

TOM BILLEY, VIRGINIA, CHAIRMAN

W.J. "BILLY" TAUZIN, LOUISIANA  
 MICHAEL G. OXLEY, OHIO  
 MICHAEL BILIRAKIS, FLORIDA  
 JOE BARTON, TEXAS  
 FRED UPTON, MICHIGAN  
 CUFF STEARNS, FLORIDA PAUL  
 E. GILLMOR, OHIO  
 JAMES C. GREENWOOD, PENNSYLVANIA  
 CHRISTOPHER COX, CALIFORNIA  
 NATHAN DEAL, GEORGIA  
 STEVE LARGENT, OKLAHOMA  
 RICHARD BURR, NORTH CAROLINA  
 BRIAN P. OLORAY, CALIFORNIA  
 ED WHITFIELD, KENTUCKY  
 OREO GANSKE, HAWAII  
 CHARLIE NORWOOD, GEORGIA  
 TOM A. COBURN, OKLAHOMA  
 RICK LAZIO, NEW YORK  
 BARBARA CUBIN, WYOMING  
 JAMES E. ROGAN, CALIFORNIA  
 JOHN SHIMKUS, ILLINOIS HEATHER  
 WILSON, NEW MEXICO  
 JUHN U. SHADEUG, AKMUNA  
 CHARLES W. "CHIEF" PICKBUNG, M66BSIPPI  
 VITO FIDSELLA, NEW YORK  
 ROY BLUNT, MISSOURI  
 ED BRYANT, TENNESSEE  
 ROBERT L. EHRLICH, JR, MARYLAND

JOHN D. DINGELL, MICHIGAN  
 HENRY A. WAXMAN, CALIFORNIA  
 EDWARD J. MARKEY, MASSACHUSETTS  
 RALPH M. HALL, TEXAS  
 RICK BOUCHER, VIRGINIA  
 EDCLPHUS TOWNS, NEW YORK  
 FRANK PALLONE, JR, NEW JERSEY  
 SHERROD BROWN, OHIO DART  
 GORDON, TENNESSEE  
 PETER DEUTSCH, FLORIDA  
 BOBBY L RUSH, ILLINOIS  
 ANNA O ESHOO, CALIFORNIA  
 RON KLINK, PENNSYLVANIA  
 BARTSTUPAK, MICHIGAN  
 ELIOT L ENGEL, NEW YORK  
 THOMAS G. SAWYER, OHIO ALBERT  
 R. WYNN, MARYLAND  
 GENE GREEN, TEXAS  
 KAREN McCARTHY, MISSOURI  
 TED STRICKLAND, OHIO  
 DIANA DeGETTE, COLORADO  
 THOMAS M. BARRETT, WISCONSIN  
 BILL LUTHER, MINNESOTA  
 LOIS CAPP, CALIFORNIA

JAMES E. DERDERIAN, CHIEF OF STAFF

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

July 20, 2000

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

Dear Dr. Knopman:

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

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

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

Sincerely,



Joe Barton  
 Chairman

Subcommittee on Energy and Power

Attachment

**QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD FROM MR BARTON FOR NWTRB**

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