	--
			01275	00071	DC	C.5.7	--	--	--
			01275	00072	DS	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			01275	00073	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01275	00074	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
			01275	00075	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01275	00076	DS	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01275	00077	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01275	00078	DS	C.5.1	C.5.11	C.5.4	--
			01275	00079	DS	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01275	00080	DS	C.5.4	C.5.5	C.5.7	C.5.6
			01275	00081	DS	C.5.6	--	--	--
			01275	00082	DS	C.8.4	C.4.1.1.5	--	--
			01275	00083	DS	C.8.4	--	--	--
			01275	00084	DS	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01275	00085	DS	C.8.4	--	--	--
			01275	00086	DS	C.5.8	C.4.1.1.8	--	--
			01275	00087	RN	C.4.1.1.6	C.4.3	--	--
			01275	00088	RN	C.4.1	--	--	--
			01275	00089	RN	C.5.1	C.6.3	--	--
			01275	00090	RN	C.4.1.1	C.4.1.2	C.5.1	--
			01275	00091	RN	C.5.4	--	--	--
			01275	00092	RN	C.5.4	--	--	--
			01275	00094	RN	C.8.4	--	--	--
			01275	00095	RN	C.8.4	--	--	--
			01275	00096	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01275	00097	-----	C.4.3	C.4.2.2	--	--
			01275	00098	DS,RN,DC	C.4.3	C.4.3	--	--
			01275	00099	DC,RN,DS	C.7.1.1	C.7.2.3	C.7.2.3	C.7.1.1
			01275	00100	DS,DC	C.7.2.3	C.7.1.1	--	--
			01275	00101	DS,RN	C.7.2.3	C.7.1.1.3	C.7.1.1	--
			01275	00102	DS,DC,RN	C.4.3	C.4.2.2	C.3.7	C.7.1
			01275	00103	DC,RN,DS	C.4.2.2	C.3.7	C.7.1	--
			01275	00104	DC,RN,DS	C.4.2.2	C.7.1	C.3.7	--
			01275	00105	DC,RN,DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01275	00106	DC,RN,DS	C.8.2	C.6.5	--	--
			01275	00107	DC,RN,DS	C.5.7	C.5.7	--	--
			01275	00108	DS	C.6.6	C.6.5	--	--
			01275	00110	DC,RN,DS	C.5.11	C.5.11	--	--
			01275	00111	DC,RN,DS	C.4.3	C.4.3	--	--
			01275	00112	DC,RN,DS	C.5.11	C.5.11	C.5.11	--
			01275	00113	DC,RN,DS	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01275	00114	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
C.9-75	Kearns, Artis	Dept. of Army Corps of Engineers	01275	00115	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01275	00116	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			01275	00117	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01275	00118	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01275	00119	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01275	00120	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01275	00121	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01275	00122	DC,RN,DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01275	00123	DC,RN,DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01275	00124	DC,RN,DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01275	00125	DS	C.4.3	C.5.11	--	--
			01275	00127	DS,DC,RN	C.5.7	C.6.1	--	--
			01275	00128	DS,DC,RN	C.8.4	C.8.4	--	--
			01275	00129	-----	C.2.7	--	C.5.7	--
			Magnees, III, Col. Thomas H.	Dept. of Army Corps of Engineers	01440	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--
	01440	00004A			-----	C.2.8	--	--	--
	01440	00004B			-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	02697	00007			RN	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
	02697	00023			-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	02697	00026			RN	C.6.4	C.7.1.1.1	C.7.2.1	--
	02697	00027			RN	C.6.4	C.7.1.1.1	C.7.2.1	--
	Martin, Terri	National Parks & Cons. Assoc.	02697	00028	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--
			02195	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02195	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			02195	00003	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02195	00004	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			02195	00005	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			02195	00006	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			02195	00007	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
	Parker, Frank L.	National Research Council	02195	00008	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			02195	00009	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02669	00001	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02669	00002	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02669	00003	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02669	00004	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02669	00005	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02669	00006	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02669	00007	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
			02669	00008	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02669	00009	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02669	00010	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02669	00011	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02669	00012	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02669	00013	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02669	00014	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02669	00015	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02669	00016	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
Santman, L.D.	U.S. Dept. of Transportation		02669	00017	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01568	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01568	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01568	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01568	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01568	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01568	00007	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01568	00008	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01568	00009	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01568	00010	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01568	00011	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01568	00012	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01568	00013	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01568	00014	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01568	00015	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01568	00016	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01568	00017	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01568	00018	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01568	00022	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01568	00023	DC	C.3.3.2	--	--	--
	01568	00024	DS	C.3.3.2	--	--	--		
Severance, Owen	Natl Parks & Conservation Assn.		01568	00025	DS	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01276	00001	DC	C.3.1.2	C.3.1.3	--	--
			01276	00002	-----	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			01276	00003	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			01276	00004	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01276	00005	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			01276	00006	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			01276	00007	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
			01276	00008	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			01276	00009	DC	C.7.2.4	C.7.2.5	--	--
			01276	00010	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			01276	00011	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01276	00012	DC	C.7.2.5	C.7.1.1.5	--	--
			01276	00013	DC	C.7.2.5	C.7.1.1.5	--	--
			01276	00014	DC	C.7.2.5	C.7.1.1.5	--	--
			01276	00015	DC	C.4.1.3.5	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.2.4	--
			01276	00016	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01276	00017A	DC	C.4.1.5	--	--	--
			01276	00018A	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			01276	00018B	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01276	00019	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01276	00020	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01276	00021	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01276	00022	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01276	00023	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01276	00024	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01276	00025	DC	C.7.4	C.7.2	--	--
			01276	00026	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			01276	00027	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
			01276	00028	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01276	00029	DC	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
			01276	00030	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01276	00031	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01276	00032	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			01276	00033	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01276	00034	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			01276	00035	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01276	00036	DC	C.4.2.1	--	--	--
			01276	00038	DC	C.4.2.1	--	--	--
			01276	00039	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01276	00040	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01276	00041	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01276	00042	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01276	00043	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01276	00044	DC	C.4.1.3.4	--	--	--
			01276	00045	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
			01276	00046	DC	C.7.2	C.7.1.1	--	--
			01276	00047	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--	--
			01276	00048A	DC	C.7.1.1.3	C.7.2.3	--	--
			01276	00048B	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			01276	00049	DC	C.4.1.3.5	--	--	--
			01276	00050	DC	C.7.2.2	C.4.1.3.2	--	--
			01276	00051	DC	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
			01276	00052	DC	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
			01276	00053	DC	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
			01276	00054	DC	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
			01276	00055	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
Shiflet, Thomas	U.S. Dept. of Agriculture	01238	00001	DS,RN,DC	C.6.6	C.5.11	C.2.7	--	
		01238	00002	DS,RN,DC	C.2.2.1	C.7.1.1	C.7.2	--	
		01238	00003	DS,RN,DC	C.4.1.1	C.4.1	C.4.1.1	--	
		01238	00004	DS,RN,DC	C.4.3	--	--	--	
		01238	00005	DS	C.4.1.2.1	C.7.1.1.8	--	--	
		01238	00006	DS	C.7.2	--	--	--	
		01238	00007	DS	C.4.1.2.1	C.4.1.3	--	--	
		01238	00008	DS	C.4.1.3	--	--	--	
		01238	00009	DS	C.4.1.1.2	--	--	--	
		01238	00010	DS	C.4.1.1.9	--	--	--	
		01238	00011	DS	C.4.1.2.3	--	--	--	
		01238	00012	DS	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--	
		01238	00013	DS	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--	
		01238	00014	DS	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--	
		01238	00015	DS	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--	
		01238	00016	DS	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--	
		01238	00017	DS	C.4.2.1	--	--	--	
		01238	00018	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--	
		01238	00019	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--	
		01238	00020	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--	
		01238	00021	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--	
		01238	00022	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--	
		01238	00023	DS	C.4.2.3	--	--	--	
		01238	00024	DS	C.7.1.1.1	--	--	--	
		01238	00025	DS	C.7.1.1.8	--	--	--	
		01238	00026	DS	C.7.1.1	--	--	--	
		01238	00027	DS	C.7.1.1.1	C.7.1.2	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington, D.C.</u> (continued)									
Smith, David W. Stennis, John Swift, Congressman Al <									

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Florida</u> (continued)									
	Votae, Deborah		00062	00004	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Williams,Jr., J.W.	Florida Power & Light Company	02691	00001	-----	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01556	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
<u>Georgia</u>									
	Sokol, Jean	The Wilderness Society	00652	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	C.7.2.5	C.7.3	--
			00652	00002	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00652	00003	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
			00652	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Yarbrough, Mrs. J.C.		00083	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00083	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00083	00003	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
<u>Idaho</u>									
	Anonymous	C.A.N.W.E	01162	00001	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			01162	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01162	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01162	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01162	00006	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
	Brower, Cheryl		02609	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02609	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	C.7.2.5	--	--
			02609	00003	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			02609	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Funderburg, Robert D.	State of Idaho	00173	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			00173	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			00173	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			00173	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Hall, S.J.		00150	00001A	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Hanson, Wes & Gertie		01142	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01142	00003	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
	Patchin, Margaret		01149	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Pinkham, Allen V.	Nez Perce Tribal Exec. Comm.	01253	00001	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01253	00003	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
			01253	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01253	00005	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			01253	00006	-----	C.2.5.1	--	--	--

C.9-80

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Idaho (continued)									
			01253	00008	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01253	00015	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			01253	00078	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01253	00103	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01253	00104	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01253	00105	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01253	00106	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01253	00107	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01253	00108	-----	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01253	00109	-----	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01253	00110	-----	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01253	00111	-----	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01253	00112	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
Robinson, Mary & Dwight			01585	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01585	00002	-----	C.2.6.2	--	--	--
Illinois									
	Coyner, Donald R.		00461	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00461	00002	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
Dinelli, Wayne		DuPage Audubon Society	00149	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
Gursh, Marla Kay			00161	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00161	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
Hulmer, Ross and Sylvia			00326	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
Kendorski, Francis S.		Terraform Engineers Inc.	02719	00001	DC	C.4.1.1.6	--	--	--
Leineweber, Kevin			00313	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
Listermann, Nick			00312	00001	DC	C.7.2.5	C.7.2.2	C.7.3	--
McGuire, Margaret A.			00052	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
Rice, Larry			00172	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
Scheff, Dorothy			00181	00001	DC	C.6.5	--	--	--
Smith, Jill Janine			00146	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00146	00002	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			00146	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00146	00004	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00146	00005	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00146	00006	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
Smith, Joan C. J.			00325	00001	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			00325	00002	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Illinois</u> (continued)									
			00325	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00325	00004	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00325	00005	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
	Speron, Sam J.		00302	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00302	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Stern, David A.		00196	00001	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
	Tolliver, Judy		00532	00001	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
	Tsiang, Margaret		01071	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01071	00002	DC	C.7.1	--	--	--
			01071	00003	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
	Warble, Steve		01066	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
		Wilderness & Nature Photography	00038	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Wilson, Richard C.		00621	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00621	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	C.7.2.6	--	--
	Wyatt, John J.	Illinois Central Gulf	01740	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
<u>Indiana</u>									
	Cox, Gary M.		00477	00001	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			00477	00002A	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00477	00002B	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00477	00003	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			00477	00004	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			00477	00005A	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00477	00005B	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00477	00006	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00477	00007A	DC	C.4.1.5	--	--	--
			00477	00007B	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00477	00008	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00477	00009	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			00477	00010	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00477	00011	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
	Crockett, Dr. Wayne A.		00248	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Noe, Nicholas W.		00363	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Read, Charlotte J.	Save the Dunes Council	00048	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--

C.9-82

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Kansas</u>									
		Boy Scouts of America, Pack 3	02736	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Klann, Erik	Public Citizen	02737	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Russell, Derek		02738	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Moore-Anderson, Carol J.		00034	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Moore-Fleming, Delores B.		00036	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Moore-Jones, Joan E.		00037	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Sperry, Theodore M.		00080	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Tyseh, Nathan	Public Citizen	02739	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
<u>Kentucky</u>									
	Kelly, James C.		00197	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00197	00002	DC	C.6.5	--	--	--
			00197	00003	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00197	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
<u>Louisiana</u>									
	Anonymous		02178	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02178	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02178	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02178	00007	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
		Bienville Parish Police Jury	02175	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02175	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02175	00003	-----	C.2.4.3	--	--	--
			02175	00007	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Anonymous		02176	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02176	00006	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02176	00008	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
			02176	00009	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--
	Beatty, Mayor Lloyd		00910	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00910	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00910	00007	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Bohlinger, L. Hall		00906	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00906	00002	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			00906	00003	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00906	00004	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00906	00005	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Louisiana (continued)									
Bohlinger, L. Hall	LA Dept. of Environ. Quality	02172	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
		02172	00002	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--	
		02172	00003	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--	
		02172	00004	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--	
		02172	00005	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
		01368	00005	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--	
		01368	00006	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--	
		01368	00047	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		01368	00048	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		01368	00049	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		01368	00050	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		01368	00051	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		01368	00053	-----	C.7.3	--	--	--	
		01368	00054	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		01368	00055	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		01368	00056	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		01368	00057	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		01368	00058	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		01368	00059	-----	C.7.3	--	--	--	
		Bohlinger, L. Hall	Office of Air Qual. & Nuc. Eng.	01368	00060	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--
01368	00062			-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
01368	00063			-----	C.7.3	--	--	--	
01368	00064			-----	C.7.3	--	--	--	
01368	00065			-----	C.7.3	--	--	--	
01368	00110			-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--	
01368	00111			-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
02168	00001			-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
02168	00002			-----	C.2.2	--	--	--	
02168	00003			-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--	
Bohlinger, L. Hall	Office of Air Qual. & Nuc. Eng.	02168	00004	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--	
		02168	00005	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
		02683	00001	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--	
		02683	00002	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--	
		02683	00003	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--	
		02683	00004	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--	
		02683	00005	-----	C.2.7.1	--	--	--	
		02683	00009	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--	
		02683	00013	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Louisiana</u> (continued)									
			02683	00028	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			02683	00030	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02683	00031	-----	C.2.4.2	--	--	--
			02683	00038	RN	C.7.2	--	--	--
			02683	00060	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02683	00061	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Bolinger, L. Hall		00898	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00898	00002	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			00898	00003	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00898	00004	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00898	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Byars, Mayor Noel		00911	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00911	00006	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00911	00008	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Collins, Harry		00920	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
		Office of Air Qual. & Nuc. Eng.	02684	00001	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02684	00002	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02684	00003	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02684	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02684	00005	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			02684	00006	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02684	00007	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02684	00008	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02684	00010	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02684	00011	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02684	00014	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02684	00015	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02684	00016	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02684	00019	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02684	00020	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02684	00021	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02684	00022	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02684	00286	-----	C.5.7	--	--	--
			02684	00287	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02684	00319	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			02684	00326	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02684	00345	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02684	00346	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Louisiana</u> (continued)									
			02684	00367	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02684	00492	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02684	00493	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			02684	00494	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			02684	00495	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			02684	00496	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02684	00497	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02684	00498	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02684	00499	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02684	00501	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02684	00502	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02684	00503	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02684	00504	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02684	00505	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02684	00506	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02684	00507	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02684	00508	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02684	00509	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02684	00510	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02684	00511	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02684	00512	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
		Office of Air Qual. & Nuc. Eng.	02685	00005	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			02685	00007	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02685	00009	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02685	00016	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02685	00019	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
	Cramer, George		00904	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			00904	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			00904	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			00904	00006	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
	Cramer, George		02171	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02171	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02171	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02171	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02171	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02171	00007	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Daigre, Glen		00899	00001	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			00899	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Louisiana (continued)									
	Fields, David		00909	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00909	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00909	00003	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--
			00909	00007	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Garrett, Bruce		00913	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Hammond, Frank		00919	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00919	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Henagan, L. A.		02169	00001	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			02169	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Henagan, L. A.	LA State Planning Office	02174	00001	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			02174	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02174	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Lacour, SMS Henry J.	USAF Retired	00006	00001	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			00006	00002	-----	C.2.8	--	--	--
			00006	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Lowe, Patsy		00917	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Mailin, Ronald	Sierra Club	02631	00001	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			02631	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02631	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02631	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02631	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02631	00006	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
	Martin, Ronald A.		00411	00001	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			00411	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00411	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00411	00004	-----	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00411	00005	-----	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00411	00006	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
	Martin, Ronald		00914	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00914	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00914	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			00914	00004	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			00914	00007	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			00914	00008	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			00914	00009	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			00914	00010	-----	C.3.3.1	--	--	--
	McMullen, Ted		00908	00002	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			00908	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Louisiana</u> (continued)									
	Moore-Iverson, Fannie F.	Webster Parish Police Jury	00047	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Robertson, Bill		02177	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Selbin, Joel		00903	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Skibitzke, Herbert		00905	00001	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
	Tobin, Robert		00918	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
<u>Massachusetts</u>									
	Greene, Cathy C.	Greone, Alan	00656	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00656	00005	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			00656	00006	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00396	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00396	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00396	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00396	00004	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
	Halpern, Harvey		01077	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Kesselman, Barry		00276	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Prost, Carol		00332	00001	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			00332	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Sibik, Sara & Charlie		00045	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00045	00002	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			00045	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00045	00004	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00045	00005	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00045	00006	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
			00045	00007	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Stedman, Anne B.	00353	00001	-----	C.7.2.5	--	--	--	
		00353	00002	-----	C.7.2.4	--	--	--	
		00353	00003	-----	C.7.1	--	--	--	
		00353	00004	-----	C.7.1	--	--	--	
		00353	00005	-----	C.7.2.6	--	--	--	
		00353	00006	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
	Talcott, Jane	00187	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--	
	Watson, Wendy	02112	00001	DC	C.7.1.1	C.7.2	--	--	
		02112	00002	DC	C.7.1.1.2	C.7.2.2	--	--	
		02112	00003	DC	C.7.1.1.6	C.7.2.6	--	--	
		02112	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Maryland</u>									
	Drews, Kenneth A.		00089	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00089	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Goff, Alice		01811	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Solomon, Dr. Kenneth	Sheppard & Enoch Pratt Hospital	00086	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00086	00002	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			00086	00003	DC	C.6.5	--	--	--
			00086	00004	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00086	00005	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00086	00006	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			00086	00007	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			00086	00008	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00086	00009	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
<u>Maine</u>									
	Adams, David A		01193	00001	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01193	00002	DC	C.7.2.6	C.7.1	C.7.2.4	C.7.2.5
			01193	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Brainerd, John W.		00092	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00092	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
<u>Michigan</u>									
	Booker, Danny		00271	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Coyer, Gayle	Upper Peninsula Env. Coalition	00650	00001	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			00650	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00650	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00650	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00650	00005	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			00650	00006	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00650	00007	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00650	00008	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			00650	00009	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			00650	00010	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			00650	00011	DC	C.5.6	--	--	--
			00650	00012	DC	C.6.3	--	--	--
			00650	00013	DC	C.7.2.5	C.7.2.3	--	--
			00650	00014	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Michigan</u> (continued)									
			00650	00015	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			00650	00016	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00650	00017	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00650	00018	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
	Leighton, M.		00422	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00422	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Martin, Dr. James E.	School of Public Health	02605	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	C.3.1.3	--	--
			02605	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Scherpenisse, Carol Sue		00462	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Stone, G. W. E.		00489	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
<u>Minnesota</u>									
C.9-90	Peterson, William V.		00134	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Schnabel, Daniel E.		00275	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00275	00004	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
<u>Mississippi</u>									
	Abbott, Carol		01963	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Abbott, Chestre H.		01964	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Abbott, Kelly J.		01999	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Adamo, Vincent		00942	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00942	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Agar, Tina		01749	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Allain, Governor Bill		01031	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01031	00002	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01031	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01031	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01031	00005	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01031	00005A	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01031	00005B	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01031	00006	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Allen, Elizabeth		01936	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Alvarado, Julie Elizabeth		01852	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Anonymous		01637	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Anonymous		01736	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Anonymous		01800	00001	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Mississippi</u> (continued)									
	Anonymous		01817	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Anonymous		01906	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Anonymous		01908	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Anonymous		01940	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Anonymous		01956	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Anonymous		01968	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Anonymous		01984	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
		Home Builders Assn. of Jackson	01683	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
		MS State Med. Assn. of Delegat.	01681	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
		Mississippi Situation	01737	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
		Pre School, Director	01814	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
		Sierra Club Central MS Group	01607	00001	RN	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
			01607	00002	RN	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
			01607	00003	RN	C.6.3	--	--	--
			01607	00004	RN	C.5	C.7.2.8	--	--
			01607	00005	RN	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01607	00006	RN	C.5.7	--	--	--
			01607	00007	RN	C.4.2	--	--	--
			01607	00008	RN	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01607	00009	RN	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			01607	00010	RN	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01607	00011	RN	C.7.3	--	--	--
	Asche, Suzanne L		01949	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Atkins, James W.		01927	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Austin, Virginia B.		00217	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Backstrom, Kally		01000	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Backstrom, Kally		01641	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Baillieul, Thomas	NWTS Program Office	01744	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Bakker, Shirley J.		01777	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Bakker, Adolph R.		01778	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Bakker, Terry		01780	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Baldwin, Rev. Fred		00993	00001	RN	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00993	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00993	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00993	00004	RN	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00993	00005	RN	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00993	00006	RN	C.7.4.4	--	--	--
	Ball, Mary		01623	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

C. 9-92

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Mississippi</u> (continued)									
C. 9-92	Ball, Wilbur G.	MS Dept. of Energy and Trans.	01370	00001	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			01370	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01370	00003	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--
			01370	00004	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01370	00005	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01370	00006	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			01370	00007	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			01370	00008	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			01370	00009	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01370	00010	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01370	00011	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01370	00012	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01370	00013	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01370	00014	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01370	00015	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01370	00016	-----	C.3.4.2.1	--	--	--
			01370	00017	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01370	00018	-----	C.3.4.1	C.3.4.2.2	--	--
			01370	00019	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01370	00020	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01370	00021	RN,DC,DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01370	00022	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01370	00023	RN	C.4.1.1.6	--	--	--
			01370	00024	-----	C.3.4.2.1	--	--	--
			01370	00025	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01370	00026	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--
			01370	00027	RN	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01370	00028	RN	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01370	00029	RN	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01370	00030	RN	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01370	00031	RN	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01370	00032	RN	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01370	00033	RN	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01370	00034	RN	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01370	00035	RN	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01370	00036	RN	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01370	00037	RN	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01370	00038	RN	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Mississippi</u> (continued)									
			01370	00039	RN	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01370	00040	RN	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01370	00041	RN	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01370	00042	RN	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01370	00043	RN	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01370	00044	RN	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01370	00045	RN	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01370	00046	RN	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01370	00047	RN	C.5.1	C.5.11	--	--
			01370	00048	RN	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01370	00049	RN	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01370	00050	RN	C.3.3.2	C.5.6	C.4.1.1.5	--
			01370	00051	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01370	00052	RN	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01370	00053	RN	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01370	00054	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01370	00055	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01370	00056	RN	C.5.6	--	--	--
			01370	00057	RN	C.5.6	C.4.1.1.5	--	--
			01370	00058	RN	C.5.6	C.4.1.1.5	--	--
			01370	00059	RN	C.5.6	C.4.1.1.5	--	--
			01370	00060	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01370	00061	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01370	00062	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01370	00063	RN	C.4.1.1.7	--	--	--
			01370	00064	RN	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01370	00065	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01370	00066	RN	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01370	00067	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01370	00068	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01370	00069	RN	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01370	00070	RN	C.4.1.1.5	C.4.1.1.8	--	--
			01370	00071	RN	C.4.1.1.5	C.5.3	C.8.2	--
			01370	00072	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01370	00073	RN	C.8.3	C.8.2	C.7.2	--
			01370	00074	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01370	00075	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01370	00076	RN	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Mississippi</u> (continued)									
			01370	00077	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01370	00078	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01370	00079	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01370	00080	RN	C.4.1.1.6	--	--	--
			01370	00081	RN	C.4.1.1.5	C.5.3	C.8.2	--
			01370	00082	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01370	00083	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01370	00084	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01370	00085	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01370	00086	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01370	00087	RN	C.5.7	C.4.1.1.5	--	--
			01370	00088	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01370	00089	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01370	00090	RN	C.4.2.1	--	--	--
			01370	00091	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01370	00092	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01370	00093	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01370	00094	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01370	00095	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01370	00096	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01370	00097	RN	C.4.2.1	--	--	--
			01370	00098	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01370	00099	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01370	00100	RN	C.4.1.1.6	--	--	--
			01370	00101	RN	C.4.1.1.6	--	--	--
			01370	00102	RN	C.5.8	--	--	--
			01370	00103	RN	C.5.8	--	--	--
			01370	00104	RN	C.4.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01370	00105	RN	C.4.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01370	00106	RN	C.4.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01370	00107	RN	C.4.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01370	00108	RN	C.4.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01370	00109	RN	C.4.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01370	00110	RN	C.4.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01370	00111	RN	C.5.8	C.4.1.1	--	--
			01370	00112	RN	C.5.8	--	--	--
			01370	00113	RN	C.5.8	C.4.1.1.8	--	--
			01370	00114	RN	C.4.1.1.8	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

C

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Mississippi</u> (continued)									
			01370	00115	RN	C.4.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01370	00116	RN	C.4.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01370	00117	RN	C.4.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01370	00118A	RN	C.5.8	--	--	--
			01370	00118B	RN	C.4.1.1.5	C.5.8	--	--
			01370	00119A	RN	C.4.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01370	00119B	RN	C.6.6	--	--	--
			01370	00120A	RN	C.4.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01370	00120B	RN	C.6.6	--	--	--
			01370	00121	RN	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
			01370	00122	RN	C.7.2.7	--	--	--
			01370	00123	RN	C.6.6	--	--	--
			01370	00124	RN	C.6.6	--	--	--
			01370	00125	RN	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
			01370	00126	RN	C.4.1.3.2	C.5.11	--	--
			01370	00127	RN	C.4.1.3.2	C.5.11	--	--
			01370	00128	RN	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
			01370	00129	RN	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
			01370	00130	RN	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01370	00131	RN	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01370	00132	RN	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
			01370	00133	RN	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			01370	00134	RN	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
			01370	00135	RN	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
			01370	00136	RN	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
			01370	00137	RN	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			01370	00138	RN	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
			01370	00139	RN	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01370	00140	RN	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
			01370	00141	RN	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01370	00142	RN	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01370	00143	RN	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01370	00144	RN	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01370	00145	RN	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01370	00146	RN	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01370	00147	RN	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01370	00148	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01370	00149	RN	C.4.2.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

C. 9-96

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Mississippi (continued)									
			01370	00150	RN	C.4.1.2.3	--	--	--
			01370	00151	RN	C.4.1.2.3	--	--	--
			01370	00152	RN	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
			01370	00153	RN	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
			01370	00154	RN	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01370	00155	RN	C.7.1.1.2	--	--	--
			01370	00156	RN	C.7.1.1.2	--	--	--
			01370	00157	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01370	00158	RN	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01370	00159	RN	C.4.1.5.1	--	--	--
			01370	00160	RN	C.4.1.5.4	--	--	--
			01370	00161	RN	C.7.4.4	C.4.1.5.4	C.4.1.5	--
			01370	00162	RN	C.4.1.5	--	--	--
			01370	00163	RN	C.4.1.3	--	--	--
			01370	00164	RN	C.4.1.3.1	C.6.1	--	--
			01370	00165	RN	C.4.1.3	C.4.1.5	--	--
			01370	00166	RN	C.4.1.5	C.7.4	--	--
			01370	00167	RN	C.7.2	C.7.4	--	--
			01370	00168	RN	C.4.1.3	C.4.1.5	--	--
			01370	00169	RN	C.4.1.5	C.7.4	--	--
			01370	00170	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01370	00171	-----	C.3.4.2.1	--	--	--
			01370	00172	RN	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
			01370	00173	RN	C.4.1.5	--	--	--
			01370	00174	RN	C.4.1.5	--	--	--
			01370	00175	RN	C.4.1.5.1	--	--	--
			01370	00176	RN	C.4.1.5.1	--	--	--
			01370	00177	RN	C.4.1.5.1	--	--	--
			01370	00178	RN	C.4.1.5.1	--	--	--
			01370	00179	RN	C.4.1.5.1	--	--	--
			01370	00180	RN	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			01370	00181	RN	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	--
			01370	00182	RN	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	--
			01370	00183	RN	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01370	00184	RN	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			01370	00185	RN	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01370	00186	RN	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			01370	00187	RN	C.7.4.3	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Mississippi</u> (continued)									
			01370	00188	RN	C.7.4.4	--	--	--
			01370	00189	RN	C.7.4.4	--	--	--
			01370	00190	RN	C.7.4	C.7.1.2	--	--
			01370	00191	RN	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
			01370	00192	RN	C.7.4	C.7.1.2	--	--
			01370	00193	RN	C.4.1.3.6	--	--	--
			01370	00194	RN	C.7.4.1	C.4.1.5.1	--	--
			01370	00195A	RN	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			01370	00195B	RN	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01370	00196	RN	C.4.1.5.4	--	--	--
			01370	00197	RN	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01370	00198	RN	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01370	00199	RN	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			01370	00200	-----	C.2.1	--	--	--
			01370	00201	RN	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01370	00202	RN	C.4.1.2.3	--	--	--
			01370	00203	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01370	00204	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01370	00205	RN	C.4.1.1	--	--	--
			01370	00206	RN	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01370	00207	RN	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01370	00208	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01370	00209	RN	C.5.3	--	--	--
			01370	00210	RN	C.5.5	--	--	--
			01370	00211	RN	C.4.1.3.2	C.7.1.1.2	--	--
			01370	00212	RN	C.4.1.5	C.7.4	--	--
			01370	00213	RN	C.4.1.5	--	--	--
			01370	00214	RN	C.4.1.5	--	--	--
			01370	00215	RN	C.4.1.5	--	--	--
			01370	00216	RN	C.4.1.5	--	--	--
			01370	00217	RN	C.4.1.5	--	--	--
			01370	00218	RN	C.4.1.5	--	--	--
			01370	00219	RN	C.4.1.5	--	--	--
			01370	00220	RN	C.4.1.5	--	--	--
			01370	00221	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
Banch, Jack		City of Gulfport	01702	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
Barsinew, M. J.		NPO/DOE	01702	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01723	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--

C.9-97

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Mississippi</u> (continued)									
	Bartlett, F. G.		01941	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Basnight, Melissa L.		01799	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Bates, Jr., Hughie G.		01812	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Baumhauer, Dr. & Mrs. Emile		01951	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Beardsley, Derek		00990	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Beaugez, Hope Alison		01902	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Beaugez, Robert L.		01904	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Bellande, Mary H.		01962	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Bellande, Jr., William E.		01858	00001	RN	C.7.2	C.7.4	--	--
	Ben Bow, Roy W.		01883	00001	RN	C.7.4	--	--	--
	Bennett, Lloyd U.		01970	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Bennett, Kanzetty F.		01973	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Bergeron, Dixie	Richton Elementary School	01212	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Bess, V.		02000	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Billington, W.		01886	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Birkoliw, Lee D.		02703	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02703	00002	-----	C.2.1.5	--	--	--
	Blackman, Carolyn		01017	00001	RN	C.6.1	--	--	--
			01017	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01017	00003	RN	C.4.1.5.1	--	--	--
			01017	00004	RN	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01017	00005	RN	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01017	00006	RN	C.6.5	--	--	--
			01017	00007A	RN	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			01017	00007B	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01017	00008	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01017	00009	RN	C.7.4.4	--	--	--
			01017	00010	RN	C.4.1.3.5	--	--	--
			01017	00011	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01017	00012	RN	C.4.1.1	--	--	--
			01017	00013	RN	C.4.1.1.6	--	--	--
			01017	00014	RN	C.8.2	--	--	--
			01017	00015	RN	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01017	00016	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Blackman, Joe		01019	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01019	00002	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
			01019	00003	RN	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01019	00004	RN	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Mississippi</u> (continued)									
C.9-99	Blankenship, Dorothy M. Blanton, Tom		01019	00005	RN	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
			01019	00006	RN	C.7.4.4	--	--	--
			01019	00007	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01762	00001	RN	C.5.6	C.4.1.1.5	C.7.2.8	C.6.1
			00949	00001	-----	C.2.8	--	--	--
			00949	00002	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			00949	00003	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			00949	00004	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--
			00949	00005	RN	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
			00949	00006	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			00949	00007	RN	C.5.3	--	--	--
			00949	00008	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Blanton, Tom		00989	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00989	00002	RN	C.4.1.1.8	C.7.4.2	--	--
			00989	00003	RN	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00989	00004	RN	C.3.1.3	C.5.8	--	--
			00989	00005	RN	C.5.7	C.3.1.3	C.4.1.1.5	--
			00989	00006	RN	C.5.6	C.4.1.1.5	--	--
			00989	00007	RN	C.5.2	--	--	--
			00989	00008	RN	C.5.11	--	--	--
			00989	00009	RN	C.5.3	C.5.11	--	--
			00989	00010	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
	Blessey, Mayor Gerald		00989	00011	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00935	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00935	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00935	00003	RN	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
			00935	00004	RN	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00935	00005	RN	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00935	00006	RN	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00935	00007	RN	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00935	00008	RN	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00935	00009	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Blessey, Ann Blessey, Mayor Gerald Blessey, Mayor Gerald Bograd, Jessie Boland, Mrs. Michael J.	City of Biloxi	01697	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01887	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01686	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02254	00001	RN	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01863	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01618	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Mississippi</u> (continued)									
C.9-100	Boland, Mike	Christ Episcopal Day School	01618	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Boland, Molly		01619	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Boland, Jon		01620	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Bolen, Jr., James E.		01622	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01751	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01751	00002	RN	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01751	00003	RN	C.5.1	C.7.2.8	--	--
			01751	00004	RN	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01751	00005	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Bossier, Mollie		00972	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Bossier, Regina		01665	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Bossier, Regina		01667	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Boushay, Kim		00983	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Bowman, Teresa		01898	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Bowman, Calvin D.		01899	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Bowman, Raymond I.		01915	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Boyll, Jamie		01035	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01035	00002	RN	C.5.7	C.4.1.1.5	--	--
			01035	00003	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01035	00004	RN	C.7.4.1	C.6.4	--	--
			01035	00005	RN	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01035	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01035	00007	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01035	00008	RN	C.6.5	--	--	--
			01035	00009	RN	C.5.1	C.5.11	--	--
			01035	00010	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			01035	00011	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01035	00012	-----	C.2.5.1	--	--	--
			01035	00013	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01035	00014	RN	C.4.3	C.7.2.8	--	--
	Brackeen, Charlie D.	State of MS Military Dept	01301	00002	-----	C.3.2	--	--	--
			01301	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01301	00004	-----	C.2.3	--	--	--
			01301	00006	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01301	00008	RN	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
			01301	00009	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01301	00010	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01301	00011	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

C.9-101

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Mississippi</u> (continued)									
			01301	00012	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
			01301	00031	-----	C.6.4	--	--	--
			01301	00032	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Braun, Taleta Gayle	Braun & Co. Realtors	01668	00001	RN	C.4.1.1.5	C.3.2	--	--
	Breal, B. J.		01876	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Brooks, Sarah		01787	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			01787	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Brown, Dr. Brenda		01750	00001	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--
	Brown, Stephanie		02016	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Bryant, Candace I.		01754	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Bryant, William Rae		01783	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Buchanan, Michael		01774	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Buchanan, Jennifer		01862	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Bullard, Bettie Posey		01765	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Burgess, R. M.		01616	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Burke, John W.		02025	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Bush, Catherine		00992	00001	RN	C.6.3	C.5.4	--	--
	Bush, Katherine P.		01640	00001	RN	C.5.4	C.6.3	C.3.4.3	--
	Byrd, Gail Hinton		01872	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Calhoun, Dr. Joanne P.		02047	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Calhoun, Joseph W.		02048	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Callim, Dorothy M.		02018	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Cameron, Mack	Office of the Attny General	01029	00001	-----	C.6.1	--	--	--
			01029	00002A	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01029	00002B	-----	C.2.1.5	--	--	--
			01029	00003	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01029	00004	RN	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01029	00005	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01029	00006	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01029	00007	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Cameron, Mack		01605	00001	-----	C.6.1	--	--	--
			01605	00002	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			01605	00002A	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01605	00002B	-----	C.2.1.5	--	--	--
			01605	00003	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01605	00004	RN	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01605	00005A	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01605	00005B	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Mississippi</u> (continued)									
C.9-102	Canizaro, Robert H. Caranna, Cono	AIA	01679 00938 00938 00938	00001 00001 00002 00003	----- ----- ----- -----	C.3.4.4 C.3.4.4 C.3.1.2 C.3.4.4	-- -- -- --	-- -- -- --	-- -- -- --
	Carter, Amanda Carter, Claudia Carter, Mary F. Cates, Arlene Chipley, Dixie Wright Chipley, Robert Clement, Sheri Cleveland, Mr. & Mrs Milton Cochran, Senator Thad Coffey, Dovin	CAND	01878 01879 01937 01922 00979 00986 01798 01782 01661 00964 00964 00964 00996 00996 00996 00996 00996 00996	00001 00001 00001 00001 00001 00001 00001 00001 00001 00001 00002 00003 00001 00002 00003 00004 00005 00006 00007 00008 00009 00010 00011 00012 00013 00014 00015 00016 00017 00018 00019	----- RN ----- ----- ----- ----- ----- ----- ----- ----- ----- ----- ----- ----- RN RN ----- ----- ----- ----- RN RN ----- ----- ----- RN				

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Mississippi</u> (continued)									
Cole, Bonnie		Perry County CAND	01022	00003	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01022	00004	RN	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01022	00005	RN	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
			01323	00001	RN	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			01323	00002	RN	C.7.4	--	--	--
Cole, Dorothy G.		Perry County CAND	01323	00003	RN	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			01282	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
Cole, Dorothy G.		Perry County CAND	01282	00002	RN	C.3.2	--	--	--
			01636	00001	RN	C.4.1.3.5	--	--	--
			01636	00002	RN	C.3.2	--	--	--
			01636	00003	RN	C.4.1.5	C.7.4	--	--
			01636	00004	RN	C.4.1.5	--	--	--
			01636	00005	RN	C.7.4.2	C.5.1	--	--
			01636	00006	RN	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01636	00007	RN	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01636	00008	RN	C.4.1.5	--	--	--
			01636	00009	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01636	00010	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01636	00011	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01636	00012	RN	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
			01636	00013	RN	C.6.2	--	--	--
			01636	00014	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			01636	00015	-----	C.2.1.5	--	--	--
			01636	00016	RN	C.7.2.2	C.7.4.2	--	--
			01636	00017	RN	C.5.8	--	--	--
			01636	00018	RN	C.5.3	C.5.1	C.5.6	--
			01636	00019	RN	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01636	00020	RN	C.7.4.5	--	--	--
			01636	00021	RN	C.4.1	--	--	--
			01636	00021A	-----	C.2.3	C.4.1	--	--
			01636	00021B	-----	C.2.3.1	C.4.1	--	--
			01636	00022	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
Collins, Ken Collins, Stephen F. Collins, Gloria C. Collins, Terese P.		Perry County CAND	01942	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02001	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02002	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02020	00001	-----	C.2.8.1	C.3.4.4	--	--
			02020	00001A	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02020	00001B	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Mississippi</u> (continued)									
C.9-104	Collins, Daniel G.	Harrison County Bar Assoc.	02023	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02023	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02023	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Collins, Joseph		02026	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Comeaux, Audry		01892	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Corban/Blackwell, L. C./ Leonard		01693	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Cousins, Muriel M.		02059	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Covington, Steve		00962	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00962	00002	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			00962	00003	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00962	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Cox, Mrs. Charles M.	MS Assoc. of Supervisors	01855	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Cox, C. M.		02036	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Crotts, Lamar M.		00644	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00644	00002	RN	C.5.1	C.5.11	--	--
	Crowell, Jr., Robert		01755	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Cruthirds, Mark		01839	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Cruthirds, Jamie L.		01840	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Cumbest/Littlejohn, Lum R./Clark		01678	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Curtis, John S.		01654	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Daneson, Mrs. William		01965	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01965	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Daugherty, Yvonne	League of Women Voters	01810	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Davenport, Shirley H.		01894	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	David, Monte J.		01847	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01847	00002	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Davies, Agnes		01684	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Davis, O. J.		00982	00001	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			00982	00002	RN	C.5.11	--	--	--
			00982	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00982	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00982	00005	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Davis, Charles		00991	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00991	00002	RN	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00991	00003	RN	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00991	00004	RN	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00991	00005	RN	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00991	00006	RN	C.7.3	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Mississippi</u> (continued)									
	Davis, Clyde A.		01757	00001	-----	C.2.3	--	--	--
			01757	00001A	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01757	00001B	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			01757	00001C	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
	Dedeaux-Jones, Kim		02037	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Dehmer, Dorothy Coco		01614	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Dewitt, Wendy	Richton Elementary School	01210	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Dix, Frank		01974	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Dobson, Dorothy F.		01880	00001	RN	C.7.2.7	C.7.2.8	--	--
	Dollar, Dennis		00945	00001	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			00945	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00945	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			00945	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00945	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Domino, S. S.		01997	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Dossett, Dorothy		00368	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			00368	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00368	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	DuBois, Mr. & Mrs. B. E.		01760	00001	RN	C.7.2.7	--	--	--
	Dubaz, Gary A.		01976	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Dubaz, Stephen		01977	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Dubrusson, Wanda		01655	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Duffy, Mark W.		01856	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Duffy, Mrs. Rhonda		01857	00001	RN	C.7.4.4	--	--	--
	Edgeworth, Lucille E.		01102	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Edwards, Tara	Richton Elementary School	01218	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Egerton, Charles		00981	00001	RN	C.5.8	--	--	--
	Eldridge, Martha		01795	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Ellery, Mitchell	MS State Representative	01660	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Ellington, Win		01617	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Ellytor, Cleta Elaine		01615	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Evans, Mary L.		00973	00002	RN	C.4.1.1.6	--	--	--
			00973	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00973	00004	RN	C.4.1.2	C.5.1	C.7.2.8	--
			00973	00005	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00973	00006	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00973	00007	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00973	00008	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Mississippi</u> (continued)									
	Evans, Mrs. Sampson		02019	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Farris, Scott		00226	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Fears, Beulah Bessie		01753	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Fears, Robert O.		01761	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Ferrill, Ssan		02060	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Findeiser, Audrey A.		01790	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Finn, Donald F.X.		00129	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00129	00002	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			00129	00003	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			00129	00004	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			00129	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			00129	00006	RN	C.4.1.4	--	--	--
			00129	00007	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			00129	00008	RN	C.4.1.1.8	--	--	--
			00129	00009	RN	C.4.1.3.5	--	--	--
			00129	00010	RN	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00129	00011	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			00129	00012	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			00129	00013	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
	Finn, Donald F. X.		01028	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01028	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01028	00003	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01028	00004	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01028	00005	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			01028	00006	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			01028	00007A	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			01028	00007B	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			01028	00008	RN	C.4.1	--	--	--
			01028	00009	RN	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01028	00010	RN	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01028	00010A	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01028	00010B	RN	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01028	00011	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01028	00012	RN	C.4.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01028	00013	RN	C.4.1.3.5	--	--	--
			01028	00014	-----	C.3.4.2.1	--	--	--
			01028	00015	RN	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01028	00016	-----	C.2.1.5	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Mississippi</u> (continued)									
C.9-107	Finn, Donald F. X.		01028	00017	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			01028	00019	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01028	00020	-----	C.2.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01028	00021	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01604	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01604	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01604	00003	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01604	00004	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			01604	00005	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			01604	00006A	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			01604	00006B	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			01604	00007	RN	C.4.1	--	--	--
			01604	00008	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01604	00009	RN	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01604	00010A	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01604	00010B	RN	C.4.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01604	00010C	RN	C.4.1.3.5	--	--	--
			01604	00011	RN	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01604	00012	RN	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01604	00013	RN	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01604	00014	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			01604	00015	RN	C.4.1	--	--	--
			01604	00016	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			01604	00017	RN	C.5.6	C.4.1.1.5	--	--
			01604	00018	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Fisher, Larry	01026	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--	
	Fisher, Larry J.	01603	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--	
	Fitch, Richard R.	01891	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
	Fitch, Barbara Jo	01893	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
	Fitzpatrick, MaryJoan G.	01653	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
		01653	00002	-----	C.5.7	--	--	--	
	Flake, Mrs. Lilly Pearl	01865	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
	Flint, Stan	00937	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--	
		00937	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	C.2.1.2	--	--	
		00937	00003A	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
		00937	00003B	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
		00937	00004	RN	C.4.1	--	--	--	
		00937	00006	RN	C.3.1.3	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Mississippi (continued)									
C.9-108	Flint, Stan		00987	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00987	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00987	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00987	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00987	00005	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00987	00007	RN	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00987	00008	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00987	00009	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--
			00987	00010	RN	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00987	00011	RN	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00987	00012	RN	C.4.1.3.5	--	--	--
			00987	00013	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			00987	00014	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00987	00015	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			00987	00016	RN	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00987	00017	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00987	00018	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00987	00019	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Flint, Stanley D.	CAND	01675	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01675	00002	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
	Flint, Stan		01705	00001	-----	C.3.8	--	--	--
	Flint, Stan		01706	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Flint, Stan		01708	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Flint, Stan		01712	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Flint, Stanley D.	MS House of Rep.	01671	00001	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
	Flint, Stan	CAND	01713	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Flint, Stan		01715	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Flint/Williams, Candace/Mitzi		01674	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Ford, Robert		00960	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00960	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00960	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			00960	00004	RN	C.5.10	--	--	--
			00960	00005	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00960	00006	-----	C.2.8	--	--	--
			00960	00007	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--
			00960	00008A	-----	C.2.1.2	C.2.1.1	--	--
			00960	00008B	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--
	Ford, Twila		01789	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
C.9-109	<u>Mississippi</u> (continued)								
	Ford, Jr., Robert	Mississippi E & T Board	01797	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Forenand, Diane L.		01920	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Forsythe, Ron		01727	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Forsythe, Ron		01728	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Forsythe, Ron		01732	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Fortenberry, Annie V.		01982	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Foshee, Jamie and Linda		02705	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02705	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Foster, James T.		01986	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Foster, Patti		01988	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Foushee, Jr., Mrs. William H.	MS Psychologist Association	01613	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Franck, Dorothy Walker		01621	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Franks, Jim		01796	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Franz, Becky		01885	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Gallary, Wayne L.		01838	00001	-----	C.2.4.2	--	--	--
	Gardner, Joe		01890	00001	RN	C.5.1	C.6.1	C.6.5	C.7.2.8
	Garrett, Connie M.		01947	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Gast, Mr. & Mrs. Fred C.		01946	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Gaston, C. D.		01691	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01691	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
		01691	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
	George, Critz H.	Office of Waste Isolation	01741	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Gibbens/Price, Margaret C./Helene C	Hancock Cty Historical Society	01692	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Gilbert, Valerie	Richton Elementary School	01874	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Gilliam, Dr. Scott & Evelyn		02709	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02709	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Gillis, Walter		01027	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Goarskill, Kayleey		01214	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Gollot, Senator	U. S. Senate	01699	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Gonzalez, Jennifer Crowell	DOE & DOT Nuclear Waste Division	01752	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Gottsche, Joanne M.		01975	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Goundas, Joy Harrison		01829	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Graley, Carolyn		02024	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Green, Janet		00977	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Green, John		01024	00001	RN	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01024	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Green, John		01601	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			01601	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Mississippi (continued)</u>									
Green, John		DOE and Transportation	01745	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
Green, John		Dept Energy and Transportation	00505	00001	RN	C.4.1.5	--	--	--
			00505	00002	RN	C.4.1.5	--	--	--
			00505	00003	RN	C.4.1.5	--	--	--
			00505	00004	RN	C.4.1.5	--	--	--
			00505	00005	RN	C.4.1.5	--	--	--
			00505	00006	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
Green, John		E & T Board, MS	01724	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
Green, John		MS Dept Energy & Transportation	02696	00001	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			02696	00002	RN	C.5.8	--	--	--
			02696	00003	RN	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
Green, John		Mississippi E & T Board	01722	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
Green, John			01733	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
Griffin, Priscilla O.			01868	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
Gutierrez, Paige			00939	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00939	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
Hagin, James J.			00386	00001	RN	C.5.1	C.5.11	--	--
			00386	00002	RN	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00386	00003	RN	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			00386	00004	RN	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
Hague, Douglas and Renee			01944	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
Haig, Doug			00957	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00957	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
Hall, John			01823	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
Hall, Representative L.		MS Legislature	01658	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
Halthu, Cynthia R.			01833	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
Hamilton, Pam			01023	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01023	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01023	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
Hamilton, Clarence W.			01835	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
Hammett, Elisabeth M.			01961	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
Hammond, William T. & Lois B.			01959	00001	RN	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01959	00001A	-----	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01959	00001B	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
Hand, Charles Ray			01786	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
Hansen, Dorothy			01842	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
Hansen, William Mark			01844	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
Harris, Annette			01816	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Mississippi</u> (continued)									
	Harris, Bill	The Biloxi Jaycees	01690	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Harrison, Timothy M.		01828	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Havens, Lynn	CAND	01673	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Heller, Earl G.		01801	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Herrell, Vicki		01030	00001	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01030	00002	RN	C.5.3	--	--	--
			01030	00002A	RN	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			01030	00002B	RN	C.5.7	--	--	--
			01030	00002C	-----	C.2.4.4	--	--	--
			01030	00002D	-----	C.2.4.4	--	--	--
			01030	00003	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
	Herrell, Vicki		01606	00001	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01606	00003	RN	C.5.3	--	--	--
			01606	00004	RN	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			01606	00005	RN	C.5.7	--	--	--
			01606	00006	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01606	00007	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Hickey, Sylvia		01764	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Hicks, Swink		01032	00001	RN	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
			01032	00002	RN	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
			01032	00003	RN	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
			01032	00004	RN	C.6.3	--	--	--
			01032	00005	RN	C.5.1	C.7.2.8	--	--
			01032	00006	RN	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01032	00007	RN	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01032	00008	RN	C.5.7	--	--	--
			01032	00009	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01032	00010	RN	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01032	00011	RN	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			01032	00012	RN	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01032	00013	RN	C.7.3	--	--	--
	Hight, Anna		02015	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Hilliard, Barry A.		01785	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Hinton, Paige		01004	00001	RN	C.5.11	--	--	--
	Hinton, Rev. Archie		01020	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01020	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Hinton, Paige		01657	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Hobbs, Richard H.		01802	00001	RN	C.5.11	--	--	--

