DOE/RW-0072
Volume 3 of 3

Nuclear Waste Policy Act
(Section 112)

Environmental Assessment

Richton Dome Site, Mississippi

Volume III

May 1986

U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management

DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED

Free copies can be obtained from the Department of Energy until supply is exhausted.

Write to:
U.S. Department of Energy
Attention: EA
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

This report has been reproduced directly from the best available copy.

Additional copies may be purchased from the National Technical Information Service, U.S. Department of Commerce, Springfield, Virginia 22161.

Price: Printed Copy A99
Microfiche A01

Codes are used for pricing all publications. The code is determined by the number of pages in the publication. Information pertaining to the pricing codes can be found in the current issues of the following publications, which are generally available in most libraries: *Energy Research Abstracts, (ERA); Government Reports Announcements* and Index *(GRA and I); Scientific and Technical Abstract Reports (STAR);* and publication, NTIS-PR-360 available from (NTIS) at the above address.

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.

DOE/RW--0072-Vol.3

TI91 017504

Nuclear Waste Policy Act
(Section 112)

Environmental Assessment

Richton Dome Site, Mississippi

Volume III

May 1986

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

MASTER

DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED

Appendix C

COMMENT-RESPONSE DOCUMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
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
C.2.3.3	Schedule	C.2-32

Page

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
C.2.4.2 Retrievability C.2-49

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

		Page
	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.2.9	References for C.2	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.3-8
	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.3-10
	C.3.1.2.4 Screening for sites in salt	C.3-11
	C.3.1.2.5 Particular siting issues	C.3-13
	C.3.1.2.6 Alternative repository locations	C.3-15
C.3.2	Evaluation of disqualifying conditions	C.3-15
C.3.3	Evaluation of geohydrologic settings	C.3-15
C.3.4	Nomination and recommendation of sites for characterization	C.3-19
	C.3.4.1 Comparison of sites on the basis of postclosure guidelines	C.3-20
	C.3.4.4.1 System guideline	C.3-20
	C.3.4.1.2 Geohydrology	C.3-21

		Page
C.3.4.1.3	Geochemistry	C.3-29
C.3.4.1.4	Rock Characteristics	C.3-34
C.3.4.1.5	Climatic Change	C.3-38
C.3.4.1.6	Erosion	C.3-39
C.3.4.1.7	Dissolution	C.3-41
C.3.4.1.8	Tectonics	C.3-42
C.3.4.1.9	Natural Resources	C.3-44
C.3.4.1.10	Site ownership and control	C.3-46
C.3.4.2	Comparison of sites on the basis of preclosure guidelines	C.3-46
C.3.4.2.1	Preclosure radiological safety	C.3-46
C.3.4.2.2	Environment, socioeconomics and transportation	C.3-51
C.3.4.2.3	Ease and cost of siting, construction, operation and closure	C.3-59
C.3.4.3	Decision method	C.3-64
C.3.4.4	Miscellaneous comments on the nomination and Recommendation process	C.3-66
C.3.5	Miscellaneous	
C.3.6	References for Chapter C.3	C.3-75
C.3.6.1	References listed by author	
C.3.6.2	Federal regulations and statutes	
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.4-1
C.4.1.1.1	Regional geology	C.4-3
C.4.1.1.2	Geomorphology	C.4-4
C.4.1.1.3	Stratigraphy	C.4-4
C.4.1.1.4	Paleontology	C.4-6
C.4.1.1.5	Structure and tectonics	C.4-7
C.4.1.1.6	Rock characteristics	C.4-12
C.4.1.1.7	Geochemistry	C.4-16
C.4.1.1.8	Mineral resources	C.4-19
C.4.1.1.9	Soils	C.4-20
C.4.1.2	Hydrologic conditions	C.4-21
C.4.1.2.1	Surface water	C.4-21
C.4.1.2.2	Ground water	C.4-22
C.4.1.2.3	Current use	C.4-24
C.4.1.3	Environmental conditions	C.4-25
C.4.1.3.1	Land use	C.4-26
C.4.1.3.2	Ecosystems	C.4-26
C.4.1.3.3	Air quality and weather	C.4-28
C.4.1.3.4	Noise	C.4-29
C.4.1.3.5	Aesthetic resources	C.4-29
C.4.1.3.6	Archaeological, cultural, and historical resources	C.4-30

