



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD  
2300 Clarendon Boulevard, Suite 1300  
Arlington, VA 22201

December 20, 2002

Ms. Judy Treichel  
Executive Director  
Nevada Nuclear Waste Task Force, Inc.  
Alamo Plaza  
4550 W. Oakey Blvd., Suite 111  
Las Vegas, NV 89102

Dear Ms. Treichel:

Thank you very much for your November 1, 2002, letter regarding perceived conflicts of interest and the potential effect that those perceptions might have on the public's trust in the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board (Board). The Board has spent considerable time over the last two months discussing many of the issues raised in your letter. I realize that your concerns arise from your sincere regard for the Board and the need to continue the Board's tradition of unbiased and objective technical review of Department of Energy (DOE) activities. I share your regard for the Board and take very seriously the need to respond credibly to the issues that you have raised. Toward that end, I offer the following observations that are relevant to these issues. The observations are my personal views and do not necessarily reflect the consensus views of the Board or the views of individual Board members.

*The Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board (Board) is composed of members who have a broad range of views.* Although members of the Board are nominated solely on the basis of their scientific or engineering expertise, their views about Yucca Mountain may span a wide range. This has not affected the objectivity of the Board's findings, conclusions, and recommendations related to the technical and scientific validity of the DOE's work in the past, and the Board is strongly committed to maintaining the objectivity and integrity of its evaluations in the future.

*By law, the Board's role is to review the technical basis for the DOE's work, not to make or comment on policy decisions.* The Board did not offer an opinion on whether to recommend Yucca Mountain for repository development and will not make a recommendation related to whether a license application should be approved for a proposed repository at Yucca Mountain. However, developing a solid foundation of scientific and technical information to provide a proper technical basis for making such decisions is in everyone's interest. Accordingly, the Board will continue providing its objective views on the technical and scientific validity of the DOE's work that will form the basis for future decision-making.

*Board members decide on Board findings, conclusions, and recommendations as a group.* Although the chairman may be called on to act as spokesperson for Board opinion, all 11

members of the Board work together to develop Board statements, and all Board members scrutinize Board letters and reports for clarity and potential bias. This process has worked well in the past, and there is no reason that it should not continue to work well in the future.

In closing, I want to emphasize that the Board will continue to encourage public participation and an open and free exchange of viewpoints at its meetings, most of which will continue to be held in Nevada. As stated earlier, the entire Board is strongly committed to maintaining the integrity and objectivity of its technical and scientific reviews. Therefore, I hope that you will judge the Board by how it conducts its meetings and by the technical and scientific objectivity and content of its future findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

Thank you again for your thoughtful letter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Michael Corradini". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, prominent initial "M".

Michael Corradini  
Chairman