C.9-111

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

C 9-112

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Mississippi</u> (continued)									
	Hokinker, Jeannine		00969	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00969	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00969	00003	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
			00969	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Holt, Maurite E.		01808	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Horgan, Dana		01905	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Howell, Arlie		01726	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Howell, Arlie		01742	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Howell, Arlie	Mississippi Consultant	01721	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Howell, Arlie		01729	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Howell, Arlie		01730	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Howell, Arlie	Mississippi State	01718	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Huddleston, Joy		01805	00001	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			01805	00002	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Huddleston, Shira		01806	00001	RN	C.7.4	--	--	--
	Hudson, Tom	Sierra Club, Mississippi Chapter	01272	00001	RN	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01272	00002	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01272	00003	RN	C.5.7	C.4.1.1.5	--	--
			01272	00004	RN	C.5.7	--	--	--
			01272	00005	RN	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01272	00006	RN	C.4.1.1.2	--	--	--
			01272	00007	RN	C.5.8	--	--	--
			01272	00008	RN	C.4.1.1.6	--	--	--
			01272	00009	-----	C.2.4.3	--	--	--
			01272	00010	RN	C.7.1.1.8	C.7.2.8	--	--
			01272	00011	RN	C.7.1.1.8	C.7.2.8	--	--
			01272	00012	RN	C.4.3	C.7.1.1.8	C.7.2.8	--
			01272	00013	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01272	00014	RN	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01272	00015	RN	C.5.1	C.5.11	--	--
			01272	00016	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01272	00017	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01272	00018	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01272	00019	RN	C.5.6	--	--	--
			01272	00020	RN	C.4.3	C.4.1.1.5	--	--
			01272	00021	RN	C.4.1.5	--	--	--
			01272	00022	RN	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01272	00023	RN	C.7.4.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Mississippi</u> (continued)									
			01272	00024	RN	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			01272	00025	RN	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			01272	00026	RN	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			01272	00027	RN	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			01272	00028	RN	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			01272	00029	RN	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			01272	00030	RN	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			01272	00031	RN	C.7.4.4	--	--	--
			01272	00032	RN	C.6.1	--	--	--
			01272	00033	RN	C.6.1	--	--	--
			01272	00034A	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			01272	00034B	RN	C.6.1	--	--	--
			01272	00035	RN	C.6.3	--	--	--
			01272	00036	RN	C.6.3	--	--	--
			01272	00037	RN	C.6.3	--	--	--
			01272	00038	RN	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
			01272	00039	RN	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
			01272	00040	RN	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01272	00041	RN	C.7.1.1.8	C.7.2	--	--
			01272	00042	RN	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01272	00043	RN	C.4.1.3.2	C.7.2	--	--
			01272	00044	RN	C.4.1.3.2	C.7.2	--	--
	Hughes, Ellise H.	Westinghouse	02051	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Hughes, Inez		02058	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Humphrey, Cindy		01748	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Humphries, Margaret		01831	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Humphries, John		01834	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Hunt, Dianne R.		01900	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Hussey, Phyllis		02003	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Hutto,Jr., Andrew Clifton		01943	00001	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
	Ingram, John		01987	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Iverson, Eric		01998	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Jackson, Lenn		01624	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Jacquet, Janie		01824	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	John, William E.		02041	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Johnson, Solon W.		01859	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Johnson, Elizabeth M.		01861	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Johnston, Juliet		01627	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--

C.9-114

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Mississippi (continued)									
C 9-1174	Johnston, Elta P.	Junior League of Jackson, Inc.	01627	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01609	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01609	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01609	00003	RN	C.5.7	--	--	--
			01609	00004	RN	C.5.7	--	--	--
			01609	00005	RN	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01609	00006	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01609	00007	RN	C.7.4.1	C.6.4	--	--
			01609	00008	RN	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01609	00009	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01609	00010	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01609	00011	RN	C.6.5	--	--	--
			01609	00012	RN	C.6.5	--	--	--
			01609	00013	RN	C.5.1	C.5.11	--	--
			01609	00014	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			01609	00015	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01609	00016	-----	C.2.5.1	--	--	--
			01609	00018	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01609	00019	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			01609	00020	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01609	00021	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01609	00022	RN	C.4.1.1.6	--	--	--
			01609	00023	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01609	00024	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01609	00025	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
			01609	00026	RN	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01609	00027	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01609	00028	RN	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
			01609	00029	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01609	00030	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01609	00031	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			01609	00032	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			Jones, Jayson R.	00970	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--
00970	00002	-----		C.3.4.4	--	--	--		
00970	00003	-----		C.3.4.4	--	--	--		
00970	00004	-----		C.3.4.4	--	--	--		
Jones, Henry Jones, Dorothy	00999	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--		
	01014	00001	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--		

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Mississippi</u> (continued)									
C.9-115	Jones, Frank		01014	00002	RN	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
			01014	00003	RN	C.7.1.1.1	--	--	--
			01014	00004	RN	C.6.3	C.7.2.8	--	--
			01014	00005	RN	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
			01016	00001	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01016	00002	RN	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
			01016	00003	RN	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
			01016	00004	RN	C.7.4.4	--	--	--
			01016	00005	RN	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01016	00006	RN	C.4.1.5.4	--	--	--
			01016	00008	-----	C.2.1.5	--	--	--
	Jones, Doris	Richton Elementary School	01628	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Jones, Dorothy		01650	00001	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01650	00002A	RN	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
			01650	00002B	RN	C.3.3.1	--	--	--
			01650	00003	RN	C.6.3	C.7.2.8	--	--
			01650	00004	RN	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
	Jones, Cecil E.		01771	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Jones, JoAnn		01832	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Jones, Henry		01216	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Jones, Henry		01635	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Kallery, Mrs. Easton	MS Chapter Sierra Club	01992	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Kanady/Shulman, Cathy/Ruth		01663	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01663	00002	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			01663	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01663	00004	RN	C.4.1.1	--	--	--
	Kay, Patty		02028	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Kay, Jonathan		02029	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Keating, Angela		02035	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Keenerly, Amanda		00953	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00953	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Keller, D. L.	Batelle, Project Mgmt Division	01720	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Keller, D. L.		01735	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Kennedy, Cynthia		00941	00001A	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00941	00001B	RN	C.3.3.2	--	--	--
			00941	00001C	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
	Kennedy, Cynthia	CAND	01676	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Kennedy, Cynthia		01709	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Mississippi (continued)</u>									
C.9-116	Kennedy, Cynthia		01710	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Kennedy, Cynthia		01711	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Kennedy, Cynthia		01714	00001	RN	C.5.11	--	--	--
	Kennerly, Amanda		01662	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01662	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01662	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01662	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Kent, Barbara		02052	00001	-----	C.3.8	--	--	--
	Kerley, W. Joseph		00292	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Knight, Rose H.		01769	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Knight, Marion C.		02055	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Kochtitzky, Bob		00145	00001	RN	C.5.10	--	--	--
	KohaneK, Harriet K.		01670	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Kosbab, Dick	Hancock Cty. Chamber of Commerce	01704	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Kostmayer, Mrs. Elise		01820	00001	RN	C.7.2.7	C.5.11	--	--
	Kostmayer, Lillian		01929	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Kostmayer, Shaun L.		01932	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Kostmayer, R. Lee		02046	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Kostmayer, Jr., Robert Lee		01931	00001	-----	C.2.6	--	--	--
	Kriuanec, Mr. & Mrs. Joey		01770	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	LaGrone, Tonette		00946	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00946	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	LaGrone, Don		00947	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00947	00002	-----	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00947	00003	RN	C.3.2	--	--	--
			00947	00004	RN	C.6.5	--	--	--
			00947	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			00947	00006	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
			00947	00007	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			00947	00008	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00947	00009	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Landry, Sarah		01871	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Lang, Mrs. Charles V.	Oak Park Garden Club	01669	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Latimer, Mel		00963	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00963	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00963	00003	RN	C.5.1	--	--	--
			00963	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Lawler, Mrs. Sibyl R.		02009	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Mississippi (continued)</u>									
C 9 117	Lemon, Fred		00978	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00978	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00978	00003	RN	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			00978	00004	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			00978	00005	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00978	00006	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00978	00007	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Leslie, Robert C.		01979	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
		Lesso, Fay		00956	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--
			00956	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Litchfield, Kathy		00169	00001	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
			00169	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Litchfield, Norman		00959	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00959	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00959	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01917	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Lloyd, Eva		01767	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Lofton, Mary Cruso		01656	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Loftus, Jeff		01837	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Loftus, John B.		02017	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Logan, Mrs. S. J.		01939	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Longino, Lewis		01005	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Lyman, India		01645	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Lyman, India		01948	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Mallgy, Betty W.		01033	00001	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
	Mann, Carol		01033	00002	RN	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01033	00003	RN	C.5.2	--	--	--
			01033	00004	RN	C.6.5	--	--	--
		01033	00005	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--	
		01033	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		01033	00007	RN	C.7.4	--	--	--	
		01033	00008	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--	
		01033	00009	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--	
		01033	00010	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
		01608	00002	RN	C.5.1	--	--	--	
		01608	00003	RN	C.5.2	--	--	--	
		01608	00004	RN	C.6.5	--	--	--	
		01608	00005	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Mississippi</u> (continued)									
C.9-118			01608	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01608	00007	RN	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01608	00008	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			01608	00009A	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01608	00009B	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01608	00009C	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			01608	00009D	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01608	00009E	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01608	00009F	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01608	00009G	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01608	00009H	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01608	00010	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Marie, Connie	City of Biloxi	01698	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Marino, Frank	Cong. Lungrin Office	01746	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Masters, David and Carolyn N.		02706	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02706	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02706	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Mattuiri, Judy C.		01846	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Mayfield, Frances		01784	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	McCall, Dennis Alan		01843	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	McCall, Kathy Smith		01993	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	McCandliss, Robert K.		01928	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	McCaskill, Mallory	Richton Elementary School	01213	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	McCaudliss, Virginia G.		01930	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	McCormick, David O.	Jackson County Young Lawyers Ass	01689	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	McGuire, Jane A.		01818	00001	RN	C.5.7	C.6.1	--	--
	McIlwain, Lana		01010	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01010	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01010	00003	RN	C.7.1.2	C.7.4.4	--	--
			01010	00005	RN	C.5.3	--	--	--
			01010	00006	RN	C.7.4.4	C.6.5	--	--
	McIlwain, Lana B.	Richton Woman's Club, Inc.	01648	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01648	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01648	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01648	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01648	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	McLarty, Margaret P.		01612	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01612	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Mississippi</u> (continued)									
	McLarty, William		01625	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01625	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	McRae, Debi		01845	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Meek, Gary		02049	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Meyer, Jr., William H.		01921	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Miller, Betty Jo		01809	00001	RN	C.7.4	C.5.11	--	--
	Miller, Glenn		01895	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Misko, Marilyn, Jason & Senta		01826	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Misko, Jr., Joseph R.		01825	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Moore, Cynthia K.		00188	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Moore, Mr. & Mrs. George E.		00189	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Moore, Cherri J.		00209	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Moore, David		00961	00001A	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00961	00001B	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
			00961	00002	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
			00961	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Moore, Michael C.	DA-Jackson and Greene County	01672	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Moran, Dan	Central Point & Supply Inc.	02032	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Morgan, Wanda, Debra & Brenda		00122	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00122	00002	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
			00122	00003	RN	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00122	00004	RN	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00122	00005	RN	C.4.1.2.3	--	--	--
			00122	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			00122	00007	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00122	00008	RN	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00122	00009A	RN	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00122	00009B	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00122	00010	RN	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			00122	00011	RN	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Morgan, Wanda		01002	00001	RN	C.3.1.3	C.7.4.4	--	--
			01002	00002	-----	C.2.1	--	--	--
			01002	00003	-----	C.2.8	--	--	--
			01002	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Morgan, Wanda		01643	00001	RN	C.3.1.3	C.7.4.4	--	--
			01643	00002	-----	C.2.1	--	--	--
			01643	00003	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
			01643	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Mississippi</u> (continued)									
	Morris, Barbara		01866	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Morris, C. A.		01950	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Morris, Sammie R.		01953	00001	RN	C.7.2.7	--	--	--
	Morris, Jr., Daniel L.		01955	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Mowery, Heidi A.		01971	00001	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
	Murphy, Diana		01864	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Murphy, C. P.		01907	00001	RN	C.7.2.7	--	--	--
	Musgrave, Mrs. Ray S.		00287	00001	RN	C.7.3	--	--	--
	Necaise, Clinton		01819	00001	RN	C.7.2.7	C.5.11	--	--
	Nercaise, Serinie		01969	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Netherland, Linda J.		01773	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Netherland, Rev. Dan		01775	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Netherland, Chad		01776	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Netherland, Heidi L.		01779	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Newell, Penny	Richton Elementary School	01208	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Niblick, B.		01896	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Noble, Mary W.		01918	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Nuwer, David And Deanne		01983	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	O'Brien, Mrs. Vivan		02042	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	O'Keefe, John		00948	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00948	00002	RN	C.5.1	--	--	--
			00948	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00948	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Odle, Jr., Robert C.	Intergovernmental & Public Affa.	01739	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Oehler, James A.		01827	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Oliver, James		00984	00001	-----	C.2.6.2	--	--	--
			00984	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00984	00003	RN	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
			00984	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Olson, Mrs. A.		01772	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Osgood, J. Isaac		01882	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Overstreet, Peggy & Kenneth		02021	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Pagano, Dottie G.		02012	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02012	00002	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
	Parker, Althea		01972	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Parkman, Paula W.		01849	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Pate, Mrs. William H.	Friends of Gulfport-Harrison	01687	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Patterson, Burt L.	Ocean Springs Cham. of Commerce	01695	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Mississippi</u> (continued)									
	Paulk, Angela	Richton Elementary School	01209	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Peroyea, Suzanne		02033	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Peters, T. N.		01610	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Peters, Esther T.	City of Gulfport	01626	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Peterson, Anne		01688	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Pickett, Jack & Jane		01990	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01990	00002	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
			01369	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
		State of Mississippi	01369	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01369	00003	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01369	00004	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01369	00005	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			01369	00006	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01369	00007	RN	C.3.2	C.7.4.1	--	--
			01369	00008	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			01369	00009	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--
			01369	00010	-----	C.4.1	--	--	--
			01369	00011	-----	C.3.3	--	--	--
			01369	00012	RN	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
			01369	00013	RN	C.7.1.1.2	C.7.1.1.6	C.4.2.3	C.2.7
			01369	00014	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			01369	00015	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01369	00016	RN	C.6.5	--	--	--
			01369	00017	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			01369	00018	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
		01369	00019	RN	C.4.2.2	C.4.3	--	--	
		01369	00020	RN	C.4.1.1.5	C.4.3	--	--	
		01369	00021	RN	C.4.1.1.5	C.4.1.2.2	C.5.1	--	
		01369	00022	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--	
		01369	00023	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
		01369	00024	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--	
		01369	00025	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--	
		01369	00026	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--	
		01369	00027	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--	
		01369	00028	-----	C.5.1	--	--	--	
		01369	00040	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
		01369	00041	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--	
		01369	00042	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	

C.9-121

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Mississippi</u> (continued)									
C.9-122			01369	00043	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01369	00044	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			01369	00045	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			01369	00046	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--
			01369	00047	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Pontius, Dr. William		00971	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Porter, Michael		01830	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Porter, Robert L.		02050	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Powell, Syble S.		01791	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Powell, Benjamin F.		01792	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Powell, Stephen F.		01794	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Powers, Sue		00980	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00980	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Powers, George E.		01848	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Prather, Thelma & Virgil		02031	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Puckett, Claudette		00985	00001	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			00985	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Purdy, Susan		01034	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01034	00002	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01034	00003	RN	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01034	00004	RN	C.6.3	--	--	--
			01034	00005	RN	C.4.1.5	--	--	--
			01034	00006	RN	C.6.1	--	--	--
			01034	00007	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01034	00008	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			01034	00009	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Quigley, Claudette M.		02008	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Rahaim, Mayor Ron		00988	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00988	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00988	00003	RN	C.7.4.4	--	--	--
			00988	00004	RN	C.4.3	C.6.2	--	--
			00988	00005	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00988	00006	RN	C.3.1.3	C.6.1	--	--
			00988	00007	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			00988	00007A	RN	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00988	00007B	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			00988	00008	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Rahaim, Mayor Ron	Town of Richton	01639	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--

C.9-123

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Mississippi</u> (continued)									
			01639	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01639	00005	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01639	00007A	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			01639	00007B	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			01639	00008	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Rammell, Ellen		01914	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Rammell, James D.		01916	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Ramsey, Byron L.		01994	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Ramsey, Sibyl S.		02007	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Randall, Jack		01877	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Rasmussen, Bill		01807	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Rhodeman, Mrs. Clare Marino		01821	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Riccardi, S.		01666	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01666	00002A	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
			01666	00002B	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Rich, Kenneth		01008	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01008	00002	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01008	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01008	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01008	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01008	00006	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01008	00007	RN	C.7.2.1	C.7.2.8	C.4.3	--
			01008	00008	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01008	00009	RN	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
			01008	00010	RN	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
			01008	00011	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01008	00012	RN	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01008	00013	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01008	00014	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Rich, Kenneth Edward		01646	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01646	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01646	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01646	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01646	00005	RN	C.4.3	C.7.2.1	--	--
			01646	00006	RN	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
			01646	00007	RN	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
			01646	00008	RN	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
			01646	00009	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Mississippi</u> (continued)									
	Richard, Everett C.	City of Moss Point	02027	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Richardson, Margaret		02011	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Roberts, Lloyd E.		01696	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01696	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Robertson, Willaim R.		01841	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Robinson, Lillian		01860	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Roch, Jules C.	MS Legislature	01901	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Rogers, Bobby		00974	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Rogers, Joe		00975	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00975	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00975	00003	RN	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			00975	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Rogers, Dorothy		02022	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Rose, Navalou Dunaway		00968	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Rosenblatt and Mills, Sen.		01659	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Rubbin, M.		01642	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Ruddiman, Mary		01815	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01815	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Ruffin, Macy		01001	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Ruffin, Lou		01018	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01018	00002	RN	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			01018	00003	RN	C.7.4.5	--	--	--
			01018	00004	RN	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01018	00005	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
		01918	00006	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--	
		01018	00007	RN	C.6.2	--	--	--	
	Ruffin, Mary	Richton Elementary School	01018	00008	-----	C.2.1.5	C.2.7	--	--
	Sangrouber, Ruby		01215	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Satchfield, Charles		02004	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Scarborough, B. R.		01903	00001	-----	C.3.8	--	--	--
	Schmidt/Chance, Richard C./J.Michael		02034	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Schroeder, Jewel		01701	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Schwartzman, Nina		01978	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00952	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00952	00002A	RN	C.6.1	--	--	--
			00952	00002B	RN	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
			00952	00002C	RN	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
			00952	00002D	RN	C.7.4.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Mississippi</u> (continued)									
Schwartzman, Nina M.	MS Restaurant Assoc.	00952	00003A	RN		C.5.1	C.6.5	--	--
		00952	00003B	RN		C.5.7	--	--	--
		00952	00003C	RN		C.6.1	--	--	--
		00952	00005	-----		C.2.8.1	--	--	--
		01664	00001	-----		C.3.4.4	--	--	--
		01664	00002A	RN		C.6.1	--	--	--
		01664	00002B	RN		C.7.2.1	--	--	--
		01664	00002C	RN		C.7.2.2	--	--	--
		01664	00002D	RN		C.7.4.2	--	--	--
		01664	00002E	RN		C.5.1	C.7.4.2	--	--
		01664	00002F	RN		C.5.7	--	--	--
		01664	00002G	RN		C.6.1	--	--	--
		01664	00003	-----		C.2.8.2	--	--	--
		01664	00004	-----		C.2.8.1	--	--	--
Sellers, Mary C.		00997	00020	RN		C.5.1	--	--	--
		00997	00021	RN		C.7.4.5	--	--	--
		00997	00022	RN		C.4.1	--	--	--
		00997	00022B	-----		C.2.3	C.4.1	--	--
Sellers, E. Clyde		01007	00001	-----		C.2.1.1	--	--	--
		01007	00002	-----		C.2.3.2	--	--	--
		01007	00003	RN		C.4.1.5	--	--	--
		01007	00004	RN		C.4.1.4	--	--	--
		01007	00005A	RN		C.4.1	--	--	--
		01007	00005B	RN		C.7.3	--	--	--
		01007	00006	RN		C.4.3	C.3.2	--	--
		01007	00007	RN		C.4.2.3	--	--	--
		01007	00008	RN		C.4.3	--	--	--
		01007	00009	RN		C.7.4.2	--	--	--
		01007	00010	-----		C.2.1.1	--	--	--
		01007	00011	-----		C.2.1.1	--	--	--
		01007	00012	-----		C.3.4.4	--	--	--
Sellers, E. Clyde		01631	00001	-----		C.2.1.1	--	--	--
		01631	00002	RN		C.4.1.5	--	--	--
		01631	00003	RN		C.4.1.4	--	--	--
		01631	00004	RN		C.4.1	--	--	--
		01631	00005	RN		C.7.3	--	--	--
		01631	00006	RN		C.4.3	C.3.2	--	--
		01631	00007	RN		C.4.2.3	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Mississippi</u> (continued)									
C. 9-126			01631	00008	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01631	00009	-----	C.2.1.5	--	--	--
			01631	00010	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01631	00011	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Semski, Lawrence P.		01960	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Shankland, Nora		01873	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Shanks, Sandra		01875	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Shea, Mildred E.		01981	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Shea, Thomas W.		01995	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Shelton, Leslie		01925	00001	RN	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
	Sherrell, Eunice		02010	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Shipp, H. P.		01788	00001	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
	Shrader, Jr., Frank D.		01822	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Simmons, Robert E.		01781	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Sims, Tom	Attorney and Counselor at Law	01734	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Smith, Felicia		01096	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01096	00002A	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01096	00002B	RN	C.6.1	--	--	--
	Smith, Suzanne		01611	00001	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
	Smith, Estelle		01938	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Smith, James		01954	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Snider, Ken		01803	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Snider, Margaret S.		01804	00001	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
	Snyder, Chris		00940	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00940	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00940	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Snyder, Susan		00955	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Sohnier, Carrol J.		02039	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Sonnier, Lelia		02038	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Spence, Laura		01758	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Spencer, Johnnie W.		00167	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00167	00002	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
			00167	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00167	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00167	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Spinks, Phillip		02005	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Spinks, Patricia A.		02006	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Spooner, Larry		02030	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Mississippi</u> (continued)									
	Stallworth, Bill		00936	00001	RN	C.4.1.2	C.4.1.3.3	--	--
			00936	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Stanley, Mrs. Nora		01763	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01763	00002	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Stanley, Robert		01888	00001	RN	C.7.4	--	--	--
	Steele, Janie		01924	00001	-----	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
	Stet, Chrissy		01768	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Stevens, Henry		01009	00001	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01009	00002	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			01009	00003	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01009	00004	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01009	00005	-----	C.2.6	--	--	--
			01009	00006	RN	C.7.4	--	--	--
	Stevens, Henry	B. M. Stevens Company	01647	00001	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01647	00002	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			01647	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01647	00004	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01647	00005	-----	C.2.6	--	--	--
			01647	00006	RN	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
	Stokes, Mary and Jack		01909	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Stokes, Mark		01911	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Stokes, Tina		01913	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Strader, Maria F.		01991	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Strickland, Becky		00994	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00994	00002	RN	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00994	00003	RN	C.7.2	C.5.10	--	--
			00994	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Strickland, Warren		01006	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01006	00002	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01006	00003	-----	C.3.3.2	--	--	--
	Strickland, Adrian		01011	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Strickland, Barry		01012	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Strickland, Becky	Richland Home and Garden Club	01638	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01638	00002	RN	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01638	00003	RN	C.7.2	C.5.10	--	--
			01638	00004	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01638	00006	RN	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
	Strickland, Adrian	Richton Elementary School	01217	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Mississippi</u> (continued)									
C.9-128	Strickland, Barry	Richton High School	01632	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Strickland, Adrian		01633	00001	-----	C.1	--	--	--
			01634	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01634	00002	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01634	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Strong, Lon	Commission on Wildlife Conserv.	01682	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Stuart, Jimmie D		01958	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Stuart, Dorothy		01967	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Sundeen, Dr. Dan	University of So. Mississippi	01717	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Suryadevara, Dr. R. B.		00954	00001	RN	C.6.5	--	--	--
	Sutton, Amy		00967	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Tait, Mr. & Mrs. William		01889	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Talbot, Jill		01766	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Tanner, Mr. & Mrs. Lettman		01933	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Taylor, Senator Gene		00958	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Taylor, Ellis		00965	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00965	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Taylor, Ellis	Fifth Congressional District	01685	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01685	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Teck, William		00943	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00943	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00943	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Thibault, Kelly		01966	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Thompson, Russell		00976	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00976	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00976	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Thompson, Russell D.	Ocean Springs Cham. of Commerce	01694	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Tillingshast, Nellie		00951	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00951	00002	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			00951	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00951	00004	RN	C.4.1	--	--	--
			00951	00005	RN	C.4.1.1	--	--	--
	Titler, Helen		01793	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Todaro, Antonia C.		02044	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Todaro, Sr., Guy S.		02045	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Tracy, Mrs. John		01629	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Tracy, Shawn		01630	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Trahan, Jennifer		00966	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

						CLASSIFICATION			
STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Mississippi</u> (continued)									
C.9-129	Umbdenstock, Mrs. P. J.		02014	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Umbdenstock, Jr., P. J.		02013	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Valerine, Mrs. V. H.		01996	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Vasselus, Kathryn S.		01151	00001	RN	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01151	00002	RN	C.5.7	--	--	--
			01151	00003	RN	C.5.1	C.5.11	--	--
	Vickers, Mary A.		01756	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Vorhes, Donna C.		01853	00001	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
			01853	00002	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Vorhes, Paul & Donna		01854	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Wadley, William T.		02043	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02043	00218	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
	Wahlers, Salissa Ruth		01759	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Wahlers, Kemmez		01980	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Walley, Oren		01013	00001	RN	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
	Walley, Pettis		01743	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Walley, Oren	Richton Rotary Club	01649	00001A	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
			01649	00001B	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
	Walters, Fred		00944	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00944	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00944	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00944	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Walters, Joe		00950	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00950	00002	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			00950	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Walton, Ronnie L.	Pat Harrison Waterway District	01700	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Ware, Fred		01935	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Watson, Leon R.		01867	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Watson, Clara A.		01870	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Watson, Ruth A.		01934	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Watson, Angela		01985	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Weatherly, Mrs. Patricia C.		02056	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Welch, Mr. Mark		01881	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Wells, Mauelle H.		01957	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Wentzell, Bobby R.		01923	00001	RN	C.5.1	C.5.3	C.7.2.8	--
			01923	00001A	-----	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			01923	00001B	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	White, John D.		01015	00001	-----	C.2.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Mississippi</u> (continued)									
			01015	00002	-----	C.2.1	C.6.2	C.2.3.1	--
			01015	00003	RN	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01015	00003A	RN	C.4.1.5	--	--	--
			01015	00003B	RN	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01015	00003C	RN	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01015	00003D	RN	C.4.1.5	--	--	--
			01015	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
White, John B.			01651	00001	-----	C.2.1	--	--	--
			01651	00002	-----	C.2.1	--	--	--
			01651	00003	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
Wilburn, William			02057	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
Wilkerson, Bill			01719	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
Wilkerson, Bill		Mississippi House of Reps	01725	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
Wilkerson, Bill		State of Mississippi	01731	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
Wilkinson, Charles			01025	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01025	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
Wilkinson, Charles		Emerg Management/City of Jackson	01602	00001	RN	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01602	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
Williams, Peggy			01813	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
Williams, Marlane H.			01836	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
Williams, Wanda			01850	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
Williams, Jesse			01851	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
Williams, John C.			01989	00001A	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
			01989	00001B	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01989	00002	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
Williams, Nellie			02040	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
Williamson, Victor H.			01952	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
Wilson, L. A.			01021	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01021	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01021	00004	-----	C.2.1.5	--	--	--
			01021	00005	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01021	00006	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
Wilson, Gail			01912	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
Wilson, Denise J.			01945	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
Wilson, L. A.		The Richton Dispatch	01652	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01652	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
Wise, Catherine		Richton Elementary School	01211	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
Wynne, Mrs. G. M.			01897	00001	RN	C.5.3	C.5.7	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Mississippi</u> (continued)									
	York, David & Sue		01910	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Zimmerman, Mavin D.		02053	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Zimmerman, Virginia		02054	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
<u>Missouri</u>									
	Cosbey, Elizabeth S		01061	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
	Haubein, George P.		00473	00001	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			00473	00002	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
	Keebler, James H.		00300	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00300	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00300	00004	DS	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00300	00006	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
	Kyle, Marjorie		00522	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00522	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00522	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Moore, James Douglas		00030	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Orr, Richard A.		00642	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00642	00002	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			00642	00003	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			00642	00004	DC	C.7.2	C.7.1.1	--	--
			00642	00005	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00642	00006	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			00642	00007	DC	C.7.3	C.7.2.4	--	--
			00642	00008	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			00642	00009	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
<u>Montana</u>									
	Anonymous	Coalition for Canyon Preserv.	00070	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	DeBolt, Ann		00270	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00270	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00270	00003	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00270	00004	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00270	00005	DC	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
			00270	00006	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00270	00007	DC	C.7.1.1.9	--	--	--
			00270	00008	DC	C.4.1.3	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Montana</u> (continued)									
	Hetrick, Amy L.		00612	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00612	00002	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00612	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Kay, Mrs. Edw.		00157	00001	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
	Kay, Charles		00165	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00165	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00165	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Miller-Richardson, Gail		00216	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00216	00002	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			00216	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00216	00004	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00216	00005	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Schunk, George		02250	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Shaw, Dr. William S.		00308	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00308	00002	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00308	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Taylor, Kelli J.		00520	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
<u>Nebraska</u>									
	Hahn, Kandra	State of Nebraska/Energy Office	02695	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02695	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02695	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02695	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02695	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02695	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02695	00007	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02695	00008	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02695	00009	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02695	00010	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02695	00011	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02695	00012	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02695	00013	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02695	00014	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02695	00015	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02695	00016	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Kerrey, Governor Robert	State of Nebraska	01512	00001	-----	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01512	00002	-----	C.7.3	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Nebraska</u> (continued)									
			01512	00003	-----	C.2.1	--	--	--
			01512	00004	-----	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01512	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01512	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01512	00007	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			01512	00008	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01512	00009	-----	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01512	00010	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01512	00011	-----	C.7.3	--	--	--
<u>New Jersey</u>									
	Kale, Shirley W.		00540	00001	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			00540	00002	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
	Loeser, Carl & Mrs.		00629	00001	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
<u>New Mexico</u>									
	Brown, Philip		02702	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02702	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02702	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02702	00004	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Covington, Margo		00160	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00160	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Fickett, Jim and Mary		00076	00001	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
	Goette, Judy C.		00343	00001	-----	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			00343	00002	-----	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00343	00003	-----	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
	Jones, Dan	Rio Grande Chapter Sierra Club	00440	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00440	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00440	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Kosel, Mark E.		00194	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Mabery, Ken and Marilyne V.		00404	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Olivo, R.N., B.S.N., Noemi	The College of Santa Fe	02074	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Ranno, Dr. Russel A.		00164	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00164	00002	DC	C.3.2	--	--	--
	Stanco, Alan D.		00421	00001	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
	Teague, Jonathan M.		00330	00001	DC	C.7.1.1.8	--	--	--

C.9-133

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>New Mexico</u> (continued)									
			00330	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00330	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00330	00004	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00330	00005	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00330	00006	DC	C.3.2	--	--	--
			00330	00007	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			00330	00008	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
	de Narvaez, Cynta		01160	00001	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
<u>Nevada</u>									
		City of Caliente, Lincoln County	02644	00001	-----	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02644	00003	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			02644	00012	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02644	00013	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02644	00025	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
			02644	00035	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02644	00036	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02644	00042	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02644	00043	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02644	00044	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02644	00045	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02644	00046	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02644	00051	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02644	00068	-----	C.3.1.1	C.3.7	--	--
			02644	00079	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
			02644	00081	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02644	00082	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02644	00083	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02644	00084	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02644	00085	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
	Adams, Mrs.		00424	00002	-----	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00424	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00424	00005	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Anonymous	Las Vegas City Council	01431	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
		NV Commission on Tourism	01426	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01426	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
		Reno City Government	01427	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION					
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH		
Nevada (continued)											
C.9-135	Armstrong, Gail	Lincoln County	01427	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--		
			01411	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--		
			01411	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--		
	Ballow, Thomas W. Barbano, Andrew	St of NV, Dept of Agriculture	02651	00001	-----	C.2.4.2	--	--	--		
			01453	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--		
			01453	00002	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--		
	Bass, John	Beatty Town Advisory Committee	01453	00003	-----	C.2.8	--	--	--		
			01416	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
			01416	00002	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--		
			01416	00003	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--		
			01416	00004	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--		
			01416	00005	-----	C.3.4.4	C.7.4	--	--		
			01416	00006	-----	C.2.1.5	--	--	--		
			01416	00007	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
			Bass, John R. Bass, John	Beatty Town Advisory Council	00136	00001	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
					01402	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	01402	00002			-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--		
	01402	00007			-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
	Baughman, Mike	Clark County Commission	01449	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--		
			01449	00007	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--		
			01449	00008	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--		
			01422	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--		
	Bechtel, Dennis	Clark County Commission	01422	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--		
			01422	00006	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--		
			01422	00008	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--		
			01422	00011	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--		
			01486	00002	-----	C.2.3	--	--	--		
			01486	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--		
	Bernard, Jackie Bernard, M. Bernheimer, Mrs. Bird, Marian J.	Clark County Commission	01461	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--		
			01462	00001	-----	C.2.6.3	--	--	--		
			01454	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--		
			00266	00010	-----	C.2.4.3	--	--	--		
	Bradbury, Audry Bradhurst, Stephen T.	Nye County Planning Consultant	00266	00011	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--		
			01420	00006	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--		
			01558	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--		
			01558	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
			01558	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--		
			01558	00009	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--		

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Nevada</u> (continued)									
C.9-136			01558	00011	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01558	00015	-----	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			01558	00016	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01558	00017	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01558	00018	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01558	00028	-----	C.2.4.1	C.4.1.4	--	--
			01558	00030	-----	C.2.4.1	C.4.1.4	--	--
			01558	00080	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
			01558	00082	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
			01558	00098	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
			01558	00100	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Bryan, Governor Richard H.	State of Nevada	02671	00001	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			02671	00002	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02671	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02671	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02671	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Bukowski, Grace		02671	00006	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00511	00003	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			00511	00005	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Bukowski, Grace		00511	00008	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01482	00002	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			01482	00003	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
			01482	00005	-----	C.2.4.2	--	--	--
			01482	00008	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01482	00010	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Byrd, Mark	Sierra Club	01441	00002	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Byrne, Bernard		01438	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
	Carrico, Helen R. & Renee		00031	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Christensen, Douglass		01434	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Curry, Harold		00513	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
Dangerfield, G.		01470	00001	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--	
Dehne, Donald L.	Dept of Commerce, Div Emer Mgmt.	02654	00021	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
Dickinson, Bob		01414	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--	
		01414	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		01414	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		01414	00004	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--	
		01414	00005	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--	
Dickinson, Bob		01452	00003	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Nevada (continued)									
	Dobra, John L.	Bureau Business & Economic Resea	02653	00025	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			02653	00044	-----	C.2.1.3	--	--	--
	Doherty, Frank		00004	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00004	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00004	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00004	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00004	00005	-----	C.7.3	--	--	--
	Dondero, Thalia	Board of Co. Commissioners	01230	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01230	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01230	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01230	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01230	00005	-----	C.3.3	--	--	--
			01230	00006	-----	C.3.3	--	--	--
			01230	00007	-----	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01230	00008	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01230	00009	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			01230	00010	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01230	00011	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01230	00013	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01230	00014	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
			01230	00015	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
			01230	00016	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
				Early, Ann		01230	00021	-----	C.3.4.3
01097	00001	-----				C.3.4.4	--	--	--
01097	00006	-----				C.2.8.1	C.4.1.5.1	--	--
01097	00008	-----				C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
	Fedinic, C Ferraro, Mayor, Fulkerson, Mr. B.	Boulder City City Council	01466	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01428	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01457	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01457	00007	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01457	00009	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01457	00015	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01457	00016	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01457	00017	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
			01457	00018	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01457	00019	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Fulkerson, Bob	Citizen Alert	01262	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
			01262	00008	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Nevada</u> (continued)									
C.9-138	Gary, Keneth Gary, Jean Gates, David A. Gregory, T	Dept. of Commerce	01262	00009	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
			01262	00010	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01262	00016	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01262	00017	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01405	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01406	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02658	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01459	00001	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
			01459	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01459	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Hale, Ms. C.		01455	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01455	00002	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01455	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01455	00004	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			01412	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Hall, Robert Hammes, Babe Hardy, James K.	Torok Expl.,Min.,& Constr. Co.	01409	00001	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			01110	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01110	00002	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			01110	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01432	00001	-----	C.2.4.3	--	--	--
	Harlan, Shirley Harlan, Sirley J.	Cold Comfort Farm	01168	00001	-----	C.2.4.3	--	--	--
			01168	00003	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			01168	00004	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
			02655	00001	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			02655	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Hill, Ronald W.	Dept. of Transportation	02655	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02655	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02655	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02655	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02655	00007	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02655	00012	-----	C.2.4.1.18	--	--	--
			02655	00020	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			00517	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00139	00001	-----	C.3.4.2.4	--	--	--
			00139	00002	-----	C.3.4.2.4	--	--	--
			01471	00002	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			01471	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01263	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Hock, Betty Hock, Betty E.	NV Gen Fed Women's Clubs NV. Gen Fed. of Women's Clubs	00517	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00139	00001	-----	C.3.4.2.4	--	--	--
	Hoke, M		00139	00002	-----	C.3.4.2.4	--	--	--
			01471	00002	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
	Holmes, Richard B.	Dept. of Comprehensive Planning	01471	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01263	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Nevada</u> (continued)									
			01263	00002A	-----	C.3.3	--	--	--
			01263	00002B	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01263	00003	-----	C.3.4.3	C.3.1.1	--	--
			01263	00004	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01263	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01263	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01263	00007	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01263	00008	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01263	00009	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01263	00010	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01263	00011	-----	C.2.5.1	--	--	--
			01263	00012	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01263	00016	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01263	00017	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01263	00018	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01263	00019	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01263	00020	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01263	00021	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01263	00023	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01263	00024	-----	C.2.4.3	--	--	--
			01263	00041	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01263	00045	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01263	00047	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01263	00096	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.2.7	--	--
			01263	00099	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
			01263	00105	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
			01263	00106	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
			01263	00107	-----	C.7.3	C.2.4.1	--	--
			01263	00122	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
			01263	00123	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
			01263	00126	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			01263	00131	-----	C.2.4.1	C.6.1	--	--
			01263	00138	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
			01263	00139	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
			01263	00140	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.5	--	--
			01263	00145	-----	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01263	00146	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01263	00147	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Nevada</u> (continued)									
C.9-140	Holtz, Charles		01263	00148	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01263	00149	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01400	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01400	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	C.2.8	C.2.7	--
			01400	00006	-----	C.3.4.3	C.7.4	C.3.4.2.1	--
			01400	00007	-----	C.2.7	C.7.2.7	--	--
			01400	00009	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01400	00010	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01400	00011	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01400	00012	-----	C.2.1.5	--	--	--
			01400	00013	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01400	00015	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
	Janisek, Stan		01444	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01444	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01444	00004	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Johnson, Willard E.		00201	00001	-----	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00201	00002	-----	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00201	00003	-----	C.7.3	--	--	--
	Johnson, A.		01476	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01476	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01476	00003	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			01476	00004	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01476	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01476	00009	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01476	00010	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			01476	00015	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01476	00017	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01581	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01581	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
			01581	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Kearns, Ardis		01581	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
			01581	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01581	00006	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			01581	00007	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01581	00008	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01581	00009A	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01581	00009B	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01581	00010	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Nevada (continued)</u>									
C.9-141	Knapp, Bob		01433	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Koncher, Louis		00138	00001	-----	C.2.8	--	--	--
			00138	00004	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Kouslier, Louis		00426	00001	-----	C.2.8	--	--	--
			00426	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00426	00003	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Kretschmer, Theresa		00510	00001	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			00510	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Kretschmer, Theresa		00510	00006	-----	C.2.2	C.2.3	--	--
			01483	00001	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			01483	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01483	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
			01483	00007	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Kulas, Pauline A.		00514	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Kulas, Kathy Ann		00514	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00515	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00515	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			00515	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Kulas, Kenneth M.		00518	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Kutenai, K.		01456	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01456	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	C.4.1.1	--	--
			01456	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01456	00005	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
	Loux, Robert		01448	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	C.4.1.1	--	--
			01448	00003	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--
			01448	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01448	00005	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
	Loux, Robert	Gov's Nuclear Waste Office	01407	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01407	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01407	00007	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.2	--	--
			01407	00008	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01407	00009	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01407	00010	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
	Loux, Robert	Nuclear Waste Project Office	02640	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02640	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02640	00003	-----	C.3.1	--	--	--
			02640	00004	-----	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			02640	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

C-9-172

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Nevada</u> (continued)									
			02640	00006	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02640	00007	-----	C.3.1.2	C.7.4	--	--
			02640	00008	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02640	00009	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			02640	00010	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02640	00011A	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			02640	00011B	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			02640	00011C	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02640	00012	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02640	00014	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02640	00015	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			02640	00016	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02640	00017	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			02640	00018	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02640	00021	-----	C.2.4.1	C.4.1.5	--	--
			02640	00023	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			02640	00024	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			02640	00025	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02640	00026	-----	C.2.5.1	--	--	--
			02640	00027	-----	C.2.5.1	--	--	--
			02640	00028	-----	C.2.5.1	C.3.1.3	--	--
			02640	00029	-----	C.2.5.1	--	--	--
			02640	00030	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02640	00031	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02640	00032	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02640	00033	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02640	00034	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02640	00035	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02640	00036	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02640	00038	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02640	00100	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			02640	00106	-----	C.3.1.2	C.3.1.3	--	--
			02640	00107	-----	C.3.1.2	C.3.1.3	--	--
			02640	00108	-----	C.3.1.2	C.3.1.3	--	--
			02640	00109	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02640	00110	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02640	00111	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02640	00112	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Nevada</u> (continued)									
C.9-143			02640	00114	-----	C.2.7	C.3.1.3	--	--
			02640	00115	-----	C.2.8.2	C.3.1.3	--	--
			02640	00116	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02640	00117	-----	C.2.1.3	--	--	--
			02640	00118	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02640	00119	-----	C.2.4.2	--	--	--
			02640	00120	-----	C.2.7.1	--	--	--
			02640	00121	-----	C.2.7.1	--	--	--
			02640	00124	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02640	00125	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Lowicki, Peter		01415	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01415	00002	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01415	00003	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01415	00004	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			01415	00005	-----	C.2.7	C.3.5	--	--
			01415	00006	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			01415	00007	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.2	--	--
			01415	00008	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
	Lurie, Mayor Ron		01408	00001	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01408	00002	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01408	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01408	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01408	00005	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			01408	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Macaulay, B.		01465	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01465	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	C.7.3	--	--
			01465	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01465	00007	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Markoff, Mike		01443	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Markoff, Mike		01445	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01445	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Marshall, Lawrence		01484	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	McFarland, Linda	Amargosa Town Advisory Council	01403	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	McGirk, Blair		01481	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01481	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01481	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	C.7.3	--	--
			01481	00007	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
			01481	00008	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Nevada</u> (continued)									
	McKey, Mary	Water Resources Center	01481	00009	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			01480	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Mifflin, Martin		01480	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02659	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02659	00006	-----	C.2.7	C.2.8	--	--
			02659	00007	-----	C.2.7	C.2.8	--	--
			02659	00015	-----	C.2.8.3	C.4.1.3.3	--	--
			02659	00016	-----	C.2.8.3	C.4.1.3.3	--	--
			02659	00080	-----	C.2.7	C.5.2	--	--
			02659	00091	-----	C.2.7	C.3.1.3	--	--
			02659	00092	-----	C.2.7	C.3.1.3	--	--
			02659	00095	-----	C.2.7	C.4.1.2.2	--	--
			02659	00106	-----	C.2.7	C.4.1.2.2	--	--
			02659	00107	-----	C.2.7	C.4.3	--	--
			02659	00108	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02659	00109	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02659	00329	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--
			02659	00331	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--
			02659	00332	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--
			02659	00333	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--
			02659	00335	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--
			02659	00336	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--
			02659	00337	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--
			02659	00338	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--
			02659	00339	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--
			02659	00341	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02659	00342	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--
			02659	00343	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
		02659	00344	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
	Miller, Glen	01485	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
	Millman, Dr. J.	01458	00001	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--	
		01458	00003	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--	
		01458	00005	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--	
		01458	00006	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
	Mills, Joe	01436	00002	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--	
	Montrose, K. Hugh	01430	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
	Oakley, Bessie	01491	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--	
		01491	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Nevada</u> (continued)									
	Painter, Ms.		01473	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
			01473	00004	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
	Palich, Joseph		01573	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01573	00002	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
	Peterson, Dan		01404	00003	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			01404	00004	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			01404	00005	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
	Petition		01425	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Poulos, R. Jane	City of North Las Vegas	02646	00001	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02646	00020	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02646	00021	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02646	00022	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02646	00024	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02646	00028	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02646	00029	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02646	00034	-----	C.2.4.1	C.4.1.3.7	--	--
			02646	00035	-----	C.2.4.1	C.4.1.3.7	--	--
			02646	00036	-----	C.2.4.1	C.4.1.3.7	--	--
			02646	00037	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02646	00038	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02646	00039	-----	C.2.5	--	--	--
			02646	00040	-----	C.2.5	--	--	--
			02646	00041	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02646	00042	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02646	00043	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02646	00044	-----	C.2.5	--	--	--
			02646	00045	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02646	00046	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
			02646	00048	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02646	00049	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02646	00050	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
			02646	00054	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
			02646	00055	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02646	00056	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02646	00057	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02646	00058	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
			02646	00059	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02646	00060	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Nevada (continued)									
C.9-146	Rader, Scott		02646	00061	-----	C.2.1.3	--	--	--
	Reinsehl, Toni		01487	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
	Reiss, B.		01421	00001	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
	Robbins, E.		01464	00001	-----	C.3.4.2.1	--	--	--
	Robertson, J.		01477	00002	-----	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01460	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01460	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
	Robinson, William J.	UNLV Bus. & Econo. Research	02652	00001	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02652	00002	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02652	00003	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02652	00011	-----	C.2.5	--	--	--
			02652	00013	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.4	--	--
			02652	00040	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
	Rosse, Verne	St of NV, Dept Conserv & Nat Res	02650	00001	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			02650	00002A	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02650	00002B	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--
			02650	00029	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02650	00030	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Rosse, Mr.	Western Shoshone National Council	01450	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01450	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
		Yomba Shoshone Tribe	01451	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Schilling, John	NV Bureau of Mines & Geology	02648	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02648	00006	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02648	00055	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--
			02648	00056	-----	C.3.4.2.3	--	--	--
			02648	00057	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--
	Shire, D.H.		00358	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Shire, Durward		01442	00001	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
	Sill, M.		01468	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01468	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01468	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
			01468	00007	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01468	00008	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01468	00009	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01468	00010	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
	Sill, M.		02641	00001	-----	C.2.4.2	C.7.3	--	--
			02641	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	C.2.8.2	C.3.7	--
			02641	00004	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