		Page
	C.4.1.3.7 Background radiation	C.4-30
	C.4.1.4 Transportation	C.4-30
	C.4.1.5 Socioeconomic conditions	C.4-31
	C.4.1.5.1 Population	C.4-32
	C.4.1.5.2 Economic conditions	C.4-33
	C.4.1.5.3 Community services	C.4-34
	C.4.1.5.4 Social conditions	C.4-34
	C.4.1.5.5 Government and fiscal conditions	C.4-35
C.4.2	Activities proposed for site characterization	C.4-35
	C.4.2.1 Field studies	C.4-35
	C.4.2.2 Exploratory shaft	C.4-36
	C.4.2.3 Other activities	C.4-40
	C.4.2.4 Alternative activities	C.4-42
C.4.3	The repository	C.4-42
C.4.4	Chapter 4 references	C.4-69
	C.4.4.1 References listed by author	C.4-69
	C.4.4.2 Federal regulations and statutes	C.4-73
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.5-6
C.5.4	Climate changes	C.5-15
C.5.5	Erosion	C.5-16
C.5.6	Dissolution	C.5-16
C.5.7	Postclosure tectonics	C.5-18
C.5.8	Human interference (natural resources)	C.5-23
C.5.9	Postclosure site ownership and control	C.5-27
C.5.10	Postclosure system guideline	C.5-28
C.5.11	Assessment of postclosure performance	C.5-28
C.5.12	Chapter 5 references	C.5-51
	C.5.12.1 References listed by author	C.5-51
	C.5.12.2 Federal regulations and statutes	C.5-59
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.6-6
C.6.5	System guideline - preclosure radiological safety	C.6-6
C.6.6	Assessment of preclosure performance	C.6-8
C.6.7	Chapter 6 references	C.6-10
	C.6.7.1 References listed by author	C.6-10
	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.7-2

			Page
		C.7.1.1.1 Land use	C.7-3
		C.7.1.1.2 Ecosystems	C.7-4
		C.7.1.1.3 Air quality	C.7-5
		C.7.1.1.4 Aesthetic conditions	C.7-6
		C.7.1.1.5 Noise	C.7-6
		C.7.1.1.6 Archaeological, cultural, and historical resources	C.7-7
		C.7.1.1.7 Radiological	C.7-7
		C.7.1.1.8 Water quality	C.7-7
		C.7.1.1.9 Transportation and utilities	C.7-8
	C.7.1.2	Effects on socioeconomic conditions	C.7-8
C.7.2		Environmental quality	C.7-9
	C.7.2.1	Land use	C.7-11
	C.7.2.2	Ecosystems	C.7-12
	C.7.2.3	Air quality	C.7-14
	C.7.2.4	Aesthetic conditions	C.7-14
	C.7.2.5	Noise	C.7-14
	C.7.2.6	Archaeological, cultural, and historical resources	C.7-15
	C.7.2.7	Radiological	C.7-15
	C.7.2.8	Water quality	C.7-16
C.7.3		Expected effects of transportation	C.7-17
C.7.4		Expected effects on socioeconomic conditions	C.7-21
	C.7.4.1	Population density and distribution	C.7-22
	C.7.4.2	Economic conditions	C.7-23
	C.7.4.3	Community services	C.7-25
	C.7.4.4	Social conditions	C.7-26
	C.7.4.5	Fiscal conditions and government structure	C.7-27
C.7.5		System guideline	C.7-28
C.7.6		Chapter 7 references	C.7-30
	C.7.6.1	References listed by author	C.7-30
	C.7.6.2	Federal regulations and statutes	C.7-30
	C.7.6.3	State of Mississippi laws	C.7-30
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.8-9
C.8.4		Preclosure tectonics	C.8-11
C.8.5		System guideline	C.8-13
C.8.6		Chapter 8 references	C.8-15
	C.8.6.1	References listed by author	C.8-15
	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.

Classification number	Subject
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.

Classification number	Subject	EA section
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.

Classification number	Subject	EA section
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.

Classification number	Subject	EA section
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

Classification number	Subject	EA section
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.

Classification number	Subject	EA section
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.

Classification number	Subject	EA section
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.

Classification number	Subject	EA section
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. Futhermore, 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. Futhermore, 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 drefts 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 shiping 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 contri- butors 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 nonoccupational 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 made 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 sepcific 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 environemental 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 Reguluatory 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 not 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 firs 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 correpondence 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 socioeconomics 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 though 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-NRC, 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 was 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 19, 1985 (EPA, 1985), 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 undergound 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.3.2 EVALUATION OF DISQUALIFYING CONDITIONS

No comments on the evaluation of the Richton Dome site against the disqualifying conditions of the guidelines, as summarized in Section 2.3 of the EA, were received.

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 Richton, Cypress Creek, and Vacherie Domes.

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 give in Section 2.4 of the EA.) The changes in findings did not change the conclusion that the Richton Dome is the preferred site in the Gulf Coast salt-dome geohydrologic setting. Section 2.4 of the final EA was revised to reflect these changes in findings.

Issue

One commenter felt that justification was needed for siting a repository in a location that could be under water. The EA states that Richton Dome is 160 to 190 feet above the mean sea level. According to Aronow (1982), potential rises in sea level of up to 360 feet above present mean sea level are predicted with the melting of glacial ice.

Response

The DOE examined and evaluated available data on sea-level changes due to the melting of the ice caps. There is no evidence that the earth's glacial ice has ever melted completely. The DOE has modified the Section 6.3.1.5 of the final EA to clarify the rationale for selecting a particular value for the maximum sea-level rise from the many estimates that have been published.

Issue

One commenter questioned why the Richton Dome was ranked ahead of the other salt domes on the issue of dissolution, pointing out that saline anomalies in the vicinity of the Richton Dome may indicate salt dissolution. Also mentioned as possible indicators of dissolution were porous conditions at the salt-caprock contact and porous conditions within the caprock.

Response

The final EA has been revised to present a more thorough and integrated analysis of the dissolution issue in Sections 3.2.5.7, 3.2.7, and 6.3.1.6. Additional data not available when the draft EA was prepared have been incorporated--in particular, analyses of the structure and mineral composition of the caprock and the characteristics of the salt-caprock interface. These studies used data from more than 70 wells near the dome. The results indicate that significant dissolution of the Richton Dome salt stock ended approximately 25 million years ago. A reevaluation of the drilling records for wells MRIH-II and MH-4, downgradient of the dome, indicates that the previously reported anomalous salinities were due to the contamination of aquifers by saline drilling fluids. If these two anomalous well record are discounted, there is no geochemical evidence of ongoing dissolution in the vicinity of the Richton Dome.

Issue

One commenter stated that the seismic risk at the Richton Dome was underrated and should have been used as a discriminating factor in selecting among the salt domes. Specifically, the commenters noted the proximity of the Richton Dome to the Phillips Fault System and the Pickens-Gilbertown Fault zone.

Response

Sections 3.2.5 and 6.3.1.7 of the final EA have been rewritten to clarify the nature of the known faults near the Richton Dome. The Phillips Fault is clearly separated from the Richton Dome and does not involve the dome. Studies indicate that the Phillips Fault has been inactive for over 100 million years. Section 6.3.1.7 evaluates the seismic hazard to the site from seismic sources including the Pickens-Gilbertown Fault System. The seismic hazard for the Richton Dome area is shown to be low, as it is for other domes in the interior basis of Mississippi and Louisiana.

Issue

One commenter questioned whether previous exploration drilling along the flanks of the Richton Dome has potentially affected the capability of the site for waste containment and isolation. Specific reference is made to the drilling records of the well Shell-Masonite 23-7.

Response

The DOE has examined the drilling records of Shell-Masonite 23-7 and agrees that the well intersected the salt stock for a short distance at approximately the level of the proposed repository. This intersection occurred in the very outermost part of the planned 800-foot perimeter pillar. Sections 6.3.1.8 and 6.4.2.6 of the EA have been expanded to evaluate the potential for salt dissolution from existing boreholes. Additional analyses have confirmed that boreholes along the flanks of the dome would not significantly affect the containment and isolation capability of the site.

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 quideline, 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 x 10^{-6} meter per day (7.2 to 1.5 x 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 socioeconomics 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 reconaissance-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 diqualified (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 socioeconomics 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 socioeconomics 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 socioeconomics 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 inconsistentcies 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 to 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 tehnical 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 socioeconomics 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 compartive 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, socioeconomics, 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 Ioslation, 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 Ioslation, 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), 1984. "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), 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.

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

Issues raised by commenters and responded to in this section are general in nature. They include the lack of site-specific data and the inadequate data base.

Issue

Some commenters were concerned about the lack of site-specific technical data gathered from the site that would not be representative of the area under consideration. It was stated that too many assumptions, which could be manipulated to arrive at any conclusion, resulted in erroneous conclusions being made.

Response

Information presented in the EA was extracted from verified references appropriate to the various areas of study. Only verifiable data were reported. Small differences in data may exist between references, and these are reflected in the discussions of assumptions and data uncertainties.

Regarding the "too many assumptions" comment, conclusions in the EAs are based upon extrapolations, projections, and interpolations of regional, areal, and, where available, site data. Where assumptions were made, they were realistic and conservative and would tend to overstate the magnitude of projected impacts. The data are sufficient to meet the requirements of 10 CFR 960.3-1-4-2 to support the nomination of a site as suitable for characterization.

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 Richton Dome 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 the following smaller categories: regional geology, geomorphology, stratigraphy,

paleontology, structure and tectonics, rock characteristics, geochemistry, mineral resources, and soils. These smaller categories were selected to be closely aligned to specific sections in Chapter 3 of the EA.

Issues raised by the commenters include the following:

- Lack of site-specific technical data
- Adequacy of the regional geology description
- Appropriateness of regional geomorphic data
- Discussion of stratigraphy
- Existence of dissolution
- Existence of other gaps between the salt caprock
- Lack of adequate discussion related to alternative ground-water pathways
- Presence and nature of anomalous zones
- Limited data base used to define the geometry of Richton Dome
- Seismic setting of Richton Dome
- Location and rate of uplift in the region
- Possibility of induced dissolution
- Relationship of structural features and their effect on repository conditions
- Dome movement
- Effects of discontinuities, heterogeneities, and impurities on rock mass behavior
- Salt material model
- Variation in the rock and soil properties measurements
- In situ stresses
- Site-specific soil corrosiveness
- Information on the design thermal-load-limit-per-acre for a salt dome repository
- Adequate use of geochemical modeling

- Radionuclide mobility/migration
- Mineral resources
- Locations of sulfur exploration.

Issue

A few commenters noted a lack of site-specific data available to describe the site. In particular, the use of regional and generic data, as well as an insufficient description of the data base, were noted.