C 9-1747

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Nevada</u> (continued)									
			02641	00005	-----	C.2.1.4	--	--	--
			02641	00006	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02641	00007	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02641	00014	-----	C.2.7	C.3.1.1	--	--
			02641	00019	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			02641	00021	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02641	00022	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02641	00023A	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02641	00023B	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02641	00024	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02641	00025	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02641	00026	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02641	00027	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02641	00029	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02641	00030	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02641	00031	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02641	00032	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02641	00033	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02641	00034	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02641	00035	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02641	00036	-----	C.3.1.2	C.3.1.3	--	--
			02641	00037	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02641	00038	-----	C.3.1.2	C.3.1.3	--	--
			02641	00040	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02641	00041	-----	C.4.1	--	--	--
			02641	00042	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02641	00043	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02641	00044	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02641	00045	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			02641	00057	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02641	00058	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02641	00059	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			02641	00060	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02641	00061	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02641	00062	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02641	00063	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02641	00064	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02641	00065	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Nevada</u> (continued)									
C 9-168			02641	00066	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02641	00068	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02641	00069	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02641	00070	-----	C.3.1.2	C.5.4	--	--
			02641	00071	-----	C.3.1.2	C.5.4	--	--
			02641	00072	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02641	00073	-----	C.3.1.2	C.3.1.3	--	--
			02641	00074	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02641	00075	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02641	00076	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02641	00077	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02641	00078	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02641	00079	-----	C.3.1.2	C.3.1.3	--	--
			02641	00080	-----	C.3.1.2	C.3.1.3	--	--
			02641	00081	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			02641	00082	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02641	00083	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02641	00084	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02641	00085	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02641	00086	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02641	00087	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02641	00088	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02641	00089	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02641	00090	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02641	00108	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02641	00160	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02641	00165	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02641	00169	-----	C.2.4.1	C.4.1.4	--	--
			02641	00217	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			02641	00218	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02641	00255	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			02641	00267	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			02641	00269	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			02641	00270	-----	C.2.6	--	--	--
			02641	00289	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02641	00290	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
		02641	00304	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		02641	00307	-----	C.5.7	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Nevada</u> (continued)									
			02641	00308	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
			02641	00309	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			02641	00311	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
			02641	00312	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02641	00314	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02641	00315	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02641	00316	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02641	00317	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02641	00318	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02641	00319	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02641	00320	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02641	00321	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			02641	00322	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
			02641	00323	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02641	00331	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02641	00332	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02641	00333	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02641	00335	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
			02641	00427	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
			02641	00429	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
			02641	00430	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02641	00431	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
			02641	00432	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02641	00433	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02641	00434	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02641	00441	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
			02641	00442	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02641	00553	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02641	00554	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02641	00555	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02641	00556	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02641	00557	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02641	00558	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02641	00559	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02641	00560	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			02641	00562	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			02641	00563	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			02641	00565	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Nevada</u> (continued)									
			02641	00566	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			02641	00567	-----	C.3.1.1	C.3.4.1	--	--
			02641	00568	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			02641	00571	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			02641	00572	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			02641	00573	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			02641	00575	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			02641	00576	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			02641	00577	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			02641	00578	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			02641	00579	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			02641	00585	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			02641	00586	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			02641	00588	-----	C.3.4.2.2	C.3.1.3	--	--
			02641	00589	-----	C.3.4.2.2	C.3.1.3	--	--
			02641	00590	-----	C.3.4.2.2	C.4.1.2.3	--	--
			02641	00591	-----	C.3.4.2.2	C.4.1.2.3	--	--
			02641	00592	-----	C.3.4.2.2	C.4.1.2.3	--	--
			02641	00593	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
			02641	00594	-----	C.3.4.2.2	C.3.4.3	--	--
			02641	00595	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02641	00596	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02641	00597	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02641	00598	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
			02641	00599	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
			02641	00600	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
			02641	00601	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
			02641	00603	-----	C.3.4.2.3	--	--	--
			02641	00605	-----	C.3.4.2.3	C.3.1.3	--	--
			02641	00606	-----	C.3.4.2.3	--	--	--
			02641	00607	-----	C.3.4.2.3	--	--	--
			02641	00608	-----	C.3.4.2.3	--	--	--
			02641	00609	-----	C.3.4.2.3	--	--	--
			02641	00610	-----	C.3.4.2.3	--	--	--
			02641	00611	-----	C.3.4.2.3	--	--	--
			02641	00612	-----	C.3.4.2.3	--	--	--
			02641	00613	-----	C.3.4.2.3	--	--	--
			02641	00614	-----	C.3.4.2.3	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION				
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	
C.9-151	Nevada (continued)									
				02641	00615	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
				02641	00616	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
				02641	00617	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
				02641	00618	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
				02641	00619	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
				02641	00620	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
				02641	00621	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
				02641	00622	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
				02641	00623	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
				02641	00624	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
				02641	00625	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
				02641	00626	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
				02641	00627	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
				02641	00628	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
				02641	00629	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
				02641	00630	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
				02641	00631	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
				02641	00632	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
				02641	00633	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
				02641	00634	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
				02641	00635	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
		Spencer, George	Union of Concerned Scientists	01410	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
		Strickland, Rose		01463	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
				01463	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
				01463	00003	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
				01463	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
				01463	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
				01463	00006	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
		Strickland, Rose	Sierra Club	01316	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
				01316	00006	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
		Tanne, Sydney		01424	00004	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
		Tanner, K.		01475	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
				01475	00005	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
				01475	00006	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
				01475	00007	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
		Terlizzi, Loretta		00425	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
				00425	00002	-----	C.2.8	--	--	--
		Terlizzi, Loretta		00519	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION					
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH		
<u>Nevada</u> (continued)											
C.9-152	Thomason, Jack	City of Las Vegas	00519	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--		
			00519	00003	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--		
			00519	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--		
			02645	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--		
			02645	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--		
			02645	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--		
			02645	00007	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--		
			02645	00008	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--		
			02645	00009	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--		
			02645	00010	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--		
			02645	00014	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--		
			02645	00015	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--		
			02645	00016	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--		
			Treichel, J.		01417	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
					01417	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
01417	00004	-----			C.3.4.4	--	--	--			
01417	00005	-----			C.3.4.4	--	--	--			
01417	00008	-----			C.2.5.2	C.6.4	--	--			
01447	00001	-----			C.3.1.2	--	--	--			
Trinko, Mark Twedt, P.		01479			00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--	
		01479			00003	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--	
		01479	00004	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--			
		01479	00005	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--			
Van Neuren, Heimi		01479	00006	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--			
		01413	00001	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--			
		01413	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--			
		01413	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--			
		01413	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--			
		01413	00005	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--			
		Vincent, Bill	Sthrn. Coord. for Cit. Alert	01418	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--	
				01418	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--	
01418	00003			-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--			
01418	00004			-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--			
Wasson, G.	Shoshone Indians	01469	00004	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--			
		01469	00006	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--			
		01469	00007	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--			
		01467	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--			
Watson, C.		01467	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--			

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

C.9-153

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Nevada (continued)									
	Weiss, Tom		01490	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Williams, A.		01472	00001	-----	C.2.8	--	--	--
			01472	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Wilson, Robert D.	City of Henderson	02647	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02647	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02647	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02647	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02647	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02647	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02647	00007	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Wyman, Richard	Civil & Mech. Engineering	01423	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Zorn, Ann	League of Women Voters of Nevada	01119	00003	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01119	00004	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01119	00005	-----	C.2.1.5	--	--	--
			01119	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01119	00007	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01119	00008	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01119	00009	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01119	00010	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01119	00011	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01119	00016	-----	C.3.3	--	--	--
			01119	00017	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01119	00018	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01119	00019	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
	Zorn, Ann	NV League of Women Voters	01419	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01419	00002	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01419	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
			01419	00007	-----	C.2.8.3	C.7.3	--	--
			01419	00008	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
			01419	00011	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01419	00014	-----	C.2.6	--	--	--
			01419	00015	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01419	00017	-----	C.2.1.2	C.7.4.2	C.7.4.5	--
New York									
	Cardlin, Nancy		00093	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00093	00002A	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>New York</u> (continued)									
C.9-154	Concra, Jr., Louis M.	NY State Dept. Envir. Conserv.	00093	00002B	DC	C.6.5	--	--	--
			00093	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00093	00004	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01570	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01570	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01570	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01570	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01570	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01570	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01570	00007	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01570	00008	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01570	00009	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Constant, Robert L. Copeland, Dr. Robert L.	Donaldson, Lufkin & Jenrette	01570	00010	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01583	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Crocco, Vera B. Crocco, Evelyn A. Diserlo, Matthew J. Forster, James Hale, Mary Hazel, James	Donaldson, Lufkin & Jenrette	00065	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00065	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00423	00001	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			00459	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01571	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00281	00001	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00355	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00148	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00148	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00360	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Khan, Bebe		00360	00002	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			00360	00003	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00360	00004	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00112	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00112	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Le Roy, Mary		00112	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00305	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01101	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01285	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
01285			00002	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--	
Norr, Carol Simon, Davis Wakefield, D. Audrey		01285	00003	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--	
		01285	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
		01551	00001	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--	
		01551	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
Walker, Jean									

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>New York</u> (continued)									
	Walker, Franklin V.		02076	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02076	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Werzinski, Joseph		02113	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02113	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02113	00003	-----	C.7.2	--	--	--
			02113	00004	-----	C.7.4	--	--	--
<u>North Carolina</u>									
	Daland, Robert T.	Univ. N.C./ Chapel Hill	00042	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00042	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00042	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00042	00004	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
<u>Ohio</u>									
	Clark, Judith		02608	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02608	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02608	00003	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
	Sauer, Rodney		01186	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			01186	00002	-----	C.2.3	--	--	--
	Walter, Laura		00207	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00207	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00207	00003	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
			00207	00004	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
<u>Oklahoma</u>									
	Dalton, Jr., Andrew L.	Attorney at Law	00084	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00084	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Stevens, Dr. Larry Charles		02106	00001	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--	--
			02106	00002	DC	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.2.4	--	--
			02106	00003	DC	C.5.10	--	--	--
			02106	00004	DC	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.2.4	--	--
			02106	00005	DC	C.7.2.5	C.7.2.6	--	--
	Walker, Mrs. Charles H.		00224	00001	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
	Williams, Janice L.		02120	00001	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION				
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	
C.9-156	<u>Oregon</u>									
	Adams, J. Ross & Lois H. Amara, Mark & Margaret		00543	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
			01128	00001	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--	
			01128	00002	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--	
			01128	00003	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--	
			01128	00005	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--	
			01128	00012	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
			01128	00013	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
			01128	00015	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--	
			01128	00017	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
			01128	00018	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
			01128	00019	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		Anderson, Harvard		02441	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
				02441	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02441	00005	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
			02441	00006	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
	Anderson, Judith			02475	00003	-----	C.2.10	--	--	--
				02475	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02475	00005	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--	
			02475	00006	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--	
			02475	00007	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--	
		Andre, Mary Ellen Anonymous	KGW-TV		01163	00002	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--
				02606	00001	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
				02606	00002	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
	Arum, John		02457	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
			02457	00002	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--	
			02457	00003	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--	
			02457	00004	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--	
			02457	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
			02457	00006	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
			02457	00010	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
			02457	00011	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
		Arum, John	Forelaws on Board		02694	00002A	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--
					02694	00002B	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--
		Ashburn, Dan		02446	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
				02446	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Ashburn, Daniel	WSSG		02446	00003	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	
				01363	00001	-----	C.2.6.3	--	--	--
			01363	00002	-----	C.2.6.3	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

C.9-157

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Oregon (continued)									
			01363	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01363	00004	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--
	Bailey, Don W.		00476	00005	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Barber, William		01592	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Barker, Rev., Catherine A.		01554	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Bauman, Rick		02469	00001	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			02469	00002	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			02469	00003	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
	Bauman, Rick	House of Rep. Oregon Leg. Assemb.	01248	00001	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			01248	00001A	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			01248	00001B	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			01248	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01248	00009	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Bell, Charles		02493	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02493	00003	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			02493	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02493	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02493	00006	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			02493	00007	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
			02493	00009	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02493	00010	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02493	00011	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			02493	00012	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02493	00013	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Bell, Charles F.	Fellowship of Reconciliation	01305	00001	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			01305	00003B	-----	C.2.3	--	--	--
			01305	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01305	00005	-----	C.2.3	--	--	--
			01305	00008	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01305	00009	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Belsey, Dick		02473	00004	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02473	00005	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
	Berry, Diane	City of Echo	01319	00001	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			01319	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
			01319	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Bickett, Gary		01280	00001	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			01280	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01280	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Oregon</u> (continued)									
C.9-158	Bickett, Gary		01280	00005	-----	C.2.4.3	--	--	--
			01280	00011	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			01280	00012	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			01280	00015	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01320	00002	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			01320	00003	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01320	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01320	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01320	00008	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01320	00010	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			01320	00011	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			01320	00012	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			01320	00015	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01320	00221	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
	Bleckman, Laurie		02498	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02498	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Boon, Jayna A.		01099	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01099	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Borge, John		00544	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00544	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	C.7.3	--	--
	Bradbury, Senator Bill		02442	00004	-----	C.3.2	--	--	--
			02442	00012	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02442	00013	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02442	00014	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Broadwell, Jo	Students for Nuclear Awareness	01359	00003	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			01359	00005	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
			01359	00006A	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01359	00006B	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Bunch, Ron & Margaret		02085	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02085	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02085	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02085	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02085	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Carl, Lisa A.		01135	00001	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			01135	00005	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01135	00006	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Claggett, Bill		01241	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01241	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Oregon</u> (continued)									
Coulter, Karen L.			01241	00003	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
			01241	00004	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
			01241	00005	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
			01354	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01354	00002	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			01354	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01354	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01354	00005	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01354	00006	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			01354	00011	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01354	00013	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
Crenshaw, Terry		01279	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
Dave, Arita		02459	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
		02459	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
Davies, Carol		02474	00002	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--	
		02474	00004	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--	
Davis, Mark		00469	00001	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--	
		00469	00002	-----	C.2.8	--	--	--	
		00469	00003A	-----	C.2.4.3	--	--	--	
		00469	00003B	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--	
		00469	00005	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--	
		00469	00008	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
		00469	00009	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
Delwiche, Laurel A.		00495	00002	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--	
Dixon, Bill		02467	00001	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--	
Dixon, Bill	Department of Energy	02070	00001	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--	
		02070	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		02070	00003	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--	
		02070	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		02070	00006	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--	
		02070	00007	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--	
		02070	00010	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
		02070	00013	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--	
		02070	00030	-----	C.2.5.1	--	--	--	
		02070	00040	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		02070	00041	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		02070	00042	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		02070	00043	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION				
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	
<u>Oregon</u> (continued)										
C.9-160			02070	00044	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
			02070	00045	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
			02070	00046	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
			02070	00047	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
			02070	00048	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
			02070	00049	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
			02070	00050	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
			02070	00051	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
			02070	00052	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
			02070	00054	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
			02070	00055	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
			02070	00056	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
			02070	00060	-----	C.2.2.2	--	--	--	
			02070	00062	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
			02070	00064	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
			02070	00073	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
			02070	00074	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
			02070	00075	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
			02070	00076	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
			02070	00077	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
			02070	00078	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
			02070	00079	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
			02070	00080	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
			02070	00081	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
			02070	00082	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--	
		Dobratz, Ruth Marie		02698	00001	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
				02698	00002	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
				02698	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
				02698	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
				02698	00005	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
				02698	00006	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
		Fawbush, Rep., Wayne		02444	00001	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
				02444	00007	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
		Frank, Lynn		02440	00003	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
				02440	00004	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
		Friedman, Sid		02483	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
				02483	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
				02483	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Oregon</u> (continued)									
			02483	00004	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			02483	00005	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02483	00006	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02483	00007	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02483	00008	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02483	00009	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02483	00010	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
Frison, Theodore		Koinonia Ecumenical Community	01249	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01249	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01249	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01249	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01249	00005	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			01249	00006	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01249	00007	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01249	00008	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01249	00009	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01249	00010	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
Frison, Theodore			01361	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01361	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01361	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01361	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01361	00006	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			01361	00008	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
Fry, Peter F.			01202	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01202	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01202	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01202	00004	-----	C.2.3	--	--	--
Gee, Sandra			02485	00002	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			02485	00004	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
Germond, Norma Jean			02490	00002	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			02490	00003	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02490	00004	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02490	00007	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02490	00008	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
Germond, Norma Jean		Columbia River Task Force	02503	00002	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			02503	00003	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02503	00004	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02503	00007	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Oregon</u> (continued)									
	Gilevich, Welsh, Shari, Manning		02503	00008	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			00619	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00619	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00619	00003	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			00619	00004	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			00619	00005	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			00619	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			00619	00008	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			00619	00009	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			02480	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02480	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02480	00006	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Goldberg, Marshall		02480	00007	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			01156	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02477	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02470	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02470	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02470	00006	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			00676	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			00681	00002	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			02495	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02495	00006	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02495	00007	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			02073	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Henningsgaard, Mayor Edith	Astoria City Council	02073	00002	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			02073	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01365	00001	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			01365	00002	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			01365	00003	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			01365	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01365	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01365	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01365	00007	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01365	00008	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01365	00009	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01365	00010	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Henry, David	WSSSG	01365	00011	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01365	00012	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION					
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH		
<u>Oregon</u> (continued)											
C.9-163	Herdon/Hill, Co-chair, Ron/Alma	Rainbow Organizing Committee	01365	00013	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--		
			00521	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
			00521	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--		
			00521	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
			00521	00004	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--		
	Hidden, William		00521	00007	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--		
			02456	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--		
	Hollis, Jack F.		02456	00003	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--		
			00456	00001	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--		
			00456	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--		
			00456	00003A	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--		
			00456	00003B	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--		
	Holmes, Jenny		00456	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--		
			01289	00001	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--		
	Howell, Mary L.		01293	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--		
			01293	00002	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--		
	Huetten, Fred		02499	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
			02499	00002	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--		
			02499	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--		
			02499	00006	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--		
			02499	00007	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--		
			02499	00008	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--		
			02499	00009	-----	C.2.1.3	--	--	--		
			02499	00010	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--		
			02499	00011	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--		
			Hughes, Jim	WSSG	01364	00001	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
					01364	00002	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
	01364	00003			-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--		
	01364	00004			-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--		
	01364	00005			-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
	Jackson, Johnny		01364	00006	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--		
			02460	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--		
	Jones, Rick & Kathy		02460	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
			01068	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--		
			01550	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
			01122	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--		
			01122	00002	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--		
	Kirby, K. W.	Hood River County	01227	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Oregon</u> (continued)									
C.9-164	Kite, Sandra		00551	00003	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			00551	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Kleiner, Mary E.		00669	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Knuse, T. B.		01578	00002	-----	C.3.2	--	--	--
	Korb, Nancy		02443	00001	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			02443	00002	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			02443	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02443	00006	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			02443	00007	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02443	00010	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02443	00011	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Lacourse, Victor		02449	00001	-----	C.8.2	C.2.3.1	--	--
			02449	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02449	00003	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			02449	00005	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			02449	00006	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Lasley, Mark		01157	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	LePage, Albert J.		00618	00001	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			00618	00002	-----	C.2.8	--	--	--
			00618	00003	-----	C.2.8	--	--	--
			00618	00005	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
			00618	00008	-----	C.2.8	--	--	--
			00618	00010	-----	C.2.8	--	--	--
			00618	00011	-----	C.2.8	--	--	--
			00618	00012	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
	Lieberman, Carol		02450	00001	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			02450	00002	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			02450	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02450	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02450	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02450	00006	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			02450	00007	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02450	00011	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02450	00012	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02450	00013	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02450	00014	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Lindberg, Mike		02455	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02455	00002	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Oregon</u> (continued)									
C.9-165	Lindberg, Mike	Office of Public Affairs	02455	00009	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02455	00010	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			02618	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02618	00003	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			02618	00004	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--
	Lindsay, John	WSSG	02618	00005	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02618	00006	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			01362	00002	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			01362	00006	-----	C.2.6.1	C.7.4	--	--
			01362	00007	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Lindstrom, Stephen R.	Port of Morrow	02079	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	C.6.4	--	--
			02079	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02079	00003	-----	C.4.2.1	--	--	--
	Long, Jim		02461	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02461	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02461	00003	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02461	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02461	00005	-----	C.2.1	--	--	--
			02461	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02461	00007	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02461	00010	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02461	00011	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02461	00012	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
			02461	00013	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
			02461	00014	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--
	Luzier, James Maduro, Gina		02466	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02494	00001	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02494	00002	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02494	00003	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02494	00004	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			02494	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02494	00006	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			02494	00007	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02494	00008	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02494	00009	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02494	00010	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02494	00011	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			02494	00013	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION				
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	
<u>Oregon</u> (continued)										
C. 9-166	Maret, Lloyd		02494	00014	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--	
			02494	00015	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
			02492	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--	
			02492	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
			02492	00005	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--	
			02492	00006	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
	Margolis, William		02492	00007	-----	C.2.5.1	--	--	--	
			00479	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--	
	Marthaller, Karen & Don		01167	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
			01167	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
	Mathis, Faith		00299	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
		McLaughlin, Barbara		02482	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02482	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
			02482	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
			02482	00005	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--	
			02482	00008	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--	
			02476	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
	McManus, Jorge		02476	00003	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--	
			02476	00007	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
			02476	00008B	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--	
		McManus, Mary		02487	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
				02487	00002	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
				02487	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02487	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
	McVay, Merle Ann		01107	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
		Mead, Bill		02445	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02445	00002	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--	
	Miller, Mindy	Miller, Caroline		01553	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02465	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
			02465	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
			02465	00003	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--	
			02465	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
			02465	00005	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--	
			02465	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
			02465	00007	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--	
Miller, Ron				02479	00001	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
				02479	00002	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
		02479	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--		

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Oregon</u> (continued)									
C.9-167			02479	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02479	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02479	00008	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02479	00009	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02479	00010	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02479	00011	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Miller, Joseph		02488	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02488	00002	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			02488	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02488	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Milne, Thomas		02451	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02451	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02451	00004	-----	C.3.3	--	--	--
			02451	00005	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Mix, Merry1		00611	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Mix, Merry1		00677	00001	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
	Moore, Madeline		00234	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Muller, Kris		00626	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			00626	00002	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
			00626	00003	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			00626	00004	-----	C.2.5.1	--	--	--
			00626	00005	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Muller, Chris		02283	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02283	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02283	00004	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
	Nicholas, Mrs. Edwin L.		02619	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02619	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02619	00004	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02619	00005	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02619	00007	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02619	00010	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
			02619	00011	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Nicholson, Jenny		00463	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00463	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00463	00005	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Nitsos, M.		01584	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Pace, Evalyne		02464	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02464	00002A	-----	C.2.3	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

C.9-168

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Oregon</u> (continued)									
Palmer, Leonard			02464	00004	-----	C.3.4.2.1	--	--	--
			02464	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02464	00006	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02468	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02468	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02468	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
Patawa, Elwood		Umatilla Indian Reservation	02468	00007	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02468	00008	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			01494	00001	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			01494	00007	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			01494	00008	-----	C.2.5.1	--	--	--
			01494	00009	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01494	00010	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
			01494	00011	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01494	00012	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01494	00013	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01494	00014	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01494	00015	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01494	00016	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01494	00017	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01494	00018	-----	C.2.5.1	2.5.6	C.2.6.1	--
			01494	00019	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			01494	00080	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			01494	00106	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01494	00107	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01494	00108	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01494	00109	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01494	00110	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01494	00111	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01494	00112	-----	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01494	00113	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01494	00114	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01494	00115	-----	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01494	00116	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
Peck, John			00531	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00531	00002	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			00531	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION					
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH		
<u>Oregon</u> (continued)											
C.9-169	Petersen, Gary & Family Peterson, Nancy	House of Representatives	00531	00004	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--		
			00531	00007	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--		
			00531	00011	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--		
			00531	00012	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--		
			01302	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--		
			01352	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--		
			01352	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--		
			01352	00006	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--		
			02489	00003	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--		
			02472	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--		
	Phelps, Anne Powell, Laura		02472	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
			02472	00003	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--		
			02472	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
			02472	00005	-----	C.2.5.1	--	--	--		
			02472	00006	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--		
			01291	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--		
			01291	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
			00500	00003	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--		
			00500	00004	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--		
			02453	00001	-----	C.2.5.1	--	--	--		
	Quinlan, Gordon		02453	00002	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--		
			02453	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
			02453	00004	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--		
			02453	00005	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--		
			02453	00006	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--		
			02453	00009	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--		
			00262	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
			02478	00001	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--		
			02478	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
			02478	00003A	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--		
	Ruben, Barbara Saltzman, Dan		00449	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--		
			02484	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
			02484	00002	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--		
			02484	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	C.3.1.2	--	--		
			02484	00003A	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--		
			02484	00003B	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
			02484	00004	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--		
			00367	00002	-----	C.7.3	--	--	--		
			Schade, Dr. Charles P.	Multnomah County Oregon							

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Oregon</u> (continued)									
C.9-170			00367	00004	-----	C.7.3	--	--	--
	Schectel, Tim		02481	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Schietinger, Chuck		02500	00000	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Silver, Erika		02463	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02463	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Sleeman, Larry & Lori		00501	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Smith, Julie		01219	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01219	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01219	00003	-----	C.2.3	--	--	--
			01219	00004	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			01219	00005	-----	C.2.3	--	--	--
			01219	00006	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01219	00007	-----	C.2.3	--	--	--
	Spillman, James		00671	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00671	00008	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
	Stachon, Eric		02448	00001	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			02448	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02448	00003	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
	Stout, Myrna Duffy		01591	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01591	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Strong, Bruce		00218	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Tucker, Tom		02458	00001	-----	C.2.5.1	--	--	--
			02458	00002	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
			02458	00003	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
			02458	00004	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			02458	00005	-----	C.2.5.1	--	--	--
			02458	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02458	00007	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Van Cise, Glen		01165	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01165	00003	-----	C.2.3	--	--	--
	VanCise, Debra J.		00436	00001	-----	C.2.8	--	--	--
	Vivian, Pat		01593	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01593	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01593	00003	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			01593	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Vogt, Dr. Thomas M.		00484	00002	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
	Wallace, Jerry		02496	00002	-----	C.5.3	C.3.4	--	--
			02496	00005	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Oregon</u> (continued)									
C.9-171	Wapato, Tim	Dept. of Health & Human Services	02447	00003	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Webster, T. R.		01232	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01232	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
	Weinmann, Sheila		02454	00002	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			02454	00003	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			02454	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02454	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02454	00007	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02454	00008	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02454	00009	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Westervelt, Susan		01108	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01108	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01108	00006	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Whittwer, Paulette		02471	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02471	00002	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
			02471	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02471	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Williams, Hal & Cathy		00610	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00610	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00610	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00610	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Williams, Reece		02486	00002	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			02486	00003	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
	Willits, Howard D.		02452	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Wineland, Mrs. C. E.		00202	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00202	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00202	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Wisecarver, Beth		01575	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Yarbrough, Carol A.		01173	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
<u>Pennsylvania</u>									
	Delgado, Linda		00468	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00468	00002	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00468	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00468	00004	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Good, Milton	Z & G Rubber Horse Shoes	00001	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Morgan, Robert E.		00401	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

C.9-172

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Pennsylvania</u> (continued)									
			00401	00002	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			00401	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00401	00004	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00401	00005	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00401	00006	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00401	00007	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Ress, Regina		02711	00001	DS	C.7.4.2	C.7.2.1	--	--
			02711	00002	-----	C.5.1	--	--	--
	Schmotzer, Michael & Constance		00653	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00653	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	C.7.2.5	--	--
	Young, Alice C.		00203	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00203	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00203	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Young, Hugh		01072	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01072	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
<u>South Carolina</u>									
	Taylor, Reid		00091	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00091	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00091	00003	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
<u>Tennessee</u>									
	Cohn, Waldo E.		01286	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Crass, Ted		00182	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00182	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00182	00003	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			00182	00004	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00182	00005	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
	Edwards, Sandra	TN Citizens for Wilderness Plan	00387	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00387	00002	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
	Hartman, Doris M.		00135	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00135	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Honicker, Dolph		01869	00001	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
	Murray, Stanley A.	S. Appalachian Highlands Cnsv.	00471	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Selby, Paul B.		00429	00001	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
	White, Michael E.		00071	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--

C.9-172

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

C-9-173

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Tennessee</u> (continued)									
			00071	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00071	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
<u>Texas</u>									
	Adibi, Alma		00378	00001	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00378	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00378	00003	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
	Anderson, Gary		00699	00001	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00699	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Anonymous		00044	00001	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
			00206	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00206	00002	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00206	00003A	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00206	00003B	DS	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00206	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
		City of Vega	01271	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01271	00002	-----	C.2.1.5	--	--	--
			01271	00003	DS	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			01271	00004	DS	C.4.1.2.3	--	--	--
			01271	00005	DS	C.4.1.2.3	--	--	--
			01271	00006	DS	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			01271	00007	DS	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			01271	00008	DS	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
			01271	00009	DS	C.4.1.4	--	--	--
			01271	00010	DS	C.4.2.2	C.7.4.3	--	--
			01271	00011	DS	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	--
			01271	00012	DS	C.4.1.2.3	--	--	--
			01271	00013	DS	C.4.1.2.3	C.7.4.3	--	--
			01271	00014	DS	C.4.1.2.3	C.7.4.3	--	--
			01271	00015	DS	C.7.4.3	C.7.4.5	--	--
			01271	00016	DS	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			01271	00017	DS	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
			01271	00018	DS	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	--
			01271	00019	DS	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	--
			01271	00020	DS	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			01271	00021	DS	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			01271	00022	DS	C.6.1	C.3.2	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION				
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	
<u>Texas</u> (continued)										
C.9-174			01271	00023	DS	C.6.1	--	--	--	
			01271	00024	DS	C.6.1	--	--	--	
			01271	00025	DS	C.7.4.1	--	--	--	
			01271	00026	DS	C.7.4.1	--	--	--	
			01271	00027	DS	C.7.4.1	--	--	--	
			01271	00028	DS	C.7.4.1	--	--	--	
			01271	00029	DS	C.7.4.1	C.4.1.5.1	--	--	
			01271	00030	DS	C.4.1.5.1	--	--	--	
			01271	00031	DS	C.7.4.4	--	--	--	
			01271	00032	DS	C.7.1.2	--	--	--	
			01271	00033	DS	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--	
			01271	00034	DS	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	--	
			01271	00035	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--	
			01271	00036	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--	
			01271	00037	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--	
			01271	00038	DS	C.5.1	C.3.2	--	--	
			01271	00039	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--	
			01271	00040	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--	
			01271	00041	DS	C.7.4.4	--	--	--	
			01271	00042	DS	C.7.1.1	--	--	--	
			01271	00043	DS	C.7.1.2	--	--	--	
			01271	00044	DS	C.6.5	--	--	--	
			01271	00045	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
			01271	00046	DS	C.7.3	--	--	--	
			01271	00047	DS	C.7.4.3	--	--	--	
			01271	00048	DS	C.7.4.3	--	--	--	
			01271	00049	DS	C.7.4.3	--	--	--	
			01271	00050	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--	
			01271	00051	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--	
	Anonymous			02147	00001	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
				02147	00002	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
				02147	00003	DS	C.4.1.2.2	C.4.1.3.1	--	--
			02147	00004	DS	C.7.4.3	--	--	--	
			02147	00005	DS	C.7.4.3	--	--	--	
			02147	00006	DS	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	--	
			02147	00007	DS	C.7.4.3	--	--	--	
			02147	00008	DS	C.7.4.5	--	--	--	
			02147	00009	DS	C.7.4.3	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION				
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	
<u>Texas</u> (continued)										
C.9-175			02147	00010	DS	C.7.2.8	--	--	--	
			02147	00011	DS	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	--	
			02147	00012	DS	C.7.4.5	--	--	--	
			02147	00013	DS	C.6.1	--	--	--	
			02147	00014	DS	C.7.4.1	--	--	--	
			02147	00015	DS	C.7.4.1	--	--	--	
			02147	00016	DS	C.7.4.4	--	--	--	
			02147	00017	DS	C.7.1.2	--	--	--	
			02147	00018	DS	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--	
			02147	00019	DS	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	--	
			02147	00020	DS	C.7.4.5	--	--	--	
			02147	00021	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--	
			02147	00022	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--	
			02147	00023	DS	C.7.1.2	--	--	--	
			02147	00024	DS	C.7.2	--	--	--	
			02147	00025	DS	C.6.5	--	--	--	
			02147	00026	DS	C.6.5	--	--	--	
			02147	00027	DS	C.7.4.4	--	--	--	
			02147	00028	DS	C.7.4.3	--	--	--	
			02147	00029	DS	C.7.3	--	--	--	
			02147	00030	DS	C.7.4.5	--	--	--	
			High Plains Underground Water	02139	00001	DS	C.7.1.1.8	C.7.2.8	--	--
				02139	00002	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
				02139	00003	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
				02139	00004	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
				02139	00005	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
				02139	00006	DS	C.7.1.1.8	--	--	--
				02139	00007	DS	C.7.2.1	C.7.2.8	--	--
				02139	00008	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
				02139	00009	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
				02139	00010	DS	C.4.1.2.3	--	--	--
			02139	00011	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--	
			02140	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
			02140	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
			02140	00003	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--	
			02140	00004	-----	C.2.6	--	--	--	
			02140	00005	DS	C.3.3	--	--	--	
			02140	00006	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--	
	Anonymous									

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION				
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	
<u>Texas</u> (continued)										
C.9-176			02140	00007	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--	
			02140	00008	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--	
			02140	00009	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--	
			02140	00010	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--	
			02140	00011	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--	
			02140	00012	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--	
			02140	00013	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--	
			02140	00014	DS	C.7.2.1	C.7.2.8	--	--	
			02140	00015	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--	
			02140	00016	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--	
			02140	00017	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--	
			02140	00018	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--	
			02140	00019	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--	
			02140	00020	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--	
			02140	00021	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--	
			02140	00022	DS	C.7.2	--	--	--	
			02140	00023	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--	
			02140	00024	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--	
			02140	00025	-----	C.2.4.3	--	--	--	
			02140	00026	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--	
			Swisher Cnty. Commiss. Court	02166	00001	DS	C.7.4	C.7.3	C.5.1	--
			Tulia Wheat Growers, Inc.	02135	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
		Armitage, Mrs. R. A.		02164	00001	DS	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
				02164	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
				02164	00003	DS	C.7.1.2	C.7.4	--	--
				02164	00004	DS	C.7.1.1.8	C.7.2.8	--	--
				02164	00005	DS	C.4.3	C.7.2.1	--	--
				02164	00006	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
				02164	00007	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
				02164	00008	DS	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
				02164	00009	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
		Auckerman, Rick		00842	00001	DS	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
				00842	00002	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
				00842	00003	DS	C.4.1.5.2	C.7.4.2	--	--
				00842	00004	DS	C.4.1.5.2	C.7.4.2	--	--
		Auckerman, Georgia		00843	00001	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
				00843	00002	DS	C.7.3	--	--	--
				00843	00003	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Texas</u> (continued)									
			00843	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00843	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00843	00006	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00843	00007	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00843	00008	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00843	00009	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Bair, Nova		00865	00001	DS	C.5.11	--	--	--
			00865	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Bair, Mrs. Nova S.		00865	00003	DS	C.7.2.7	--	--	--
			02159	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02159	00002	DS	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
			02159	00003	DS	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
			02159	00004	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02159	00005	DS	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
	Barber, Gene R.	Merriman & Barber	00508	00001	DS	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
			00508	00002	DS	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
			00508	00003	DS	C.4.1.5	--	--	--
			00508	00004	DS	C.7.1.2	C.7.4.2	--	--
			00508	00005	DS	C.7.1.2	C.4.1.5.1	C.7.4.1	--
			00508	00006	DS	C.4.1.5	C.7.4.5	C.7.1.2	--
			00508	00007	DS	C.4.1.5	C.7.4.5	C.7.1.2	--
			00508	00008	DS	C.4.1.5	C.7.1.2	C.7.4.3	--
			00508	00009	DS	C.4.1.5	--	--	--
			00508	00010	DS	C.4.1.5	C.7.1.2	--	--
	Barber, P.E., Gene R.		02086	00001	DS	C.7.1.2	C.7.4.1	--	--
			02086	00002	DS	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
			02086	00003	DS	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
			02086	00004	DS	C.7.3	--	--	--
			02086	00005	DS	C.7.4.3	C.7.1.2	--	--
			02086	00006	DS	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
	Barnard, Charlene		00875	00001	DS	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
			00875	00002	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			00875	00003	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
	Barnes, Debbie		00715	00002	DS	C.6.5	--	--	--
			00715	00004	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			00715	00005	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Beck, Malcolm	Garden-Ville Fertilizer Co.	02708	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02708	00002	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Texas (continued)									
C.9-178	Blakely, Lisa		00848	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00848	00002	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			00848	00003	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			00848	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00848	00005	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			00848	00006	DS	C.4.2.2	C.5.3	--	--
			00848	00007	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
			00848	00008	-----	C.2.1.5	--	--	--
			00848	00009	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00848	00010	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			00848	00011	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			00848	00012	DS	C.6.5	--	--	--
	Bledsoe, Jolene		00177	00001	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00177	00002	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00177	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Bledsoe, Jolene		00177	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02165	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
02165			00002	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--	
Boatwright, Kenneth	TX Dept. of Agriculture	02165	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		01383	00001	DS	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--	
		01383	00002	DS	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--	
		01383	00003	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--	
		01383	00004	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--	
		01383	00005	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--	
		01383	00006	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--	
		01383	00007	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--	
		01383	00008	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--	
		01383	00009	DS	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--	
		01383	00010	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--	
		01383	00011	DS	C.4.1.5	--	--	--	
		01383	00012	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--	
		01383	00013A	DS	C.7.1.2	--	--	--	
		01383	00013B	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--	
		01383	00014	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--	
		01383	00015	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--	
		01383	00016A	DS	C.6.5	--	--	--	
		01383	00016B	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--	
01383	00017	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--			

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Texas</u> (continued)									
C.9-179	Borchardt, Brian		01383	00018	DS	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01383	00019	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01383	00020	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01383	00021	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01383	00022	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01383	00023	DS	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			01383	00024	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01383	00025	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01383	00026	DS	C.7.4.2	C.2.1.5	--	--
			01383	00027	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01383	00028	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			00697	00001	DS	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
			00697	00002	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00697	00003	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00697	00004	DS	C.7.2.8	C.7.2.1	--	--
		Borchardt, Mona		00697	00005	DS	C.7.4.4	--	--
			00705	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00705	00002	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00705	00003	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00705	00004	DS	C.7.4.5	--	--	--
			00705	00005	DS	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00705	00006	DS	C.6.5	C.5.11	C.7.3	--
			00705	00007	DS	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Borchardt, Brian		00705	00008	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02129	00001	DS	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
			02129	00002	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02129	00003	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
	Borchardt, Mona		02129	00004	DS	C.7.2.8	C.7.2.1	--	--
			02129	00005	DS	C.7.4.4	--	--	--
			02131	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02131	00002	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02131	00003	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02131	00004	DS	--	C.7.4.5	--	--
			02131	00005	DS	C.7.2	C.7.1	--	--
			02131	00006	DS	C.6.5	C.5.11	C.7.3	--
	Boulter, Beau		02131	00007	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02131	00008	DS	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00689	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Texas</u> (continued)									
C.9-180	Boulter, Beau	Texas Representative	00689	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00689	00003	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00689	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00689	00005	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			00689	00006	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			00689	00007	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00689	00008	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			02124	00001	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			02124	00002	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--
			02124	00003	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Bright, Eunice		02124	00004	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			02124	00005	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			02124	00006	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			00708	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00708	00002	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			00708	00003	-----	C.3.3	--	--	--
			00708	00005	-----	C.7.3	--	--	--
			Bright, LuLu Marjorie		00710	00001	DS	C.7.1.1.1	C.7.2.1
	00710	00002			DS	C.5.7	--	--	--
	00710	00003			-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
	Briscoe, Greg		00710	00004	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00895	00001	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			00895	00002	DS	C.4.1.1.1	--	--	--
			00895	00003	DS	C.5.7	--	--	--
			00895	00004	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00895	00005	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			00895	00006	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
			00895	00007	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
			00895	00008	DS	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
			00895	00009	-----	C.3.2	--	--	--
	Brody, Julie		00836	00001	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00836	00002	DS	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
00836			00003	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--	
00836			00004	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--	
00836			00005	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--	
00836			00006	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--	
00836			00007	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--	
Brody, Julia	TX Dept. of Agriculture	01384	00001	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Texas (continued)									
C.9-181	Brody, Julie	Texas Department of Agriculture	01384	00002	DS	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			01384	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01384	00004	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01384	00005	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01384	00006	DS	C.6.5	C.7.2	--	--
			01384	00007	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01384	00008	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01384	00009	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01384	00010	DS	C.7.4	C.6.5	--	--
			01384	00011	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01384	00012	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			02138	00001	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
	02138	00002	DS	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--		
	02138	00003	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--		
	02138	00004	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--		
	02138	00005	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--		
	02138	00006	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--		
	02138	00007	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--		
	Byrd, Wylie Chedester, Barbara Claire, Clendon B.	00706	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
		00029	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
		00376	00001	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--	
	Coleman, Jean	00376	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
		00376	00003	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--	
		00375	00001	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--	
	Combest, Larry	00375	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
		00375	00003	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--	
		00835	00001	DS	C.3.1.3	--	--	--	
	Combest, Larry	00835	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
		00835	00003	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--	
		00835	00004	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--	
	Combest, Larry	00835	00005	DS	C.7.4.2	C.7.4.4	--	--	
		00835	00006	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
		02137	00001	DS	C.7.2.8	C.3.1.3	--	--	
	Cominos, Nicholas	02137	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
		02137	00003	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--	
		02137	00004	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--	
	Cominos, Nicholas	02137	00005	DS	C.7.4.2	C.7.4.4	--	--	
		00892	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION				
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	
<u>Texas</u> (continued)										
C.9-182	Cook, Joanne		00892	00002	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--	
			00892	00003	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--	
			00847	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
			00847	00002	DS	C.5.2	--	--	--	
			00847	00003	DS	C.7.1.1.8	--	--	--	
			00847	00004	DS	C.7.2.1	C.7.1.1.1	--	--	
			00847	00005	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--	
			00847	00006	DS	C.6.1	--	--	--	
	Cook, Joanne		00847	00007	DS	C.6.1	--	--	--	
			00847	00008	DS	C.6.6	--	--	--	
			02144	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
			02144	00002	DS	C.5.2	--	--	--	
			02144	00003	DS	C.7.1.1.8	--	--	--	
			02144	00004	DS	C.7.1.1.1	C.7.2.1	--	--	
			02144	00005	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--	
			02144	00006	DS	C.6.1	--	--	--	
	Cooper, Margaret		02144	00007	DS	C.6.1	--	--	--	
			02144	00008	DS	C.6.6	--	--	--	
			00857	00001	DS	C.7.4.4	--	--	--	
			00857	00002	DS	C.7.4.4	--	--	--	
		Cooper, Margaret Owen		00857	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
				02152	00001	DS	C.7.4.4	--	--	--
				02152	00002	DS	C.7.4.4	--	--	--
		Davis, Beverly		02152	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00499	00001	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--	
			00499	00002	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--	
			00499	00003A	DS	C.7.2.1	--	--	--	
			00499	00003B	DS	C.6.5	--	--	--	
			00499	00003C	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--	
			00499	00004	DS	C.6.5	--	--	--	
			00499	00005	DS	C.7.3	--	--	--	
	Dawson, Marjorie		00499	00006	DS	C.6.2	C.7.4.4	--	--	
			00695	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
	Dawson, Marjorie Musick		00695	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
			02127	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
	Denko, Dr. John V.	Northwest Texas Hospital		02127	00003	-----	C.7.3	--	--	--
				01266	00001	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
				01266	00002	DS	C.7.4.4	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Texas</u> (continued)									
Detten, Ralph			01266	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01266	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			00868	00001	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
Devin, Delbert			00868	00002	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00691	00001	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			00716	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	C.7.4.2	--	--
Devin, Albert			00716	00002	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00716	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00716	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00716	00005	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			00716	00006	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			00716	00007	DS	C.7.2	--	--	--
Devin, Delbert			00885	00001	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
Downey, Margaret			00885	00009	-----	C.3.4.2.1	--	--	--
			00888	00001	DS	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			00888	00002	DS	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			00888	00003	DS	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			00888	00004	DS	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			00888	00005	DS	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			00888	00006	DS	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			00888	00007	DS	C.4.1.5.2	C.7.4.2	--	--
			00010	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
Ford, Melva			00010	00002	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
Ford, Melva			00017	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00017	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00017	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
Ford, Melva			00022	00001	DS	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00022	00002	-----	C.7.2	--	--	--
Ford, Melva			00028	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00028	00002	DS	C.6.1	--	--	--
Ford, Frank			00876	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00876	00003	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
Ford, Melva			01338	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
Forrest, Richard			00851	00001	DS	C.4.1.2.3	--	--	--
			00851	00002	-----	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00851	00003	DS	C.4.1.3.1	C.4.1.2.2	--	--
			00851	00004	DS	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			00851	00005	DS	C.7.4.3	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Texas</u> (continued)									
C.9-184	Forrest, Richard	Witherspoon, Aikin & Langley	00851	00006	DS	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	--
			00851	00007	DS	C.4.1.5.3	C.7.4.3	--	--
			00851	00008	DS	C.7.4.5	--	--	--
			00851	00009	DS	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			00851	00010	DS	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
			00851	00011	DS	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	--
			00851	00012	DS	C.7.4.5	C.4.1.3.5	--	--
			00851	00013	DS	C.6.1	--	--	--
			00851	00014	DS	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			00851	00015	DS	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			00851	00016	DS	C.7.4.4	--	--	--
			00851	00017	DS	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
			00851	00018	DS	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
			00851	00019	DS	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			00851	00020	DS	C.7.4.5	--	--	--
			00851	00021	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00851	00022	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			00851	00023	DS	C.7.4.4	--	--	--
			00851	00024	DS	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00851	00025	DS	C.6.5	--	--	--
			00851	00026A	DS	C.6.5	--	--	--
			00851	00026B	DS	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00851	00027	DS	C.7.4.4	--	--	--
			00851	00028	DS	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			00851	00029	DS	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00851	00030	DS	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			01270	00001	DS	C.4.1.2.3	--	--	--
			01270	00002	DS	C.4.1.2.3	--	--	--
			01270	00003	DS	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	--
			01270	00004	DS	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
			01270	00005	DS	C.4.1.4	--	--	--
			01270	00006	DS	C.4.2.2	C.7.4.3	--	--
			01270	00007	DS	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	--
			01270	00008	DS	C.7.4.5	--	--	--
			01270	00009	DS	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			01270	00010	DS	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
			01270	00011	DS	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			01270	00012	DS	C.7.4.5	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Texas</u> (continued)									
C.9-185	Frishman, Steve	Nuclear Waste Prgms. Office	01270	00013	DS	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			01270	00014	DS	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
			01270	00015	DS	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			01270	00016	DS	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			01270	00017	DS	C.7.4.5	--	--	--
			01270	00018	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			02686	00001	-----	C.2.5.1	--	--	--
			02686	00002	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			02686	00003	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			02686	00004	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			02686	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02686	00006	DS	C.4.2.2	C.4.3	--	--
			02686	00007	DS	C.4.2.2	C.4.3	--	--
			02686	00008	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02686	00009	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02686	00010	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02686	00011	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02686	00012	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02686	00013	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02686	00014	DS	C.4.1.1.6	C.5.3	C.8.2	--
			02686	00015	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			02686	00016	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02686	00017	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02686	00018	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
	Frishman, Steve	Nuclear Waste Prgms. Office	02687	00001	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02687	00003	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02687	00005	-----	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			02687	00006	DS	C.4.2.2	C.4.3	--	--
			02687	00007	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			02687	00008	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02687	00009	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02687	00010	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02687	00011	-----	C.4.1.1	--	--	--
			02687	00012	-----	C.2.8	--	--	--
			02687	00014	DS	C.4.1.2.2	C.4.1.1.6	C.5.3	C.8.2
			02687	00015	DS	C.3.3.2	C.4.3	--	--
			02687	00017	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02687	00022A	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Texas</u> (continued)									
C.9-186	Frishman, Steve	Nuclear Waste Pgrms. Office	02687	00022B	-----	C.3.4.2	--	--	--
			02687	00022C	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			02687	00097	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02687	00100	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02687	00105	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--
			02687	00133	DS	C.7.3	--	--	--
			02687	00155	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			02687	00156	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			02688	00001	DS	C.4.1.1	--	--	--
			02688	00002	DS	C.4.1.1.1	--	--	--
			02688	00003	DS	C.4.1.1.6	--	--	--
			02688	00004	DS	C.4.1.1.2	--	--	--
			02688	00005	DS	C.4.1.1.6	--	--	--
			02688	00006A	DS	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			02688	00006B	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			02688	00007	DS	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			02688	00008	DS	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			02688	00009	DS	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			02688	00010	DS	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			02688	000101	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02688	00011	DS	C.4.1.1.6	--	--	--
			02688	00012	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			02688	00013	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			02688	00014	DS	C.8.2	--	--	--
			02688	00015	DS	C.5.11	--	--	--
			02688	00016	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02688	00017	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02688	00018	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02688	00019	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02688	00020	DS	C.7.3	C.2.8.2	--	--
			02688	00021	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02688	00022	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02688	00023	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02688	00024	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02688	00025	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02688	00026	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02688	00027	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02688	00028	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Texas</u> (continued)									
			02688	00029	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02688	00030	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02688	00031	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02688	00032	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02688	00033	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02688	00034	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02688	00035	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02688	00036	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02688	00037	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02688	00038	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02688	00039	DS	C.7.3	--	--	--
			02688	00040	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02688	00041	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02688	00042	DS	C.7.3	--	--	--
			02688	00043	DS	C.7.3	--	--	--
			02688	00044	DS	C.7.3	--	--	--
			02688	00045	DS	C.7.3	--	--	--
			02688	00046	DS	C.7.3	--	--	--
			02688	00047	DS	C.4.1.4	--	--	--
			02688	00048	DS	C.7.1.1.9	--	--	--
			02688	00049	DS	C.4.3	C.7.3	--	--
			02688	00050	DS	C.4.3	C.7.3	--	--
			02688	00051	DS	C.4.1.4	--	--	--
			02688	00052	DS	C.7.3	--	--	--
			02688	00053	DS	C.7.3	--	--	--
			02688	00054	DS	C.7.3	C.7.4.1	--	--
			02688	00055	DS	C.7.3	--	--	--
			02688	00056	DS	C.7.3	--	--	--
			02688	00057	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02688	00058	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			02688	00059	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			02688	00060	DS	C.4.3	C.7.2.8	C.7.2.1	C.7.3
			02688	00061	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02688	00062	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02688	00063	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02688	00064	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			02688	00065	DS	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			02688	00066	DS	C.7.4.3	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

C. 9-188

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Texas</u> (continued)									
			02688	00067	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			02688	00068	DS	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
			02688	00069	DS	C.7.4.3	C.7.4.5	--	--
			02688	00070	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			02688	00071	DS	C.7.1.1.6	C.7.2.6	--	--
			02688	00072	DS	C.4.1.3.6	--	--	--
			02688	00073	DS	C.7.4.2	C.7.2.1	C.4.1.3.1	--
			02688	00074	DS	C.4.1.3.1	C.7.4.2	C.7.2.1	--
			02688	00075	DS	C.7.4.2	C.7.2.1	C.4.1.3.1	--
			02688	00076	DS	C.4.1.3.1	C.7.4.2	C.7.2.1	C.7.1.1.1
			02688	00077	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02688	00078	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02688	00079	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02688	00080	DS	C.7.2.7	C.6.6	--	--
			02688	00081	DS	C.6.6	--	--	--
			02688	00082	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02688	00083	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02688	00084	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			02688	00085	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			02688	00086	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			02688	00087	DS	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
			02688	00088	DS	C.4.1.3.6	--	--	--
			02688	00089	DS	C.4.1.4	--	--	--
			02688	00090	DS	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			02688	00091	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			02688	00092	DS	C.7.2.8	C.8.3	--	--
			02688	00093	DS	C.7.2	--	--	--
			02688	00094	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			02688	00095	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02688	00096	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			02688	00097	-----	C.2.1.3	--	--	--
			02688	00098	DS	C.7.1.1.3	C.7.2.3	--	--
			02688	00099	DS	C.7.1.1.3	C.7.2.3	--	--
			02688	00100	DS	C.7.1.1.3	C.7.2.3	--	--
			02688	00102	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			02688	00103	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			02688	00104	DS	C.7.2	--	--	--
			02688	00105	DS	C.7.1.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Texas</u> (continued)									
C.9-189	Frishman, Steve	Nuclear Waste Prgms. Office	02688	00106	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
			02688	00107	DS	C.4.1.2.3	--	--	--
			02688	00108	DS	C.4.1.2.3	--	--	--
			02688	00109	DS	C.4.1.2.3	--	--	--
			02688	00110	DS	C.4.1.2.3	--	--	--
			02688	00111	DS	C.4.1.2.3	--	--	--
			02688	00112	DS	C.4.1.2.3	--	--	--
			02688	00113	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			02688	00114	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			02688	00115	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			02688	00116	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			02688	00117	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			02688	00118	DS	C.4.1.2.2	C.5.1	--	--
			02688	00119	DS	C.7.1.1.8	C.7.2.8	--	--
			02688	00120	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			02688	00121	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			02688	00122	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			02688	00128	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02689	00001	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02689	00002	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02689	00003	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02689	00004	DS	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			02689	00005	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02689	00006	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
	Frishman, Steve	State of Texas	02689	00007	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01381	00001	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01381	00002	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01381	00003	DS	C.4.1.4	--	--	--
			01381	00004	DS	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01381	00005	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01381	00006	DS	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01381	00007	DS	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
			01381	00008	DS	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			01381	00009	DS	C.7.1.1.1	C.4.2.1	--	--
			01381	00010	DS	C.7.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01381	00011	DS	C.4.3	C.7.2	--	--
			01381	00012	DS	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
			01381	00013	DS	C.7.3	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

C-9-190

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Texas</u> (continued)									
			01381	00014	DS	C.5.10	--	--	--
			01381	00015	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01381	00016	DS	C.3.3.1	C.4.1.2.2	--	--
			01381	00017	DS	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			01381	00018	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01381	00019	DS	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			01381	00020	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01381	00021	DS	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			01381	00022	DS	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			01381	00023	DS	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			01381	00024	DS	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			01381	00025	DS	C.4.1.1.1	--	--	--
			01381	00026	DS	C.4.1.1.1	--	--	--
			01381	00027	DS	C.4.1.1.1	--	--	--
			01381	00028	DS	C.4.1.1.2	--	--	--
			01381	00029	DS	C.4.1.1.2	--	--	--
			01381	00030	DS	C.4.1.1.2	--	--	--
			01381	00031	DS	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01381	00032	DS	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01381	00033	DS	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01381	00034	DS	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01381	00035	DS	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01381	00036	DS	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01381	00037	DS	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01381	00038	DS	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01381	00039	DS	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01381	00040	DS	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01381	00041	DS	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01381	00042	DS	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01381	00043	DS	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01381	00044	DS	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01381	00045	DS	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01381	00046	DS	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01381	00047	DS	C.4.1.1.6	--	--	--
			01381	00048	DS	C.4.1.1.6	--	--	--
			01381	00049	DS	C.4.1.1.6	--	--	--
			01381	00050	DS	C.4.1.1.6	--	--	--
			01381	00051	DS	C.4.1.1.6	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Texas</u> (continued)									
			01381	00052	DS	C.4.1.1.6	--	--	--
			01381	00053	DS	C.4.1.1.6	--	--	--
			01381	00054	DS	C.4.1.1.6	--	--	--
			01381	00055	DS	C.4.1.1.6	--	--	--
			01381	00056	DS	C.4.1.1.6	--	--	--
			01381	00057	DS	C.4.1.1.6	--	--	--
			01381	00058	DS	C.4.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01381	00059	DS	C.4.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01381	00060	DS	C.4.1.1.9	--	--	--
			01381	00061	DS	C.4.1.1.9	--	--	--
			01381	00062	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01381	00063	DS	C.4.1.1.9	--	--	--
			01381	00064	DS	C.4.1.2.1	--	--	--
			01381	00065	DS	C.4.1.2.1	--	--	--
			01381	00066	DS	C.4.1.2.1	--	--	--
			01381	00067	DS	C.4.1.2.1	--	--	--
			01381	00068	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01381	00069	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01381	00070	DS	C.4.1.2.3	--	--	--
			01381	00071	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01381	00072	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01381	00073	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01381	00074	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01381	00075	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01381	00076	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01381	00077	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01381	00078	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01381	00079	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01381	00080	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01381	00081	DS	C.4.1.1.7	--	--	--
			01381	00082	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01381	00083	DS	C.4.1.2.3	--	--	--
			01381	00084	DS	C.4.1.2.3	--	--	--
			01381	00085	DS	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
			01381	00086	DS	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
			01381	00087	DS	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
			01381	00088	DS	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
			01381	00089	DS	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Texas</u> (continued)									
			01381	00090	DS	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
			01381	00091	DS	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
			01381	00092	DS	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
			01381	00093	DS	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
			01381	00094	DS	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
			01381	00095	DS	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
			01381	00096	DS	C.4.1.3.4	--	--	--
			01381	00097	DS	C.4.1.3.5	--	--	--
			01381	00098	DS	C.4.1.3.4	--	--	--
			01381	00099	DS	C.4.1.3.6	--	--	--
			01381	00100	DS	C.4.1.3.7	--	--	--
			01381	00101	DS	C.4.1.4	--	--	--
			01381	00102	DS	C.4.1.4	--	--	--
			01381	00103	DS	C.4.1.5	--	--	--
			01381	00104	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01381	00105	DS	C.4.2.1	--	--	--
			01381	00106	DS	C.4.2.1	--	--	--
			01381	00107	DS	C.4.2.1	--	--	--
			01381	00108	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01381	00109	DS	C.4.2.1	--	--	--
			01381	00110	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01381	00111	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01381	00112	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01381	00113	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01381	00114	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01381	00115	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01381	00116	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01381	00117	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01381	00118	DS	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01381	00119	DS	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01381	00120	DS	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			01381	00121	DS	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			01381	00122	DS	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01381	00123	DS	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01381	00124	DS	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01381	00125	DS	C.7.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01381	00126	DS	C.7.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01381	00127	DS	C.7.1.1.8	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Texas</u> (continued)									
			01381	00128	DS	C.7.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01381	00129	DS	C.7.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01381	00130	DS	C.7.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01381	00131	DS	C.7.1.1.1	--	--	--
			01381	00132	DS	C.7.1.1.1	--	--	--
			01381	00133	DS	C.7.1.1.1	--	--	--
			01381	00134	DS	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01381	00135	DS	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01381	00136	DS	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			01381	00137	DS	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			01381	00138	DS	C.7.1.1.1	--	--	--
			01381	00139	DS	C.7.1.1.9	--	--	--
			01381	00140	DS	C.7.1.1.9	--	--	--
			01381	00141	DS	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
			01381	00142	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01381	00143	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01381	00144	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01381	00145	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01381	00146	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01381	00147	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01381	00148	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01381	00149	DS	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
			01381	00150	DS	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
			01381	00151	DS	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
			01381	00152	DS	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
			01381	00153	DS	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
			01381	00154	DS	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
			01381	00155	DS	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
			01381	00156	DS	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
			01381	00157	DS	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
			01381	00158	DS	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
			01381	00159	DS	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			01381	00160	DS	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			01381	00161	DS	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
			01381	00162	DS	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			01381	00163	DS	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			01381	00164	DS	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			01381	00165	DS	C.7.3	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Texas</u> (continued)									
			01381	00166	DS	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01381	00167	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01381	00168	DS	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			01381	00169	DS	C.6.1	--	--	--
			01381	00170	DS	C.6.3	--	--	--
			01381	00171	DS	C.6.4	--	--	--
			01381	00172	DS	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			01381	00173	DS	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
			01381	00174	DS	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
			01381	00175	DS	C.6.3	--	--	--
			01381	00176	DS	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01381	00177	DS	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01381	00178	DS	C.6.1	--	--	--
			01381	00179	DS	C.6.5	--	--	--
			01381	00180	DS	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01381	00181	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01381	00182	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01381	00183	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01381	00184	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01381	00185	DS	C.5.2	--	--	--
			01381	00186	DS	C.5.2	--	--	--
			01381	00187	DS	C.5.3	--	--	--
			01381	00188	DS	C.5.3	--	--	--
			01381	00189	DS	C.5.3	--	--	--
			01381	00190	DS	C.5.3	--	--	--
			01381	00191	DS	C.5.4	--	--	--
			01381	00192	DS	C.5.5	--	--	--
			01381	00193	DS	C.5.6	--	--	--
			01381	00194	DS	C.5.6	--	--	--
			01381	00195	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01381	00196	DS	C.5.4	--	--	--
			01381	00197	DS	C.5.7	--	--	--
			01381	00198	DS	C.8.5	--	--	--
			01381	00199	DS	C.8.3	--	--	--
			01381	00200	DS	C.8.4	--	--	--
			01381	00201	DS	C.8.1	--	--	--
			01381	00202	DS	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01381	00203	DS	C.5.11	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION				
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	
<u>Texas</u> (continued)										
C.9-195			01381	00204	DS	C.5.11	--	--	--	
			01381	00205	DS	C.5.11	--	--	--	
			01381	00207	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
			01381	00208	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
			01381	00209	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
			01381	00210	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
			01381	00211	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
			01381	00212	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
			01381	00213	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
			01381	00214	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
			01381	00215	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
			01381	00216	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
			01381	00217	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
			01381	00218	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
			01381	00219	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
			01381	00220	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
			01381	00221	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
			01381	00222	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
			01381	00223	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
			01381	00224	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--	
			01381	00225	-----	C.3.4.2	--	--	--	
			01381	00226	-----	C.7.3	--	--	--	
			01381	00227	-----	C.3.4.2	--	--	--	
			01381	00228	-----	C.3.4.2.3	--	--	--	
	Frishman, Steve		TX Dept. of Agriculture	01382	00002	DS	C.4.1.5	--	--	--
				01382	00003	DS	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
				01382	00004	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
				01382	00005	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
				01382	00006	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
				01382	00007	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
				01382	00008	DS	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
				01382	00009	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
				01382	00010A	DS	C.7.2	--	--	--
				01382	00010B	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
				01382	00011	DS	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
				01382	00012	DS	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
				01382	00013	DS	C.7.1.1.1	--	--	--
				01382	00014	DS	C.7.1.1.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Texas</u> (continued)									
			01382	00015	DS	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
			01382	00016	DS	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
			01382	00017A	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01382	00017B	DS	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			01382	00018	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01382	00019	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01382	00020	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01382	00021	DS	C.7.2.7	--	--	--
			01382	00022	DS	C.7.2.7	--	--	--
			01382	00023	DS	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			01382	00024	DS	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			01382	00025	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01382	00026	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01382	00027	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01382	00028	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01382	00029	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01382	00030	DS	C.7.2.7	C.7.4	--	--
			01382	00031	DS	C.6.1	--	--	--
			01382	00032	DS	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
			01382	00033A	DS	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
			01382	00033B	DS	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
			01382	00034	DS	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			01382	00035	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01382	00036	DS	C.3.2	--	--	--
			01382	00037	DS	C.7.2.7	--	--	--
			01382	00038	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01382	00039	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01380	00001	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01380	00001A	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01380	00001B	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01380	00002A	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01380	00002B	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01380	00003	DS	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			01380	00004	DS	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			01380	00005	DS	C.4.1.4	--	--	--
			01380	00006	DS	C.7.3	C.7.1.1.9	--	--
			01380	00007	DS	C.7.1.1.9	--	--	--
			01380	00008	DS	C.7.3	--	--	--
	Frishman, Steve	Nuclear Wste. Pgrms. Office							

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Texas</u> (continued)									
			01380	00009	DS	C.4.1.5.1	--	--	--
			01380	00010	DS	C.4.1.5.1	--	--	--
			01380	00011	DS	C.4.1.5.1	--	--	--
			01380	00012	DS	C.4.1.5.1	--	--	--
			01380	00013	DS	C.4.1.5.1	--	--	--
			01380	00014A	DS	C.4.3	C.7.4.2	--	--
			01380	00014B	DS	C.4.1.5.1	--	--	--
			01380	00014C	DS	C.4.3	C.7.4.2	--	--
			01380	00015	DS	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			01380	00016	DS	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			01380	00017	DS	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			01380	00018	DS	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			01380	00019	DS	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			01380	00020	DS	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			01380	00021	DS	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			01380	00022	DS	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			01380	00023	DS	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			01380	00024	DS	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			01380	00025	DS	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			01380	00026	DS	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			01380	00027	DS	C.7.4.5	--	--	--
			01380	00028	DS	C.7.4.5	--	--	--
			01380	00029	DS	C.7.4.5	--	--	--
			01380	00030	DS	C.7.4.5	--	--	--
			01380	00031	DS	C.7.4.5	--	--	--
			01380	00032	DS	C.7.4.5	--	--	--
			01380	00034A	DS	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	--
			01380	00035	DS	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
			01380	00036	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01380	00037	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01380	00038	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01380	00039	DS	C.7.1.1.1	--	--	--
			01380	00040	DS	C.7.1.1.9	--	--	--
			01380	00041	DS	C.7.1.1.9	--	--	--
			01380	00042	DS	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
			01380	00043	DS	C.4.1.5.1	--	--	--
			01380	00044	DS	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
			01380	00045	DS	C.7.1.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Texas</u> (continued)									
C.9-198	Galbraith, Shirley		01380	00046	DS	C.7.1.2	C.7.4.1	--	--
			01380	00047	-----	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01380	00048	DS	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			01380	00049	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01380	00050	DS	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
			01380	00051	DS	C.7.1.1.9	--	--	--
			00852	00001A	DS	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			00852	00001B	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			00852	00002	DS	C.7.4.4	--	--	--
			00852	00002B	-----	C.3.1	--	--	--
			00852	00003	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00852	00004	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
	Galbraith, Shirley		02148	00001A	DS	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			02148	00001B	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			02148	00002	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02148	00003	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
	Garrett, Bryce		02148	00004	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00861	00001	DS	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
			00861	00002	DS	C.7.1.1.1	--	--	--
			00861	00003	DS	C.7.1.1.1	--	--	--
			00861	00004	DS	C.5.11	--	--	--
	Garrett, Bryce		00861	00005	DS	C.7.2	--	--	--
			02155	00001	DS	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
			02155	00002	DS	C.7.1.1.1	--	--	--
			02155	00003	DS	C.7.1.1.1	--	--	--
			02155	00004	DS	C.5.10	--	--	--
	Gibbons, Lucille		02155	00005	DS	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00873	00001	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00873	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00873	00003	DS	C.5.8	--	--	--
			00873	00004	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			00873	00005	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			00873	00006	DS	C.6.5	--	--	--
			00873	00007	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			00873	00008	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			00873	00009	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			00873	00010	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00873	00011	DS	C.7.4.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Texas</u> (continued)									
C.9-159	Gierisch, Bobby		00873	00012	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00877	00001	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
	Gilliam, Winston E.		00877	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	C.2.1.1	--	--
			02111	00001	DS	C.5.11	--	--	--
	Givans, Cam		02111	00002	DS	C.5.10	--	--	--
			00702	00001	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00702	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00702	00003	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Hamilton, Jo		00007	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00007	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Hancock, Don		00717	00008	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00717	00009	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
	Hancock, Don		00717	00011	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			00869	00001	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			00869	00002	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			00869	00003	DS	C.6.3	C.3.4.2.2	--	--
			00869	00004	-----	C.3.4.2.1	--	--	--
			00869	00005	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
	Hancock, Don		00869	00006	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			00884	00001	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			00884	00002	DS	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			00884	00004	DS	C.7.1.1	C.7.1.2	--	--
	Hancock, Don	Landowners in Deaf Smith, Swisher	00884	00005	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			00884	00008	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			01260	00001	DS	C.3.2	--	--	--
			01260	00002	DS	C.3.3	--	--	--
			01260	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01260	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01260	00005	-----	C.2.8	--	--	--
			01260	00006	-----	C.4.1	--	--	--
			01260	00007	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01260	00008	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			01260	00009	-----	C.2.8	--	--	--
			01260	00010	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01260	00011	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01260	00012	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
	01260	00013	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--		
	01260	00014	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--		

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Texas</u> (continued)									
			01260	00015	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01260	00017	DS	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
			01260	00020	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			01260	00021	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01260	00022	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01260	00023	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01260	00024	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01260	00025	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01260	00026	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01260	00027	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01260	00028	DS	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			01260	00030	DS	C.3.2	--	--	--
			01260	00031	DS	C.3.2	--	--	--
			01260	00032	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01260	00033	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01260	00034	DS	C.3.2	--	--	--
			01260	00035	DS	C.4.1	--	--	--
			01260	00036	DS	C.4.1	--	--	--
			01260	00037	DS	C.4.1	--	--	--
			01260	00038	DS	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01260	00039	DS	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01260	00040	DS	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01260	00041	DS	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01260	00042	DS	C.4.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01260	00043	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01260	00044	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01260	00045	DS	C.4.1.2.3	--	--	--
			01260	00046	DS	C.4.1.2.3	--	--	--
			01260	00047	DS	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
			01260	00048	DS	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
			01260	00049	DS	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
			01260	00050	DS	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01260	00051	DS	C.7.1.1.1	--	--	--
			01260	00052	DS	C.7.1.1.1	--	--	--
			01260	00053	DS	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			01260	00054	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01260	00055	DS	C.7.4.4	--	--	--
			01260	00056	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Texas</u> (continued)									
C 9-201			01260	00057	DS	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
			01260	00058	DS	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
			01260	00059	DS	C.4.2.3	C.7.1.1.1	--	--
			01260	00060	DS	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			01260	00061	DS	C.4.2.2	C.4.3	--	--
			01260	00062	DS	C.7.1.1.1	--	--	--
			01260	00063	DS	C.7.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01260	00064	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01260	00065	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01260	00066	DS	C.7.1.1.1	--	--	--
			01260	00067	DS	C.7.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01260	00068	DS	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
			01260	00069	DS	C.4.3	C.7.2.8	--	--
			01260	00070	DS	C.4.3	C.7.2.3	--	--
			01260	00071	DS	C.4.3	C.7.2.1	--	--
			01260	00072	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01260	00073	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01260	00074	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01260	00075	DS	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
			01260	00076	DS	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
			01260	00077	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01260	00078	DS	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
			01260	00079	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01260	00080	DS	C.6.2	--	--	--
			01260	00081	DS	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			01260	00082	DS	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			01260	00083	DS	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			01260	00084	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01260	00085	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01260	00086	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01260	00087	DS	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
			01260	00088	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--
			01260	00089	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--
		01260	00090	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--	
		01260	00091	DS	C.8.3	--	--	--	
		01260	00092	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
		01260	00093A	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
		01260	00093B	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	

C.9-201

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Texas</u> (continued)									
			01260	00094	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01260	00095	-----	C.3.4.2.1	--	--	--
			01260	00096	-----	C.3.4.2.1	--	--	--
			01260	00097	-----	C.3.4.2.1	--	--	--
			01260	00098	-----	C.3.4.2.1	--	--	--
			01260	00099	-----	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01260	00100	-----	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01260	00101	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01260	00102	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01260	00103	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01260	00118	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01260	00119	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01260	00120	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01260	00121	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01260	00142	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			01260	00146	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01260	00156	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01260	00158	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--
			01260	00170	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			01260	00171	-----	C.2.4.3	--	--	--
			01260	00172	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
Hancock, Don		Stand and Power	02692	00001	DS	C.7.4.2	C.7.1.2	--	--
			02692	00002	-----	C.4.1.1	--	--	--
			02692	00003	-----	C.2.5.1	C.2.6.1	--	--
			02692	00004	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--
			02692	00005	DS	C.4.1	C.7.4	--	--
			02692	00006	-----	C.7.4.2	C.3.2	C.7.1.2	--
			02692	00007	-----	C.7.4.2	C.7.1.2	--	--
			02692	00008	-----	C.7.4.2	C.7.1.2	--	--
			02692	00009	-----	C.7.4.2	C.7.1.2	--	--
			02692	00010	-----	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
			02692	00011	-----	C.7.4.2	C.7.1.2	--	--
			02692	00012	-----	C.7.4.2	C.3.2	C.7.1.2	--
			02692	00013	-----	C.5.1	C.7.1.1.8	C.7.2.8	--
			02692	00014	-----	C.7.2	--	--	--
			02692	00015	DS	C.5.7	C.5.6	--	--
			02692	00016	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02692	00017	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--

C.9-202

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Texas</u> (continued)									
C.9-203			02692	00018	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02692	00019	-----	C.3.4.2.2	C.2.4.1	--	--
			02692	00020	-----	C.2.5.1	--	--	--
			02692	00021	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
	Haney, Ken		00839	00001	DS	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
	Harman, Otis		00700	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Harman, Otis	Texas Wheat Producers Assn.	02130	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Harrison, Dan		00897	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Harwell, Mark		00850	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00850	00002	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
	Hector, Alice		00703	00002	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			00703	00003	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			00703	00004	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			00703	00005	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			00703	00006	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
	Hector, Alice		00870	00001	DS	C.4.1	--	--	--
			00870	00002	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			00870	00003	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			00870	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00870	00005	DS	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			00870	00006	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			00870	00007	DS	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			00870	00008	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
	Hector, Alice		00889	00001	DS	C.7.4.2	C.7.1.2	--	--
			00889	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00889	00004	DS	C.3.1.3	C.3.1.2	--	--
	Herring, John		00704	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00704	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Herrington, LaVerne		01747	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Hicks, Donald	Texas Historical Commission	00849	00001	DS	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			00849	00002	DS	C.7.4.2	C.5.1	--	--
			00849	00003	DS	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			00849	00004	DS	C.4.1	C.2.1.1	--	--
			00849	00005	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			00849	00006	DS	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
			00849	00007	DS	C.4.2.1	--	--	--
			00849	00008	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00849	00009	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Texas (continued)									
	Hicks, Renea		00880	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00880	00002A	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			00880	00002B	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00880	00002C	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Hicks, Donald		02146	00001	DS	C.4.1	C.3.4.4	--	--
			02146	00002	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			02146	00003	DS	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
			02146	00004	DS	C.4.2.1	--	--	--
			02146	00005	DS	C.4.1.5.4	--	--	--
			02146	00006	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
	Hicks, Donald	Grain Sorghum Producers Assn.	02145	00001	DS	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			02145	00002	DS	C.5.1	C.7.4.2	--	--
			02145	00003	DS	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
	Hightower, Commissioner Jim		00878	00001	DS	C.7.2.1	C.7.4.2	--	--
			00878	00002	DS	C.7.2.1	C.7.4.2	--	--
			00878	00003	DS	C.4.1.3.1	C.7.4.2	C.7.2.1	--
			00878	00004	DS	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
			00878	00005	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			00878	00006	DS	C.4.1.5.3	C.3.1.3	--	--
			00878	00007	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00878	00008	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00878	00009	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00878	00010	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00878	00011	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
	Hightower, Jim	Commissioner of Agriculture	02128	00001	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
	Hogue, Sanny Sue		00874	00001	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
			00874	00002	DS	C.6.3	--	--	--
			00874	00003	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
			00874	00004	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
	House, Gary		00694	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Irlbeck, Albert		00718	00001	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			00718	00002	DS	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			00718	00003	DS	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			00718	00004	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			00718	00005	DS	C.5.11	--	--	--
			00718	00006	DS	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			00718	00007	DS	C.7.4.5	--	--	--
			00718	00008	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Texas</u> (continued)									
C.9-205	Jacobson, Robert		00718	00009	-----	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00718	00010	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00863	00001	DS	C.4.1.1.2	--	--	--
			00863	00002	DS	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
			00863	00003	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
			00863	00004	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
	Jacobson, Robert	Panhandle Assoc Soil and Water	00863	00005	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			00863	00006	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
			02157	00001	DS	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
			02157	00002	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
			02157	00003	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
			02157	00004	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
	Jones, Cal		02157	00005	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
			00844	00001	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00844	00002	DS	C.5.1	C.4.1.2.2	--	--
			00844	00003	DS	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			00844	00004	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02142	00001	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
	Jones, Calvin K.	Holly Sugar Corporation	02142	00002	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
			02142	00003	DS	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			02142	00004	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00066	00001A	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00066	00001B	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00841	00001	DS	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	--
	Kent, Leonard		00841	00002A	DS	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			00841	00002B	DS	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	--
			00841	00003	DS	C.7.4.5	--	--	--
			00183	00001	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00183	00002	DS	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
			02141	00001	DS	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
	Kent, Leonard	Vega Independent School District	02141	00002A	DS	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			02141	00002B	DS	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	--
			02141	00003	DS	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			00856	00001	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00856	00002	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00856	00003	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
	King, Carl		00856	00004	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			00856	00005	DS	C.6.5	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Texas</u> (continued)									
C. 9-206	Kirkpatrick, Ann		00856	00006	DS	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
			00856	00007	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02136	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Kleinkauf, Kathleen		02136	00002	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
			02136	00003	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00506	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Kleuskens, Tonya		00506	00002	DS	C.5.1	C.5.11	--	--
			00846	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00846	00002	DS	C.3.2	--	--	--
			00846	00003	DS	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			00846	00004	DS	C.4.1	--	--	--
			00846	00005	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00846	00006	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00846	00007	DS	C.6.5	--	--	--
			00846	00008	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			00846	00009	DS	C.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
			00846	00010	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			00846	00011	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			00846	00012	DS	C.6.5	C.5.11	--	--
			00846	00013	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
			00846	00014	DS	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			00846	00015	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--
			00846	00016	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			00846	00017	DS	C.6.2	--	--	--
			00846	00018	DS	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
	La Fever, Lou Ann		00846	00019	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00011	00001	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00011	00002	DS	C.5.10	--	--	--
			00011	00003	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
	Lamb, Angela		00011	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00690	00001	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00690	00002	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00690	00003	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00690	00004	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00690	00005	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00690	00006	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00690	00007	DS	C.7.2.1	C.7.4.2	--	--
			00690	00008	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Texas (continued)									
C.9-207	Lamb, Angela K.	Department of Agriculture	00690	00009	DS	C.7.4.2	C.7.2.1	--	--
			00690	00010	DS	C.7.4.2	C.7.2.1	--	--
			02125	00001	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02125	00002	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02125	00003	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02125	00004	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02125	00005	-----	C.2.1.5	--	--	--
			02125	00006	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02125	00007	DS	C.7.2.1	C.7.4.2	--	--
			02125	00008	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02125	00009	DS	C.7.4.2	C.7.2.1	--	--
			02125	00010	DS	C.7.4.2	C.7.2.1	--	--
	Lloyd, Browning		00709	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00709	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00709	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00709	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00709	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00709	00006	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00709	00007	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			00709	00008	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			00709	00009	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00536	00005	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	McClurg, Mary M.	J. N. Montgomery Farms	00536	00006	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			00536	00007	-----	C.3.2	--	--	--
	McClurg, Mrs. Mary Montgomery		02134	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02134	00002	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
			02134	00004	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02134	00005	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			02134	00006	-----	C.2.1.5	--	--	--
	McKeever, Terry		00692	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00864	00001A	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
	McNeil, Marianne		00864	00001B	DS	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			00864	00001C	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
	McNeil, Marianne		02158	00001	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
			02158	00002	DS	C.7.2.8	C.7.2.1	--	--
			02158	00003	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02158	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02158	00005	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Texas</u> (continued)									
C. 9-208	McReynolds, Don		00840	00001	DS	C.7.1.1	C.7.2.8	--	--
			00840	00002	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			00840	00003	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			00840	00004	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			00840	00005	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			00840	00006	DS	C.7.1.1.8	--	--	--
			00840	00007	DS	C.7.2.1	C.7.2.8	--	--
			00840	00008	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			00840	00009	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			00840	00010	DS	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
	McReynolds, Don	High Plains Underground Water	01243	00001	DS	C.7.1.1.8	C.5.1	--	--
			01243	00002	DS	C.4.2.2	C.4.3	--	--
			01243	00003	DS	C.4.2.2	C.4.3	C.5.1	--
			01243	00004	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01243	00005	DS	C.7.1.1	C.7.2	--	--
			01243	00006	DS	C.7.1.1.8	C.7.2.8	--	--
			01243	00007	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01243	00008	DS	C.4.1.2.3	--	--	--
			01243	00009	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01243	00010	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01243	00011	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
			01243	00012	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01243	00013	DS	C.4.1.2.2	C.5.1	--	--
			01243	00014	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01243	00015	DS	C.4.1.2.3	--	--	--
			01243	00016	DS	C.4.1.2.2	C.7.2	--	--
			01243	00017	DS	C.4.1.2.3	--	--	--
			01243	00018	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01243	00019	DS	C.7.2	C.7.4	--	--
			01243	00020	DS	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
			01243	00021	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01243	00022	DS	C.4.1	--	--	--
			01243	00023	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01243	00024	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01243	00025	DS	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01243	00026	DS	C.4.2.2	C.4.1.2.3	--	--
			01243	00027	DS	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01243	00028	DS	C.4.1.2.3	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
C. 9-209	Texas (continued)								
			01243	00029	DS	C. 6.5	C. 7.4.1	--	--
			01243	00030	DS	C. 5.3	--	--	--
			01243	00031	DS	C. 4.1.2.3	--	--	--
			01243	00032	DS	C. 4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01243	00033	DS	C. 4.1.2.3	--	--	--
			01243	00034	DS	C. 4.1.1.6	--	--	--
			01243	00035	DS	C. 4.1.1.6	--	--	--
			01243	00036	DS	C. 4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01243	00037	DS	C. 4.1.2.1	--	--	--
			01243	00038	DS	C. 4.1.2.2	C. 4.1.2.1	--	--
			01243	00039	DS	C. 4.1.2.2	C. 4.1.2.1	--	--
			01243	00040	DS	C. 4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01243	00041	DS	C. 4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01243	00042	DS	C. 4.1.2.3	--	--	--
			01243	00043	DS	C. 4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01243	00044	DS	C. 4.1.2.3	--	--	--
			01243	00045	DS	C. 4.1.5.1	--	--	--
			01243	00046	DS	C. 4.1.2.2	C. 4.2.1	--	--
			01243	00047	DS	C. 4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01243	00048	DS	C. 4.2.2	--	--	--
			01243	00049	DS	C. 4.2.2	--	--	--
			01243	00050	DS	C. 4.2.2	--	--	--
			01243	00051	DS	C. 4.2.2	--	--	--
			01243	00052	DS	C. 4.1.2.2	C. 4.2.3	--	--
			01243	00053	DS	C. 4.2.3	C. 7.1.2	--	--
			01243	00054	DS	C. 7.1.1.1	--	--	--
			01243	00055	DS	C. 7.1.1.1	--	--	--
			01243	00056	DS	C. 7.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01243	00057	DS	C. 7.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01243	00058	DS	C. 7.1.1.7	C. 4.2.2	--	--
			01243	00059	DS	C. 6.2	C. 4.3	--	--
			01243	00060	DS	C. 7.2.8	C. 4.1.2.3	--	--
			01243	00061	DS	C. 7.2.8	C. 4.1.2.3	--	--
			01243	00062	DS	C. 7.2.1	C. 7.2.8	--	--
			01243	00063	DS	C. 7.2	--	--	--
			01243	00064	-----	C. 2.4.1	--	--	--
			01243	00065	DS	C. 7.4.2	--	--	--
		01243	00066	DS	C. 7.2	C. 7.4.2	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

						CLASSIFICATION			
STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Texas</u> (continued)									
C.9-210			01243	00067	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01243	00068	DS	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			01243	00069	DS	C.5.8	C.4.1.2.2	C.4.1.2.3	--
			01243	00070	DS	C.4.1.2.3	--	--	--
			01243	00071	DS	C.4.1.2.3	--	--	--
			01243	00072	DS	C.5.11	--	--	--
	Meiwes, Patricia		01341	00001	DS	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
			01341	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Moore, Jr., George		00055	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Moore, Murphy, Ivey J.		00056	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Moore, Stafford, Raymond Faye		00180	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Moss, Walter		00845	00001	DS	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			00845	00002	DS	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			00845	00003	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00845	00004	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00845	00005	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00845	00006	DS	C.7.4.2	C.5.1	--	--
	Moss, Walter	Texas Seedman's Association	02143	00001	DS	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			02143	00002	DS	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			02143	00003	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02143	00004	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02143	00005	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02143	00006	DS	C.5.1	C.7.4.2	--	--
	Oliver, Bill		00894	00001	DS	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
			00894	00003	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
	Ontiveras, Manuel		00698	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			00698	00002	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			00698	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00698	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00698	00005	DS	C.6.5	C.7.4.2	--	--
			00698	00006	DS	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
			00698	00007	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
Paganini, Otto		00893	00001	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--	
		00893	00002	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--	
		00893	00003	DS	C.4.1.2.3	--	--	--	
		00893	00004	DS	C.4.1.3.1	C.7.2.1	--	--	
		00893	00005	DS	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--	
		00893	00006	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Texas (continued)									
	Parker, Walker & Nancy		01268	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01268	00002	DS	C.7.2.8	C.5.1	--	--
	Paschel, Louis		00867	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Paschel, Anthony & Katherine		01161	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01161	00002	DS	C.4.1.2.3	--	--	--
			01161	00003	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01161	00004	DS	C.7.2.3	C.7.2.8	--	--
			01161	00005	DS	C.7.4.4	--	--	--
			01161	00006	DS	C.7.4.4	--	--	--
			01161	00007	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01161	00008	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01161	00009	DS	C.7.1.1.1	--	--	--
			01161	00010	DS	C.7.1.1.1	--	--	--
			01161	00011	DS	C.7.1.1.9	--	--	--
			01161	00012	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
	Paschel, Louis		02161	00001	DS	C.4.1.4	--	--	--
	Petition		01265	00001	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01265	00002	DS	C.4.1.3.3	C.7.2.8	--	--
			01265	00003	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01265	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Petition		01269	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01269	00002	DS	C.7.2.8	C.5.1	--	--
			01269	00003	DS	C.4.1.3.3	C.7.2.8	--	--
			01269	00004	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01269	00005	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01269	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Petition	Lamb County	02163	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Phillips, Carthon		00890	00001	DS	C.5.8	C.7.4	C.6.3	--
			00890	00002	DS	C.5.8	--	--	--
			00890	00003	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00890	00004	DS	C.6.3	--	--	--
			00890	00005	DS	C.7.4	C.3.2	--	--
			00890	00006	DS	C.3.2	--	--	--
	Pickering, George W.	Univ. of Texas at Austin	02258	00001A	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			02258	00001B	DS	C.7.4.5	--	--	--
			02258	00001C	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02258	00002	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			02258	00003	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Texas</u> (continued)									
			02258	00004	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02258	00005	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
	Pickering, George W.	University of Texas at Austin	01076	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	C.7.4.5	--	--
			01076	00002	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
	Pickering, George W.		01076	00003	DS	C.7.4.2	C.6.5	--	--
			01360	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01360	00002	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			01360	00003	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01360	00004	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01360	00005	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01360	00006	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01360	00007	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
	Reed, James		00882	00001	DS	C.4.1.5	--	--	--
			00882	00002	DS	C.4.1.5.5	--	--	--
			00882	00003	DS	C.4.1.5.5	--	--	--
			00882	00004	DS	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			00882	00005	DS	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			00882	00006	DS	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			00882	00007	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00882	00008	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00882	00009	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00882	00010	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
	Revell, Tim		00853	00001	DS	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	--
			00853	00002	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			00853	00003	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			00853	00004	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			00853	00005	DS	C.7.4.3	C.7.1.2	--	--
			00853	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			00853	00007	DS	C.6.5	--	--	--
			00853	00008	DS	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			00853	00009	DS	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
			00853	00010	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
	Richardson, Wayne		00854	00001	DS	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			00854	00002	DS	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			00854	00003	DS	C.7.4.2	C.4.1.2.3	--	--
			00854	00004	DS	C.4.1.2.3	--	--	--
	Richardson, Trace		00859	00001	DS	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
			00859	00002	DS	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Texas</u> (continued)									
C.9-213	Richardson, Donald		00859	00003	DS	C.4.2.1	C.7.1.1.1	--	--
			00859	00004	DS	C.7.1.1.1	--	--	--
			00859	00005	DS	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			00859	00006	DS	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			00859	00007	DS	C.7.1.1.1	--	--	--
			00860	00001	DS	C.4.1.2.1	--	--	--
			00860	00002	DS	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
			00860	00003	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			00860	00004	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			00860	00005	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			00860	00006	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			00860	00007	DS	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
			00860	00008	DS	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
			00860	00009	DS	C.4.3	C.7.2.1	--	--
			00860	00010	DS	C.4.2.1	--	--	--
			00860	00011	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			00860	00012	DS	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
			00860	00013	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
	Richardson, Larry		00860	00014	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00862	00001	DS	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			00862	00002	DS	C.4.2.2	C.7.1.1.1	--	--
			00862	00003	DS	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			00862	00004	DS	C.6.5	--	--	--
			00862	00005	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00862	00006	DS	C.7.2.8	C.5.1	--	--
			00862	00007	DS	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
	Richardson, Monica		00866	00001	DS	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			00866	00002	DS	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			00866	00003	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00866	00004	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00866	00005	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00866	00006	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00866	00007	DS	C.7.4.4	--	--	--
		Richardson, Wayne		00887	00001	DS	C.4.1.5.2	--	--
			00887	00002	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00887	00003	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			00887	00004	DS	C.4.1.2.3	C.4.1.3.1	--	--
			00887	00005	DS	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Texas</u> (continued)									
Richardson, Wayne			00887	00006	DS	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			00887	00007	DS	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
			00887	00008	DS	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			00887	00009	DS	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	--
			00887	00010	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02150	00001	DS	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			02150	00002	DS	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			02150	00003	DS	C.4.1.2.3	C.7.4.2	--	--
			02150	00004	DS	C.4.1	--	--	--
			02153	00001	DS	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
Richardson, Trace			02153	00002	DS	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
			02153	00003	DS	C.4.2.1	C.7.1.1.1	--	--
			02153	00004	DS	C.7.1.1.1	--	--	--
			02153	00005	DS	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			02153	00006	DS	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
Richardson, Donald			02153	00007	DS	C.7.1.1.1	--	--	--
			02154	00001	DS	C.4.1.2.1	--	--	--
			02154	00002	DS	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
			02154	00003	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			02154	00004	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			02154	00005	DS	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
			02154	00006	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			02154	00007	DS	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
			02154	00008	DS	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
			02154	00009	DS	C.4.3	C.7.2.1	--	--
			02154	00010	DS	C.4.2.1	--	--	--
			02154	00011	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			02154	00012	DS	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
			02154	00013	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
Richardson, Larry			02154	00014	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02156	00001	DS	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			02156	00002	DS	C.4.2.2	C.7.1.1.1	--	--
			02156	00003	DS	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			02156	00004	DS	C.6.5	--	--	--
			02156	00005	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
Richardson, Monica			02156	00006	DS	C.7.2.8	C.5.1	--	--
			02160	00001	DS	C.7.4.5	--	--	--
			02160	00002	DS	C.7.4.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Texas</u> (continued)									
C.9-215	Rike, John	First State Bank	02160	00003	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02160	00004	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02160	00005	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02160	00006	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02160	00007	DS	C.7.4.4	--	--	--
			00713	00002	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00713	00003	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
	00713		00004	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--	
	Rike,III, John S.		00713	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02119	00001	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02119	00002	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
	Riley, Barbara L.		02119	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00008	00001	DS	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00008	00002	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
	Schermbek, Jim		00008	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00883	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00883	00002	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
	Schoenenberger, Margaret		00278	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00278	00002	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00278	00003A	DS	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
			00278	00003B	DS	C.4.1.3.5	--	--	--
			00278	00004	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			00896	00001	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
			01267	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Shults, Regina Southard, E. Stanford, Geoffrey		00881	00001	DS	C.5.10	--	--	--
			00881	00002	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
			00881	00003	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
	Staniswalis, Chip		02133	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02133	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02133	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02133	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02133	00005	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02133	00006	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02133	00007	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			02133	00008	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
02133		00009	-----	C.2.4.3	--	--	--		
Steiert, Jim		00872	00001	DS	C.7.2.8	C.7.2.1	--	--	
	00872	00002	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--		