Response

The description of the geologic conditions at the site in the draft EA relies on sources that are regional as well as site specific. The DOE has expanded Section 3.2.3 based on information not available during preparation of the draft EA (ETC, 1985; Werner, 1985a,b). The additional information consists of detailed evaluations of regional and overdome stratigraphy and caprock based on the records of 70 overdome borings. This information has provided an enhanced understanding of dome growth history and rates of salt dissolution. The DOE has reviewed the information presented in Chapter 3 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

Some commenters questioned the adequacy of the regional geology description. Specifically, insufficient use of references in descriptions of salt domes and unclear discussions of the Gulf Coast geosyncline were noted.

Response

The DOE has expanded Section 3.2.1 of the EA text using additional primary references to provide a more complete and concise description of the development of the Gulf Coast geosyncline. Additional discussion of modern theories of salt dome development also is presented in Sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.5.

C.4.1.1.2 Geomorphology

Issue

A commenter questioned the appropriateness of using regional geomorphic data. In particular, it was noted that the denudation rate at Richton Dome cannot be determined from regional data.

Response

The DOE acknowledges that data needed to calculate the denudation rates specific to Richton Dome are not available. Therefore, in the draft EA, the DOE presented denudation rates for two areas that are of similar climate, soil, elevation, and distance inland from the Gulf Coast as Richton Dome. There are no characteristics of the Richton Dome site that would indicate denudation rates significantly different from those in the broader region.

Issue

A commenter noted that the presentation of alternate explanations of the development of the drainage network over Richton Dome is hampered by an inaccurate citation and the insufficient use of available data.

Response

The DOE has reviewed and analyzed data regarding the drainage network over Richton Dome and possible causes of the drainage pattern. These possible causes consist of tectonically controlled fractures, joints (or other avenues of easy erodibility), and variations in lithology. Section 3.2.2.1 of the EA text has been modified to correct the misrepresented citation regarding the cause of the drainage patterns and to present these alternate explanations for the patterns of streams.

C.4.1.1.3 Stratigraphy

Issue

A commenter noted inaccuracies in the discussion of stratigraphy, particularly in the location and stratigraphic relationship of the Citronelle Formation.

Response

It is recognized that, on a regional scale, the Citronelle Formation is deposited unconformably over a number of units. The DOE has modified Section 3.2.1 of the EA text to reflect this stratigraphic relationship.

Issue

A commenter questioned the possible existence and extent of dissolution at Richton Dome and its effect on repository integrity.

Response

The DOE has conducted a more thorough and integrated analysis of the dissolution issue since the draft EA was issued (Werner, 1985a,b; ETC, 1985).

These analyses looked at caprock characteristics, such as vugs, cavities, fractures and fracture fillings; gaps between the caprock and salt stock; the nature and pattern of overdome sediments; and the field data for the purported saline anomaly. All these data were used in evaluating the likelihood of active dissolution, the rate of dissolution, and the potential importance of the rate of dissolution on the repository integrity. The available data suggest that dissolution has not significantly altered the site over the past 25 million years and that the potential for future dissolution is low. The DOE has revised Sections 3.2.5.7 and 6.3.1.6 to present these analyses in response to this issue.

Issue

A commenter stated that the existence of other gaps between the salt caprock contact is possible.

Response

The "gap" referred to is actually a zone of predominantly granular anhydrite. The DOE acknowledges the possibility of the existence of similar zones between the caprock and the salt stock elsewhere and has modified Section 3.2.3.2.3 of the EA text accordingly.

Issue

Some commenters noted that there was a lack of adequate discussion related to alternative ground-water pathways leading to possible dissolution.

Response

The DOE has examined the potential for induced dissolution as a result of boreholes providing an alternative ground-water pathway. In this study, "Salt Dissolution Analysis in Existing Boreholes at Cypress Creek" (Monti and Gupta, 1984), it was conceptualized that a borehole penetrated through the outer edge of the repository into the Wilcox Aquifer, and that the hydraulic head was abnormally high in this lower aquifer. The results of this analysis indicate

that, initially, salt dissolution would cause the diameter of the borehole to increase; however, salt creep and siltation would simultaneously cause the borehole to decrease in size, leading to borehole closure. The DOE has modified Sections 3.2.5.7 and 6.3.1.6 of the EA text to reflect these additional analyses.

Issue

A commenter stated that there is a lack of site-specific data to characterize the site adequately.

Response

The DOE has reviewed the evidence presented in Chapter 3 of the EA and considers it sufficient to meet the requirements of 10 CFR 960.3-1-4-2 for nomination of sites as suitable for site characterization. Section 3.2.3.2.3 of the EA has been added to provide additional site-specific data from The Earth Technology Corporation (1985) and Werner (1985a,b) which were not available during preparation of the draft EA. The additional information consists of detailed evaluations of regional and overdome stratigraphy, and caprock, based on the records of 70 overdome borings as well as regional wells. This information has provided an enhanced understanding of site-specific geologic conditions.

Issue

A commenter questioned the characteristics of the caprock over Richton Dome. Specifically, the occurrence of fractures and solution openings in the caprock and their relationship to ground-water flow were questioned.

Response

The DOE has reviewed and analyzed the characteristics of the caprock over Richton Dome, as they relate to ground-water flow and dissolution, using new analyses on the Richton Dome caprock (ETC, 1985; Werner, 1985a,b) performed since the release of the draft EA. The available data suggest that permeability within Richton Dome caprock occurs in discrete zones at the top of the caprock, primarily within the limestone portion, and does not appear to occur deeper into the caprock. The DOE has expanded Sections 3.3.2.1.2 and 3.2.5.7 of the text based on this analysis.

C.4.1.1.4 Paleontology

No comments were received.

C.4.1.1.5 Structure and Tectonics

Issue

Some commenters noted apparent structural, stratigraphic, and hydrologic evidence for continuing diapiric movement of Richton Dome and questioned its long-term stability.

Response

The DOE has evaluated new stratigraphic and structural data which are presented in The Earth Technology Corporation (1985) and Werner (1985a,b), and previous information to interpret the development of Richton Dome and determine the rate and timing of dome growth. Based on this and an understanding of basin development, a composite history of salt tectonic processes was developed to aid understanding of the present stability of Richton Dome. Specifically, diapiric movement is not active at Richton Dome, and postdiapiric movement is very slow.

The DOE has modified Section 3.2.5.6 of the EA text and added a new section (3.2.3.2.3) to clarify the evolution and current stability of Richton Dome.

Issue

Some commenters noted the presence and nature of anomalous zones in other salt domes and structural and stratigraphic evidence that may suggest their existence in Richton Dome.

Response

The DOE has more fully evaluated the potential for anomalous zones within Richton Dome in a comprehensive study (ETC, 1985) as part of the preparation of the final EA. The study focused on anomalous zones that have been documented in other domes, domes investigated in which no anomalous zones are present, and alternate interpretations of the structural and stratigraphic features at Richton Dome that may suggest the presence of anomalous zones based on analogy with other domes and salt dome models that have been developed. The DOE has concluded that the existence of anomalous zones in Richton Dome is possible; however, the likelihood of their existence in Gulf Coast salt domes (of which Richton Dome is classified) appears to be low.

The DOE has modified Sections 3.2.3.2, 3.2.5.6, and 6.3.3.2 of the EA text to provide an enhanced understanding of the occurrence, nature, and ramifications of the presence of anomalous zones.

Issue

Many commenters commented on the limited data base used to define the geometry of Richton Dome and the difficulty in accurately characterizing the size and shape of the dome.

Response

The DOE has reanalyzed the geometry of Richton Dome, as described in the EA, based on data from oil and sulfur exploration wells, area characterization borings, seismic reflection, and gravity data. A recent report on the geometry of the Richton Dome (ETC, 1985) has been published which revises the proposed geometry of the Dome. The appropriate figures in the final EA have been updated to show the new interpretation.

In addition, the DOE has modified Section 3.2.5.6 of the EA text to clarify what data support the dome boundary used in the EA.

Issue

Many commenters questioned the seismic setting of Richton Dome. In particular, the accuracy of the historical record, the identification of seismic sources, and the seismic hazards (ground shaking and lateral accelerations) to be expected at the site were questioned.

Response

The DOE has reviewed all seismicity-related data for the area to evaluate the accuracy and adequacy as presented in the EA. Specifically, the DOE has studied the location and cause of the Melvin, Alabama, earthquake (1978); examined other earthquakes in the Clarke County, Mississippi, and Choctaw County, Alabama, areas; analyzed epicentral uncertainty; revised epicentral locations; and updated the catalog of earthquakes within 483 kilometers (300 miles) of Richton Dome.

The DOE has expanded Section 3.2.5.2 of the EA text to reflect information provided by the data review and to discuss surface rupture of faults in the Gulf Coast area. Sections 6.3.1.7 and 6.3.3.4 have been modified accordingly.

Issue

Some commenters questioned the location and rate of uplift in the region, particularly the substantiation of geodetically measured uplift rates and the corroboration of predicted uplift by geomorphic data.

Response

The DOE has assessed the accuracy of the suggested regional uplift rates by reevaluating the geodetic data for possible errors in measurement and complications introduced by methods of analysis, and by reviewing geomorphic and geologic evidence of uplift. The assessment has shown that the uplift rates of Holdahl and Morrison (1974), when corrected for releveling errors, are lower than reported (ETC, 1985).

The DOE has revised Sections 3.2.5.4, 6.3.1.5, and 6.3.1.7 of the EA text to clarify and modify the regional uplift rates based on the results of this reevaluation.

Issue

Many commenters stated that uncertainties in the evidence pertaining to dissolution require a reexamination of the conclusions relative to dissolution. Specifically, it was noted that (1) existing data should be reevaluated to develop alternative interpretations, with an associated uncertainty analysis, related to the potential for dissolution; (2) data relating to features such as the chloride anomaly, the gap at the caprock/salt stock contact, anomalous zones within the dome, granular anhydrite, and the loss of drilling circulation indicate that dissolution has and is occurring; and (3) negative evidence, such as a lack of collapse features and the lack of overdome faults and/or faulted caprock, does not support a conclusion for the lack of dissolution and must be reexamined.