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Texas</u> (continued)									
Steiert, Jim			00872	00003	DS	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
			02162	00001	DS	C.7.2.1	C.7.2.8	--	--
			02162	00002	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
Taylor, Nancy			02162	00003	DS	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
			00374	00001	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00374	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
Taylor, Roy and Evelyn			00374	00003	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
			00493	00001	DC	C.7.1.1.8	--	--	--
			00493	00002	DC	C.4.2.2	C.4.3	--	--
			00493	00003	DC	C.7.1.1.8	--	--	--
			00493	00004	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			00493	00005	DS	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00493	00006	DS	C.5.10	--	--	--
			00493	00007	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			00493	00008	DS	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
			00493	00009	DS	C.7.1.2	C.7.4	--	--
			00493	00010	DS	C.6.2	--	--	--
			00493	00011	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00493	00012	DS	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
			00493	00013	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			Thomas-Williams, Colonel Robert			00493	00014	-----	C.3.1.2
00858	00001	-----				C.2.3.1	--	--	--
00858	00002	-----				C.3.1.2	--	--	--
00858	00003	DS				C.4.3	--	--	--
00858	00004	DS				C.7.2.1	--	--	--
00858	00005	DS				C.7.2.1	--	--	--
00858	00006	DS				C.5.8	--	--	--
00858	00007	DS				C.4.1.1.6	--	--	--
00858	00008	DS				C.5.8	--	--	--
00858	00009A	DS				C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
00858	00009B	DS				C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
00858	00010	DS				C.5.11	--	--	--
00858	00011	DS				C.6.4	--	--	--
00858	00012	DS				C.5.11	--	--	--
Thomas-Williams, Colonel Robert						00858	00013	DS	C.5.8
			00858	00014	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			00858	00015	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01367	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Texas</u> (continued)									
C.9-217	Tooley, Wendell	The Tulia Herald	01367	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01367	00003	DS	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
			01367	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01367	00005	-----	C.3.2	--	--	--
			01367	00006	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01367	00007	DS	C.7.1	--	--	--
			01367	00008	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01367	00009	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			01367	00010	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			01367	00011	-----	C.2.8	--	--	--
			01367	00012	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01367	00013	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01367	00014	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01367	00015	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			01367	00016	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			01367	00017	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Tooley, Wendell	The Tulia Herald	00707	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00707	00002	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00707	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00707	00004	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02132	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Vines, Theresa		02132	00002	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02132	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02132	00004	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02132	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00377	00001	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
	Wallace, Dr. Wes		00377	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00377	00003	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
			00891	00001	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
	Wenzler, Michael		00891	00004	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00719	00001	DS	C.6.5	--	--	--
			00719	00002	DS	C.6.5	--	--	--
			00719	00003A	-----	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00719	00003B	-----	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00719	00004	DS	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00719	00006	DS	C.6.5	--	--	--
			00719	00008	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
	Wenzler, Michael		02167	00001	DS	C.6.5	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION				
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	
<u>Texas</u> (continued)										
C.9-218	White, Governor Mark		02167	00002	DS	C.7.3	--	--	--	
			02167	00003	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--	
			02167	00004	DS	C.6.5	--	--	--	
			02167	00005	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--	
			02167	00006	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--	
			02677	00001	DS	--	--	--	--	
			00879	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	C.3.1.1	--	--	
			00879	00002	DS	C.3.1.3	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	
			00879	00003	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--	
			00879	00004	DS	C.5.1	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	
			00879	00005	DS	C.4.2.2	--	--	--	
			00879	00006	DS	C.4.2.2	C.4.3	C.7.2	--	
			00879	00007	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--	
			00879	00008	DS	C.7.2	--	--	--	
			00879	00009	DS	C.4.1.5	--	--	--	
		Whitson, Hollis		00879	00010	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			00879	00011	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--	
			00879	00012	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
			00711	00001	DS	C.4.1	--	--	--	
			00711	00002	DS	C.7.2	--	--	--	
			00711	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
			00711	00006	DS	C.7.2.8	C.7.1.1.8	--	--	
	Whitson, Hollis			00711	00007	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
				00871	00001	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
				00871	00002	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
				00871	00003	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
				00871	00004	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00871	00005	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--	
			00871	00006	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--	
			00871	00007	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--	
	Whitson, Hollis		00871	00008	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--	
			00871	00009	DS	C.7.1.2	--	--	--	
			00886	00001	DS	C.7.1.2	--	--	--	
			00886	00002	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--	
	Williams, Lawana		00886	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
			00886	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
			00886	00005	DS	C.7.4.1	--	--	--	
			00195	00002	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Texas</u> (continued)									
C.9-219	Witkowski, Les		00855	00001	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
			00855	00002	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			00855	00003	DS	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
			00855	00004	DS	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
	Witkowski, Leo		02149	00001	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
			02149	00002	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			02149	00003	DS	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
			02149	00004	DS	C.4.1	--	--	--
	Witkowski, Leo		02151	00001	-----	C.5.1	--	--	--
			02151	00002	-----	C.4.3	--	--	--
			02151	00003	-----	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
			02151	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Womack, Tommy		00714	00001	DS	C.5.1	C.7.2.8	--	--
			00714	00002	-----	C.2.8.1	C.7.4.2	--	--
			00714	00003	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
	Woods, Becky		00712	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00712	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Wyatt, Wayne		00693	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00693	00002	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			00693	00003	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			00693	00004	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			00693	00005	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			00693	00006	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			00693	00007	DS	C.4.1.1.6	--	--	--
			00693	00008	DS	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			00693	00009	DS	C.4.1.2.2	C.4.1.1.6	--	--
	Wyatt, A. Wayne		02612	00001	DS	C.5.6	--	--	--
			02612	00002	DS	C.5.6	--	--	--
	<u>Utah</u>								
			State of Utah	02712	00001	DC	C.4.2.3	C.7.2.3	--
Adams, Lisle			00921	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00921	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
Adams, Bruce B.		Petition	00015	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
Adams, Lisle		Gibson Dome Oversight Committee	02179	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02179	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
Aide, Mitch			00815	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION				
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	
Utah (continued)										
C.9-220	Anderson, Lyle		00927	00001	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
			00927	00002	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--	
			00927	00003	DC	C.7.4.3	--	--	--	
	Anderson, Lyle R.		02184	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
			02184	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--	
			02184	00004	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
			02184	00005	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--	
			02184	00006	DC	C.7.4.3	--	--	--	
	Anonymous		02221	00001	-----	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--	
			02221	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
	Anonymous		02222	00001	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--	
			02222	00002	DC	C.5.5	--	--	--	
			02222	00003	DC	C.5.7	--	--	--	
			02222	00004	-----	C.5.1	--	--	--	
			02222	00005	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--	
			02222	00006	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--	
			02222	00007	DC	C.5.8	--	--	--	
			02222	00008	DC	C.5.5	C.5.11	C.5.7	--	
			02222	00009	-----	C.2.2	C.5.1	--	--	
	Anonymous		02223	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
			02223	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
			02223	00003	DC	C.4.1.3.4	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--	
			02223	00004	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--	
			02223	00005	DC	C.7.4	C.4.1.5	--	--	
			02223	00006	DC	C.4.1.5	--	--	--	
		City of Monticello		02187	00001	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
				02187	00002	-----	C.6.3	C.4.1.3.3	--	--
				02187	00003	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
				02187	00004	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
				02187	00005	DC	C.7.4	C.4.1.5	--	--
				02187	00006	-----	C.3.4.2	--	--	--
				02187	00007	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
				02187	00008	DC	C.4.1.5.1	--	--	--
		Robert Frost School		02213	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
				02213	00002	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
				02213	00003	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Archuleta, Letitia		02216	00001	-----	C.7.2	--	--	--	
			02216	00002	-----	C.7.2	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Utah</u> (continued)									
	Archuleta, Letitia		00798	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00798	00002	DC	C.3.1.2	C.3.1.3	--	--
	Arnold, Thomas		00749	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00749	00002	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
	Baer, T. John		00735	00001	DC	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			00735	00002	DC	C.7.4.3	C.4.1.5.3	--	--
			00735	00003	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00735	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			00735	00005	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
	Balcom, Julia		00833	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00833	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00833	00003	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			00833	00004	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			00833	00005	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			00833	00006	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			00833	00007	DC	C.7.1.1.6	--	--	--
			00833	00008	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00833	00009	DC	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
			00833	00010	DC	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
			00833	00011	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Balling, Kurt		00737	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00737	00002	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00737	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
		State of Utah	00737	00004	DC	C.2.4.2	--	--	--
	Bangerter, Governor Norman		00750	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00750	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00750	00003	-----	C.2.5.1	--	--	--
			00750	00004	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			00750	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00750	00006	DC	C.4.1.1.1	--	--	--
			00750	00007	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			00750	00008	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00750	00009	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00750	00010	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
			00750	00011	DC	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			00750	00012	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
			00750	00013	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
	Bangerter, Governor Norman H.	State of Utah	02188	00001	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Utah</u> (continued)									
C.9-222	Bangerter, Governor Norman H.		02188	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02188	00003	-----	C.2.5.1	--	--	--
			02188	00004	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			02188	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02188	00006	DC	C.4.1.1.1	--	--	--
			02188	00007	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			02188	00008	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			02188	00009	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			02188	00010	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
			02188	00011	DC	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			02188	00012	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
			02188	00013	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01392	00001	DC	C.7.4.1	C.4.1	--	--
			01392	00002	DC	C.4.1.3.1	C.7.4.1	--	--
			01392	00003	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01392	00004	DC	C.4.1.2.3	--	--	--
			01392	00005	DC	C.4.1.5.2	C.4.1.5.1	--	--
			01392	00006	DC	C.7.1	C.4.2.1	--	--
			01392	00007	DC	C.7.1.1	C.4.2	--	--
			01392	00008	DC	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01392	00009	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01392	00010	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01392	00011	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			01392	00012	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
			01392	00013	DC	C.7.1.1	C.7.1.2	--	--
			01392	00014	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
			01392	00015	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
			01392	00016	DC	C.7.1.1.6	--	--	--
			01392	00017	DC	C.7.3	C.7.2.1	--	--
			01392	00018	DC	C.7.3	C.7.2.2	--	--
			01392	00019	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			01392	00020	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			01392	00021	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			01392	00022	DC	C.7.2.3	C.7.4	--	--
			01392	00023	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01392	00024	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01392	00025	DC	C.7.4.5	--	--	--
			01392	00026	DC	C.7.4	C.7.1.2	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
C.9-223	Utah (continued)								
			01392	00027	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01392	00028	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	00029	DC	C.6.3	--	--	--
			01392	00030	DC	C.7.4	C.7.5	--	--
			01392	00031	DC	C.6.5	C.7.5	--	--
			01392	00032	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01392	00033	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01392	00034	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01392	00035	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			01392	00036	DC	C.3.2	--	--	--
			01392	00037	DC	C.3.3	--	--	--
			01392	00038	DC	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			01392	00039	DC	C.6.2	--	--	--
			01392	00040	DC	C.3.3	--	--	--
			01392	00041	DC	C.3.3	--	--	--
			01392	00042	DC	C.3.3	--	--	--
			01392	00043	DC	C.3.3	--	--	--
			01392	00044	DC	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			01392	00045	DC	C.4.1.5	--	--	--
			01392	00046	DC	C.4.1.3.6	--	--	--
			01392	00047	DC	C.4.1.4	--	--	--
			01392	00048	DC	C.4.1.1	--	--	--
			01392	00049	DC	C.4.1.1.2	--	--	--
			01392	00050	DC	C.4.1.1.2	--	--	--
			01392	00051	DC	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01392	00052	DC	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01392	00053	DC	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01392	00054	DC	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01392	00055	DC	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01392	00056	DC	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01392	00057	DC	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01392	00058	DC	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01392	00059	DC	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01392	00060	DC	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01392	00061	DC	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01392	00062	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01392	00063	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
		01392	00064	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION				
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	
C. 9-224	Utah (continued)									
				01392	00065	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
				01392	00066	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
				01392	00067	DC	C.4.1.1.6	--	--	--
				01392	00068	DC	C.4.1.1.6	--	--	--
				01392	00069	DC	C.4.1.1.6	--	--	--
				01392	00070	DC	C.4.1.1.6	--	--	--
				01392	00071	DC	C.4.1.1.6	--	--	--
				01392	00072	DC	C.4.1.1.7	--	--	--
				01392	00073	DC	C.4.1.1.7	--	--	--
				01392	00074	DC	C.4.1.1.7	--	--	--
				01392	00075	DC	C.4.1.1.7	--	--	--
				01392	00076	DC	C.4.1.1.7	--	--	--
				01392	00077	DC	C.4.1.1.7	--	--	--
				01392	00078	DC	C.4.1.1.6	--	--	--
				01392	00079	DC	C.4.1.1.6	--	--	--
				01392	00080	DC	C.4.1.1.8	--	--	--
				01392	00081	DC	C.4.1.1.8	--	--	--
				01392	00082	DC	C.4.1.1.8	--	--	--
				01392	00083	DC	C.4.1.1.8	--	--	--
				01392	00084	DC	C.4.1.1.8	--	--	--
				01392	00085	DC	C.4.1.1.8	--	--	--
				01392	00086	DC	C.8.2	--	--	--
				01392	00087	DC	C.4.1.1.8	--	--	--
				01392	00088	DC	C.4.1.1.9	--	--	--
				01392	00089	DC	C.4.1.1.9	--	--	--
				01392	00090	DC	C.4.1.1.9	--	--	--
				01392	00091	DC	C.4.1.1.9	--	--	--
				01392	00092	DC	C.4.1.1.9	--	--	--
				01392	00093	DC	C.4.1.1.9	--	--	--
				01392	00094	DC	C.4.1.1.9	--	--	--
				01392	00095	DC	C.4.1.1.9	--	--	--
				01392	00096	DC	C.4.1.1.9	--	--	--
				01392	00097	DC	C.4.1.2.1	--	--	--
				01392	00098	DC	C.4.1.2.1	--	--	--
				01392	00099	DC	C.4.1.2.1	--	--	--
			01392	00100	DC	C.4.1.2.1	--	--	--	
			01392	00101	DC	C.4.1.2.1	--	--	--	
			01392	00102	DC	C.4.1.2.1	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION				
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	
C.9-225	<u>Utah</u> (continued)									
				01392	00103	DC	C.4.1.2.1	--	--	--
				01392	00104	DC	C.4.1.2.1	--	--	--
				01392	00105	DC	C.4.1.2.1	--	--	--
				01392	00106	DC	C.4.1.2.1	--	--	--
				01392	00107	DC	C.4.1.2.1	--	--	--
				01392	00108	DC	C.4.1.2.1	--	--	--
				01392	00109	DC	C.4.1.2.1	--	--	--
				01392	00110	DC	C.4.1.2.1	--	--	--
				01392	00111	DC	C.4.1.2.1	--	--	--
				01392	00112	DC	C.4.1.2.1	--	--	--
				01392	00113	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
				01392	00114	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
				01392	00115	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
				01392	00116	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
				01392	00117	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
				01392	00118	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
				01392	00119	DC	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
				01392	00120	DC	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
				01392	00121	DC	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
				01392	00122	DC	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
				01392	00123	DC	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
				01392	00124	DC	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
				01392	00125	DC	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
				01392	00126	DC	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
				01392	00127	DC	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
				01392	00128	DC	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
				01392	00129	DC	C.4.1.5	--	--	--
				01392	00130	DC	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
				01392	00131	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
				01392	00132	DC	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
				01392	00133	DC	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
				01392	00134	DC	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
				01392	00135	DC	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
				01392	00136	DC	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
				01392	00137	DC	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
				01392	00138	DC	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
				01392	00139	DC	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
				01392	00140	DC	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION				
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	
C.9-226	Utah (continued)									
				01392	00141	DC	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
				01392	00142	DC	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
				01392	00143	DC	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
				01392	00144	DC	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
				01392	00145	DC	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
				01392	00146	DC	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
				01392	00147	DC	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
				01392	00148	DC	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
				01392	00149	DC	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
				01392	00150	DC	C.4.1.3.4	--	--	--
				01392	00151	DC	C.4.1.3.4	--	--	--
				01392	00152	DC	C.4.1.3.4	--	--	--
				01392	00153	DC	C.4.1.3.5	--	--	--
				01392	00154	DC	C.4.1.3.5	--	--	--
				01392	00155	DC	C.4.1.3.6	--	--	--
				01392	00156	DC	C.4.1.3.6	--	--	--
				01392	00157	DC	C.4.1.3.6	--	--	--
				01392	00158	DC	C.4.1.3.6	--	--	--
				01392	00159	DC	C.4.1.3.7	--	--	--
				01392	00160	DC	C.4.1.4	--	--	--
				01392	00161	DC	C.4.1.4	--	--	--
				01392	00162	DC	C.4.1.4	--	--	--
				01392	00163	DC	C.4.1.4	--	--	--
				01392	00164	DC	C.4.1.4	--	--	--
				01392	00165	DC	C.4.1.4	--	--	--
				01392	00166	DC	C.4.1.4	--	--	--
				01392	00167	DC	C.4.1.4	--	--	--
				01392	00168	DC	C.4.1.4	--	--	--
				01392	00169	DC	C.4.1.4	--	--	--
				01392	00170	DC	C.4.1.4	--	--	--
				01392	00171	DC	C.4.1.5	--	--	--
				01392	00172	DC	C.4.1.5	--	--	--
				01392	00173	DC	C.4.1.5.1	--	--	--
				01392	00174	DC	C.4.1.5.1	--	--	--
				01392	00175	DC	C.4.1.5.1	--	--	--
				01392	00176	DC	C.4.1.5.1	--	--	--
				01392	00177	DC	C.4.1.5.1	--	--	--
				01392	00178	DC	C.4.1.5.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
C.9-227	<u>Utah</u> (continued)								
			01392	00179	DC	C.4.1.5.1	--	--	--
			01392	00180	DC	C.4.1.5.1	--	--	--
			01392	00181	DC	C.4.1.5.1	--	--	--
			01392	00182	DC	C.4.1.5.1	--	--	--
			01392	00183	DC	C.4.1.5.1	--	--	--
			01392	00184	DC	C.4.1.5.1	--	--	--
			01392	00185	DC	C.4.1.5.1	--	--	--
			01392	00186	DC	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			01392	00187	DC	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			01392	00188	DC	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			01392	00189	DC	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			01392	00190	DC	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			01392	00191	DC	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			01392	00192	DC	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			01392	00193	DC	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			01392	00194	DC	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			01392	00195	DC	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			01392	00196	DC	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			01392	00197	DC	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			01392	00198	DC	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			01392	00199	DC	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			01392	00200	DC	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			01392	00201	DC	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			01392	00202	DC	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	--
			01392	00203	DC	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	--
			01392	00204	DC	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	--
			01392	00205	DC	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	--
			01392	00206	DC	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	--
			01392	00207	DC	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	--
			01392	00208	DC	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	--
			01392	00209	DC	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	--
			01392	00210	DC	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	--
			01392	00211	DC	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	--
			01392	00212	DC	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	--
			01392	00213	DC	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	--
			01392	00214	DC	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	--
			01392	00215	DC	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	--
		01392	00216	DC	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION				
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	
C. 9-228	Utah (continued)									
				01392	00217	DC	C. 4. 1. 5. 3	--	--	--
				01392	00218	DC	C. 4. 1. 5. 3	--	--	--
				01392	00219	DC	C. 4. 1. 5. 3	--	--	--
				01392	00220	DC	C. 4. 1. 5. 3	--	--	--
				01392	00221	DC	C. 4. 1. 5. 3	--	--	--
				01392	00222	DC	C. 4. 1. 5. 4	--	--	--
				01392	00223	DC	C. 4. 1. 5. 4	--	--	--
				01392	00224	DC	C. 4. 1. 5. 4	--	--	--
				01392	00225	DC	C. 4. 1. 5. 5	--	--	--
				01392	00226	DC	C. 4. 1. 5. 5	--	--	--
				01392	00227	DC	C. 4. 1. 5. 5	--	--	--
				01392	00228	DC	C. 4. 1. 5. 5	--	--	--
				01392	00229	DC	C. 4. 1. 5. 5	--	--	--
				01392	00230	DC	C. 4. 1. 5. 5	--	--	--
				01392	00231	DC	C. 6. 2	--	--	--
				01392	00232	DC	C. 7. 2. 1	--	--	--
				01392	00233	DC	C. 7. 1. 1. 1	--	--	--
				01392	00234	DC	C. 4. 2. 1	--	--	--
				01392	00235	DC	C. 4. 2. 1	--	--	--
				01392	00236	DC	C. 4. 2. 1	--	--	--
				01392	00237	DC	C. 7. 1. 1	--	--	--
				01392	00238	DC	C. 7. 3	--	--	--
				01392	00239	DC	C. 7. 1. 1	--	--	--
				01392	00240	DC	C. 7. 1. 1	--	--	--
				01392	00241	DC	C. 7. 1. 1	--	--	--
				01392	00242	DC	C. 4. 2. 1	--	--	--
				01392	00243	DC	C. 7. 1. 1	--	--	--
				01392	00244	DC	C. 4. 2. 1	--	--	--
				01392	00245	DC	C. 7. 1. 1	--	--	--
				01392	00246	DC	C. 4. 2. 1	--	--	--
				01392	00247	DC	C. 4. 2. 1	--	--	--
				01392	00248	DC	C. 4. 2. 1	--	--	--
				01392	00249	DC	C. 7. 1. 1. 1	--	--	--
				01392	00250	DC	C. 4. 2. 1	--	--	--
				01392	00251	DC	C. 4. 2. 1	--	--	--
				01392	00252	DC	C. 4. 2. 1	--	--	--
				01392	00253	DC	C. 4. 2. 1	--	--	--
				01392	00254	DC	C. 4. 2. 2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
C.9-229	Utah (continued)								
			01392	00255	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01392	00256	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01392	00257	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01392	00258	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01392	00259	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01392	00260	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01392	00261	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			01392	00262	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01392	00263	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01392	00264	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01392	00265	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01392	00266	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01392	00267	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01392	00268	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01392	00269	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01392	00270	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01392	00271	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01392	00272	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01392	00273	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01392	00274	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01392	00275	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01392	00276	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01392	00277	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01392	00278	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01392	00279	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01392	00280	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01392	00281	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01392	00282	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01392	00283	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01392	00284	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01392	00285	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01392	00286	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01392	00287	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			01392	00288	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01392	00289	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			01392	00290	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			01392	00291	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
		01392	00292	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Utah (continued)									

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
C.9-231	Utah (continued)								
			01392	00331	DC	C.7.1.1.2	--	--	--
			01392	00332	DC	C.7.1.1.2	--	--	--
			01392	00333	DC	C.7.1.1.2	--	--	--
			01392	00334	DC	C.7.1.1.2	--	--	--
			01392	00335	DC	C.7.1.1.2	--	--	--
			01392	00336	DC	C.7.1.1.2	--	--	--
			01392	00337	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01392	00338	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01392	00339	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01392	00340	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01392	00341	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01392	00342	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01392	00343	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01392	00344	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01392	00345	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01392	00346	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01392	00347	DC	C.7.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01392	00348	DC	C.7.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01392	00349	DC	C.7.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01392	00350	DC	C.7.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01392	00351	DC	C.7.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01392	00352	DC	C.7.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01392	00353	DC	C.7.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01392	00354	DC	C.7.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01392	00355	DC	C.7.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01392	00356	DC	C.7.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01392	00357	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			01392	00358	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			01392	00359	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			01392	00360	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			01392	00361	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01392	00362	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01392	00363	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01392	00364	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01392	00365	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01392	00366	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01392	00367	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
		01392	00368	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
C.9-232	Utah (continued)								
			01392	00369	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01392	00370	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01392	00371	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01392	00372	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01392	00373	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			01392	00374	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			01392	00375	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			01392	00376	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			01392	00377	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			01392	00378	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			01392	00379	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			01392	00380	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			01392	00381	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			01392	00382	DC	C.7.1.1.6	--	--	--
			01392	00383	DC	C.7.1.1.6	--	--	--
			01392	00384	DC	C.7.1.1.9	--	--	--
			01392	00385	DC	C.7.1.1.9	--	--	--
			01392	00386	DC	C.7.1.1.9	--	--	--
			01392	00387	DC	C.7.1.1.9	--	--	--
			01392	00388	DC	C.7.1.1.9	C.7.3	--	--
			01392	00389	DC	C.7.1.1.9	--	--	--
			01392	00390	DC	C.7.2.1.9	--	--	--
			01392	00391	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			01392	00392	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			01392	00393	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			01392	00394	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01392	00395	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01392	00396	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01392	00397	DC	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.1.1.5	--	--
			01392	00398	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01392	00399	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01392	00400	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			01392	00401	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01392	00402	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.1.2	--	--
			01392	00403	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
			01392	00404	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
			01392	00405	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
		01392	00406	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION				
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	
C.9-233	Utah (continued)									
				01392	00407	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.1.2	--	--
				01392	00408	DC	C.7.1.1.8	--	--	--
				01392	00409	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
				01392	00410	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
				01392	00411	DC	C.7.1.1.3	C.7.1.1.4	--	--
				01392	00412	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
				01392	00413	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
				01392	00414	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
				01392	00415	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
				01392	00416	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
				01392	00417	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
				01392	00418	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
				01392	00419	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
				01392	00420	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
				01392	00421	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
				01392	00422	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
				01392	00423	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
				01392	00424	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
				01392	00425	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
				01392	00426	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
				01392	00427	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
				01392	00428	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
				01392	00429	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
				01392	00430	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
				01392	00431	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
				01392	00432	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
				01392	00433	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
				01392	00434	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
				01392	00435	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
				01392	00436	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
				01392	00437	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
				01392	00438	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
				01392	00439	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
				01392	00440	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
				01392	00441	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
				01392	00442	DC	C.7.1.1	C.7.1.1.3	--	--
				01392	00443	-----	C.4.2.4	--	--	--
				01392	00444	-----	C.4.2.4	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Utah</u> (continued)									
C.9-234			01392	00445	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01392	00446A	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01392	00446B	DC	C.4.2.4	--	--	--
			01392	00448	DC	C.7.1.1.1	--	--	--
			01392	00449	DC	C.7.1.1.1	--	--	--
			01392	00450	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01392	00451	DC	C.4.2.2	C.7.1.2	--	--
			01392	00452	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			01392	00453	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01392	00454	DC	C.7.1.1.6	--	--	--
			01392	00455	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01392	00456	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01392	00457	DC	C.7.1.1.9	--	--	--
			01392	00458	DC	C.7.1.1.9	--	--	--
			01392	00459	DC	C.7.1.1.9	--	--	--
			01392	00460	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			01392	00461	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01392	00462	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01392	00463	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01392	00464	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01392	00465	DC	C.4.3	C.4.1.2.1	--	--
			01392	00466	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01392	00467	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01392	00468	DC	C.6.3	--	--	--
			01392	00469	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01392	00470	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01392	00471	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01392	00472	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01392	00473	DC	C.4.3	C.7.3	--	--
			01392	00474	DC	C.4.3	C.7.3	--	--
			01392	00475	DC	C.4.3	C.7.3	--	--
			01392	00476	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01392	00477	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01392	00478	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01392	00479	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
			01392	00480	DC	C.4.3	C.4.1.3.3	--	--
			01392	00481	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01392	00482	DC	C.4.3	C.7.3	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION				
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	
C.9-235	Utah (continued)									
				01392	00483	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
				01392	00484	DC	C.4.3	C.7.1.2	--	--
				01392	00485	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
				01392	00486	DC	C.4.3	C.7.3	--	--
				01392	00487	DC	C.4.3	C.7.3	--	--
				01392	00488	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
				01392	00489	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
				01392	00490	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
				01392	00491	DC	C.4.3	C.4.2.2	--	--
				01392	00492	DC	C.7.1	--	--	--
				01392	00493	DC	C.7.1	--	--	--
				01392	00494	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
				01392	00495	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
				01392	00496	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
				01392	00497	DC	C.7.3	C.4.2.2	--	--
				01392	00498	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
				01392	00499	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
				01392	00500	DC	C.4.3	C.7.3	--	--
				01392	00501	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
				01392	00502	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
				01392	00503	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
				01392	00504	DC	C.7.2	C.7.3	--	--
				01392	00505	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
				01392	00506	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
				01392	00507	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
				01392	00508	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
				01392	00510	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
				01392	00511	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
				01392	00512	DC	C.5.6	--	--	--
				01392	00513	DC	C.5.5	--	--	--
				01392	00514	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
				01392	00515	DC	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
				01392	00516	DC	C.7.2.1	C.7.2.3	--	--
				01392	00517	DC	C.7.2	C.7.2.2	--	--
				01392	00518	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
				01392	00519	DC	C.7.2.1	C.7.2.2	--	--
				01392	00520	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
				01392	00521	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION				
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	
C.9-236	<u>Utah</u> (continued)									
				01392	00522	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
				01392	00523	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
				01392	00524	DC	C.4.3	C.7.2.1	--	--
				01392	00525	DC	C.5.8	C.7.2.1	--	--
				01392	00526	DC	C.5.8	--	--	--
				01392	00527	DC	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
				01392	00528	DC	C.7.2.8	C.4.3	--	--
				01392	00529	DC	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
				01392	00530	DC	C.4.3	C.7.2.8	--	--
				01392	00531	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
				01392	00532	DC	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
				01392	00533	DC	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
				01392	00534	DC	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
				01392	00535	DC	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
				01392	00536	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
				01392	00537	DC	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
				01392	00538	DC	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
				01392	00539	DC	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
				01392	00540	DC	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
				01392	00541	DC	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
				01392	00542	DC	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
				01392	00543	DC	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
				01392	00544	DC	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
				01392	00545	DC	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
				01392	00546	DC	C.4.3	C.7.2.8	--	--
				01392	00547	DC	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
				01392	00548	DC	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
				01392	00549	DC	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
				01392	00550	DC	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
				01392	00551	DC	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
				01392	00552	DC	C.3.1.3	C.7.2.1	--	--
				01392	00553	DC	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
				01392	00554	DC	C.7.2.1	C.7.2.4	--	--
				01392	00555	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
				01392	00556	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	00557	DC	C.7.2.1	--	--	--	
			01392	00558	DC	C.7.2.1	--	--	--	
			01392	00559	DC	C.7.2.1	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION				
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	
C.9-237	Utah (continued)									
				01392	00560	DC	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
				01392	00561	DC	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
				01392	00562	DC	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
				01392	00563	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
				01392	00564	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
				01392	00565	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
				01392	00566	DC	C.7.2.2	C.7.3	--	--
				01392	00567	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
				01392	00568	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
				01392	00569	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
				01392	00570	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
				01392	00571	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
				01392	00572	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
				01392	00573	DC	C.7.2.2	C.7.3	--	--
				01392	00574	DC	C.7.2.2	C.7.3	--	--
				01392	00575	DC	C.7.2.2	C.7.3	--	--
				01392	00576	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
				01392	00577	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
				01392	00578	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
				01392	00579	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
				01392	00580	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
				01392	00581	DC	C.7.2.2	C.7.3	--	--
				01392	00582	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
				01392	00583	DC	C.7.2.2	C.7.3	--	--
				01392	00584	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
				01392	00585	DC	C.7.2.2	C.7.3	--	--
				01392	00586	DC	C.7.2.2	C.7.3	--	--
				01392	00587	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
				01392	00588	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
				01392	00589	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
				01392	00590	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
				01392	00591	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
				01392	00592	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
				01392	00593	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
				01392	00594	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			01392	00595	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--	
			01392	00596	DC	C.7.2.1	C.7.2.3	--	--	
			01392	00597	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION				
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	
C.9-238	Utah (continued)									
				01392	00598	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
				01392	00599	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
				01392	00600	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
				01392	00601	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
				01392	00602	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
				01392	00603	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
				01392	00604	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
				01392	00605	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
				01392	00606	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
				01392	00607	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
				01392	00608	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
				01392	00609	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
				01392	00610	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
				01392	00611	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
				01392	00612	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
				01392	00613	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
				01392	00614	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
				01392	00615	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
				01392	00616	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
				01392	00617	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
				01392	00618	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
				01392	00619	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
				01392	00620	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
				01392	00621	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
				01392	00622	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
				01392	00624	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
				01392	00625	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
				01392	00626	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
				01392	00627	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
				01392	00628	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
				01392	00629	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
				01392	00630	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
				01392	00631	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
				01392	00632	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
				01392	00633	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			01392	00634	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--	
			01392	00635	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--	
			01392	00636	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION				
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	
C.9-239	Utah (continued)									
				01392	00637	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
				01392	00638	DC	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
				01392	00639	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
				01392	00640	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
				01392	00641	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
				01392	00642	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
				01392	00643	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
				01392	00644	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
				01392	00645	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
				01392	00646	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
				01392	00647	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
				01392	00648	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
				01392	00649	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
				01392	00650	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
				01392	00651	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
				01392	00652	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
				01392	00653	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
				01392	00654	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
				01392	00655	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
				01392	00656	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
				01392	00657	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
				01392	00658	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
				01392	00659	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
				01392	00660	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
				01392	00661	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
				01392	00662	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
				01392	00663	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
				01392	00664	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
				01392	00665	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
				01392	00666	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
				01392	00667	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
				01392	00668	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
				01392	00669	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
				01392	00671	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
				01392	00672	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
				01392	00673	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
				01392	00674	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
				01392	00675	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

C.9-240

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Utah</u> (continued)									
			01392	00676	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	00677	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	00678	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	00679	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	00680	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	00681	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	00682	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	00683	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01392	00684	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	00685	DC	C.7.3	C.7.4	--	--
			01392	00686	DC	C.7.1.1	C.7.2	C.7.3	--
			01392	00687	DC	C.7.1.1.8	C.7.2.8	C.7.3	--
			01392	00688	DC	C.7.1.1.1	C.7.2.1	C.7.3	--
			01392	00689	DC	C.7.2.2	C.7.3	--	--
			01392	00690	DC	C.7.2.4	C.7.3	--	--
			01392	00691	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.3	--	--
			01392	00692	DC	C.7.1.1.6	C.7.2.6	C.7.3	--
			01392	00693	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	00694	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	00695	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	00696	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	00697	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	00698	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	00699	DC	C.4.3	C.7.4.1	--	--
			01392	00700	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	00701	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	00702	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	00704	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	00705	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01392	00706	DC	C.4.3	C.7.4	--	--
			01392	00707	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	00708	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	00709	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	00710	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	00711	DC	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			01392	00712	DC	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			01392	00713	DC	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			01392	00714	DC	C.7.4.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
C.9-241	Utah (continued)								
			01392	00715	DC	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			01392	00716	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01392	00717	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01392	00718	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01392	00719	DC	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			01392	00720	DC	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			01392	00721	DC	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			01392	00722	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01392	00723	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01392	00724	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01392	00725	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01392	00726	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01392	00727	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01392	00728	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01392	00729	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01392	00730	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01392	00731	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01392	00732	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01392	00733	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01392	00734	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01392	00735	DC	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			01392	00736	DC	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			01392	00737	DC	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			01392	00738	DC	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			01392	00739	DC	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			01392	00740	DC	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			01392	00741	DC	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			01392	00742	DC	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			01392	00743	DC	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			01392	00744	DC	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			01392	00745	DC	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			01392	00746	DC	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			01392	00747	DC	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			01392	00748	DC	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			01392	00749	DC	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			01392	00750	DC	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			01392	00751	DC	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
		01392	00752	DC	C.7.4.3	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
C.9-242	Utah (continued)								
			01392	00753	DC	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			01392	00754	DC	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			01392	00755	DC	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			01392	00756	DC	C.7.4.4	--	--	--
			01392	00757	DC	C.7.4.4	--	--	--
			01392	00758	DC	C.7.4.4	--	--	--
			01392	00759	DC	C.7.4.4	--	--	--
			01392	00760	DC	C.7.4.4	--	--	--
			01392	00761	DC	C.7.4.4	--	--	--
			01392	00762	DC	C.7.4.4	--	--	--
			01392	00763	DC	C.7.4.4	--	--	--
			01392	00764	DC	C.7.4.4	--	--	--
			01392	00765	DC	C.7.4.5	--	--	--
			01392	00766	DC	C.7.4.5	--	--	--
			01392	00767	DC	C.7.4.5	--	--	--
			01392	00768	DC	C.7.4.5	--	--	--
			01392	00769	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01392	00770	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01392	00771	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01392	00772	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01392	00773	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01392	00774	DC	C.4.3	C.7.2.1	--	--
			01392	00775	DC	C.4.3	C.7.2.2	--	--
			01392	00776	DC	C.4.3	C.7.2.2	--	--
			01392	00777	DC	C.4.3	C.7.2.3	--	--
			01392	00778	DC	C.4.3	C.7.2.4	--	--
			01392	00779	DC	C.4.3	C.7.2.5	--	--
			01392	00780	DC	C.4.3	C.7.2.4	C.7.2.3	C.7.2.5
			01392	00781	DC	C.4.3	C.7.3	--	--
			01392	00782	DC	C.4.3	C.7.3	--	--
			01392	00783	DC	C.4.3	C.7.4.5	--	--
			01392	00785	DC	C.4.3	C.7.2	--	--
			01392	00786	DC	C.4.3	C.7.2.1	--	--
			01392	00787	DC	C.4.3	C.7.2.2	--	--
			01392	00788	DC	C.4.3	C.7.2.2	--	--
			01392	00789	DC	C.4.3	C.7.2.3	--	--
			01392	00790	DC	C.4.3	C.7.2.4	--	--
		01392	00791	DC	C.4.3	C.7.2.5	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
C. 9-243	Utah (continued)								
			01392	00792	DC	C. 4. 3	C. 7. 2. 3	C. 7. 2. 4	C. 7. 2. 5
			01392	00793	DC	C. 4. 3	C. 7. 3	--	--
			01392	00794	DC	C. 4. 3	C. 7. 3	--	--
			01392	00795	DC	C. 4. 3	C. 7. 4. 5	--	--
			01392	00796	DC	C. 4. 3	C. 7. 4	C. 7. 2. 5	--
			01392	00797	DC	C. 4. 3	C. 7. 2	--	--
			01392	00798	DC	C. 4. 3	C. 7. 2. 2	--	--
			01392	00799	DC	C. 4. 3	--	--	--
			01392	00800	DC	C. 3. 2	--	--	--
			01392	00801	-----	C. 2. 7	--	--	--
			01392	00802	-----	C. 3. 1. 1	--	--	--
			01392	00803	DC	C. 5. 9	--	--	--
			01392	00804	DC	C. 5. 9	--	--	--
			01392	00805	DC	C. 5. 9	--	--	--
			01392	00806	DC	C. 5. 9	--	--	--
			01392	00807	DC	C. 5. 9	--	--	--
			01392	00808	DC	C. 5. 9	--	--	--
			01392	00809	DC	C. 5. 9	--	--	--
			01392	00810	DC	C. 6. 2	--	--	--
			01392	00811	DC	C. 6. 2	--	--	--
			01392	00812	DC	C. 6. 2	--	--	--
			01392	00813	DC	C. 6. 2	--	--	--
			01392	00814	DC	C. 6. 2	--	--	--
			01392	00815	DC	C. 6. 2	--	--	--
			01392	00816	DC	C. 6. 2	--	--	--
			01392	00817	DC	C. 6. 3	--	--	--
			01392	00818	DC	C. 6. 3	--	--	--
			01392	00819	DC	C. 6. 3	C. 4. 1. 3. 3	--	--
			01392	00820	DC	C. 6. 3	C. 7. 3	--	--
			01392	00821	DC	C. 6. 3	--	--	--
			01392	00822	DC	C. 6. 3	C. 7. 2. 8	--	--
			01392	00823	DC	C. 6. 3	C. 4. 3	--	--
			01392	00824	DC	C. 6. 4	--	--	--
			01392	00825	DC	C. 6. 4	C. 7. 3	--	--
			01392	00827	DC	C. 7. 2	C. 4. 1. 3	--	--
			01392	00828	DC	C. 7. 2	--	--	--
			01392	00829	DC	C. 7. 2	--	--	--
		01392	00830	DC	C. 7. 2	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION				
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	
C.9-244	Utah (continued)									
				01392	00831	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
				01392	00832	DC	C.7.1	--	--	--
				01392	00833	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
				01392	00834	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
				01392	00835	DC	C.7.2	C.7.2.8	--	--
				01392	00836	DC	C.7.2	C.7.2.1	--	--
				01392	00837	DC	C.7.2	C.7.2.1	--	--
				01392	00838	DC	C.7.2	C.7.3	--	--
				01392	00839	DC	C.7.2	C.3.1.3	--	--
				01392	00840	DC	C.7.2	C.3.1.3	--	--
				01392	00841	DC	C.7.2	C.7.2.8	--	--
				01392	00842	DC	C.7.2	C.7.3	--	--
				01392	00843	DC	C.7.2	C.7.2.2	--	--
				01392	00844	DC	C.7.2	C.7.2.8	--	--
				01392	00845	DC	C.7.2	C.7.2.2	--	--
				01392	00846	DC	C.7.2	C.7.3.1	--	--
				01392	00847	DC	C.7.2	C.7.2.5	--	--
				01392	00848	DC	C.7.2	C.7.2.3	--	--
				01392	00849	DC	C.7.2	C.7.2.3	--	--
				01392	00850	DC	C.7.2	C.7.2.3	--	--
				01392	00851	DC	C.7.2	C.4.2.3	--	--
				01392	00852	DC	C.7.2	C.7.2.6	C.7.3	--
				01392	00853	DC	C.7.2	C.7.2.6	--	--
				01392	00854	DC	C.7.2	C.7.2.8	--	--
				01392	00855	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
				01392	00856	DC	C.7.2	C.7.2.1	--	--
				01392	00857	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
				01392	00858	DC	C.7.2	C.7.2.8	C.4.1.2.2	--
				01392	00859	DC	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
				01392	00860	DC	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
				01392	00861	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
				01392	00862	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
				01392	00863	DC	C.7.2	C.7.2.8	C.7.2.3	--
				01392	00864	DC	C.7.2.5	C.7.2.2	--	--
				01392	00865	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
				01392	00866	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
				01392	00867	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
				01392	00868	DC	C.7.2	C.3.1.3	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION				
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	
C.9-245	Utah (continued)									
				01392	00869	DC	C.4.2.2	C.4.3	C.7.2.1	--
				01392	00870	DC	C.7.2.1	C.7.2.2	--	--
				01392	00871	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
				01392	00872	DC	C.7.2.3	C.7.2	--	--
				01392	00873	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
				01392	00874	DC	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
				01392	00875	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
				01392	00876	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
				01392	00877	DC	C.7.2.5	C.7.3	--	--
				01392	00878	DC	C.7.2.2	C.7.3	--	--
				01392	00879	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
				01392	00880	DC	C.7.2	C.3.1.3	--	--
				01392	00881	DC	C.7.2	C.3.1.3	--	--
				01392	00882	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
				01392	00883	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
				01392	00884	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
				01392	00885	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
				01392	00886	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
				01392	00887	DC	C.7.2	C.7.2.4	--	--
				01392	00888	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
				01392	00889	DC	C.7.4	C.7.2.2	--	--
				01392	00890	DC	C.7.2	C.7.2.1	--	--
				01392	00891	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
				01392	00892	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
				01392	00893	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
				01392	00894	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
				01392	00895	DC	C.7.2	C.7.2.8	--	--
				01392	00896	DC	C.7.2	C.7.2.1	--	--
				01392	00897	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
				01392	00898	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
				01392	00899	DC	C.7.2.6	C.7.4	--	--
				01392	00900	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
				01392	00901	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
				01392	00902	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
				01392	00903	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
			01392	00904	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--	
			01392	00905	DC	C.7.3	C.7.2.2	--	--	
			01392	00906	DC	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Utah</u> (continued)									
			01392	00907	DC	C.7.1.1.2	C.7.2.2	--	--
			01392	00908	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01392	00909	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01392	00910	DC	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
			01392	00911	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01392	00912	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01392	00913	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01392	00914	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01392	00915	DC	C.5.9	--	--	--
			01392	00916	DC	C.7.2	C.7.1.1	--	--
			01392	00917	DC	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
			01392	00918	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01392	00919	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			01392	00920	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01392	00921	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01392	00922	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01392	00923	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01392	00924	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01392	00925	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01392	00926	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
			01392	00927	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			01392	00928	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01392	00929	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01392	00930	DC	C.5.9	--	--	--
			01392	00931	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01392	00932	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01392	00933	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01392	00934	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01392	00935	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01392	00936	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01392	00937	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01392	00938	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01392	00939	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01392	00940	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	00941	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	00942	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01392	00943	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01392	00944	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--

C.9-246

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Utah</u> (continued)									
C.9-247			01392	00945	DC	C.7.3	C.6.2	--	--
			01392	00946	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	00947	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	00948	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	00949	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	00950	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	00951	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	00952	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	00953	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	00954	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	00955	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	00956	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	00957	DC	C.6.3	C.7.3	--	--
			01392	00958	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	00959	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	00960	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	00961	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	00962	DC	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
			01392	00963	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	00964	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	00965	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	00966	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	00967	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	00968	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	00969	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	00970	DC	C.6.1	--	--	--
			01392	00971	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			01392	00972	DC	C.7.2	C.7.2.3	--	--
			01392	00973	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			01392	00974	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01392	00975	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01392	00976	DC	C.7.5	--	--	--
			01392	00977	DC	C.7.3	C.7.5	--	--
		01392	00978	DC	C.7.5	--	--	--	
		01392	00979	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--	
		01392	00980	DC	C.7.4	C.4.3	--	--	
		01392	00981	DC	C.7.2.2	C.7.2.6	--	--	
		01392	00982	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--	

C.9-247

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION				
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	
C. 9-248	Utah (continued)									
				01392	00983	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
				01392	00984	DC	C.7.5	--	--	--
				01392	00985	DC	C.7.4	C.7.5	--	--
				01392	00986	DC	C.7.5	C.7.2.3	--	--
				01392	00987	DC	C.7.5	C.7.2.3	--	--
				01392	00988	DC	C.7.5	C.7.2.3	--	--
				01392	00989	DC	C.7.5	C.7.2.4	--	--
				01392	00990	DC	C.7.5	C.7.2.5	--	--
				01392	00991	DC	C.7.5	C.7.2.8	--	--
				01392	00992	DC	C.7.4	C.7.5	--	--
				01392	00993	DC	C.7.5	C.7.2.6	--	--
				01392	00994	DC	C.7.5	C.7.2.1	--	--
				01392	00995	DC	C.7.5	C.7.2.2	--	--
				01392	00996	DC	C.7.5	C.7.2.4	--	--
				01392	00997	DC	C.7.4	C.7.5	--	--
				01392	00998	DC	C.7.5	C.7.4	C.7.4.4	--
				01392	00999	DC	C.7.5	C.7.3	--	--
				01392	01000	DC	C.7.5	--	--	--
				01392	01001	DC	C.7.5	C.7.2	--	--
				01392	01002	DC	C.8.5	--	--	--
				01392	01003	DC	C.6.2	--	--	--
				01392	01004	DC	C.6.2	--	--	--
				01392	01005	DC	C.6.2	--	--	--
				01392	01006	DC	C.6.3	--	--	--
				01392	01007	DC	C.6.3	--	--	--
				01392	01008	DC	C.6.3	--	--	--
				01392	01009	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
				01392	01010	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
				01392	01011	DC	C.7.1.1	C.7.2	--	--
				01392	01012	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
				01392	01013	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
				01392	01014	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
				01392	01015	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
				01392	01016	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
				01392	01017	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
				01392	01018	DC	C.7.2	C.7.3	--	--
				01392	01019	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
				01392	01020	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION				
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	
C.9-249	Utah (continued)									
				01392	01021	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
				01392	01022	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
				01392	01023	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
				01392	01024	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
				01392	01025	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
				01392	01026	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
				01392	01027	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
				01392	01028	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
				01392	01029	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
				01392	01030	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
				01392	01031	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
				01392	01032	DC	C.5.2	--	--	--
				01392	01033	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
				01392	01034	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
				01392	01035	DC	C.5.2	--	--	--
				01392	01036	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
				01392	01037	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
				01392	01038	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
				01392	01039	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
				01392	01040	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
				01392	01041	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
				01392	01042	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
				01392	01043	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
				01392	01044	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
				01392	01045	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
				01392	01046	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
				01392	01047	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
				01392	01048	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
				01392	01049	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
				01392	01050	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
				01392	01051	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
				01392	01052	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
				01392	01053	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
				01392	01054	DC	C.5.2	--	--	--
				01392	01055	DC	C.5.2	--	--	--
			01392	01056	DC	C.5.2	--	--	--	
			01392	01057	DC	C.5.2	--	--	--	
			01392	01058	DC	C.5.2	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION				
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	
C.9-250	<u>Utah</u> (continued)									
				01392	01059	DC	C.5.2	--	--	--
				01392	01060	DC	C.5.2	--	--	--
				01392	01061	DC	C.5.2	--	--	--
				01392	01062	DC	C.5.2	--	--	--
				01392	01063	DC	C.5.2	--	--	--
				01392	01064	DC	C.5.3	--	--	--
				01392	01065	DC	C.5.3	--	--	--
				01392	01066	DC	C.5.3	--	--	--
				01392	01067	DC	C.5.3	--	--	--
				01392	01068	DC	C.5.3	--	--	--
				01392	01069	DC	C.5.3	--	--	--
				01392	01070	DC	C.5.3	--	--	--
				01392	01071	DC	C.5.4	--	--	--
				01392	01072	DC	C.5.5	--	--	--
				01392	01073	DC	C.5.5	--	--	--
				01392	01074	DC	C.5.6	--	--	--
				01392	01075	DC	C.5.6	--	--	--
				01392	01076	DC	C.5.6	--	--	--
				01392	01077	DC	C.5.7	--	--	--
				01392	01078	DC	C.5.7	--	--	--
				01392	01079	DC	C.5.7	--	--	--
				01392	01080	DC	C.5.8	--	--	--
				01392	01081	DC	C.5.8	--	--	--
				01392	01082	DC	C.5.8	C.4.1.1.8	--	--
				01392	01083	DC	C.5.8	--	--	--
				01392	01084	DC	C.5.8	--	--	--
				01392	01085	DC	C.5.8	--	--	--
				01392	01086	DC	C.8.3	--	--	--
				01392	01087	DC	C.8.1	--	--	--
				01392	01088	DC	C.8.1	--	--	--
				01392	01089	DC	C.8.1	--	--	--
				01392	01090	DC	C.8.4	--	--	--
				01392	01091	DC	C.8.2	--	--	--
				01392	01092	DC	C.8.2	--	--	--
				01392	01093	DC	C.8.5	--	--	--
				01392	01094	DC	C.8.5	--	--	--
				01392	01095	DC	C.8.5	--	--	--
			01392	01096	DC	C.8.5	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

C.9-251

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Utah</u> (continued)									
			01392	01097	DC	C.8.5	--	--	--
			01392	01098	DC	C.6.6	--	--	--
			01392	01099	DC	C.6.6	--	--	--
			01392	01100	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01392	01101	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01392	01102	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01392	01103	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01392	01104	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01392	01105	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01392	01106	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01392	01107	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01392	01108	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01392	01109	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01392	01110	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01392	01111	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01392	01112	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01392	01113	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01392	01114	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01392	01115	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01392	01117	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01392	01118	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01392	01119	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01392	01120	DC	C.4.2.1	C.4.1.2.2	C.5.1	--
			01392	01121	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01392	01122	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01392	01123	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			01392	01124	DC	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
			01392	01125	DC	C.7.2	C.2.7	--	--
			01392	01126	DC	C.7.2.1	C.7.4	C.7.2.6	--
			01392	01127	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01392	01128	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01392	01129	DC	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
			01392	01130	DC	C.7.2.1	C.7.2.6	--	--
			01392	01131	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	01132	DC	C.3.2	C.7.2	--	--
			01392	01133	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01392	01134	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	01135	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION				
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	
C.9-252	Utah (continued)									
				01392	01136	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
				01392	01137	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
				01392	01138	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
				01392	01139	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
				01392	01140	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
				01392	01141	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
				01392	01142	-----	C.3.4.2.3	--	--	--
				01392	01143	DC	C.8.3	--	--	--
				01392	01144	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
				01392	01145	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
				01392	01146	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
				01392	01147	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
				01392	01148	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
				01392	01149	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
				01392	01150	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
				01392	01151	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
				01392	01152	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
				01392	01153	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
				01392	01154	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
				01392	01155	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
				01392	01156	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
				01392	01157	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
				01392	01158	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
				01392	01159	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
				01392	01160	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
				01392	01161	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
				01392	01162	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
				01392	01163	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
				01392	01164	DC	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
				01392	01165	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
				01392	01166	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
				01392	01167	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
				01392	01168	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
				01392	01169	DC	C.4.1	--	--	--
				01392	01170	DC	C.4.1.1	C.4.1.2.2	--	--
				01392	01171	DC	C.5.1.1	C.4.1.2.2	--	--
				01392	01172	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
				01392	01173	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Utah</u> (continued)									
C.9-253			01392	01174	DC	C.7.2	C.7.3	--	--
			01392	01175	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01392	01176	DC	C.4.2.1	C.5.1	--	--
			01392	01177	DC	C.6.2	--	--	--
			01392	01178	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01392	01179	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			01392	01180	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
			01392	01181	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
			01392	01182	-----	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01392	01183A	DC	C.3.2	--	--	--
			01392	01183B	DC	C.7	--	--	--
			01392	01184	-----	C.4.2	--	--	--
			01392	01185	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			01392	01186	DC	C.4.1.5	C.7.1.2	--	--
			01392	01187	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
			01392	01188	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
			01392	01189	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
			01392	01190	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	01191	-----	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	01192	DC	C.6.2	--	--	--
			01392	01193	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	01194	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01392	01195	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01392	01196	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01392	01197	DC	C.4.3	C.7.2	--	--
			01392	01198	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			01392	01199	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01392	01200	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			01392	01201	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01392	01202	DC	C.4.1.1	--	--	--
			01392	01204	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01392	01205	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01392	01206	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01392	01207	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01392	01208	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01392	01209	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01392	01210	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01392	01211	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
C.9-254	Utah (continued)								
			01392	01212	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01392	01213	DC	C.4.2.1	C.5.1	--	--
			01392	01214	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			01392	01215	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			01392	01216	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01392	01217	DC	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
			01392	01218	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			01392	01219	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01392	01220	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01392	01221	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01392	01222	DC	C.7.2.8	C.7.1.1.8	--	--
			01392	01223	DC	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
			01392	01224	DC	C.7.3	C.7.2.8	C.7.2	--
			01392	01225	DC	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
			01392	01226	DC	C.7.2.5	C.7.1.1.5	--	--
			01392	01227	DC	C.4.1.3.4	--	--	--
			01392	01228	DC	C.4.1.3.4	--	--	--
			01392	01229	DC	C.4.1.3.4	--	--	--
			01392	01230	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--	--
			01392	01231	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--	--
			01392	01232	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--	--
			01392	01233	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--	--
			01392	01234	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--	--
			01392	01235	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--	--
			01392	01236	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--	--
			01392	01237	DC	C.7.2.5	C.7.1.1.5	--	--
			01392	01238	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--	--
			01392	01239	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--	--
			01392	01240	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--	--
			01392	01241	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--	--
			01392	01242	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--	--
			01392	01243	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			01392	01244	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			01392	01245	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			01392	01246	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			01392	01247	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			01392	01248	DC	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
		01392	01249	DC	C.7.2.8	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION				
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	
C.9-255	Utah (continued)									
				01392	01250	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
				01392	01251	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
				01392	01252	DC	C.7.2.4	C.7.4	--	--
				01392	01253	DC	C.7.1.1.1	--	--	--
				01392	01254	DC	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
				01392	01255	DC	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
				01392	01256	DC	C.7.1.1	C.7.2.2	--	--
				01392	01257	DC	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
				01392	01258	DC	C.7.1.1	C.7.2.2	--	--
				01392	01259	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
				01392	01260	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
				01392	01261	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
				01392	01262	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
				01392	01263	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
				01392	01264	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
				01392	01265	DC	C.4.1.5	--	--	--
				01392	01266	DC	C.4.1.5	--	--	--
				01392	01267	DC	C.4.1.5.4	--	--	--
				01392	01268	DC	C.4.1.5.4	--	--	--
				01392	01269	DC	C.4.1.5.4	--	--	--
				01392	01270	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
				01392	01271	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
				01392	01272	DC	C.7.1.1.6	C.7.2.6	--	--
				01392	01273	DC	C.7.1.1.6	C.7.2.6	--	--
				01392	01274	DC	C.7.1.1.6	C.7.2.6	--	--
				01392	01275	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
				01392	01276	-----	C.2.4	--	--	--
				01392	01277	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			Utah Office of Planning	01395	00001	DC	C.4.1.3.5	C.7.1.1.4	--	--
				01395	00002	DC	C.4.1.3.5	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.2.4	--
				01395	00003	DC	C.4.1.3.5	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.2.4	--
				01395	00004	DC	C.4.1.3.5	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.2.4	--
				01395	00005	DC	C.4.1.3.5	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.2.4	--
				01395	00006	DC	C.4.1.3.5	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.2.4	--
				01395	00007	DC	C.4.1.3.5	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.2.4	--
				01395	00008	DC	C.4.1.3.5	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.2.4	--
				02234	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
				02234	00002	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			Barnes, Richard D.							