Response

The DOE acknowledges that dissolution has occurred and that the potential for additional dissolution exists at the Richton Dome as it does at any site in salt. The DOE has conducted a more thorough and integrated analysis of the dissolution issue; this analysis included the following:

- A compilation and description of all the geologic, hydrologic, and geochemical evidence associated with past or active dissolution and alternative explanations of these data
- A summary of information on caprock hydrology and flow through salt to identify the hydrologic characteristics of known or suspected geologic features influencing ground-water flow (such as anomalous zones, granular anhydrite, loss of drilling circulation, and the gap at the caprock/salt stock interface) and, thus, the rate of dissolution
- Identification of the location, depth, and hydrologic condition of boreholes over or adjacent to Richton Dome and an evaluation of their influence on ground-water flow and, thus, the potential for associated dissolution

- Identification of the potential for ground-water flow along preferred paths on the basis of the hydrologic characteristics of geologic features identified at Richton Dome and the borehole information, combined with what is known or suspected about the hydrogeologic setting.

Based on this reevaluation, the DOE concludes that potential dissolution at Richton Dome, either naturally occurring or induced, would not represent a threat to repository integrity. Evidence suggests that (1) dissolution of the salt stock during the past 25 million years has been minor, (2) caprock impedes the flow of undersaturated ground water past the salt stock, and (3) boreholes have not significantly increased the potential for dissolution.

The DOE has modified Sections 3.2.5.7 and 6.3.1.6 of the EA text in response to these comments.

Issue

Some commenters stated that the possibility of induced dissolution that might result from the presence of a repository and associated human-induced changes needs to be evaluated. In particular, it was stated that the effects of ground-water pumping, thermochemical change, and boreholes on host rock integrity needed to be evaluated.

Response

The DOE has evaluated the possibility of induced dissolution in Sections 6.3.1.8 and 6.4.2.6 by conducting a thorough and integrated analysis including the following elements:

- A compilation and description of all the geologic, hydrologic, and geochemical evidence associated with past or active dissolution

- A summary of information on caprock hydrology and flow through salt to identify the hydrologic characteristics of known or suspected geologic features influencing ground-water flow

- Identification of the location, depth, and hydrologic condition of boreholes over or adjacent to Richton Dome and an evaluation of their influence on ground-water flow and, thus, the potential for associated dissolution

- Identification of the potential for ground-water flow along preferred paths on the basis of the hydrologic characteristics of geologic features identified at Richton Dome, the borehole information, and what is known or suspected about the hydrogeologic setting.

Additional discussion of the impacts of waste heat on repository isolation is presented in Section 6.4.2.3.

The DOE concludes that human-induced changes at Richton Dome will have little effect on the hydrologic or thermomechanical characteristics of the site. Such changes will results in no significant increase in dissolution and will not create preferred flow paths.

Issue

A few commenters questioned the relationship of structural features and their effect on repository conditions. In particular, it was stated that a discussion on the surface evidence of faulting is lacking, references are misquoted, and the genetic relationship of structural features and the regional stress field needs to be addressed.

Response

The DOE has examined references noted by commenters and lineament studies prepared by LETCo (1982, ONWI-120, Vol. VI) to evaluate surface evidence of faulting. The DOE has also reviewed the faulting section of the draft EA for inaccurately quoted references.

The DOE has appropriately modified Sections 3.2.5.1, 6.3.1.7, and 6.3.3.4 of the EA text based on the results of these reviews.

Issue

A few commenters noted the possibility of dome movement, fault movement, and uplift at the site and in the region during the Quaternary Period.

Response

The DOE has modified Sections 3.2.5.1 and 3.2.5.6 of the EA to more clearly state the uncertainties associated with conclusions about Quaternary fault stability, especially with regard to buried faults (e.g., F-7 and F-9 faults). The DOE has evaluated recent stratigraphic and structural data that are presented in The Earth Technology Corporation (1985) and Werner (1985b) and other existing stratigraphic and structural data to interpret the development of Richton Dome and to determine the rate and timing of dome growth. Specifically, the data suggest that the likelihood of Quaternary movement is low. Based on this and an understanding of basin development, a composite history of salt tectonic processes was developed to better understand the present stability of Richton Dome.

The DOE has modified Sections 3.2.5.1 and 3.2.5.6 of the EA text to clarify the evolution of the Richton Dome.

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 need to be discussed. These discontinuities, heterogeneities, and impurities include anomalous zones and subsurface faults.

Response

The DOE has examined available site-specific and relevant generic information for the Richton Dome site, Mississippi, and has incorporated recent studies to establish a basis for response. The information consists of (1) studies of anomalous zones of Gulf Coast salt domes; (2) caprock features and overdome structure and stratigraphy at Richton Dome; (3) discontinuities known to occur in various rock masses, including domal salt; and (4) heterogeneities and impurities in domal salt.