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Utah</u> (continued)									
C.9-256	Barnett, Jack A.	CO Riv Basin/Salinity Control	01311	00001	DC	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
	01311		00002	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--	
	Barth, Martin J.	01143	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--	
	Beener, Colleen	01143	00002	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--	
		00074	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
		00074	00002	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--	
		00074	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--	
		00074	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
	Belka, Wayne	00074	00005	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--	
		00764	00001	DC	C.5.1	C.7.2.8	--	--	
		00764	00002	DC	C.3.1.3	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	
		00764	00003	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--	
		00764	00004	DC	C.4.1.2.1	--	--	--	
	Belka, Wayne	00764	00005	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--	
		02198	00001	DC	C.7.2.8	C.5.1	--	--	
		02198	00002	DC	C.4.1.1.5	C.3.1.3	--	--	
		02198	00003	DC	C.4.1.2.1	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	
		02198	00004	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--	
	Berry, John	01100	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
		01100	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--	
		01100	00003	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--	
		01100	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
	Berry, Raymond Scott	Attorney at Law	00046	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00046	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00046	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Bigler, Matt		00277	00001	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00277	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00277	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Black, Calvin		00928	00001	-----	C.3.4.2.1	--	--	--
			00928	00002	DC	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
			00928	00003	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00928	00004	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			00928	00005A	DC	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			00928	00005B	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00928	00005C	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00928	00006	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
	Black, Calvin		00928	00007	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02185	00001	DC	C.6.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Utah (continued)									
Black, Calvin		San Juan County Commission	02185	00002	DC	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
			02185	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			02185	00004	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02185	00005	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			02185	00006	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01539	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01539	00003	DC	C.7.4.2	C.7.4.3	--	--
			01539	00005	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01539	00006	DC	C.4.1	--	--	--
			01539	00007	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01539	00008	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01539	00009	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
Blair, William		State of Utah	02637	00001A	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			02637	00001B	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			02637	00002	DC	C.3.2	--	--	--
			02637	00003	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			02637	00003A	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			02637	00004	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			02637	00005	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			02637	00006	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			02637	00007	DC	C.7.1.1.1	--	--	--
			02637	00008	DC	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
			02637	00009	DC	C.6.2	--	--	--
			02637	00010	DC	C.4.1.3.5	--	--	--
			02637	00011	DC	C.4.2.1	--	--	--
			02637	00012	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			02637	00013	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			02637	00014	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00015	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00016	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00017	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00018	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
			02637	00019	DC	C.7.1.1.6	C.7.1.1.4	--	--
			02637	00020	DC	C.7.2.3	C.7.2.4	--	--
			02637	00021	-----	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			02637	00022	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
02637	00023	-----	C.7.2.4	--	--	--			
02637	00024	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--			

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

C.9-258

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
15LG, LM=13, Footer 47, Starting page number 258 through 311Utah (continued)									
			02637	00025	DC	C.7.2.4	C.7.3	--	--
			02637	00026	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			02637	00027	DC	C.7.2.4	C.7.3	--	--
			02637	00028	DC	C.7.5	--	--	--
			02637	00029	DC	C.7.5	--	--	--
			02637	00030	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02637	00031	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			02637	00032	DC	C.3.3	--	--	--
			02637	00033	DC	C.3.3	C.7.2.4	--	--
			02637	00034	DC	C.3.3	C.7.2.4	--	--
			02637	00035	DC	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
			02637	00036	DC	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
			02637	00037	DC	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
			02637	00038	DC	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
			02637	00039	DC	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
			02637	00040	DC	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
			02637	00041	DC	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
			02637	00042	DC	C.4.1.3.5	--	--	--
			02637	00043	DC	C.4.1.3.5	--	--	--
			02637	00044	DC	C.4.1.3.5	--	--	--
			02637	00045	DC	C.4.1.3.5	--	--	--
			02637	00046	DC	C.4.1.3.5	--	--	--
			02637	00047	DC	C.4.1.3.5	--	--	--
			02637	00048	DC	C.4.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00049	DC	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			02637	00050	DC	C.4.1.2	--	--	--
			02637	00051	DC	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			02637	00052	DC	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			02637	00053	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00054	DC	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.1.1.5	--	--
			02637	00055	DC	C.7.1.1.6	--	--	--
			02637	00056	DC	C.7.1.1.6	--	--	--
			02637	00057	DC	C.7.1.1.1	--	--	--
			02637	00058	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00059	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00060	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00061	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00062	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
C.9-259	Utah (continued)								
			02637	00063	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			02637	00064	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00065	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00066	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			02637	00067	DC	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.1.1.3	--	--
			02637	00068	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00069	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00070	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00071	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00072	DC	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.1.1.3	--	--
			02637	00073	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00074	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00075	DC	C.7.1.1.3	C.7.1.1.4	--	--
			02637	00076	DC	C.7.1.1.3	C.7.1.1.4	--	--
			02637	00077	DC	C.7.1.1.3	C.7.1.1.4	--	--
			02637	00078	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			02637	00079	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00080	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00081	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00082	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00083	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00084	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00085	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00086	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00087	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00088	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00089	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00090	-----	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00091	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00092	DC	C.4.1.3.5	C.7.2.4	--	--
			02637	00093	DC	C.4.1.3.5	--	--	--
			02637	00094	DC	C.4.1.3.5	--	--	--
			02637	00095	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00096	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00097	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00098	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00099	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
		02637	00100	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
C.9-260	Utah (continued)								
			02637	00101	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00102	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00103	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00104	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00105	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00106	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00107	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00108	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00109	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00110	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00111	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00112	DC	C.7.1.1.6	--	--	--
			02637	00113	DC	C.7.1.1.9	--	--	--
			02637	00114	DC	C.7.1.1.9	--	--	--
			02637	00115	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
			02637	00116	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			02637	00117	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00118	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00119	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00120	DC	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.1.1.9	--	--
			02637	00121	DC	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.1.1.9	--	--
			02637	00122	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02637	00123	DC	C.7.1.1.6	--	--	--
			02637	00124	DC	C.7.1.1.9	--	--	--
			02637	00125	DC	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.1.1.6	C.7.1.1.9	--
			02637	00126	DC	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.1.1.6	--	--
			02637	00127	DC	C.7.1.1.9	--	--	--
			02637	00128	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			02637	00129	DC	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
			02637	00130	DC	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
			02637	00131	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			02637	00132	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			02637	00133	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			02637	00134	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			02637	00135	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			02637	00136	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			02637	00137	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
		02637	00138	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
C.9-261	Utah (continued)								
			02637	00139	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			02637	00140	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			02637	00141	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			02637	00142	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			02637	00143	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			02637	00144	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			02637	00146	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			02637	00147	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			02637	00148	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			02637	00149	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			02637	00150	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			02637	00151	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			02637	00152	DC	C.7.4	C.7.2.4	--	--
			02637	00153	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			02637	00154	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			02637	00155	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			02637	00156	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			02637	00157	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			02637	00158	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			02637	00159	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			02637	00160	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			02637	00161	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			02637	00162	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			02637	00163	DC	C.7.2.4	C.7.3	--	--
			02637	00164	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
			02637	00165	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			02637	00166	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			02637	00167	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			02637	00168	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			02637	00169	DC	C.7.2	C.7.1	--	--
			02637	00170	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			02637	00171	DC	C.7.1.1.9	--	--	--
			02637	00172	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			02637	00173	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			02637	00174	DC	C.7.2	C.7.1	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.2.4
			02637	00175	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			02637	00176	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			02637	00177	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

C.9-262

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Utah</u> (continued)									
C.9-263	Bryan, Julie	Wasatch Mountain Club	00338	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00771	00001	DC	C.3.1.2	C.3.1.3	--	--
			00771	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Bryan, Julie		00771	00003	DC	C.3.1.2	C.3.1.3	--	--
			01237	00001	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			01237	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Budig, Michael		01237	00003	DC	C.3.1.2	C.3.1.3	--	--
			01237	00004	DC	C.3.1.2	C.3.1.3	--	--
			00779	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00779	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00779	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Budig, Michael		00779	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00779	00005	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00779	00006	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02206	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02206	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Budig, Michael		02206	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00486	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00486	00002	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			00486	00003	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00486	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Catlin, James		00486	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00785	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00785	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Catlin, James		00785	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02210	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02210	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			02210	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			02210	00005	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Cederquist, John		02210	00006	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00786	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00786	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00786	00003	DC	C.3.1.2	C.3.1.3	--	--
			00786	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Cederquist, John		02211	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02211	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02211	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02211	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Utah (continued)									
C.9-264	Chalmers, Diana		01343	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01343	00002	DC	C.5.1	C.7.2.8	--	--
			01343	00003	DC	C.7.1.1.6		--	--
			01343	00004	DC	C.4.1	--	--	--
			01343	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Chesler, Bruce		01343	00006	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00303	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00303	00002	-----	C.3.2	--	--	--
			00303	00003	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00303	00004	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
			00303	00005	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00303	00006	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00303	00007	DC	C.4.1.1	--	--	--
			00303	00008	-----	C.3.2	--	--	--
	Chinn, Doug and Terrie		02662	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02662	00002	DC	C.7.1.2	C.7.4	--	--
			02662	00003	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--	--
			02662	00004	DC	C.7.4.2	C.7.1.2	--	--
	Clark, Douglas		00541	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00541	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00541	00003	DC	C.4.1.3.4	--	--	--
			00541	00004	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
	Coley, Phyllis		00825	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00825	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	C.7.2.5	--	--
			00825	00003	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			00825	00004	DC	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.2.4	--	--
			00825	00005	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00825	00006	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00825	00007	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
			00825	00008	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00825	00009	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Comstock, Johnston		00826	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00826	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00826	00003	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00826	00004	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
	Connor, Jeff		00740	00001	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			00740	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00740	00003	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Utah</u> (continued)									
	Cowley, Jill		00392	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00392	00002	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00392	00003	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
	Cowley, Jill		02231	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02231	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	C.7.4.2	--	--
			02231	00003	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			02231	00004	DC	C.7.2.4	C.7.4.2	--	--
			02231	00005	DC	C.7.1.1.6	C.7.2.6	--	--
	Craig, Lois		00288	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Crane, Ryan		00791	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			00791	00002	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
	Crockett, Rebecca A.		00487	00001	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			00487	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00487	00003	DC	C.6.5	--	--	--
	Cumings, Coreen		00801	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00801	00002	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			00801	00003	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00801	00004	DC	C.7.2.4	C.7.4.1	--	--
			00801	00005	DC	C.3.1.2	C.3.1.3	--	--
	Cummings, Day, Glenn		02260	00005	DC	C.2.7	--	--	--
	DeLong, Scott M.		00736	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01333	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01333	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			01333	00003	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			01333	00004	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			01333	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01333	00006	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
		Earth First	00784	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00784	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00784	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Dervage, Sara		00811	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00811	00002	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			00811	00003	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			00811	00004	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--	--
			00811	00005	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			00811	00006	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--	--
			00811	00007A	DC	C.4.1.3	C.7.2	--	--
			00811	00007B	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Utah</u> (continued)									
C.9-266	Donaldson, Christie		00811	00008	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01085	00002	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
			01085	00003	DC	C.7.2.8	C.5.1	--	--
			01085	00004	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01085	00005A	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			01085	00005B	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			01085	00005C	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			01085	00006	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Dondero, Thalia M. Dorsey, Bryan	Clark Cty Board of Commisioners	01085	00007	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
			02089	00001	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			00103	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00103	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Dougherty, Nina Dudek, Robert		00554	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00724	00001	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00724	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Dudek, Robert A.	Utahns Against the Dump	00724	00003	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			02095	00001	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			02095	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02095	00003	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
	Duffy, & Hall, Christopher & Brad	Utah State University	01498	00001	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01498	00002	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01498	00003	DC	C.5.1	C.4.1.2.2	--	--
			01498	00004	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01498	00005	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01498	00006	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01498	00007	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01498	00008	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01498	00009	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01498	00010	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01498	00011	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01498	00012	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01498	00013	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01498	00014	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01498	00015	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01498	00016	DC	C.5.1	C.4.1.2.2	--	--
			01498	00017	DC	C.5.1	C.4.1.2.2	--	--
			01498	00018	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
	01498	00019	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--		

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Utah</u> (continued)									
C.9-267	Eberhardt, Janice		01498	00020	-----	C.5.1	C.4.1.2.2	--	--
			01498	00021	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01498	00022	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01498	00023	DC	C.4.1.2.2	C.5.1	--	--
			01498	00024	DC	C.4.1.2.2	C.5.1	--	--
			01498	00025	DC	C.5.1	C.7.4.3	--	--
			01498	00026	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01498	00027	-----	C.5.1	C.4.1.2.2	--	--
			01498	00028	DC	C.5.1	C.4.1.2.2	--	--
			01498	00029	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
	Elegante, John C.		02672	00001	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02672	00002	DC	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02672	00003	DC	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02672	00004	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			00474	00001	DC	C.4.1.3.5	--	--	--
			00474	00002	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			00474	00003	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			00474	00004	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00474	00005A	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00474	00005B	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00474	00005C	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00474	00006	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00474	00007	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			00474	00008	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			00474	00009	DC	C.6.5	--	--	--
			00474	00010	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00474	00011	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
		Elrod, Dale		00474	00012	DC	C.7.4	--	--
			00474	00013	DC	C.5.10	--	--	--
			01297	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	01297		00002	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--	
	01297		00003	DC	C.7.3	C.5.1	--	--	
	01297		00004	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--	
	01297		00005	DC	C.7.1.1.8	C.7.2.8	--	--	
	01297		00006	DC	C.7.1.1.6	C.7.2.6	--	--	
Emmerich, Kevin		01297	00007	DC	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.2.4	C.4.1.3.6	--	
		00090	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
		00090	00002	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Utah</u> (continued)									
C.9-268	Erickson, Steve		00090	00003	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00776	00001	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			00776	00002	-----	C.2.1.3	--	--	--
			00776	00003	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			00776	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			00776	00005	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Ernstsen, Jerriam Evans, David K.		00776	00006	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			02237	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02228	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Fawn, Jessica		02228	00002	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
			00731	00001	-----	C.2.1.5	--	--	--
	Fernley, Norma M.		00731	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00731	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00251	00001	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			00251	00002	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			00251	00003	DC	C.4.1.3.4	--	--	--
			00251	00004	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00251	00005	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Flint, Steve		01058	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01058	00002	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			01058	00003	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			01058	00004	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01058	00005	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			Floor, Jeffrey	00778	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--
	00778			00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Floor, Jeffrey		02205	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02205	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Forney, Ellen		00793	00001	DC	C.4.1.5	--	--	--
			00793	00002	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
	Frear, Ruth		00792	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00792	00002	DC	C.7.1	--	--	--
			00792	00003	DC	C.4.1.3.3	C.7.2.3	C.7.1.1.3	--
			00792	00004	DC	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.2.4	--	--
			00792	00005	DC	C.7.1.1.6	C.4.1.3.6	C.7.2.6	--
			00792	00006	DC	C.7.1.1.6	C.4.1.3.6	--	--
			00792	00007	DC	C.7.2.5	C.7.1.1.5	--	--
			00792	00008	DC	C.7.2.4	C.7.1.1.4	C.4.1.3.5	--
			00792	00009	DC	C.4.1.3.5	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Utah</u> (continued)									
C.9-269	Frear, Ruth A.		02214	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02214	00002	DC	C.4.1	--	--	--
			02214	00003	DC	C.7.2.3	C.7.1.1.3	--	--
			02214	00004	DC	C.4.1.3.3	C.7.2.3	C.7.1.1.3	--
			02214	00005	DC	C.7.1.1.6	C.4.1.3.6	C.7.2.6	--
			02214	00006	DC	C.4.1.3.4	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--
			02214	00007	DC	C.4.1.3.4	--	--	--
			02214	00008	DC	C.7.2.4	C.7.1.1.4	C.4.1.3.5	--
			02214	00009	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			02214	00010	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			02214	00011	DC	C.7.1	--	--	--
			02214	00012	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			02214	00013	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02214	00014	DC	C.7.3	C.7.2.4	C.7.2.5	--
			02214	00015	DC	C.4.3	C.5.11	--	--
			02214	00016	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			02214	00017	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
	Galbraith, Milton E. & Audrey Galway, Lewis		00126	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00830	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00830	00002	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			00830	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00830	00004	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Gelatt, Lee		00830	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00725	00001A	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			00725	00001B	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
	Glynn & Breisch, Karen & Stuart		01294	00001	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01294	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01294	00003	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			01294	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Goff, Robert D.		01350	00001	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01350	00002	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			01350	00003	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			01350	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01350	00005	DC	C.4.1.2.1	--	--	--
			01350	00006	DC	C.7.2.7	--	--	--
			01350	00007	DC	C.7.2.4	C.7.2.5	--	--
	Goodtimes, Art		00929	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00929	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Utah</u> (continued)									
Goodwin, Russ			00929	00003	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00929	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00929	00005	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00759	00001	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
Goodwin, Russell			00759	00002	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			00759	00003	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			01224	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01224	00002	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
Goodwin, Russell			01224	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01224	00004	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			02194	00001	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			02194	00002	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
Gosselin, Gilles			02194	00003	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			02194	00004	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
			02194	00005	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			00744	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
Graham, Audrey			00744	00002	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00741	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00741	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00741	00003	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
Graham, Audrey & Tim			00741	00004	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			01171	00001	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			01171	00002	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01171	00003	DC	C.4.1.5.1	--	--	--
			01171	00004	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01171	00005	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			01171	00006	DC	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
			01171	00007	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			01171	00008	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01171	00009	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			01171	00010A	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01171	00010B	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
Graham, Tim			01171	00011A	DC	C.7.4	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.2.4	--
			01171	00011B	DC	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
			02253	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02253	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
Grandy, Lawrence			02253	00003	DC	C.4.1.1.5	C.5.7	--	--
			00795	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION				
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	
<u>Utah</u> (continued)										
	Greenberg, Robert		00743	00001	DC	C.4.1.5.4	--	--	--	
			00743	00002	DC	C.4.1.5.4	--	--	--	
			00743	00003	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--	
			00743	00004	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--	
			00743	00005	DC	C.7.1.2	C.7.4.4	--	--	
			00743	00006	DC	C.7.4.4	C.7.4.2	--	--	
			00743	00007	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--	
			00743	00011A	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--	
			00743	00011B	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--	
			00743	00013	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--	
			01582	00001	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--	
			01582	00002	DC	C.7.1	C.7.2.2	--	--	
			01582	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
			01582	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
	Greenwalt, Tami R.		00109	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
			00109	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--	
			00109	00004	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--	
			00757	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
			00757	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
	Grizzard, James		00757	00003	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--	
			00757	00004	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--	
			00320	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
			00320	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
			00320	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--	
	Haggard, Lois M.		00460	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
			00460	00002	DC	C.7.1.1	C.7.2	--	--	
			00460	00003	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--	
			00460	00004	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--	
	Haines, Octavia		00297	00001A	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--	
			00297	00001B	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--	
	Harden, et al., R.	Div of Oil, Gas and Mining		02635	00001	DC	C.4.1.1.9	C.7.2.1	--	--
				02635	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
				02635	00003	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
				02635	00004A	DC	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
				02635	00004B	DC	C.4.1.1.9	--	--	--
				02635	00005	DC	C.4.1.1.9	--	--	--
				02635	00006	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
				02635	00007	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION				
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	
Utah (continued)	C.9-272		02635	00008	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--	
			02635	00009	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--	
			02635	00010	DC	C.7.1.1	C.7.2	--	--	
			02635	00011	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--	
			02635	00012	DC	C.7.1.1	C.7.2	--	--	
			02635	00013	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--	
			02635	00014	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--	
			02635	00015	DC	C.4.2.3	--	--	--	
			02635	00016	DC	C.4.2.3	--	--	--	
			02635	00017	DC	C.4.2.3.	--	--	--	
			02635	00018	DC	C.4.2.3	--	--	--	
			02635	00019	DC	C.4.2.3	--	--	--	
			02635	00020	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--	
			02635	00021	DC	C.4.1.1.9	--	--	--	
			02635	00022	DC	C.4.1.1.9	C.7.2.2	--	--	
			02635	00023	DC	C.7.2.1	C.7.2.2	--	--	
			02635	00024	DC	C.7.2.8	--	--	--	
			02635	00025	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--	
			02635	00026	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--	
			02635	00027	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--	
			02635	00028	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--	
			02635	00029	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--	
			02635	00030	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--	
			02635	00031	DC	C.7.2.1	--	--	--	
			02635	00032	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--	
			02635	00033	DC	C.7.2.2	C.7.1.1.2	--	--	
			02635	00034	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--	
			02635	00035	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--	
			02635	00036	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--	
			02635	00037	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--	
			02635	00038	DC	C.7.2.2	C.7.3	--	--	
			02635	00039	DC	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--	
			02635	00040	-----	C.2.1.3	--	--	--	
			02635	00041	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--	
			02245	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
			Harris, L. Kay	00221	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			Hatch, Garn	00827	00001	DC	C.7.4	C.7.2.4	--	--
			Hatch, Garn	00827	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Utah (continued)									
C.9-273	Haun, Matthew		00827	00003	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00827	00004	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			01154	00001	DC	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
	Hazen, Gary		01154	00002	DC	C.7.1	--	--	--
			00733	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00733	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Heldon, Karen		00824	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			00824	00002	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			00824	00003	DC	C.5.2	--	--	--
	Henrie, Dr. James Russell Hines, Alesia		00824	00004	-----	C.2.4.2	--	--	--
			00824	00005	DC	C.5.3	C.5.11	--	--
			00824	00006	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			00824	00007	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			00824	00008	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02233	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00235	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00235	00002	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			00235	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00235	00004	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
	Holland, Dorothy		00235	00005	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00043	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00043	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Hollinbeck, Rick Holly, Troy		00043	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00930	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00804	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Holt, Donna		00804	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00804	00003	DC	C.5.7	--	--	--
			00804	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00804	00005	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			02251	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Howard, Councilmember Hoyal, Christina H.	Hoyal Construction, Inc.	02251	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			02090	00001	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			00108	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00108	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00108	00003A	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00108	00003B	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			00108	00004	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
			00108	00005	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Utah</u> (continued)									
	Hunt, Jeffrey M.	AB City Policy Department	00553	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00553	00002	DC	C.4.1.3	--	--	--
			00553	00003	DC	C.3.2	--	--	--
			00553	00004	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00553	00005	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Isenberg, June/ Ison, Daniel K.		00356	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02093	00001	DC	C.4.1.5.4	--	--	--
			02093	00002	DC	C.4.1.5.4	--	--	--
	Ives, Jeff		01534	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01534	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01534	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Jablouski, Mike		00774	00001	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--	--
			00774	00002	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--	--
			00774	00003	DC	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.2.4	--	--
			00774	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
		00774	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
	Jacob, Jerry R.	01600	00001	DC	C.7.1.2	C.7.4.2	C.4.1.5	--	
		01600	00002	DC	C.7.1.2	C.7.4.2	--	--	
		01600	00003	DC	C.4.1.5.2	C.7.1.2	C.7.4.2	--	
		01600	00004	DC	C.4.1.5.4	C.7.4.4	C.7.1.4	--	
		01600	00005	DC	C.4.1.5.4	C.7.1.2	C.7.4.4	--	
		01600	00006	DC	C.4.1.5.2	C.7.1.2	C.7.4.2	--	
		01600	00007	DC	C.4.1.3.1	C.7.1.1.1	C.7.2.1	--	
		01600	00008	DC	C.7.1.1	C.7.2	--	--	
		01600	00009	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--	
		01600	00010	DC	C.7.4	C.7.2.2	--	--	
		01600	00011	DC	C.7.4.3	--	--	--	
		01600	00012	DC	C.7.1.1.3	C.7.2.3	C.7.2.4	--	
		01600	00013	DC	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.2.4	--	--	
		01600	00014	DC	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.2.4	--	--	
		01600	00015	DC	C.7.1.1	C.7.2	--	--	
		01600	00016	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--	
	Jenkins, McDonald, Richard & Vicky	01069	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
		01069	00002	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--	
	Jensen, Steven	00829	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
		00829	00003	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--	
		00829	00005	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--	
		00829	00006	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Utah (continued)									
C.9-275	Jewett, Lawrence		00829	00007	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00829	00008	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00829	00009	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00829	00010	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			00829	00011	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00829	00012	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00770	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00770	00002	DC	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
			00770	00003	DC	C.7.1.1.3	C.7.2.3	--	--
			00770	00004	DC	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
			00770	00005	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			00770	00006	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			00770	00007	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			00770	00008	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			00770	00009	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Jewett, Lawrence		00770	00010	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			02202	00001	-----	C.3.2	--	--	--
			02202	00002	DC	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
			02202	00003	DC	C.7.1.1.3	C.7.2.3	--	--
			02202	00004	DC	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
			02202	00005	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			02202	00006	DC	C.4.1.3.4	--	--	--
			02202	00007	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			02202	00008	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02202	00009	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Johnson, Michael A.		02202	00010	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00614	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00614	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00614	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			00614	00004	DC	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
			00614	00005	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			00614	00006	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00614	00007	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
	Jorgensen, David M.		00614	00008	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00552	00001	-----	C.3.2	--	--	--
			00552	00002	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00552	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00552	00004	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Utah</u> (continued)									
C.9-276	Jorgensen, David		00552	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00552	00006	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00552	00007	DC	C.7.2	C.7.1	--	--
			00552	00008	DC	C.3.2	--	--	--
			00552	00009	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00552	00010	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00552	00011	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00552	00012	DC	C.3.2	--	--	--
			00828	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00828	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	C.7.2.5	--	--
			00828	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00828	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Karkut, James		00828	00006	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00805	00001	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			00805	00002	-----	C.3.2	--	--	--
			00805	00003	DC	C.4.1.3.4	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--
			00805	00004	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00805	00005	DC	C.7.4	C.4.1.1.5	--	--
			00805	00006	DC	C.4.1.5	--	--	--
			00805	00007	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02249	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00009	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Kelleher, Mark Kelling, Mitch Keyser, Esther Kinnersley, Blanche	Grand Co. Econ. Dev. Council	00723	00001	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			02219	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02219	00002	DC	C.4.1.3.4	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--
			02219	00003	DC	C.4.1.5	C.7.4	--	--
			02219	00004	DC	C.4.1.5	C.7.4	--	--
			02219	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00813	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00813	00002	DC	C.4.1.3	C.7.2	--	--
Kirschner, Mike		00813	00003	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--	--	
		00813	00004	DC	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.2.4	--	--	
		00813	00005	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--	
		00813	00006	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--	
		00813	00007	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
		00813	00008	DC	C.7.5	--	--	--	
		00739	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--	
		00739	00002	DC	C.7.2.1	--	--	--	
Kitchell, Kate ,									

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Utah (continued)									
C.9-277	Klinkenberg, Chris M. Knight, Charlotte		02247	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00777	00001	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
		00777	00002	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--	
		00777	00003	-----	C.2.5.1	--	--	--	
		00777	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
	Kobe, Kevin Joseph		00777	00005	DC	C.7.2.4	C.7.2.5	--	--
			00237	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00237	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00237	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Kobler, Mary Alyce		00809	00001	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			00809	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	C.7.2.5	--	--
			00809	00003	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			00809	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00809	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Krueger, Heather		00809	00006	DC	C.5.10	--	--	--
			00809	00007	DC	C.7.1	--	--	--
			00809	00008	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00823	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00823	00002	DC	C.6.3	--	--	--
			00823	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			00823	00004	DC	C.7.2.8	C.5.1	--	--
			00823	00005	DC	C.7.2.2	C.7.2.6	--	--
			00823	00006	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00823	00007	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			00823	00008	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			00823	00009	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00823	00010	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00823	00011	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
			00823	00012	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
			00823	00013	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
		Lavalle, Lance		00823	00014	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--
			00822	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	C.7.2.5	--	--
			00822	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00822	00003	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			00822	00004	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
	Lavdres, Peter Lehman, Dale		00822	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01298	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00933	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION				
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	
Utah (continued)										
C.9-278	Lehmann, Diane		00933	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
			00933	00003	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--	
			00933	00004	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--	
			00933	00005	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--	
			00933	00006	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--	
			00933	00007	DC	C.7.2.1	--	--	--	
			00832	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
	Levine, Deborah		00832	00002	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--	
			00767	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
			00767	00002	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--	
			00767	00003	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--	
			00767	00004	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--	
			00767	00005	DC	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--	
			00767	00006	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--	
			00767	00007	DC	C.4.1	--	--	--	
			00767	00008	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--	
			02201	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
			02201	00002	-----	C.2.3	--	--	--	
			02201	00003	-----	C.2.3	--	--	--	
			02201	00004	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--	
			02201	00005	DC	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--	
			02201	00006	-----	C.7.3	--	--	--	
			02201	00007	DC	C.4.1	--	--	--	
			02201	00008	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--	
	Lewis, Susan		00794	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--	
		Lewis, Andy		00810	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
				00810	00002	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			00810	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--	
			00810	00004	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--	
			00810	00005	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--	
			00810	00006	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
			00810	00007	DC	C.6.5	--	--	--	
			00810	00008	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--	
			00810	00009	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
	Lilieholm, David Lindahl, Alice M.		00781	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	C.7.2.5	--	--	
			00679	00001	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--	
		00679	00002	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--		
		00679	00003	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--		

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Utah</u> (continued)									
	Lindgren, Eric		00821	00001	DC	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			00821	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00821	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00821	00004	DC	C.4.1.3.5	--	--	--
			00821	00005	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			00821	00006	DC	C.7.2.4	C.7.2.5	--	--
			00821	00007	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			00821	00008	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00821	00009	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Lindgren, Kim		02235	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Lindgren, Eric R.		02240	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	C.7.2.5	--	--
	Lindsay, LaMar W.	State of Utah Comments	02638	00001	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
			02638	00002	DC	C.4.1.3.6	--	--	--
			02638	00003	DC	C.4.1.3.6	--	--	--
	Linn, Jeanie M.		01172	00001	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			01172	00002	DC	C.7.2.5	C.7.2.4	--	--
			01172	00003A	DC	C.7.4	C.7.2.4	--	--
			01172	00003B	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01172	00004	DC	C.7.2.6	C.4.1.3.6	--	--
			01172	00005	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01172	00006	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Liverman, Dr. D. M.		02636	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02636	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02636	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02636	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02636	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02636	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02636	00007	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02636	00008	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02636	00009	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02636	00010	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02636	00011	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02636	00012	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02636	00013	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02636	00014	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02636	00015	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02636	00016	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02636	00017	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Utah</u> (continued)									
Lockhart, William			02636	00018	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02636	00019	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02636	00020	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02636	00021	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02636	00022	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02636	00023	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02636	00024	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02636	00025	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02636	00026	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			00761	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00761	00002	DC	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			00761	00003	-----	C.7.5	--	--	--
			00761	00005	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			00761	00006	DC	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
			00761	00007	DC	C.4.1.3.6	--	--	--
			00761	00008	DC	C.5.1	C.5.3	--	--
			00761	00009	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			00761	00010	DC	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			00761	00011	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
	Lockhart, William J.			00761	00012	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--
			01261	00001	DC	C.4.1.3.6	--	--	--
			01261	00002	DC	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--
			01261	00003	DC	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
			01261	00004	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01261	00005	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01261	00006	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01261	00007	DC	C.4.1.3.4	--	--	--
			01261	00008	DC	C.4.1.5	--	--	--
			01261	00009	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01261	00010	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01261	00011	DC	C.4.1.1.2	C.5.1	--	--
			01261	00012	DC	C.4.1.3.3	C.7.2.3	--	--
			01261	00013	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01261	00014	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01261	00015	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
Lockhart, William J.			01261	00016	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01261	00017	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02196	00001	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION				
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	
<u>Utah</u> (continued)										
C 8-281	Lockhart, William J.		02196	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--	
			02196	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--	
			02196	00004	DC	C.4.1.3.4	--	--	--	
			02196	00005	DC	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--	
			02196	00006	DC	C.4.1.3.6	--	--	--	
			02196	00007	DC	C.5.1	C.5.3	--	--	
			02196	00008	-----	C.5.1	--	--	--	
			02196	00009	DC	C.4.2.3	--	--	--	
			02196	00010	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--	
			02196	00011	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--	
			02614	00001	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
			02614	00002	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
			02614	00003	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
			02614	00004	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
			02614	00005	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
			02614	00006	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
		02614	00007	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--		
		02614	00008A	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--		
		02614	00008B	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--		
		02614	00008C	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--		
		02614	00008D	-----	C.3.4.2	--	--	--		
		02614	00008E	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--		
		02614	00008F	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--		
		02614	00008G	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--		
		02614	00008H	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--		
		02614	00009	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--		
		Lucas, Ken		02673	00001	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--	--
				02673	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
				02673	00003	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
				02673	00004	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
				02673	00005	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
		Lumdahl, Corde11		00768	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
				00768	00002	-----	C.2.4.2	--	--	--
	Lusk, Mark W.		00063	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
			00063	00002	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--	
			00063	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--	
			00063	00004	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--	
	Lyon, Thomas J.		00252	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Utah</u> (continued)									
C.9-282	Mangum, Todd Mangum, Todd Manning, Steven Marder, Joyce Martin, Terri Mason, Patrice Matheson, Scott M.	Utahns for Canyonlands	00252	00002	DC	C.4.1.3.4	--	--	--
			00252	00003	DC	C.4.1.3	--	--	--
			00252	00004	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00252	00005	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00797	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02215	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00769	00001	DC	C.4.1.3.6	C.3.2	--	--
			00769	00002	DC	C.4.1.3.6	--	--	--
			00762	00001	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00760	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00760	00002	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			00760	00003	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00760	00004	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00760	00005	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00742	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01235	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01235	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01235	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01235	00004	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			01235	00005	-----	C.2.4.3	--	--	--
			01235	00006	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01235	00007	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01235	00008	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01235	00009	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01235	00010	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01235	00011	DC	C.7.2.8	C.7.2.1	--	--
			01235	00012A	DC	C.4.3	C.8.1	--	--
			01235	00012B	DC	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
			01235	00014	DC	C.7.1.1.8	C.4.3	--	--
			01235	00016	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			01235	00017	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01235	00018A	DC	C.4.1.1	C.4.1.2	--	--
			01235	00018B	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01235	00019	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
			01235	00020	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
			01235	00021	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			01235	00022	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01235	00023	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Utah</u> (continued)									
C.9-283	Matheson, Scott M.		01235	00024	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01235	00025	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			01235	00026	-----	C.2.4.2	--	--	--
			01235	00027	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
			01235	00028	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			01235	00029	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01235	00030	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01235	00031	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01235	00032	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01235	00033	DC	C.5.6	C.7.3	C.7.4	C.7.2.8
			01235	00034	DC	C.4.1.3.6	--	--	--
			01235	00035	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01235	00036	DC	C.4.1.3.6	--	--	--
			01235	00037	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			01235	00038	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			01235	00039	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01235	00040	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01235	00041	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02189	00001	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			02189	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02189	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02189	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02189	00005	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			02189	00006	DC	C.7.3	C.5.6	--	--
			02189	00007	DC	C.7.1.1.6	--	--	--
			02189	00008	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			02189	00009	DC	C.7.1.1.6	--	--	--
			02189	00010	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02189	00011	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			02189	00012	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02189	00013	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02189	00014	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
		Matis, Lew	00922	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
		Maxfield, Cory	00922	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00803	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00803	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00803	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			00803	00004	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Utah</u> (continued)									
C.9-284	Maxfield, Cory		00803	00005	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00803	00006	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			00803	00007	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00803	00008	DC	C.7.2.5	C.7.1.1.5	--	--
			00803	00009	DC	C.4.1.5	C.7.4	--	--
			00803	00010	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00803	00011	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
			00803	00012	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02218	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02218	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02218	00003	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
			02218	00004	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
	Mazurski, Madeline		02218	00005	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			01117	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01117	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01117	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	McCarrick, J. E.		02224	00001	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			02224	00002	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
			02224	00003	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			02224	00004	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			02224	00005	DC	C.5.3	--	--	--
			02224	00006	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			02224	00007	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02224	00008	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			02224	00009	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			02224	00010	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	McCawley, Dr. Paul F.		02229	00001	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02229	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02229	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	McClatchy, Millie		00748	00001	DC	C.7.1.2	C.3.4.4	--	--
			00748	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			00748	00003	DC	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
			00748	00004	DC	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
	McCool, Susan		00748	00005	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00923	00001	DC	C.7.1	--	--	--
			00923	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
	McCool, Lewis		00925	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00925	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION				
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	
<u>Utah</u> (continued)										
C.9-285	McGraw, Don		00925	00003	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--	
			00925	00004	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--	
			00925	00006	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--	
			00925	00007	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--	
			00925	00008	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--	
			00925	00009	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--	
			00366	00001	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--	
			00366	00002	DC	C.4.1.1	--	--	--	
			00366	00003	DC	C.4.1.1	--	--	--	
			00366	00004	DC	C.4.1.1	--	--	--	
	McGraw, Don		00366	00005	DC	C.5.2	--	--	--	
			00366	00006A	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--	
			00366	00006B	-----	C.2.4.2	--	--	--	
			00366	00007	DC	C.4.1.1	--	--	--	
			00807	00001	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--	
			00807	00002	DC	C.5.2	--	--	--	
			00807	00003	DC	C.5.2	C.5.11	--	--	
			00807	00004	DC	C.5.2	--	--	--	
			00807	00005	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--	
			00807	00006	DC	C.4.1.2.2	C.5.1	--	--	
			00807	00007	DC	C.5.6	C.4.1.1.6	--	--	
			00807	00008	DC	C.4.1.2.2	C.5.1	--	--	
			00807	00009	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--	
			00807	00010	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--	
			00807	00011	DC	C.5.3	C.5.11	--	--	
			00807	00012	DC	C.3.2	C.5.8	--	--	
			00807	00013	DC	C.4.1.1.8	C.5.8	--	--	
			00807	00014	DC	C.5.2	C.5.11	--	--	
			00807	00015	DC	C.4.1.1.8	C.5.11	--	--	
			00807	00016	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--	
	McGraw, Don	Physics Department		00807	00017	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
				00807	00018	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
				00807	00019	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
				00807	00020	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
				02220	00001	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
				02220	00002	DC	C.5.11	C.5.2	--	--
				02220	00003	DC	C.5.11	C.5.2	--	--
				02220	00004	DC	C.5.2	C.5.11	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Utah</u> (continued)									
C.9-286	Meador, Bill B. Meador, Bill B. Meehan, William	Grand County School District	02220	00005	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			02220	00006	DC	C.4.2.2.2	C.5.1	--	--
			02220	00007	DC	C.5.6	C.4.1.1.6	--	--
			02220	00009	DC	C.5.1	C.4.1.1.6	--	--
			02220	00010	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			02220	00011	DC	C.5.3	C.5.11	--	--
			02220	00012	-----	C.3.2	--	--	--
			02220	00013	DC	C.4.1.1.8	C.5.8	--	--
			02220	00014	DC	C.5.8	C.5.10	--	--
			02220	00015	DC	C.5.10	C.4.1.1.8	--	--
			02220	00016	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--
			02220	00017	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--
			02220	00018	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			02220	00019	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			02220	00020	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
			00137	00001	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			02092	00001	DC	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	--
			02092	00002	DC	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			00782	00002	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--	--
			00782	00003	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			00782	00004	DC	C.4.1.3.4	--	--	--
			00782	00005	DC	C.7.2.5	C.7.1.1.5	--	--
			00782	00006	DC	C.4.1.3.3	C.7.1.1.3	C.7.2.3	--
			00782	00007	DC	C.4.1.3.3	C.7.1.1.3	C.7.2.3	--
			00782	00008	DC	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.2.4	--	--
			00782	00009	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00782	00010	DC	C.7.3	C.4.1.4	--	--
			00782	00011	DC	C.4.1.3.6	--	--	--
	Meehan, William A.	02208	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
		02208	00002	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--	--	
		02208	00003	DC	C.4.1.3.4	--	--	--	
		02208	00004	DC	C.4.1.3.4	--	--	--	
		02208	00005	DC	C.4.1.3.4	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--	
		02208	00006	DC	C.4.1.3.3	C.7.1.1.3	C.7.2.3	--	
		02208	00007	DC	C.4.1.3.3	C.7.1.1.3	C.7.2.3	--	
		02208	00008	DC	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.2.4	--	--	
		02208	00009	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--	
		02208	00010	DC	C.7.3	C.4.1.4	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Utah</u> (continued)									
C. 9-287	Merrell, Harvey W.		02208	00011	DC	C.4.1.3.6	--	--	--
			00734	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00734	00002	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			00734	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00734	00004	-----	C.3.4.2.1	--	--	--
			00734	00005	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			00734	00006	-----	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00734	00007	-----	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00734	00008	-----	C.3.4.2.1	--	--	--
			00734	00009	-----	C.3.4.2	--	--	--
	Merrell, Harvey W.		00734	00010	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
			00734	00011	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
			00734	00012	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01541	00002	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01541	00003	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01541	00004	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01541	00005	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01541	00006	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01541	00007	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01541	00008	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
Merrell, Harvey W.	01541	00009	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--		
	01541	00010	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--		
	01541	00011	-----	C.3.4.2.1	--	--	--		
	01541	00012	-----	C.3.4.2.1	--	--	--		
	01541	00013	-----	C.3.4.2.1	--	--	--		
	01541	00014	-----	C.3.4.2.1	--	--	--		
	01541	00015	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--		
	01541	00016	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--		
	01541	00017	-----	C.3.4.2.3	--	--	--		
	01541	00018	-----	C.3.4.2.3	--	--	--		
	01541	00019	-----	C.3.4.2.3	--	--	--		
	01541	00020	-----	C.3.4.2.3	--	--	--		
	01541	00021	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--		
	01541	00022	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--		
	01542	00001	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--		
	01542	00002	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--		
	01542	00003	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--		
	01542	00004	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--		

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION				
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	
<u>Utah</u> (continued)										
C o n f i d e n t i a l	Merrell, Harvey W.		01542	00005	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
			01542	00006	-----	C.3.4.2.1	--	--	--	
			01542	00007	-----	C.3.4.2.3	--	--	--	
			01542	00008A	-----	C.3.4.2.1	--	--	--	
			01542	00008B	-----	C.3.4.2.1	--	--	--	
			01542	00009	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--	
			01542	00010	-----	C.3.4.2.3	--	--	--	
			01542	00011	-----	C.3.4.2.3	C.3.4.3	--	--	
			01542	00012	-----	C.3.4.2.3	--	--	--	
			01542	00013	-----	C.3.4.2.3	--	--	--	
			01542	00014	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
			01542	00015	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
			01543	00001	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--	
			01543	00002	DC	C.4.1.5.1	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	
			01543	00003	DC	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--	
			01543	00004	DC	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	--	
			01543	00005	DC	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	--	
			01543	00006	DC	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	--	
			01543	00007	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--	
			01543	00008	DC	C.4.1	--	--	--	
			01543	00009	DC	C.6.2	--	--	--	
			01543	00010	DC	C.6.3	--	--	--	
			01543	00011	DC	C.6.3	--	--	--	
			01543	00012	DC	C.6.3	--	--	--	
			01543	00013	DC	C.6.3	--	--	--	
			01543	00014	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--	
			01543	00016	DC	C.4.1.1	--	--	--	
		Merrell, Harvey W.		01544	00001	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
				01544	00002	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
				01544	00003	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
				01544	00004	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
				01544	00005	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
				01544	00006	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
	01544		00007	-----	C.3.4.2.1	--	--	--		
	01544		00008	-----	C.3.4.2.2	C.3.4.3	--	--		
	01544		00009	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--		
	01544		00010	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--		
	01544		00011	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--		

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Utah</u> (continued)									
C.9-289	Merrell, Harvey W.		01545	00001	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01545	00002	-----	C.3.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01545	00007	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01545	00009	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01545	00019	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--
	Merrell, Harvey W.		02099	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02099	00002	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02099	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02099	00004	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02099	00005	-----	C.3.4.2.1	--	--	--
			02099	00006	-----	C.3.4.2	--	--	--
			02099	00007	-----	C.3.4.2	--	--	--
			02099	00008	-----	C.3.4.2.1	--	--	--
			02099	00009	-----	C.3.4.2	--	--	--
			02099	00010	DC	C.7.4	C.7.1.2	--	--
			02099	00011	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
			02099	00012	-----	C.3.4.2.3	--	--	--
			02099	00013	-----	C.3.4.2.3	--	--	--
			02099	00014	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02099	00015	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
	Millham, Bertha C.		00053	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00053	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00053	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00790	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Minix, Casey		00301	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
		Mitchell, Dr. Jerry K.		00301	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--
			00301	00003	DC	C.7.1	--	--	--
			00301	00004	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
	00301		00005	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--	
	00301		00006	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--	
	00301		00007	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
	00339		00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--	
Mitchell, Pat		00339	00002	DC	C.4.1.3	--	--	--	
		00339	00003	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--	
Montrose, K. Hugh		02091	00001	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--	
	Moorehead, Jeffrey		00932	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
		00932	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
Morgan, Billy Mack		00747	00002	-----	C.7.2.4	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION				
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	
<u>Utah</u> (continued)										
C. 9-290	Morrison, Stan		00747	00003	DC	C. 7.3	--	--	--	
			00127	00001A	-----	C. 2.8.3	--	--	--	
			00127	00001B	DC	C. 4.2.1	--	--	--	
			00127	00002	DC	C. 5.2	--	--	--	
	Moseley, Mica		00127	00003	DC	C. 4.2.2	--	--	--	
			00467	00001	-----	C. 3.4.4	--	--	--	
	Mulvey, William E.		00467	00002	DC	C. 3.1.3	--	--	--	
			02232	00001	-----	C. 3.4.4	--	--	--	
	Mulvey, Debra Dellinger		02232	00002	DC	C. 5.7	--	--	--	
			02241	00001	-----	C. 3.4.4	--	--	--	
	Nelson, Roger N.		02248	00001	-----	C. 3.4.4	--	--	--	
	Newman, Mr. & Mrs. A. O.		00005	00001	-----	C. 3.4.4	--	--	--	
	Nichols, Amber		00831	00001	-----	C. 3.1.2	--	--	--	
			00831	00002	-----	C. 3.1.2	--	--	--	
	Norcross, Frances		00831	00003	DC	C. 7.1	--	--	--	
			00806	00001	-----	C. 3.1.2	--	--	--	
			00806	00002	-----	C. 3.2	--	--	--	
			00806	00003	DC	C. 7.1.1.5	C. 7.2.5	--	--	
			00806	00004	-----	C. 3.1.2	--	--	--	
	Nordling, Thea K.		00388	00001	DC	C. 7.2.5	--	--	--	
			00388	00002	DC	C. 7.2.4	--	--	--	
			00388	00003	DC	C. 7.2	--	--	--	
			00388	00004	DC	C. 7.3	--	--	--	
			00388	00005	DC	C. 7.2.6	--	--	--	
			00388	00006	DC	C. 4.2.1	--	--	--	
			00388	00007	DC	C. 7.2	--	--	--	
			00728	00001	-----	C. 3.4.3	--	--	--	
	Norman, Robert		00728	00002	-----	C. 3.4.1	--	--	--	
			00728	00003	-----	C. 3.4.2.1	--	--	--	
			00728	00004	DC	C. 7.1.2	C. 7.4	--	--	
			00728	00005	-----	C. 3.4.2.3	--	--	--	
			00728	00006	-----	C. 3.4.2.2	--	--	--	
			00728	00007	DC	C. 7.4.3	--	--	--	
			00728	00008	-----	C. 3.4.3	--	--	--	
			00728	00009	-----	C. 3.4.3	--	--	--	
			00728	00010	DC	C. 8.2	C. 3.4.1	--	--	
			00728	00011	DC	C. 8.2	C. 3.4.1	--	--	
			02098	00001	-----	C. 3.4.3	--	--	--	
			Norman, Robert R.							