The information has been assessed to consider the effects of discontinuities, heterogeneities, and impurities on rock mass behavior and rock mass characteristics (categorized as near-surface faults, anomalous zones, joints and fractures in caprock, gas and brine pockets, rock mass property anisotropy, subsurface faults, and uncertainty with respect to dome boundaries). The assessment also included an examination of the effects on repository design.

The DOE has clarified Section 3.2.6 of the EA in response to this issue.

Issue

One commenter requested a more detailed discussion of the salt material model and its applications; in particular, the uncertainty in model parameters 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.

The total deformation of salt can be divided into the following three components: elastic deformation, thermal expansion, and inelastic deformation. The salt material model includes elastic deformation and thermal expansion. 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. 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.

Issue

A few commenters noted that the rock and soil properties measurements presented may vary in several ways and should be discussed. These properties may vary from laboratory or 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 any of the following and needs to be addressed:

- Variations from location to location because of natural spatial variation, lack of a statistically representative number of measurements, or technical uncertainties in making extrapolations
- Variations between laboratory or in situ test measurements and rock mass behavior for a single location because of natural spatial variation, 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
- Differences between test-environment and actual repository conditions.

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. Generic data for caprock and salt from laboratory studies have been used to assess data variability from location to location. Site-specific core log data have been assessed to clarify the relationship between laboratory data and the large-scale behavior of the materials.

It is generally established that laboratory tests can only be used to predict rock mass behavior accurately in the rare case that the rock mass is homogeneous and intact. Although domal salts are generally homogeneous masses, some structural and compositional variation exists which will influence rock mass behavior to a certain extent. Site-specific, at-depth testing is planned for site characterization (see EA Section 4.1.2.3) to address the question of large-scale rock behavior.

Despite their limitations, however, 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 will be developed between laboratory test

data and field test data or observed performance of underground openings when this information becomes available. For now, however, the existing information has been used to estimate its general behavior.

Issue

A few commenters indicated that a more comprehensive discussion of the in situ stresses needs to be provided. In particular, the following areas need to be discussed: the interpretation of existing stress measurements and the limitations of the measurement methods used.

Response

The DOE has reexamined the existing measurements of in situ stress in the Gulf Coast salt domes. A thorough review of indirect indicators of in situ stress in salt has been performed to supplement the direct measurement data. Based on these data, the interpretation of the existing stress measurements has been reevaluated. The DOE believes that no modification of the in situ stress assumptions set forth in the draft EA is required. However, the discussion of in situ stress in Section 3.2.6 has been expanded and clarified. A discussion of interpretations of in situ stress measurements in salt has been provided and the limitations of the methods used have been discussed.

Issue

A commenter noted an outdated Department of the Navy reference in Table 3-6.

Response

The DOE has replaced the outdated reference in Section 3.2.6.1.1.

Issue

A commenter recommended the addition of a table of measured compressive strengths for Richton Dome salt.

Response

In Section 3.2.6, an exponential Mises-Schleicher criterion was used to define failure for all salt compressive tests as shown in Table 3-8. The results of the tests are graphically depicted in Figure 3-19. Therefore, the DOE believes it is not necessary to present any additional tables of the measured compressive strength data.

Issue

A commenter noted an incorrect reference citation. The commenter also states that the Tammemagi values are incorrectly given as stress measurements.

Response

The DOE has corrected the Tammemagi et al. (1985, ONWI-364) reference in Section 3.2.6. The Tammemagi values are quoted as being "stress calculation(s)," not stress measurements.

A general discussion of the in situ stress state at Richton Dome is given in response to other issues in this section.

Issue

A commenter expressed concern with regard to the use of site-specific soil corrosiveness data.

Response

Corrosiveness descriptions for sedimentary units overlying Richton Dome (presented in the table of Estimated Geomechanical Characteristics) were based on evaluation measurements of soil resistivity. These measurements were made as part of DOE's area characterization of Richton Dome. The EA was intended to present all data which are relevant to a description of a site and to meet the requirements of 10 CFR 960.3-1-4-2 for nomination of a site as suitable for site characterization.

Issue

A commenter requested information on the design thermal load limit per acre for a salt dome repository (i.e., the temperature at which the structural integrity of a salt dome is impaired).

Response

For preliminary design and performance assessments, using a maximum waste temperature of 600 C (1,112 F) (using 10-year-old calcined reprocessing waste with the emplacement hole immediately backfilled with crushed salt), the maximum permissible thermal load is 150 kilowatts per acre (Stearns-Roger Services, Inc., 1981, ONWI-283, p. 16-2). However, the thermal criteria are complex and subject to change as the thermal properties and phenomena become better understood.

C.4.1.1.7 Geochemistry

Issue

Commenters were concerned about radionuclide mobility/migration. It was stated that the calculations of radionuclide release presented in the EA may be in error.

Response

The DOE notes that the question of radionuclide mobility/migration can be broken down into the following four areas of specific concern: oxidation/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 and has revised EA Sections 3.2.7, 6.3.1.2.2, and 6.3.1.2.3, accordingly. This evidence suggests that the at-depth chemical environment is sufficiently reducing for uranium and other actinide species to be in their less soluble, less mobile, reduced states (e.g., tetravalent uranium) and consists of the following.