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Utah</u> (continued)									
			02098	00002	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			02098	00003	-----	C.3.4.2.1	--	--	--
			02098	00004	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
			02098	00005	-----	C.3.4.2.3	--	--	--
			02098	00006	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
			02098	00007	DC	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			02098	00008	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
Norman, Robert C.		Buttes Resources Company	00132	00001	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			00132	00002	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
Nystrom, Jarl B.			01348	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01348	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01348	00003	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			01348	00004	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01348	00005	DC	C.5.3	C.4.1.1.5	--	--
			01348	00006	-----	C.2.5.1	--	--	--
			01348	00007	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01348	00008	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
O'Connell, Jean, Peter & Timothy			00021	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00021	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
O'Neill, Janet Taylor			00088	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
Olshansky, S. Jay		University of Utah	01540	00001	DC	C.4.1.5	C.7.1.2	C.7.4	--
			01540	00002	DC	C.4.1.5.1	--	--	--
			01540	00003	DC	C.4.1.5.1	--	--	--
			01540	00004	DC	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			01540	00005	DC	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			01540	00006	DC	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	--
			01540	00007	DC	C.4.1.4	--	--	--
			01540	00008	DC	C.7.1.1.9	--	--	--
			01540	00009	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
			01540	00010	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
			01540	00011	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01540	00012	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01540	00013	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01540	00014	DC	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			01540	00015	DC	C.7.4.4	--	--	--
			01540	00019	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01540	00020	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01540	00021	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Utah</u> (continued)									
Oram, Debbie			01540	00022	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01540	00023	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01344	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01344	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
Oram, Debbie	Utahns Against the Dump	01344	00003	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--	
		01344	00004	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--	
		01340	00001	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--	
		01340	00002	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--	
Oviatt, Susan		01340	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		01340	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		01340	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		01340	00006	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--	
		00627	00001	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--	
		00627	00002	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--	
		00627	00003	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--	
		00627	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
		00628	00002	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--	
		00628	00003	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--	
Oviatt, Charles G.		00628	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
		02236	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
		02238	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
		01242	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
Oviatt, Jack Oviatt, Susan Pass, Merlin R.		01242	00002	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--	
		01242	00003	DC	C.4.1	--	--	--	
		01242	00004	DC	C.4.1.1	C.4.1.2	--	--	
		01242	00005	DC	C.4.1.3	C.4.1.4	--	--	
		01242	00006	DC	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--	
		01242	00007	DC	C.4.1.3.6	--	--	--	
		01242	00008	DC	C.7.3	C.7.2.8	C.7.1.1.8	--	
		01242	00009	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--	
		01242	00010	DC	C.4.1	--	--	--	
		01242	00011	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--	
		01242	00012	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--	
		01242	00013	DC	C.5.1	C.3.2	--	--	
		01242	00014	DC	C.5.1	C.5.6	--	--	
		01242	00015	DC	C.5.6	C.5.2	--	--	
		01242	00016	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--	
		01242	00017	DC	C.4.1.2	--	--	--	

C.9-292

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Utah</u> (continued)									
C.9-293	Paterson Jensen, Danielle Margie		01242	00018	DC	C.4.1	--	--	--
			01242	00019	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01242	00020	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01242	00021	DC	C.4.1.1.7	--	--	--
			01242	00022	DC	C.4.1.1.6	--	--	--
			01242	00023	DC	C.7.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01242	00024	DC	C.4.1.3	--	--	--
			01242	00025	DC	C.7.3	C.3.2	--	--
			01242	00026	DC	C.4.1.5	--	--	--
			01242	00027	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01140	00001	-----	C.2.3	--	--	--
			01140	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01140	00003	-----	C.2.3	--	--	--
			01140	00004	DC	C.5.1	C.7.2.8	--	--
			01140	00005	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01140	00006	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			01140	00007	DC	C.4.1.3.4	C.7.1.1.5	--	--
			01140	00008	DC	C.7.4	C.7.2.4	--	--
	Paul1, Stephen E. Peterson, Dr. F. Ross		02243	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02226	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Petition	Don't Waste Utah Campaign	02226	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			02100	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Pettis, Margaret Pettis, Margaret Pickerell, Loretta		01118	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00772	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02203	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Pickerell, Loretta		00753	00001	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			00753	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00753	00003	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			00753	00004	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			00753	00005	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			01264	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01264	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01264	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01264	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01264	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01264	00006A	DC	C.3.1.2	C.3.1.3	--	--
			01264	00006B	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01264	00007	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION				
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	
<u>Utah</u> (continued)										
			01264	00008	DC	C.7.1.1.1	C.7.2.1	--	--	
			01264	00009	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	C.4.1.3.4	--	
			01264	00010	DC	C.7.1.1.3	C.7.2.3	C.4.1.3.3	--	
			01264	00011A	DC	C.7.1.1.3	C.7.2.3	C.4.1.3.3	--	
			01264	00011B	-----	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.2.4	--	--	
			01264	00012	DC	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.2.4	C.4.1.3.5	--	
			01264	00013	DC	C.7.1.1.6	C.7.2.6	C.4.1.3.6	--	
			01264	00014	DC	C.7.1.1.2	C.7.2.2	C.4.1.3.2	--	
			01264	00015	DC	C.7.1.2	C.7.4.2	C.4.1.5	--	
			01264	00016	DC	C.4.1.3	C.7.2	C.7.1.1	--	
			01264	00017	DC	C.7.1.1.9	--	--	--	
Pickere11, Loretta	Wilderness Society, Sierra Club		02191	00001	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--	
			02191	00002	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--	
			02191	00003	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--	
			02191	00004	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--	
			02191	00005	DC	C.4.1.3.4	C.7.2.5	--	--	
			02191	00006	DC	C.4.1.3.4	--	--	--	
			02191	00007	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--	
			02191	00008	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--	
			02191	00009	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--	
			02191	00010	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--	
			02191	00011	DC	C.7.1.1.3	C.7.2.3	--	--	
			02191	00012	DC	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--	
			02191	00013	DC	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--	
			02191	00014	DC	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	--	
			02191	00015	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--	
			02191	00016	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--	
			02191	00017	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--	
			02191	00018	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--	
			02191	00019	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--	
			02191	00020	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--	
			02191	00021	DC	C.4.3.6	--	--	--	
			02191	00022	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--	
			02191	00023	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--	
			02191	00024	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--	
			02191	00025	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
					02191	00026	DC	C.7.3	--	--
					02191	00027	DC	C.7.3	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Utah</u> (continued)									
			02191	00028	DC	C.4.1.1	C.4.1.2	--	--
			02191	00029	DC	C.4.1.2	--	--	--
			02191	00030	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			02191	00031	DC	C.4.1.1	C.7.1	--	--
			02191	00032	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			02191	00033	DC	C.5.1	C.7.2	--	--
			02191	00034	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			02191	00035	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02191	00036	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			02191	00037	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
Pingree, Timothy F.			00192	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00192	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
Plenk, Bruce			00787	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00787	00002	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00787	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	C.2.4.1	--	--
			00787	00004	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00787	00005	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--	--
			00787	00006	DC	C.7.1.1.6	C.7.2.6	--	--
			00787	00007	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
Pomble, David			00796	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00796	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
Radine, Gene		U.S. Department of Interior	02118	00001	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			02118	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			02118	00003	DC	C.4.1.5	--	--	--
			02118	00004	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			02118	00005	DC	C.4.1.2	--	--	--
			02118	00006	DC	--	--	--	--
			02118	00007	DC	C.4.1	--	--	--
			02118	00008	DC	--	--	--	--
			02118	00009	DC	--	--	--	--
			02118	00010	DC	C.4.1.2.1	C.4.1.2.2	--	--
			02118	00011	DC	C.4.1.2.1	--	--	--
			02118	00012	DC	C.4.1.2.3	--	--	--
			02118	00013	-----	--	--	--	--
			02118	00014	DC	--	--	--	--
			02118	00015	DC	C.7.1.2	C.7.4	--	--
			02118	00016	DC	--	--	--	--
			02118	00017	DC	--	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION				
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	
C. 9-296	Utah (continued)									
				02118	00018	DC	--	--	--	--
				02118	00019	DC	--	--	--	--
				02118	00020	DC	C.5.8	--	--	--
				02118	00021	DC	--	--	--	--
				02118	00022	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
				02118	00023	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
				02118	00024	DC	--	--	--	--
				02118	00025	DC	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
				02118	00026	DC	--	--	--	--
				02118	00027	DC	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
				02118	00028	DC	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
				02118	00029	DC	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
				02118	00030	DC	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
				02118	00031	DC	--	--	--	--
				02118	00032	DC	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
				02118	00033	DC	--	--	--	--
				02118	00034	DC	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
				02118	00035	DC	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
				02118	00036	DC	--	--	--	--
				02118	00037	DC	C.4.1.3.5	--	--	--
				02118	00038	DC	C.4.1.3.5	--	--	--
				02118	00039	DC	C.4.1.3.7	--	--	--
				02118	00040	DC	C.4.1.4	--	--	--
				02118	00041	DC	C.4.1.4	--	--	--
				02118	00042	DC	C.4.1.5.1	--	--	--
				02118	00043	DC	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
				02118	00044	DC	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	--
				02118	00045	DC	C.4.1.5.4	--	--	--
				02118	00046	DC	--	--	--	--
				02118	00047	DC	--	--	--	--
				02118	00048	DC	C.4.2.1	--	--	--
				02118	00049	DC	--	--	--	--
				02118	00050	DC	--	--	--	--
				02118	00051	DC	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
				02118	00052	DC	C.7.1.1.2	--	--	--
				02118	00053	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
				02118	00054	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
				02118	00055	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Utah</u> (continued)									
C.9-297	Raines, Paula		02118	00057	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02118	00058	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			02118	00059	DC	C.7.1.1.6	--	--	--
			02118	00060	DC	C.7.1.1.6	--	--	--
			02118	00061	DC	C.7.1.1.6	C.7.2	--	--
			02118	00062	DC	C.7.1.1.3	--	--	--
			02118	00063	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
			02118	00064	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
			02118	00065	DC	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
			02118	00067	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
			02118	00068	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02118	00069	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02118	00070	DC	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			02118	00071	DC	C.7.4.5	--	--	--
			00814	00001	DC	C.3.1.2	C.3.1.3	--	--
			00814	00002	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00814	00003	DC	C.5.3	C.4.1.1	--	--
			00814	00004	DC	C.5.10	C.5.1	--	--
			00814	00005	DC	C.5.1	C.4.1.2.2	--	--
			00814	00006	DC	C.4.1.2.2	C.5.1	C.7.2.8	--
			00814	00007	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			00814	00008	DC	C.7.2.5	C.7.1.1.5	--	--
			00814	00009	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--	--
			00814	00010	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
		00818	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
		00812	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
		00812	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
		00812	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
		00812	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
		00812	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
		00931	00001	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
		00931	00002	-----	C.3.4.2.1	--	--	--	
		00931	00003	-----	C.3.4.2.3	--	--	--	
		00931	00004	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--	
		00931	00005	DC	C.7.4.3	--	--	--	
		00931	00006	DC	C.7.4.3	--	--	--	
		00931	00007	DC	C.6.2	--	--	--	
		00931	00008	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

C.9-298

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Utah</u> (continued)									
Reece, Ron		Utah Audubon Society	00931	00009	DC	C.4.1.5.1	--	--	--
			02114	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02114	00002	DC	C.7.1.1	C.7.2	--	--
			02114	00003	DC	C.7.1.2	C.7.4	--	--
			02114	00004	DC	C.7.1.2	C.7.4	--	--
			02114	00005	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
Relling, Mary V.			02114	00006	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02114	00007	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--	--
			02256	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02256	00002	DC	C.7.2.5	C.7.1.1.5	--	--
			02256	00003	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			02256	00004	DC	C.7.4	C.7.2.2	--	--
Remington, Bruce			02256	00005	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
			00333	00001	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00333	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00333	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00333	00004	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00333	00005	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
Richardson and Fam., Reed C.			00464	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00464	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
Riley, Brent			00729	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00756	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00756	00002	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
Riley, Brent		ROCPAC	00756	00003	-----	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			01391	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	C.7.2.5	--	--
			01391	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			01391	00003	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			01391	00004	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			01391	00005	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			01391	00006	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01391	00007	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01391	00008	DC	C.7.2	C.7.2.4	C.7.2.6	--
			01391	00011	DC	C.3.2	--	--	--
			01391	00012	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01391	00013	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			01391	00014	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			01391	00015	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			01391	00016	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

C.9-299

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Utah (continued)									
Riley, Brent C.	Respectors of Canyonlands PAC	01391	00017	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--	
		02121	00001	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--	
		02121	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--	
		02121	00003	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--	
		02121	00004	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--	
		02121	00005	DC	C.4.1	--	--	--	
		02121	00007	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--	
		02121	00008	DC	C.6.2	--	--	--	
		02121	00009A	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--	
		02121	00009B	DC	C.7.4.4	--	--	--	
		02121	00010	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--	
		02121	00012	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--	
		02121	00013	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--	
		02121	00014	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--	
		02121	00015	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--	
		02121	00016	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--	
		02121	00017	DC	C.7.4.4	--	--	--	
		02121	00018	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--	
		02121	00019	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--	
		02121	00020	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--	
		02121	00021	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--	
		02121	00022	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--	
		02121	00023	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--	
		Roach, Josephine R.	00114	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00114	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00114	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
Rodine, Gene	02118	00006	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--		
	02118	00008	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--		
	02118	00009	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--		
	02118	00013	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--		
	02118	00014	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--		
	02118	00016	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--		
	02118	00017	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--		
	02118	00018	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--		
	02118	00019	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--		
	02118	00021	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--		
	02118	00024	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--		
	02118	00026	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--		

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION				
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	
C.9-300	Utah (continued)									
				02118	00031	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
				02118	00033	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
				02118	00036	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
				02118	00046	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
				02118	00047	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
				02118	00049	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
				02118	00050	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
		Rogers, Lester		00721	00001	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
				00721	00002	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
				00721	00003	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
				00721	00004	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
				00721	00005	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
				00721	00006	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
		Rogers, Laura		00754	00002A	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
				00754	00002B	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
				00754	00003	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
				00754	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
		Rogers, Lester W.		02088	00001	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
				02088	00002	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
				02088	00003	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
				02088	00004	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
				02088	00005	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
				02088	00006	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
		Rogers, Laura		02192	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
				02192	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
				02192	00003	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
				02192	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
		Rogers, Lester W.	Rogers Roost Service	01251	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
		Rogers, Lester & Margie		01252	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
				01252	00002	DC	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.2.4	C.7.4	--
				01252	00003	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
				01252	00004	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
				01252	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
		Ross, Janet	Dir, Windsong Wilderness Exped.	00620	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
				00620	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
		Rouzer, Dr. Steven V.		00243	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
				00243	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
		Roybal/Parsons, Christy/Davis		02710	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Utah (continued)									
C-9-301	Salt, Jeff		02710	00002	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
			00820	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00820	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00820	00003	DC-----	C.3.1.2	C.3.1.3	--	--
			00820	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00820	00005	DC	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
			00820	00006	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00820	00007	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			00820	00008	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00820	00009	DC	C.5.10	--	--	--
	Salzberg, Sarah Rule Schaffer, Ann		00820	00010	DC	C.6.3	--	--	--
			00102	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00470	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00470	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Schmidt, Jerry		00802	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00802	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00802	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00802	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00802	00005	-----	2.3.1	--	--	--
			00802	00006	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
			00802	00007	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00802	00008	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Schrader, Patty		00745	00001	DC	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
			00745	00002	DC	C.7.2.1	C.7.1.1.1	--	--
	Schultz, George	Chinle Associates	01086	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01086	00002	DC,DS,RN	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			01086	00003	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01086	00005	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01086	00006	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			01086	00007	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01086	00008	-----	C.3.4.4	C.7.3	--	--
			00758	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
Seed, Deeda		00758	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--	
		00758	00003	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--	
		00758	00004	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--	
		00258	00001A	DC	C.4.1.3.4	--	--	--	
Severance, Owen		00258	00001B	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--	
		00258	00001C	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Utah</u> (continued)									
			00258	00002A	DC	C.4.1.5.4	--	--	--
			00258	00002B	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00258	00003	DC	C.4.1.3.6	--	--	--
			00258	00004	DC	C.3.2	--	--	--
			00258	00005	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Severance, Owen		00269	00001	DC	C.4.1.3.4	--	--	--
			00269	00002A	DC	C.4.1.5	--	--	--
			00269	00002B	DC	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			00269	00003	DC	C.4.1.3.6	--	--	--
			00269	00004	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			00269	00005	DC	C.4.1.5	--	--	--
	Sharpsteen, Catherine		00077	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00077	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Siegendorf, Lloyd & Mary Anne		02246	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Slade, Joe		00926	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00926	00002	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
			00926	00003	DC	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.2.4	--	--
			00926	00004	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00926	00005	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00926	00006	DC	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	--
	Slade, Joe		02183	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02183	00002	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			02183	00003	DC	C.7.2.4	C.7.2.5	--	--
			02183	00004	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			02183	00005	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02183	00006	DC	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			02183	00007	DC	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			02183	00008	-----	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
	Sleight, Ken		00722	00001	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			00722	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			00722	00003	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
	Sleight, Ken	Ken Sleight Expeditions	02094	00001	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02094	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02094	00003	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
	Smith, Del		02225	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02225	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			02225	00003	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			02225	00004	DC	C.7.1.1.6	C.7.2.6	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

C.9-303

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Utah (continued)									
	Smith, Marshall & Margene	Strauss Uniforms	01580	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01580	00002	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01580	00003	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01580	00004	DC	C.4.1.3.4	C.7.2.5	--	--
			01580	00005	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01580	00006	DC	C.7.2.4	C.7.2.5	--	--
	Snow, Carl		00751	00001	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00751	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00751	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00751	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00751	00005	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			00751	00006	DC	C.7.3	C.5.6	--	--
			00751	00007	DC	C.7.1.1.6	--	--	--
			00751	00008	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00751	00009	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			00751	00010	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			00751	00011	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			00751	00012	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00751	00013	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00751	00014	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Snythe, Stewart		00808	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00808	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00808	00003	DC	C.4.1.3.5	--	--	--
			00808	00004	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00808	00005	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
	Spence, Jack		00763	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			00763	00002	DC	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
			00763	00003	DC	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
			00763	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00763	00005	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			00763	00006A	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00763	00006B	DC	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			00763	00007	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
	Spence, Jean		01130	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01130	00002	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
	Spence, Jack T.		02197	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			02197	00002	DC	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
			02197	00003	DC	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Utah</u> (continued)									
C.9-304	Spurgin, Patrick	High Level Nuclear Waste Office	02197	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02197	00005	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			02197	00006	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			02197	00007	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			02197	00008	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			02197	00009	DC	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			02197	00010	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			02197	00011	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			02634	00001	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.4.1.3.4	--	--
			02634	00002	DC	C.4.1.3.4	C.7.1.1.5	--	--
			02634	00003	DC	C.4.1.3.4	C.7.1.1.5	--	--
			02634	00004	DC	C.4.1.3.4	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--
			02634	00005	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.4.1.3.4	--	--
			02634	00006	DC	C.4.1.3.4	--	--	--
			02634	00007	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			02634	00008	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			02634	00009	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.4.2.1	--	--
			02634	00010	DC	C.4.1.3.4	C.7.2.5	--	--
			02634	00011	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			02634	00012	DC	C.7.2.5	C.7.1.1.5	--	--
			02634	00013	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--	--
			02634	00014	DC	C.7.2.5	C.7.1.1.5	--	--
			02634	00015	DC	C.4.1.3.4	--	--	--
			02634	00016	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			02634	00017	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			02634	00018	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			02634	00019	DC	C.7.1.1.5	--	--	--
			02634	00020	DC	C.7.1	--	--	--
			02634	00021	DC	C.7.1.1	C.7.1.1.5	--	--
			02634	00022	DC	C.7.1.1	C.7.1.1.5	--	--
			02634	00023	DC	C.7.2.5	C.4.1.3.4	--	--
			02634	00024	DC	C.7.2.5	C.4.1.3.4	--	--
			02634	00025	DC	C.7.2.5	C.4.1.3.4	--	--
			02634	00026	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
Stark, Douglas			01296	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01296	00002	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			01296	00003	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01296	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Utah</u> (continued)									
C.9-305	Steckel, Alex		01296	00005	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01296	00005A	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01296	00006	DC	C.7.1.1	C.7.4	C.7.2	--
			01296	00007	DC	C.7.1.1.3	C.7.2.3	C.4.1.3.3	--
			01296	00008	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	C.4.1.3.4	--
			01296	00009	DC	C.7.1.1.6	C.7.2.6	--	--
			01296	00010A	DC	C.7.4.4	--	--	--
			01296	00010B	DC	C.7.1.1.6	C.7.2.6	--	--
			01296	00010C	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01296	00010D	DC	C.7.1.1.2	C.7.2.2	C.4.1.3.2	--
	Stocks, Joe		01296	00011	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01296	00012	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00475	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00475	00002	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			00475	00003	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			00475	00004	-----	C.2.8	--	--	--
			00116	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00116	00002	DC	C.3.3	--	--	--
			00116	00003	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00116	00004	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
	Stocks, Mayor Tom		00116	00005	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00116	00006	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00116	00007	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00116	00008	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00116	00009	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00116	00010	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00720	00001	DC	C.4.1.5.1	--	--	--
			00720	00002	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
			00720	00003A	DC	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			00720	00003B	DC	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	--
	Sussman, Deborah Terrana, Phyllis		00720	00004	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
			00720	00005	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			00720	00006	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01317	00001	-----	C.3.1	--	--	--
			00834	00001	DC	C.4.1.5.4	--	--	--
			00834	00002	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			00834	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00834	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION				
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	
<u>Utah</u> (continued)										
Terrana, Phyllis			00834	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
			00834	00007	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
			01531	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
			01531	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
			01531	00003	DC	C.3.3	C.3.1.3	--	--	
			01531	00004	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--	
			01531	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
			01531	00006	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
			01531	00007	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--	
			01390	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--	
Thomas, Larry			01390	00002	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--	
			01390	00003	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--	
			01390	00004	DC	C.7.2.8	--	--	--	
			01390	00005	DC	C.7.4.2	C.7.1.2	--	--	
			01390	00006	DC	C.7.4.3	--	--	--	
			00775	00001	DC	C.3.1.2	C.3.1.3	--	--	
			00775	00002	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--	
			00775	00003	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--	
			00775	00004	DC	C.3.1.2	C.3.1.3	--	--	
			00775	00005	DC	C.3.2	--	--	--	
Thompson, Patricia			00775	00006	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--	
			00775	00007	DC	C.4.1.5	--	--	--	
			00775	00008	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.4.1.3.3	--	--	
			02204	00001	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--	
			02204	00002	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--	
			02204	00003	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--	
			02204	00004	DC	C.7.2	C.4.2	--	--	
			02204	00005	-----	C.3.2	--	--	--	
			02204	00006	DC	C.7.2	C.7.4	--	--	
			02204	00007	DC	C.4.1.5	--	--	--	
Thompson-Hanson, Patricia A.			02204	00008	DC	C.4.1.3.3	C.4.1.3.4	--	--	
			01054	00001	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--	
			01054	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--	
			01054	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
			01054	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
			01054	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
			00732	00001	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
			00732	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
	Thurman, Dr. David J.	Physicians for Social Resp.								
Till, Thomas										

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Utah</u> (continued)									
Tippets, Terry			00732	00003	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00732	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00789	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00789	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
Tooley, John			00789	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01078	00001	DC	C.4.1.2.1	--	--	--
			01078	00002	DC	C.4.1.2.1	--	--	--
			01078	00003	DC	C.4.1.2.1	--	--	--
Trittschuh, Travis			01078	00004	DC	C.4.1.2.1	--	--	--
			01078	00005	DC	C.4.1.2.1	--	--	--
			00738	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00738	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
Turner, Barbara			00738	00003	DC	C.7.2.7	--	--	--
			00738	00004	DC	C.5.3	--	--	--
			00738	00005	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
			00738	00006	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
Unsworth, Alan			02244	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02244	00002	-----	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00817	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00817	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
Valdez, Richard			00817	00003	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00766	00001	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
			00766	00002	-----	C.2.1.3	--	--	--
			00766	00003	DC	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
Valdez, Dr. Richard A.			00766	00004	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
			00766	00005	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
			02200	00001	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
			02200	00002	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
Van Frank, Alison			02200	00003	DC	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
			02200	00004	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
			02200	00005	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
			00799	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
Van Frank, Alison			00799	00002	-----	C.3.2	--	--	--
			02259	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			02259	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			02259	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
Van Gundy, Douglas			00755	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00755	00002	DC	C.7.2.8	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Utah (continued)									
Van Gundy, Douglas A.	00755	00003	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--		
	00755	00004	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--		
	00755	00005	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--		
	00755	00006	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
	02193	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
	02193	00002	DC	C.7.2.8	--	--	--		
	02193	00003	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--		
	02193	00004	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--		
	02193	00005	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--		
	02193	00006	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
Velez, Valerie S.	02207	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
	02207	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
	02207	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
Velez, Valerie S.	00780	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
	00780	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
	00780	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
Walker, Grady	00788	00001	DC	C.3.1.2	C.3.1.3	--	--		
	00788	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
	00788	00003	DC	C.7.1.1.3	C.7.2.5	--	--		
	00788	00004	DC	C.7.1.1.3	C.7.2.3	--	--		
	00788	00005	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--		
	00788	00006	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--		
	00788	00007	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--		
	00788	00008	-----	C.3.2	--	--	--		
	00788	00009	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--		
	00788	00010	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--		
Walker, Carol	00800	00001	-----	C.2.4.3	--	--	--		
	00800	00002	-----	C.2.4.3	--	--	--		
	00800	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
	00800	00004	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--		
	00800	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
	00800	00006	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
	00800	00007	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--		
	01065	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--		
	01065	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
	01065	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--		
Walker, Carol	01065	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
	01065	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Utah</u> (continued)									
C.9-309	Walker, Grady		01065	00006	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01065	00007	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			01065	00008	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			01065	00009	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			01065	00010	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01065	00011	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02212	00001	DC	C.3.2	--	--	--
			02212	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02212	00003	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	C.4.1.3.4	--
			02212	00004	DC	C.7.1.1.3	C.7.2.3	--	--
			02212	00005	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			02212	00006	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			02212	00007	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			02212	00008	-----	C.3.2	--	--	--
			02212	00009	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Walker, Mrs. C. Barry		02212	00010	-----	C.3.4.4	C.2.8.1	--	--
			02217	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02217	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02217	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02217	00004	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--
			02217	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02217	00006	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			02217	00007	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02217	00008	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Walker, Jimmie	County Commissioner	02096	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02096	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02096	00003	-----	C.3.4.2.1	C.3.4.3	--	--
			02096	00004	-----	C.7.4	C.7.1.2	--	--
			02096	00005	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02096	00006	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02096	00007	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Wallace, Matthew H.		00124	00001	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			00124	00002	DC	C.4.1.1	--	--	--
			00124	00003	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			00124	00004	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			00124	00005	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
Wallace, Anne		00124	00006	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--	
		00451	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Utah (continued)									
C.9-310	Wallingford, Lucy	Utah Wilderness Association	00451	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00730	00001	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00730	00002	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00730	00003	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00730	00004	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
	Warnick, Rick		00730	00005	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00783	00001	DC	C.3.1.2	C.3.1.3	--	--
			00783	00002	DC	C.3.1.2	C.3.1.3	--	--
			00783	00003	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
			00783	00004	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00783	00005	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00783	00006	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00783	00007	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Warnick, Richard M.		00488	00001	DC	C.3.2	--	--	--
			00488	00002	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			00488	00003	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
			00488	00004	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00488	00005	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			00488	00006	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			00488	00007	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00488	00008	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00488	00009	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00488	00010	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00488	00011	DC	C.3.2	--	--	--
			00488	00012	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Warnick, Rich		02209	00001	-----	C.3.2	--	--	--
			02209	00002	DC	C.7.1	--	--	--
			02209	00003	DC	C.5.9	--	--	--
			02209	00004	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
			02209	00005	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
			02209	00006	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
			02209	00007	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			02209	00008	DC	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			02209	00009	DC	C.4.1.3.3	C.7.2.3	--	--
			02209	00010	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			02209	00011	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			02209	00012	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			02209	00013	DC	C.7.2.1	C.7.2.4	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Utah</u> (continued)									
C.9-311	Werzinski, Ronald		02209	00014	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02209	00015	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02209	00016	-----	C.3.2	--	--	--
			02209	00017	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00816	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00816	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00816	00003	DC	C.7.5	--	--	--
			00816	00004	DC	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.2.4	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5
			00816	00005	DC	C.7.1	--	--	--
			00816	00006	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
	White, Mrs. Don		00002	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00002	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	White, Adair		00727	00001	DC	C.4.1.5	C.2.1.5	--	--
			00727	00002	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
	White, Adell		00727	00003	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02097	00001	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
	Wiggans, Tamara		02097	00002	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02097	00003	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
			00924	00001	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00924	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00924	00004	-----	C.3.2	--	--	--
	Wilburn, Margaret		00924	00005	-----	C.3.2	--	--	--
			01055	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01055	00002	DC	C.7.1.1.9	--	--	--
			01055	00003	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.1.1.4	--	--
			01055	00004	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01055	00005	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
			01055	00006	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01055	00007	DC	C.6.5	--	--	--
	Wilcox, James		01057	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01057	00002	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			01057	00003	DC	C.7.1	--	--	--
			01057	00004	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01057	00005	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
Willet, & Chapman, S.D. & D.S.	Utah State	01393	00001	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--	
		01393	00002	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--	
		01393	00003	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--	
		01393	00004	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
C.9-312	Utah (continued)								
	Willigan, J. Dennis	The University of Utah	01393	00005	DC	C.5.1	C.4.1.2.2	--	--
			00765	00001	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00765	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	00765		00003	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--	
	00765		00004	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--	
	00120		00001	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--	
	00120		00002	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--	
	00120		00003	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--	
	00120		00004	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--	
	00168		00001	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--	
	University of Utah		02199	00001	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			02199	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02199	00003	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
	Wilson, Mayor Ted L. Wolfe, Michael		02199	00004	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02190	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01314	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Wright, Marilyn M. Yasuda, Don Young, Marianna		01314	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01314	00003	DC	C.4.1.3.4	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--
			01314	00004	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01314	00005	DC	C.7.4	C.7.2.4	--	--
			00455	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00746	00001	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01295	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01295	00003	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			01295	00004	DC	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
			01295	00005	DC	C.7.2.4	C.7.2.5	--	--
			01295	00006	DC	C.7.2.6	C.4.1.3.6	--	--
	Zaccardi, Mike		01295	00007	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
		00819	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
		00819	00002	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--	
		00819	00003	DC	C.5.1	C.7.2.8	--	--	
	Zeisloft, John	Utah, High Level Nuclear Waste	00819	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01394	00001	DC	C.4.1.1.1	--	--	--
			01394	00002	DC	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01394	00003	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01394	00004	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01394	00005	DC	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01394	00007A	DC	C.4.1.1.8	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

C.9-314

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Vermont</u>									
	Elton, Wallace		01070	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01070	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			01070	00003	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
<u>Virginia</u>									
	Besore, Mary T.		00049	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Faglie, Frances F.		00079	00001	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
	Hotchkiss, Mr. & Mrs. C.T.		00061	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00061	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Lottinville, Wayne		00057	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00057	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00057	00003	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
	Mueller, Robert F.		02607	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02607	00002	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			02607	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Pettit, Marie B.		00191	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00191	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00191	00003	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
	Ries, Ken P.		00081	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00081	00002	DC	C.7.2	C.7.4	--	--
	Robertson, John B.	Off. of Hazardous Waste Hydro.	01738	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Sandy, Lawrence P.		01555	00001	DC	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
			01555	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Sprague, Elizabeth F.		00622	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00622	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00622	00003	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00622	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00622	00005	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
<u>Washington</u>									
		Nuclear Waste Board	02681	00037	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02681	00039B	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02681	00039C	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02681	00039D	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02681	00039E	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02681	00039F	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--

C.9-314

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Washington (continued)									
			02681	00039G	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02681	00039H	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
			02681	00040A	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02681	00040B	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02681	00044	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02681	00115	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--
			02681	00116	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02681	00117	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02681	00118	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02681	00119	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02681	00120	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
Allyn, Robert C.			00171	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
Amundson, Dr. Bruce .			02536	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
		E.Wash Chapt,Phys Social Respon.	01535	00006	-----	C.3.4.2.1	--	--	--
Anderson, James			01357	00003	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01357	00005	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			01357	00007	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01357	00008	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01357	00009	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			01357	00010	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01357	00011	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
Anderson, Dr. Tony			02529	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02529	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
Anderson, Richard L.			02538	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02538	00002	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
Andrews, Scott			02103	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02103	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
Anonymous			01098	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01153	00001	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
Anonymous			02410	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02410	00002	-----	C.2.6	--	--	--
			02410	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
Anonymous			02425	00003	-----	C.2.2.3	--	--	--
			02425	00009	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--
Anonymous			02428	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02428	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
		Petition	02588	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
		Tri-City Nuc. Industrial Council	02300	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington</u> (continued)									
C.9-316			02300	00002	-----	C.2.1	--	--	--
			02300	00003	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
		WASHPIRG	02630	00001A	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			02630	00001B	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02630	00001C	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			02630	00002	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--
			02630	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02630	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02630	00005	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			02630	00006	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
		Nuclear Waste Board	02682	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02682	00002A	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02682	00002D	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02682	00003	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
			02682	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02682	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02682	00007	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02682	00010	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			02682	00011	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02682	00012	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			02682	00013	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
			02682	00014	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02682	00015	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02682	00016	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
			02682	00017	-----	C.2.4.2	--	--	--
			02682	00018	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02682	00022	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			02682	00023	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02682	00024	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02682	00027	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02682	00029	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02682	00031	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02682	00032	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02682	00036	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			02682	00037	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02682	00038A	-----	C.3.1.2	C.5.1	--	--
		02682	00041	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--	
		02682	00042	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION				
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	
<u>Washington</u> (continued)										
C.9-317			02682	00049	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
			02682	00050	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
			02682	00051	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--	
			02682	00052	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
			02682	00053	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
			02682	00054	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
			02682	00055	-----	C.2.3.1	C.5.11	--	--	
			02682	00064	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
			02682	00066	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--	
			02682	00068	-----	C.2.4.2	--	--	--	
			02682	00069	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
			02682	00070	-----	C.2.4.3	--	--	--	
			02682	00071	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
			02682	00072	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
			02682	00073	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
			02682	00078	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--	
			02682	00079	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
			02682	00080	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
			02682	00081	-----	C.2.4.3	--	--	--	
			02682	00085	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--	
			02682	00092	-----	C.2.6	--	--	--	
			02682	00097	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--	
			02682	00098	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--	
			02682	00099	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--	
			02682	00100	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--	
			02682	00101	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
			02682	00104	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--	
			02682	00105	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--	
			02682	00106	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
			02682	00107	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--	
		Ardaiz, Martha C.	TICOMP	00239	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
		Ardaiz, Martha C.		00341	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
		Arter, Dennis R.		01506	00001	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
				01506	00002	-----	C.2.7.1	--	--	--
		Ashburn, Dan		02323	00001	-----	C.2.8	--	--	--
		Ashburn, Daniel J.		02625	00001	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
		Bagley,Jr., Dr. Charles M.		00190	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
				00190	00002	DC	C.4.1.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington</u> (continued)									
C.9-318	Bailey, Lyle C.	Save The Resources Committee	00190	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Baillie, Toni K.		01299	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Baker, Kris		01509	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Baker, George		00298	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00502	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			00502	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00502	00003	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
			00502	00004	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
	Baker, Roger		01104	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01104	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01104	00003	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			01104	00005	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Barner, George		02326	00006	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			02326	00007	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--
			02326	00008	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--
	Barnes, Ronald		02402	00001	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			02402	00002	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
	Barnes, Ronald		01504	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01504	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01504	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01504	00005	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--
			01504	00006	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			01504	00008	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Bartlett, Donald H.		00219	00001	-----	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00219	00003	-----	C.3.4.2	--	--	--
	Bartlett, John		02431	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Bass, Don		02436	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Bauermeister, Jim		02319	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Bauermeister, Jim		02623	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02623	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02623	00008	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Beadle, Deborah		00208	00001	-----	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00208	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00208	00005	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
			00208	00006	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Beadle, Deborah		02265	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02265	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Beadle, Deborah		02302	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington</u> (continued)									
C.9-319	Beare, Dr. John A.	Social & Health Services	02302	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01518	00001	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			01518	00003	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			01518	00006	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			01518	00010	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			01518	00014	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01518	00016	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Beckham, Ruth H. Beglin, Janice A.		01518	00017	-----	C.3.4.3	C.2.7	--	--
			00419	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01588	00001	-----	C.2.6	--	--	--
			01588	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01588	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Beglin, H. E.		01588	00004	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01589	00001	-----	C.2.6	--	--	--
			01589	00002B	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01589	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01589	00004	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Benson, William	SW Washington Health District	01234	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01234	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Berg, Mrs. Norma		00111	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00111	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Bishop, Warren A.	Nuclear Waste Board	02311	00001	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			02311	00002	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02311	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02311	00004	-----	C.2.7.1	--	--	--
			02311	00005	-----	C.2.7.1	--	--	--
			02311	00006	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--
			02311	00007	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			02311	00009	-----	C.5.11	C.5.3	--	--
			02311	00013	-----	C.2.5.1	--	--	--
			02311	00014	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02311	00015	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02680	00001	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02680	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02680	00003	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02680	00004	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--
			02680	00005	-----	C.2.7.1	--	--	--
	02680	00006	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--		

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington</u> (continued)									
C 9-320	Bishop, Warren A.	WA Nuclear Waste Board	02680	00007	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02680	00009	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02680	00010	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02680	00011	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02680	00012	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02680	00013	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02680	00014	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02680	00015	-----	C.2.5.1	--	--	--
			02680	00016	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02680	00017	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02680	00018	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02680	00019	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02680	00021	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02680	00022	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			02680	00025	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			01496	00001	-----	C.2.7.1	--	--	--
			01496	00002	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			Bishop, Warren A.		01496	00006	-----	C.2.5.1	--
	02707	00001			-----	C.2.5.1	--	--	--
	02707	00002			-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	02707	00003			-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	02707	00004			-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
	02707	00005			-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	02707	00013			-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	02707	00014			-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	02707	00015			-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	02707	00016			-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	02707	00017			-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	02707	00018			-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	02707	00019			-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	02707	00020			-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	02707	00021			-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	02707	00022			-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	02707	00023			-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	02707	00025			-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	02707	00026	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--		
Bishop, Warren A.		01511	00001	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
		01511	00002	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington</u> (continued)									
C.9-321	Bishop, Warren A.	WA State Nuclear Waste Board	01511	00003	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01511	00004	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01511	00005	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01511	00006	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01511	00007	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01511	00008	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01511	00009	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01511	00010	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01511	00011	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01511	00012	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01511	00013	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01511	00014	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01511	00015	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01511	00016	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01511	00017	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01497	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01497	00003	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			01497	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01497	00006	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01497	00007	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			01497	00008	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			01497	00009	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
			01497	00011	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--
			01497	00012	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01497	00017	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01497	00019	-----	C.2.4.3	--	--	--
			01497	00023	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01497	00025	-----	C.2.1.3	--	--	--
			01497	00026	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01497	00027	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01497	00028	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			01497	00029	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01497	00030	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01497	00032	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01497	00034	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01497	00036	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			01497	00041	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			01497	00042	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION				
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	
C. 9-322	Washington (continued)									
				01497	00044	-----	C.2.6.2	--	--	--
				01497	00045	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
				01497	00046	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
				01497	00047	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
				01497	00048	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
				01497	00049	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
				01497	00051	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
				01497	00052	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
				01497	00053	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
				01497	00054	-----	C.7.3	--	--	--
				01497	00055	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
				01497	00056	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
				01497	00057	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
				01497	00058	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
				01497	00059	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
				01497	00060	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
				01497	00061	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
				01497	00063	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
				01497	00066	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
				01497	00067	-----	C.2.6.2	--	--	--
				01497	00068	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
				01497	00069	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
				01497	00070	-----	C.2.5.1	--	--	--
				01497	00071	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
				01497	00072	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
				01497	00073	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
				01497	00075	-----	C.2.6	--	--	--
				01497	00076	-----	C.2.1	--	--	--
				01497	00077	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
				01497	00078	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
				01497	00079	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
				01497	00081	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
				01497	00082	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
				01497	00083	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
				01497	00085	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
				01497	00086	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
				01497	00087	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
				01497	00088	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington</u> (continued)									
C.9-323			01497	00089	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			01497	00090	-----	C.2.5.1	--	--	--
			01497	00091	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01497	00092	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			01497	00093	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01497	00098	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01497	00103	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--
			01497	00112	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01497	00113	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			01497	00114	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			01497	00115	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			01497	00116	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01497	00117	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01497	00118	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01497	00119	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01497	00120	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01497	00121	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01497	00122	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01497	00123	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01497	00124	-----	C.2.1.3	--	--	--
			01497	00125	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01497	00126	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01497	00127	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01497	00128	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01497	00129	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			01497	00130	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			01497	00131	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01497	00132	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01497	00140	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--
			01497	00146	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			01497	00147	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
			01497	00148	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--
			01497	00152	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			01497	00156	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01497	00159	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01497	00161A	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
			01497	00161B	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			01497	00162	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington</u> (continued)									
C.9-324			01497	00167	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01497	00174	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01497	00175	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01497	00176	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			01497	00177	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01497	00178	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
			01497	00179	-----	C.2.5.1	--	--	--
			01497	00180	-----	C.2.5	--	--	--
			01497	00181	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01497	00182	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01497	00183	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			01497	00194	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
			01497	00195	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
			01497	00197	-----	C.2.6	--	--	--
			01497	00199	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			01497	00200	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			01497	00201	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			01497	00202	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01497	00203	-----	C.2.5.1	--	--	--
			01497	00204	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01497	00205	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			01497	00206	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01497	00207A	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
			01497	00207B	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
			01497	00207C	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			01497	00207D	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			01497	00210	-----	C.2.6.3	--	--	--
			01497	00211A	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
			01497	00211B	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01497	00212	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01497	00213	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			01497	00214	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
		01497	00215A	-----	C.2.6.2	--	--	--	
		01497	00216	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
		01497	00217	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
		01497	00218	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--	
		01497	00219	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		01497	00220	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
C.9-325	<u>Washington</u> (continued)								
			01497	00221	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01497	00223	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			01497	00226	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01497	00227	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01497	00228	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01497	00229	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01497	00245	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01497	00246	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01497	00247	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01497	00248	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01497	00249	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01497	00250	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			01497	00251	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01497	00252	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01497	00253	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01497	00266	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01497	00268	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01497	00271	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01497	00274	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			01497	00276	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			01497	00278	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			01497	00279	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			01497	00280	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			01497	00281	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			01497	00282	-----	C.2.1.5	C.2.3.1	--	--
			01497	00283	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			01497	00284	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01497	00285	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01497	00286	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			01497	00287	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
			01497	00289	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			01497	00292	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			01497	00293	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01497	00294	-----	C.2.4.2	--	--	--
			01497	00295	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01497	00296	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
			01497	00297	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
		01497	00299	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION				
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	
C. 9-326	<u>Washington</u> (continued)									
				01497	00300	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
				01497	00302	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
				01497	00303A	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
				01497	00303B	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
				01497	00304	-----	C.2.5.1	--	--	--
				01497	00305	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
				01497	00306	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
				01497	00307	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
				01497	00308	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
				01497	00309	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
				01497	00310	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
				01497	00311	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
				01497	00312	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
				01497	00313	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
				01497	00314	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
				01497	00315	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
				01497	00316	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
				01497	00317A	-----	C.2.6.2	--	--	--
				01497	00317B	-----	C.2.6.2	--	--	--
				01497	00318	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
				01497	00319	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
				01497	00320	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
				01497	00321	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
				01497	00322A	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
				01497	00326	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
				01497	00343	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
				01497	00344	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
				01497	00345	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
				01497	00346A	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
				01497	00346B	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
				01497	00347	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
				01497	00348	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
				01497	00349	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
				01497	00350	-----	C.2.6.2	--	--	--
				01497	00351	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
				01497	00362	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
				01497	00366	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
				01497	00367	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington</u> (continued)									
C.9-327	Bishop, Warren A.		01497	00369	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--
			01497	00375	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			01497	00377	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			01497	00378	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01497	00379	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			02357	00001	-----	C.2.7.1	--	--	--
			02357	00002	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--
			02357	00003	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			02357	00008	-----	C.2.5.1	--	--	--
			02281	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Bissonnette, Joe Black, Gloria		01082	00001	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			01082	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Blackford, Irene Blum, Dr. Peter		00670	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02406	00001	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
	Boggess, Alva A. Bogle, Julie		00105	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02552	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	C.7.4	--	--
	Boldman, Susan		02552	00003	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			02552	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02552	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02568	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02568	00002	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			01590	00001	-----	C.2.6	--	--	--
			01590	00002B	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01590	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01590	00004	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			Booth, Patsy A.		01116	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	C.5.11
	01116	00003			-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
	Bosch, W. Bruce Brautenberg, M. Breithaupt, Steve	Clark County PUD	01116	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01116	00005	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01595	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01207	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02539	00001	-----	C.2.1.3	--	--	--
			02539	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02539	00003	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02539	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02539	00007	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02539	00008	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	02539	00009	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--		

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION							
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH				
<u>Washington</u> (continued)													
C.9-328	Bringloe, Anne		02539	00010	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--				
			02539	00011	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--				
			02539	00012	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--				
			02334	00001	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--				
			02334	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--				
			02334	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--				
			02334	00004	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--				
			02334	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--				
			02334	00006	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--				
			02334	00007	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--				
	Bringloe, Anne H.	The Sierra Club	02334	00008	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--				
			02334	00009	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--				
			02334	00010	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--				
			02365	00001	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--				
			02365	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--				
			02365	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--				
			02365	00004	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--				
			02365	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--				
			02365	00006	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--				
			02365	00007	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--				
			02365	00008	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--				
			02365	00009	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--				
			02365	00010	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--				
			Brody, Kathy		01226	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
					01226	00002	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--		
					Broschious, Charles		02569	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
							00295	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			Brown, Mr. & Mrs. A. N.		00295	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--		
					Brown, Barbara		01079	00001	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
			01079	00002			-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
	Brown, Chris	Grays Harbor Democ. Central Com.	01502	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--				
			01502	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--				
	Brownlie, Idell and Wallace		00530	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--				
			00530	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--				
	Brucato, Albert		00372	00002	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--				
	Brucato, Ingrid		00373	00002	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--				
	Budd, William W.	WSU, Environmental Science	01521	00001	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--				
			01521	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--				

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington</u> (continued)									
C. 9-329			01521	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01521	00005	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
	Buehler, Nettie B.		00496	00002	-----	C.2.4.2	--	--	--
	Buller, Eileen		02317	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02317	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Buller, Patrick		02378	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Buller, R. Eileen	Hanford Oversight Committee	02627	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02627	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Bullington, Darryl		00265	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00265	00002A	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			00265	00002B	-----	C.2.5.7	--	--	--
			00265	00002C	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			00265	00003	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			00265	00004	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			00265	00007	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
			00265	00011	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			00265	00013	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
			00265	00014	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			00265	00015	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Bullock, David	The Society of the Holy Earth	02374	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Burnet, Patricia		01111	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01111	00002A	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01111	00002B	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01111	00002C	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			01111	00002D	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01111	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01111	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01111	00005A	-----	C.3.2	--	--	--
			01111	00005B	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			01111	00006	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
	Burnum, Steven		01113	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Burt, Peggy		02535	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Bush, Shirley J.		00230	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Buske, Norman	Search Technical Services	00507	00001	-----	C.3.2	C.5.11	--	--
	Caldwell, Larry		01247	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01247	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01247	00004	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			01247	00006	-----	C.2.3.1	C.9	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington</u> (continued)									
C.9-330			01247	00008	-----	C.2.7	C.3.1.2	--	--
			01247	00011	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01247	00011A	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01247	00011B	-----	C.7.3	C.2.4.1	--	--
			01247	00011C	-----	C.7.3	C.2.4.1	--	--
			01247	00013	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			01247	00014	-----	C.2.3	--	--	--
			01247	00018	-----	C.4.2.2	C.2.8.3	--	--
	Campbell, Michael		02555	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02555	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02555	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02555	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02555	00007	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Carson, R. J.		00497	00001	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
	Carter, Dorothy E.		00646	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00646	00002	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			00646	00003	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
	Cartmell, John		02273	00002	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Cartmell, John		01508	00002	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Cassuto, Sherri		02385	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Chapin, Mildred C.		00394	00004A	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Cheney, Elinor V.		00383	00001	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
	Cheng, Peter		02400	00013	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02400	00015	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02400	00017	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02400	00018	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02400	00019	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Chicha, George S.		02521	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Chicha, George S.		02585	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Christensen, Liz		02549	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02549	00002	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02549	00004	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
			02549	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02549	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02549	00007	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02549	00008	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			02549	00008A	-----	C.2.1	--	--	--
			02549	00008B	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Washington (continued)									
C.9-331	Christensen, Liz	Action League, Hanford Education	02599	00001	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			02599	00002	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02599	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Christofferson, J.R.		00659	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00659	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00659	00005	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			00659	00006	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00659	00007	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Clausen, Phyllis		01134	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01134	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01134	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01134	00005B	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			01134	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01134	00008	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01134	00009	-----	C.2.4.2	--	--	--
			01134	00010	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			02501	00001	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
	Clausen, Phyllis		02501	00002	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02501	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02501	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02501	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02501	00007	-----	C.2.5.1	--	--	--
			02501	00008	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			01538	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00643	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Cogle, S. J.	Cole, Byron & Family	00643	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00643	00004	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			01103	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01103	00002	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Connel, Bonnie	Cordes, Deanne	02295	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01112	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Corey, Barbara		01112	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01112	00003	-----	C.2.8	--	--	--
			02372	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01549	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00274	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02345	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01245	00001	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

C.9-332

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington</u> (continued)									
			01245	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01245	00004	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
			01245	00005A	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01245	00005B	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01245	00006	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01245	00007	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01245	00008	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01245	00009	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01245	00010	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01245	00015	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
			01245	00016	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01245	00019	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01245	00020	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
			01245	00021	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01245	00022	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
			01245	00023	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
			01245	00024A	-----	C.2.6	--	--	--
			01245	00024C	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Courtright, Kelly D.		00617	00003A	-----	C.3.2	--	--	--
			00617	00003B	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
			00617	00003C	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
	Covey, Pam		00186	00001A	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00186	00002	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Cowan, Thomas R.	B.O.C. San Juan County	02621	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02621	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Cowan, Thomas R.	Bd of Commissioners, San Juan Co.	02117	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Cram, Bob and Martha		00453	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00453	00002	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Cranage, Lillian		01594	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Crane, David		01150	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01150	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01150	00004	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
	Crow, Rob		02321	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02321	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02321	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	C.8.2	C.5.3	--
			02321	00004	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
			02321	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02321	00007	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Washington (continued)									
	Crowley, Carole		00431	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Cummings, Coreen		02260	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02260	00002	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			02260	00003	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			02260	00004	DC	C.7.2.4	C.7.4.1	--	--
			02260	00005	-----	C.2.2.2	--	--	--
	Cunningham, Kevin		02556	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02556	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02556	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Cunningham, Kevin		02601	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02601	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02601	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Dalton, Patrick		02527	00008	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02527	00009	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02527	00010	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02527	00011	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02527	00012	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02527	00013	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02527	00014	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02527	00015	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02527	00016	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02527	00017	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02527	00018	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02527	00019	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02527	00020	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02527	00021	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02527	00022	-----	C.2.5.1	--	--	--
			02527	00023	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
	Dalton, Pat	City of Spokane	02590	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02590	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02590	00005	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			02590	00006	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			02590	00007	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			02590	00008	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02590	00009	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02590	00016	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02590	00017	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02590	00018	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington</u> (continued)									
C-9-334			02590	00019	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02590	00020	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02590	00021	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02590	00022	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02590	00023	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02590	00024	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02590	00025	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02590	00026	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Darvill, Dr. F. T.		00322	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00322	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Dautel, William A.		00494	00001	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			00494	00004	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			00494	00005	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
	Davis, Dorlyn		00673	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Davis, James M.		02296	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Davis, McClelland		02379	00003	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
	DeLaCruz, Joe B.	Quinault Indian Nation	01231	00001	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01231	00007	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
	DeSilva, Judith		02388	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	DeSilva, Peter		02394	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	DeLaney, Helen		02523	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02523	00002	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02523	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02523	00004	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
			02523	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02523	00009	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	DeLaney, Helen		02586	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02586	00002	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02586	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02586	00004	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
			02586	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02586	00009	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Denkeigh, Mr. and Mrs. R.		00407	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
Dilger, Bob		02267	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		02267	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		02267	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
Dilger, Bob		02315	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		02315	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington</u> (continued)									
C.9-335	Dilger, Bob		02315	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02315	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02315	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02315	00007	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02315	00008	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			02629	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02629	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02629	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02629	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02629	00007	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02629	00008	-----	C.2.1.5	--	--	--
			02352	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02291	00002	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
			02348	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02338	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Dodd, Celeste Donovan, Mr. Virgil Donnally, Lisa Douglas, Hector		02338	00002	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--
			02338	00004	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02338	00006	-----	C.2.4.3	--	--	--
			02338	00007	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02338	00008	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02368	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02368	00002	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--
			02368	00004	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02368	00006	-----	C.2.4.3	--	--	--
			02368	00007	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02368	00008	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			Douglas, Hector		02571	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--
02571	00003	-----			C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
02571	00004	-----			C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
01587	00001	-----			C.3.1.1	--	--	--	
01587	00009	-----			C.2.3.1	--	--	--	
00466	00009	-----			C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
00273	00002	-----			C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
00214	00001	-----			C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
02087	00001	-----			C.3.1.2	C.7.2	--	--	
02087	00002	-----			C.3.1.2	C.7.2	--	--	
00240	00001	-----			C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
00240	00002	-----			C.2.8.1	--	--	--	
Downing, L. E.	Nat'l Assoc Retired Vet.								
Drakovich, Elizabeth									
Draskovich, Libby									
Drew, Alice C.									
Eagle, WA State									
Eaton, Clark	Int'l Trollers Coalition								
Ebert, L. C.									

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington</u> (continued)									
C.9-336	Ebert, L.C.	Thurston County Commissioners	00240	00003	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
			00240	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00663	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00663	00002	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
			00663	00003	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
			00663	00004	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
	Ebert, L.C.		00663	00005	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
			00663	00006	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			00663	00007	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
			01507	00001	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
			01507	00002	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
			01507	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Edwards, Craig		00402	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00402	00002	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--
	Edwards, Bobby		00402	00006	-----	C.7.3	--	--	--
			02386	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Eisenman, Marilyn		00110	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01501	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Eldridge, Les		01501	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	C.5.8	--	--
			01501	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
Eldridge, Les	01501	00006	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
	01501	00007	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
	02622	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	C.4.4	--	--		
	02622	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	C.5.8	--	--		
	02622	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--		
	02622	00006	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--		
	02622	00007	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--		
	02622	00008	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--		
	Ellis, Dr. Frederick E.	02313	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--	
		02313	00003	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--	
02313		00004	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--		
02313		00005	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--		
Ellison, Mike	01306	00001	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--		
	01306	00002	-----	C.2.3	--	--	--		
	01306	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
	02395	00003	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--		
Englehart, Cindy	00291	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--		
	00158	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--		
	Evans, Stephen								
Fiddler, Mary									

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington</u> (continued)									
	Fields & Aylward, Mary & John	University of Washington	00158	00003	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
			01132	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01132	00002	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
	Filby, Royston H. Foley, Chuck	WSU, Nuclear Waste Board	01528	00009	-----	C.5.11	C.5.11	--	--
			02384	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02384	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Ford, Lillian		02384	00004	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02418	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02418	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02418	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02418	00005	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02418	00006	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02418	00008	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Ford, Lillian Foster, Dianne & Vincent		02433	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02084	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02084	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Fowler, Hugh A.	WA State, Dept. Emergency Mngt.	02084	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01519	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01519	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Foye, Coleen		00098	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00098	00004	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
	Franz, Eldon H. Frazier, C. Cheryl Fresk, Gary	WSU, Environmental Science	01522	00001	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01136	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02335	00001	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02335	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02335	00003	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Fresk, Gary	Washington Waste Site Study Grp.	02335	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02335	00005	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02366	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02366	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02366	00003	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02366	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02366	00005	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Friedman, Al		02333	00002	-----	C.3.3	--	--	--
			02333	00005	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02333	00006	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02333	00007	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02333	00008	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington</u> (continued)									
C.9-338	Friedman, Albert		02333	00009	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02333	00010	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02333	00011	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02364	00002	-----	C.3.3	--	--	--
			02364	00006	-----	C.3.3	--	--	--
			02364	00007	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02364	00008	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02364	00009	-----	C.2.4.3	--	--	--
	Fry, Elaine		02364	00010	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02364	00011	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02531	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02531	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Fuller, Mayor Walline	City of Stevenson	02531	00004	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02080	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02080	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02080	00010	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02080	00011	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			02080	00012	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			02080	00013	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02080	00014	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Fyfe, Danne		00176	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00176	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00176	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00176	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			00176	00007B	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00176	00008	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
	Garber, Loren		02336	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02336	00012	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--
			02336	00013	-----	C.2.6	--	--	--
			02336	00015	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02336	00016	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02336	00017	-----	C.2.4.3	--	--	--
	Garber, Loren	WASHPIRG	02336	00018	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02367	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02367	00012	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02367	00015	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02367	00016	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02367	00017	-----	C.2.4.3	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington</u> (continued)									
C.9-339	Gardner, Barbara A.	Nuclear Waste Board	02367	00018	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			01169	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01169	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01169	00004	-----	C.2.3	--	--	--
	Gardner, Barbara A.		01169	00006	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
			01495	00037	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01495	00044	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01495	00116	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01495	00117	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01495	00118	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01495	00119	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01495	00120	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
	Geary, John		01339	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01339	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Gibbons, Richard P.		00533	00002	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			00533	00006	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Gibbs, Christine		01139	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	C.5.7	--	--
	Giddings, Roxie		02351	00001	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
			02351	00002	-----	C.2.5.1	--	--	--
	Gifford,Jr., Frank Q.		00210	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			Gilbert, Karen	02514	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--
	02514			00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	02514			00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	02514			00007	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
	Gilbert, Karen		02577	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02577	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02577	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02577	00007	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
	Gill, Ty		00380	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00380	00002	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
	Girvin, Dr. George		02560	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02560	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Gordon, Thomas		01148	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01148	00005	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			01148	00006	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01148	00010	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			01148	00013	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Goulden, Jeff,Margie & Molly		Cascade Photo Art	00123	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington</u> (continued)									
C.9-340			00123	00002	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			00123	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Graf, David		02279	00015	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
	Graham, Phyllis		00309	00002	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Gray, Andrew		02404	00004	-----	C.3.3	--	--	--
	Grissom, Wilbur		00437	00002	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Grissom, Wilbur		01094	00002	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Grof, David		02305	00016	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
	Groves, David		02373	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02373	00002	-----	C.2.1.4	--	--	--
			02373	00003	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
			02373	00004	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
	Guilford, Rhonda	Petition	00131	00001	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
			00131	00003	-----	C.2.6.3	--	--	--
	Haaga, Caroline		02409	00001	-----	C.2.6.2	--	--	--
			02409	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Hagen, Maurie		02543	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Hagman, Shirley D.		00340	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00340	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00340	00003A	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00340	00003B	-----	C.2.3.3	C.3.4.4	--	--
			00340	00003C	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Hale, Rick A.		00286	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			00286	00002	-----	C.2.2.2	--	--	--
	Hampel, Laurel		00211	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Hanners, Albert J.		00427	00001	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			00427	00008	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
	Hanners, Al		02328	00001	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02328	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02328	00003	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02328	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Hanners, Albert J.		02624	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02624	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02624	00003	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02624	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Hansen, Phyllis L		01146	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01146	00003	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			01146	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington</u> (continued)									
	Hanski, Raimu K.		01090	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01090	00002	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			01090	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01090	00007	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Hanski, Kathryn L		01092	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01092	00002	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			01092	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01092	00007	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Hanson, Robert		02563	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02563	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02563	00005B	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
	Hanson, Marcella J.		02564	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Harb, Easa		01197	00001	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			01197	00002	-----	C.2.3	--	--	--
			01197	00003	-----	C.2.3	--	--	--
			01197	00007	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Hattrup, Susan		01288	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Headley, Joe R.	Petition	00193	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Hedge, Allen		02550	00011	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02550	00012	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02550	00013	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02550	00014	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02550	00015	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02550	00016	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
	Hedge, Alan		02600	00007	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02600	00008	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
	Heger, Marilyn		01199	00001	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			01199	00002	-----	C.2.3	--	--	--
			01199	00003	-----	C.2.3	--	--	--
	Heilgern, Anne		01115	00001A	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01115	00001B	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
	Hellman, Glen		02320	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02320	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02320	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02320	00005	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02320	00006	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
	Helstien, Beth J.		02419	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02419	00003	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION				
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	
<u>Washington</u> (continued)										
C.9-342	Hemphill, Jeanne T.		02419	00004	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--	
			01129	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
			01129	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--	
	01129		00003	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--		
	Henry, David		02513	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
			02513	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--	
			02513	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
			02513	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
			02513	00005	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--	
			02513	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
			02513	00007	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
			02513	00008	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
	Herman, Jon		01292	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
			01292	00005	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
			Hess, Dr. George	02343	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	02343			00002	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
	Hess, Dr. George H.		02371	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
			02371	00002	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--	
	Hinnen, Christine L.		00647	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
			00647	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
	Hinnen, Dr. Michael L.		Spokane Cardiology	00649	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
				00649	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
				00649	00005	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
				00649	00006	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
	Hinthorne, Royal A.		01325	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--	
			01325	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
			01325	00005	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--	
	Hinthorne, Grace L.		01326	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
			01326	00003	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--	
	Hoffman, Mrs. A. A.		02082	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
	Hohl, Dr. & Mrs. T.		00125	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
			00125	00003	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--	
			Hood, George	Big Bend - Alberta, Ltd.	00199	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--
	02519				00001	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
	02519				00002	-----	C.3.2	--	--	--
	02519				00003	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
	02551				00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Houff, Rev. William		02551	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
Houff, Patty										

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

C.9-343

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington</u> (continued)									
	Houff, Dr. William Harper	Hanford Education Action League Spokane Unitarian Church	02551	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Houff, Dr. William Harper		02604	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Houff, Dr. William Harper		02582	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Houff, Dr. William Harper		02581	00001	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02581	00002	-----	C.3.2	--	--	--
	Houghton, Mark		01127	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01127	00004	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			01127	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01127	00006	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Houston, Jack		02276	00001	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
			02276	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Houts-Hussey, Patty	Diocese of Yakima	00651	00001	DC, RN, DS	C.5.11	C.5.10	C.5.11	C.2.8.3
	Hovis, James		02270	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Hovis, Nancy		02271	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02271	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02271	00004	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02271	00005	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
	Hovis, James		02303	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Hovis, Nancy		02304	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02304	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02304	00004	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02304	00005	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Hoyt Thie, Daryl Krista		01195	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Hughes, Jim		02322	00001	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			02322	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02322	00003	-----	C.2.6.1	C.6.4	--	--
			02322	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Irwin, Lois S.		00317	00001	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
	Jakubal, Mike		00645	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00645	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00645	00003	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00645	00004	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00645	00005	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			00645	00006	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
	James, Ron		02516	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Jim, Russell		02269	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02269	00002	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			02269	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington</u> (continued)									
	Johnson, Michael O.		00438	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Johnson, Robert W.		01233	00005	-----	C.2.8	--	--	--
	Johnson, Steve		02329	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Johnson, Mayor Norman M.	City of Toppenish	02587	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Johnson, Doreen	Plateau Preservation Society	00432	00001	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			00432	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Johnson, RN, Mary Lou	Spokane League of Women Voters	02572	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02572	00003	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
	Kane, John T. & Family		00200	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Kegan, Kyn		02346	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Keller, C. Jo		00205	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Kelley, William J.	Eastern Washington University	02613	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02613	00005	-----	C.7.3	C.2.4.1	--	--
			02613	00006	-----	C.7.3	C.2.4.1	--	--
			02613	00007	-----	C.7.3	C.2.4.1	--	--
			02613	00008	-----	C.7.3	C.2.4.1	--	--
			02613	00009	-----	C.7.3	C.2.4.1	--	--
			02613	00010	-----	C.7.3	C.2.4.1	--	--
			02613	00011	-----	C.7.3	C.2.4.1	--	--
			02613	00012	-----	C.7.3	C.2.4.1	--	--
			02613	00013	-----	C.7.3	C.2.4.1	--	--
	Kelly, Bill		02534	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02534	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02534	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02534	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Kessler, Donna		01335	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01335	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01335	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Kiefel, Michael		02566	00004	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
	Kielpinski, Penelope A.		01536	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01536	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01536	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01536	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01536	00006	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Kieviet, Douglas R.		02565	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02565	00002	-----	C.2.6.2	--	--	--
	King, Alexander		00685	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00685	00002	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

C.9-345

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington</u> (continued)									
King, Joseph E.		House of Representatives	00685	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00685	00007	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01576	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01576	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
Kinne, Susan			01576	00003	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			00035	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00035	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
Kjolso, Mike			00035	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00686	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00686	00002	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			00686	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
Kriedler, Senator Mike		Washington State Senate	00686	00007	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00418	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00418	00002	-----	C.2.8	--	--	--
			00418	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
Krueger, Robert F.			00418	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01342	00001	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			01342	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01342	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01342	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01342	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01342	00008	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			01342	00010	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
Kuntz, Donn			00624	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00624	00002	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
			00624	00003	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			00624	00004	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
			00624	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00624	00006	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00624	00007	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00624	00013	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			00624	00015	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00624	00018	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			00624	00020A	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			00624	00022	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
			00624	00023	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
Kuntz, Don			02553	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02553	00002	-----	C.2.3	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington</u> (continued)									
			02553	00003	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02553	00004	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
			02553	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02553	00006	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			02553	00012	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Kuntz, Don		01510	00001	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			01510	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01510	00003	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
	LaVassar, Joanne B.		00445	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00445	00003	DS	C.6.5	--	--	--
			00445	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	LaVassar, John		00687	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00687	00002	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			00687	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00687	00007	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	LaVassar, Joanne		00688	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00688	00002	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			00688	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00688	00007	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Laddin, Judy		02548	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Laddon, Judy		02598	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Lange, Kristen		02435	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Larson, William H.		02615	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Lasmanis, Raymond	Dept. of Natural Resources	01513	00005	-----	C.7.2	C.2.7	--	--
			01513	00007	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01513	00008	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01513	00009	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01513	00010	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			01513	00010A	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			01513	00010B	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01513	00011	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01513	00054	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
	Lawrence, Robert C.		02412	00001	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
	Lawson, Kevin C.		00370	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00370	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Lazar, David		02342	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Leaumont, Richard J.	Lower Columbia Basin Audubon Soc	01125	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01125	00003	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION				
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	
<u>Washington</u> (continued)										
C. 9-347	Leibert, Sharon		00113	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--	
			00113	00002	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--	
			00113	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
			00113	00004	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
	Leutz, Linda		00408	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
			00408	00002	-----	C.7.3	--	--	--	
			00408	00005	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
			00393	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
	Lewis, Robin L. Lewis, Lynne L.		00666	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
			00666	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
	Liebeler, Penelope Long, Bobbi Davis		02102	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
			01170	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
			01170	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
			00550	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
	Lorenzo, A. Jane Lunde, Barbara J. Lutes, Joy L.		00492	00001	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--	
			00512	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
			00512	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
			00512	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
			00512	00004	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--	
			02325	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
	Lutes, Joy		02325	00002	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--	
			02325	00004	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--	
		Lyon, James M. Maag, Judith R.		00285	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
				00684	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	00684		00002	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--		
	00684		00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
Maloney, Mrs. D. K.		00684	00007	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
		00481	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
		00481	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--		
		00481	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--		
	Mangan, A1 Mangan, A1		00094	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--	
			02546	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		02546	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--		
		02546	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--		
		02546	00004	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--		
		02546	00005	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--		
Mangan, A1		02597	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--		
		02597	00002	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--		

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington</u> (continued)									
Mangan, Al	HCR1	02597	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		02597	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		02597	00005A	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		02597	00005B	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--	
		02597	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		02597	00007	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		02597	00009	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--	
		02597	00010	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--	
		01240	00001	-----	C.2.6	--	--	--	
		01240	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		01240	00003	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--	
		01240	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		01240	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		01240	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		01240	00008	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		01240	00009	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		01240	00011	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		01240	00012	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--	
		01240	00013	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--	
		01240	00014	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--	
		01240	00015	-----	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--	
		01240	00016	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		01240	00018	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		01240	00019	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		01240	00022	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--	
		01240	00023	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
Marcus, Allan H. Mayer, William H.	Washington State University FEMA, RX	00625	00006	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--	
		00255	00001	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--	
McAllister, Maxine		00255	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		00682	00001	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--	
		00682	00002	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--	
		00682	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
McAllister, Susan		00682	00007	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
		01091	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
		01091	00002	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--	
		01091	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
		01091	00007	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington</u> (continued)									
	McClain, Charles		00314	00001	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
			00314	00002	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			00314	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00314	00004	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	McCrea, Steve		02518	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02518	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02518	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02518	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02518	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	McKay, Jeffrey		02324	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	McKusick, Helen		00364	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	C.3.4.4	--	--
			00364	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	McVicker, Carol		02547	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02547	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02547	00005	-----	C.2.5.1	--	--	--
	Mcword, Keith		02429	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Meeker, Eugenia		02288	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Metheny, David		02393	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Mickelson, Amy		00616	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00616	00002	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			00616	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00616	00007	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			00616	00014	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			00616	00019	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			00616	00020A	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
			00616	00020B	-----	C.2.6.3	--	--	--
			00616	00021	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			00616	00022	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00616	00023	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00616	00025	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			00616	00026	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			00616	00027	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			00616	00028	-----	C.2.8	--	--	--
	Mickelson, Amy		02544	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02544	00002	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington</u> (continued)									
C.9-350	Mickelson, Amy		02544	00004	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			02544	00005	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
			02596	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02596	00002	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			02596	00004	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
	Miles, Joe		01356	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Miller, Michael Barrett		00213	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Mineke, Jim & Ruth		00662	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Mizrahi, Nancy Kelley		01228	00001	-----	C.4.2.1	C.5.1	--	--
			01228	00002	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01228	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01228	00004	-----	C.3.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01228	00005	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01228	00006	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Montague, Evelyn		01166	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	C.3.1.2	C.3.2	--
			01166	00002	-----	C.2.7	C.2.1.1	--	--
	Moomaw, Alan		01081	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01081	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	C.3.1.2	--	--
			01081	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01081	00005	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01081	00006	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Moon, S.A.	Dept. of Transportation	01515	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01515	00009	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01515	00010	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
	Mootry, Joan		02517	00001	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			02517	00002	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			02517	00003	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02517	00004	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
	Morris, Newton		02405	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02405	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02405	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Mote, Karl W.	Mining Association	01503	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Mote, Karl W.	Northwest Mining Association	00442	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Neff, Mary E.		00097	00001	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
	Nelson, Milton		00336	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Nelson, Marcella		00556	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00556	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Nelson, Dick		02331	00003	-----	C.7.4	C.2.2	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington</u> (continued)									
C.9-351	Newell, Greg	City of Spokane	02331	00004	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	No11, Alice		00416	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			02392	00001	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			02392	00003	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Novak, Terry		02526	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Novak, Terry L.		02589	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Nuess, Mike		02533	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02533	00002	-----	C.2.7	C.5.1	--	--
			02533	00003	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Nuess, Mike		02591	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
		02591	00002A	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--	
		02591	00005	-----	C.2.5.1	--	--	--	
	Nutley, Representative Busse	Wash State House Representatives	01596	00002	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
	Nwab, Charles		02293	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Nylander, Donna		02522	00001	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
		02522	00002	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--	
		02522	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		02522	00006	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--	
		City of Ellensburg	01307	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01307	00002	-----	C.2.3	--	--	--
			01307	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01307	00004	-----	C.2.3	--	--	--
			01307	00005	-----	C.2.3	--	--	--
			01307	00006	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
	O'Neal, Diane		00324	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
		00667	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
	O'Reilly-Doyle, Kathleen	01322	00001	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
		01322	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
	Oliver, Dan	00166	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
	Olsen, Gordon D. & Bonnie A.	01315	00003	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--	
	Oram, Jr., Ray	02382	00001	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--	
		02382	00002	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--	
	Ortman, David E.	02375	00001	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--	
		02375	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
	Otto, Dale	01324	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
		01324	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
		01324	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--	
	Packer, S.E.	01121	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington</u> (continued)									
	Para, Molly J.		01121	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Parson, Janice		00535	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Partain, Dr. William L.		02266	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01114	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01114	00002	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			01114	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Paul, Alexa Drew		00335	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Pellett, Howard		00072	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00072	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Penberthy, Larry		02312	00004	-----	C.2.4.2	--	--	--
	Penberthy, H. Larry		02620	00001	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02620	00002	-----	C.3.3	--	--	--
	Penberthy, Larry	Penberthy Electromelt Int'l Inc	02358	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02358	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Penberthy, Larry		02359	00001	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
	Pence, Mark		02292	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02292	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Peterson, Warren S.		00482	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			00482	00003	-----	C.2.8	--	--	--
			00482	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00482	00007	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			00482	00009	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00482	00010	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Peterson, M.		00672	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Pierglund, D. E.	WASHPIRG	02439	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Pilcher, Patrick		02396	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02396	00002	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
	Pilcher, Patrick L.		02427	00005	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02427	00006	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
	Platt, Chris		02339	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02339	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Platt, Chris		02369	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02369	00002	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			02369	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Plattner, Jacqueline		02401	00008	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02401	00009	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Poeter, Eileen		01525	00002	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
	Poinor, Mayor John		02557	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington</u> (continued)									
Pollet, Gerald			02557	00003	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02399	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02399	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02399	00003	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02399	00004	-----	C.2.4.3	--	--	--
			02399	00005	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			02399	00006	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			02399	00007	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			02399	00008	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02380	00001	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
Powell, Walbridge J.			02380	00002	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			02380	00007	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02380	00010	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
Powell, Walbridge J.			02421	00001	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02421	00002	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
Power, Max	Washington State Legislature		01499	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01499	00002	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01499	00003	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01499	00004	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01499	00005	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01499	00006	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01499	00007	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01499	00008	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01499	00009	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01499	00010	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01499	00011	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01499	00012	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01499	00013	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01499	00014	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01499	00015	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01499	00016	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01499	00017	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01499	00018	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01499	00019	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01499	00020	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
Poyner, Mayor John	City of Richland		01499	00021	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02301	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02301	00003	-----	C.2.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

C.9-354

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington</u> (continued)									
	Poyner, Mayor John		02602	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02602	00003	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Poynor, Mayor John		02264	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02264	00003	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Price, Eleanor		02344	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02344	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Quigley, Phillip		02340	00001	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
			02340	00003	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02340	00004	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02340	00006	-----	C.2.6	--	--	--
			02340	00007	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Ramsey, Colleen		01200	00001	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			01200	00002	-----	C.2.3	--	--	--
			01200	00003	-----	C.2.3	--	--	--
			01200	00007	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Rapport, Dr. Richard		02387	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Redfearn, Brett		02330	00001	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			02330	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02330	00003	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--
			02330	00004	-----	C.2.7.1	--	--	--
			02330	00005	-----	C.2.4.3	--	--	--
			02330	00006	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			02330	00007	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Redfearn, Brett		02341	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Reel, David		02403	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02403	00004	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
			02403	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02403	00022	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			02403	00029	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02403	00030	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02403	00031	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			02403	00032	-----	C.2.4.3	--	--	--
			02403	00033	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Reel, David		02426	00001	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02426	00003	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			02426	00005	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--
			02426	00007	-----	C.2.7	C.7.4	--	--
			02426	00008	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington</u> (continued)									
C. 9-355			02426	00009	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
			02426	00011	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02426	00027	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02426	00034	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02426	00035	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02426	00036	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			02426	00037	-----	C.2.4.3	--	--	--
			02426	00038	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02426	00039	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
	Renaud, Mary		01574	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Reynolds, Edward A.		02570	00001	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
	Richardson, Barbara		02541	00001A	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02541	00001B	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02541	00001C	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Richmond, Teresa N.		01131	00001	-----	C.3.3	--	--	--
			01131	00002	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
	Ridgeway, John		02350	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Risbell, Marian		00362	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00362	00002	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
			00362	00003	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			00362	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00362	00008	-----	C.2.5.1	--	--	--
	Robillard, Mrs. F. E.		02081	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Rose, Bob		02327	00001	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--
			02327	00002	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--
			02327	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02327	00004	-----	C.2.4.3	--	--	--
			02327	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02327	00006	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02327	00007	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02327	00008	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02327	00010	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
	Rose, Bob		02628	00001	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--
			02628	00002	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--
			02628	00003	-----	C.3.3	--	--	--
		02628	00004	-----	C.2.4.3	--	--	--	
		02628	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
		02628	00006	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington</u> (continued)									
C.9-356			02628	00007	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02628	00008	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02628	00010	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
	Rosenberg, Leslie		02413	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02413	00002	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
	Ross, Kathleen A.	Heritage College	01222	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01222	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Rowland, Skip		02528	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Runestrand, Sally		02616	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	C.7.2	--	--
	Rupel, William E.		02299	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Rupel, William E.	Department of Energy	02261	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Russell, Mary and James		00457	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Rust, Michael S.		01530	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Ryan, Chilton "Tope"		01355	00001	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			01355	00007	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			01355	00008	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Salter, Andrew H.		00257	00001	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
	Sampson, Vice-Chair, Melvin R.	Yakima Indian Nation	01273	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01273	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01273	00041	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			01273	00095	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01273	00096	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01273	00097	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01273	00098	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01273	00099	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01273	00100	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--
			01273	00101	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--
			01273	00102	-----	C.3.4.2	--	--	--
			01273	00103	-----	C.3.4.2.1	--	--	--
			01273	00104	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--
			01273	00105	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--
			01273	00106	-----	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01273	00107	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--
			01273	00108	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--
			01273	00109	-----	C.3.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01273	00110	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01273	00112	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01273	00113	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington</u> (continued)									
C.9-357	Saracino, Jr., Anthony V. Sauers, Jack Savage, Cathy		01273	00114	-----	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01273	00115	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01273	00116	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01273	00117A	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01273	00117B	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01273	00118	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01273	00119	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01273	00120	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--
			01273	00121	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			01273	00129	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
	Scherpelz, Robert I.		01273	00130	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01273	00136	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01273	00138	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01273	00139	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			00349	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00250	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01155	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01155	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01155	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00675	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Schmidt, Cynthia M. Schmidt, Bob		00675	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00665	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02280	00001	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02280	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Schoen, Mayor George A.	Town of South Cle Elum	02280	00003	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			00238	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00238	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01196	00001	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
	Schultz, Stephen		01196	00002	-----	C.2.3	--	--	--
			01196	00003	-----	C.2.3	--	--	--
			01196	00007	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01327	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	See, Molly		01327	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01327	00003	-----	C.3.4.2.1	--	--	--
			01327	00004	-----	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01327	00005	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
	See, Molly See, Elizabeth		02268	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02437	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington</u> (continued)									
C.9-358	Seidl, Bryce	City of Vancouver	01053	00001	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			01053	00002	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
			01053	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Sharples, Vivien		02430	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Shay, Mr. & Mrs. Rodney O.		00454	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Sheffter, Nancy		01080	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Sheppard, Irene		00433	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Sheroke, Charles		02567	00001	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--
			02567	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Shields, Walter W.		02540	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02540	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Shields, Walter W.		02595	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02595	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Shook, Larry		02558	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	C.2.3.1	--	--
			02558	00001A	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02558	00001B	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02558	00002	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
	Sisk, Robert	Wash Nuc. Weapons Freeze Coalition	02101	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Skala, Mayor Ernest J.	City of North Bonneville	01203	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01203	00002	-----	C.2.2	--	--	--
			01203	00003	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			01203	00005	-----	C.2.3	--	--	--
			01203	00006	-----	C.7.4	C.3.2	--	--
			01203	00007	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01203	00008	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01203	00009	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			01203	00014	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01203	00015	-----	C.2.3	--	--	--
			01203	00016	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Smith, Pam		00143	00002	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Smith, Ben		00174	00002	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
	Smith, Al		00397	00005	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
	Snow, Jeanne Carter		01328	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01328	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Soveroski, Marie		01281	00005	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01281	00007	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			01281	00008	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
	Soveroski, Marie		02511	00007	-----	C.2.3	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington</u> (continued)									
C.9-359	Spitznagel, Steve		01147	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01147	00004	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			01147	00006	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			01147	00007	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
	Stack, Karen		00631	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Stewart, Loretta		00119	00001A	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00119	00001E	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Stewart, Cheryl		00417	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00417	00003	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			00417	00004	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
	Stiles, Kim		01073	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Storey, Ann		02282	00001	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
	Swanson, Susan		00632	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Swanson, Elizabeth M.	Clark County Pomona No. 1	01537	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Swatzell, June		00547	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00547	00002	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
	Szulinski, M.J.		01346	00001	-----	C.2.5	--	--	--
			01346	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01346	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01346	00004	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01346	00005	-----	C.5.8	--	--	--
			01346	00012	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Taggart, Tom		02524	00001	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Talkington, Scott		00130	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00130	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00130	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00130	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Tatom, Jeff		02414	00002	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02414	00003	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			02414	00004	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
	Taylor, Paul J.		02574	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Telford, Paul		02318	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Thatcher, H. Stanton & Barbara		01164	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01164	00005	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01164	00006	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Thomas, James P.		00483	00001	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			00483	00003	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			00483	00004	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION					
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH		
<u>Washington</u> (continued)											
C.9-360	Thomas, Angelina Cory		00483	00005	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
			00483	00006	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--		
			00483	00007A	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--		
			00483	00007B	-----	C.3.4	--	--	--		
			00483	00008A	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--		
			00483	00008B	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--		
			00483	00008C	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--		
			00483	00009	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--		
			01126	00001	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--		
	Thomas, James		01126	00002A	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
			01126	00002B	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
			01126	00003	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--		
			01126	00005	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--		
			02512	00001	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--		
			02512	00003	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--		
			02512	00004	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--		
			02512	00005	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--		
			02512	00006	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--		
			02512	00007	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--		
			02512	00008	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
			02512	00009	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--		
			02512	00010	-----	C.2.3.2	--	--	--		
			02512	00011	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
	Thomas, James P.		02512	00012	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--		
			02575	00001	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--		
			02575	00003	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--		
			02575	00004	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--		
			02575	00005	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--		
			02575	00006	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--		
			02575	00007	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--		
			02575	00008	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
			02575	00009	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--		
			02575	00010	-----	C.2.8	--	--	--		
			02575	00011	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--		
			Tickner, Arthur L. and Wyn		02575	00012	-----	C.2.8	--	--	--
					00390	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
00390	00002	-----			C.2.5.1	--	--	--			
00390	00003	-----			C.3.4.4	--	--	--			

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington</u> (continued)									
C.9-361	Tisch, Shirley	House of Representatives	01067	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Tollackson, Dorothy		00450	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00450	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Towne, Henry		01505	00001	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
	Townsend, Shari		02109	00002	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02109	00003	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Turnbull, David S.		00664	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Tuttle, Daniel and Barbara		00434	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00434	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Unsoeld, Jolene		01236	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01236	00002	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01236	00003	-----	C.3.1.3	C.6.4	--	--
			01236	00006	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Unterschuetz, Susan	Tri-City Nuc. Industrial Council	02559	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Valenzuela, Karengale		01120	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01120	00004	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01120	00005	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Vinson, Greg		02417	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Volpentest, Mr. Sam		02263	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02263	00002	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			02263	00003	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
	Wahl, Kathleen M.		02415	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Walters, C.		00212	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Wardle, Jay		01124	00001	-----	C.3.3.1	--	--	--
			01124	00002	-----	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01124	00006	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
		01124	00007	-----	C.2.6.3	--	--	--	
	Warner, James E.	01283	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
		01283	00002	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--	
		01283	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
		01283	00007	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
	Warren, Roselee	01229	00001	-----	C.2.4.3	--	--	--	
		01229	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
		01229	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
		01229	00004	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--	
	Warwick, Lorintha	02525	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
	Washburn, Steve R.	02316	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	C.7.3	C.3.1.2	--	
		02316	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington</u> (continued)									
C.9-362	Washburn, Steve R.		02626	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02626	00002	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Watts, Peggy		01205	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Weiner, Ruth		02332	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02332	00002	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			02332	00003	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02332	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02332	00007	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02332	00008	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02332	00010	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
			02332	00011	-----	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			02332	00025	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02332	00026	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Weiner, Ruth F.		02363	00001	-----	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			02363	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02363	00003	-----	C.3.3	--	--	--
			02363	00006	-----	C.3.3	--	--	--
			02363	00007	-----	C.3.3	--	--	--
			02363	00009	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
			02363	00010	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02363	00011	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02363	00012	-----	C.2.7.1	--	--	--
			02363	00021	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02363	00048	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
	Weis, Deborah S.		02434	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Welinski, C. J.		00447	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00447	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Wendling, F. E.		01206	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Wheeler, Catherine A.		00099	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Wheeler, Catherine A.		00162	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00162	00003	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
			00162	00004	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			00162	00005	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			00162	00006	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
	Whitbeck, R.O.N.	Christian Commun. Consultants	01532	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Whitbeck, R.O.N.	Christian Commun. Consultants	02083	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	White, Margaret S.		00674	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			00674	00003	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION					
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH		
<u>Washington</u> (continued)											
C.9-363	Whitson, Paula L.	Spokane Group Sierra Club	02594	00001	-----	C.2.1.3	--	--	--		
			02594	00002	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--		
			02594	00003	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--		
			02594	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
			02594	00005	-----	C.2.4.2	--	--	--		
			02594	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--		
			02594	00007	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--		
			02594	00008	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--		
			02594	00009	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--		
			02594	00010	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--		
			02594	00011	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--		
			02594	00012	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--		
	Wilgress, Laura Wilkinson, J.R.		02398	00001	-----	C.2.8.2	--	--	--		
			00144	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
			00144	00012	-----	C.3.4.2.4	--	--	--		
			00144	00013	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--		
			00144	00014	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--		
			00144	00015	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--		
			00144	00016	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--		
			00144	00017	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--		
			00144	00018	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--		
			Wilkinson, James R.		02520	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
					02520	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
					Wilkinson, James R.		02584	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--
	02584	00012					-----	C.3.4.2.4	--	--	--
	02584	00013					-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
	02584	00014					-----	C.2.3	--	--	--
	Williams, Agatha				02584	00015	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02584	00016	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--		
			02584	00017	-----	C.2.8.1	--	--	--		
			00683	00001	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--		
			00683	00002	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--		
			00683	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
			00683	00007	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--		
Williams, Thomas		01198	00001	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--			
		01198	00002	-----	C.2.3	--	--	--			
		01198	00003	-----	C.2.3	--	--	--			
		01198	00007	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--			

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington</u> (continued)									
	Williams, Senator Al		02314	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02314	00002	-----	C.3.3	--	--	--
			02314	00003	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02314	00004	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02314	00005	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02314	00006	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
	Williams, Al	ECO Northwest	02361	00001	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02361	00002	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02361	00003	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02361	00004	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02361	00005	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02361	00006	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02361	00007	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02361	00008	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02361	00009	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02361	00010	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02361	00011	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02361	00012	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02361	00013	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02361	00014	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02361	00015	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02361	00016	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02361	00017	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02361	00018	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02361	00020	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02361	00021	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02361	00022	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02361	00023	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02361	00024	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02361	00025	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02361	00026	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02361	00027	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02361	00028	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02361	00029	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02361	00030	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02361	00031	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02361	00032	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			02361	00033	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--

C.9-364

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION				
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	
<u>Washington</u> (continued)										
C.9-365			02361	00034	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
			02361	00035	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
			02361	00036	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
			02361	00037	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
			02361	00039	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
			02361	00040	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
			02361	00041	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
			02361	00042	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
			02361	00043	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
			02361	00044	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
			02361	00045	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
			02361	00046	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
			02361	00047	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
			02361	00048	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
			02361	00049	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
			02361	00050	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
			02361	00051	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
			02361	00052	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
			02361	00053	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
			02361	00054	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
			02361	00055	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
			02361	00056	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
			02361	00058	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
			02361	00059	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--	
	Williams, Senator A1		State of Washington	02360	00001	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
				02360	00002	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
				02360	00003	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
				02360	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
				02360	00005	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
				02360	00006	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
				02360	00007	-----	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
				02360	00008	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
				02360	00009	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
	Williams, Senator A1			02731	00001	-----	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			02731	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--	
			02731	00003	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
			02731	00004	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	
			02731	00005	-----	C.3.4.3	--	--	--	

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Washington</u> (continued)									
C.9-366	Wilson, Callie		02347	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Wilusz, Janet		02278	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Wolf, Hazel		02376	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02376	00002	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02376	00003	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02376	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02376	00005	-----	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			02376	00006	-----	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02376	00007	-----	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
	Wonacott, Steve		02383	00003	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
	Woodhouse, Philip R.		00249	00002	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
	Woods, Carole		02389	00001	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
			02389	00002	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
	Worby, Bernard H.		00204	00001	-----	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00204	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00204	00003	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00204	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Young, John R.		00268	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00268	00003	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00268	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Zepeda, Barbara		02411	00001	-----	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
	Ziegler, Nick J.		00163	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00163	00002	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00163	00003	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Zucker, Dr. Frank		02390	00001	-----	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
<u>Wisconsin</u>									
	Hofmeister, William F.		00290	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Knapp, Mrs. Evelyn C.		00156	00001A	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00156	00001B	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
<u>Wyoming</u>									
	Ankersmit/Jobson, Karen/Mark		02666	00001	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02666	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02666	00003	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			02666	00004	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION			
						FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
<u>Wyoming</u> (continued)									
	Barmore, Jr., William J.		00064	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00064	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Carlman, Leonard R.		00524	00001	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00524	00002	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			00524	00003	-----	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00524	00004	-----	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Franklin, Dr. Chuck		02665	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Gaymer/Webb, Jean Alden/William		02663	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Rose, Judy A.		02664	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02664	00002	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			02664	00003	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
	Anonymous		01152	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Inglis, Mrs. Terry		02110	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			02110	00002	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			02110	00003	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			02110	00004	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
	Knorr, Michele		00608	00001	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00608	00002	-----	C.3.4.4	--	--	--

C.9-367