Reduced forms of carbon (organic material), iron (pyrite), and sulfur (elemental sulfur) are known to be present in the Richton Dome caprock (Drumheller et al., 1982, ONWI-277). The salt stock also contains minor amounts of pyrite and organic matter (Drumheller et al., 1982, ONWI-277). Fluid inclusions in the host salt contain hydrocarbons, with mean occluded methane contents of 0.64 microliters per gram (Mullin, 1982, p. 37; Drumheller et al., 1982, ONWI-277). Ground water surrounding the dome contains methane, ethane (Drumheller et al., 1982, ONWI-277), and sulfide (Section 3.2.7.3) and is considered to be chemically reducing (LETCo, 1982, ONWI-120, Vol. VII, p. C-3-13). Sedimentary units adjacent to the dome contain lignite, pyrite, siderite, and glauconite. Garrels and Christ (1965, pp. 209-224) show that the presence of siderite indicates a system with an Eh probably less than -100 millivolts. Russell (1984, pp. 19-20) reports Eh values averaging less than -17 millivolts in formation fluids from the Upper Aquifer unit. Lindberg and Runnells (1984) point out that obtaining reliable Eh measurements in ground water is problematic; however, the presence of redox-sensitive species such as sulfide and methane can provide at least a qualitative guide to the redox status of water. At these lower redox potentials expected in the lower hydrostratigraphic unit (HSU), redox-sensitive radionuclides are expected to be stable in their lower oxidation states.

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 brines (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 to minimize any associated adverse effects.

The potential for transport of radionuclides as complexes with organic chemical species has been reevaluated in Section 6.3.1.2.2. Site-specific organic geochemical data are not available for either deep formation fluids adjacent to the dome or for the host halite. However, acetate and other low molecular weight aliphatic acid anions are common anaerobic breakdown products of sedimentary organic matter, and it would not be surprising if they occurred in ground water in the domal setting. For example, short-chain aliphatic anions have been identified in deep brines from the Palo Duro Basin in Texas (Means and Hubbard, 1985, BMI/ONWI-578) and have been tentatively identified in formation fluids from the Leadville Limestone underlying the Paradox Basin in Utah (McCulley et al., 1984). Carothers and Kharaka (1978) identified short-chain aliphatic acid anions in ground water from the Houston and Corpus Christi areas of Texas, with acetate concentrations ranging up to 1,200 milligrams per liter. Acetate and propionate predominate in deep ground waters from the Iberia oil-field in south-central Louisiana, with concentrations ranging up to 66 and 44 milligrams per liter, respectively (Workman and Hanor, 1985). While organic geochemical data on deep domal brines are lacking, if short-chain aliphatic acid anions are the principal organic species present, then significant radionuclide complexation would not be expected (Means and Hubbard, 1985, BMI/ONWI-578). Richton Dome salt stock and formation fluids adjacent to the dome contain hydrocarbons, including methane and ethane (Drumheller et al., 1982, ONWI-277). The radiolysis of these organic gases will likely form polyethylene and formic acid, in addition to carbon dioxide and water (Lind, 1961; Gray, 1984). None of the expected radiolytic by-products possesses significant radionuclide complexation characteristics. The speciation and amount of organic matter contained in Richton Dome halite as inclusions and possible effects on radionuclide complexation have not yet been evaluated.

Colloids may enhance the transport of radionuclides in ground water under some conditions. Section 6.3.1.2.2 of the EA has 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 geologic substrates. The applicability of this phenomenon to radiocolloid transport in a salt repository needs to be further established.

The draft EA briefly stated in Sections 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 strata, which contain clay minerals, lignite, and glauconite (Drumheller et al., 1982, ONWI-277); however, present data are insufficient to permit a quantitative assessment of this phenomenon. Since no credit for

sorption is taken in the performance assessment calculations (Section 6.4.2), no further adverse effects from repository-related processes are possible. Data collected during detailed site characterization will address the extent to which radionuclide adsorption 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 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.

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 expanded on the discussion of evidence for postdeposition dissolution in Sections 3.2.5.7, 6.3.1.2.2, and 6.3.1.6 of the revised EA. An analysis of the timing of caprock formation at Richton Dome is presented in Section 3.2.5.7. The caprock appears to have been completely formed by late Oligocene time, and there are no indications of ground-water movement through the caprock since that time. Discussion in Section 6.3.1.6 concludes that there is no evidence of significant Quaternary dissolution at Richton Dome and no evidence that continued dissolution, even at unlikely maximum rates, will lead to a loss of waste isolation within 10,000 years after repository closure. This evaluation was based on (1) evidence for the long-term (greater than 25 million years) hydrologic stability of the site; (2) consistently slow (less than 6 centimeters (2.4 inches) per 1,000 years and more likely less than 3 centimeters (1.2 inch) per 1,000 years dissolution rate estimates based on reasonable geologic constraints and conservative assumptions; and (3) the buffer zone of salt and anhydrite caprock, which is estimated to be at least 144 meters (800 feet), that will separate the repository from the nearest aquifer. Based on maximum dissolution rate estimates, the repository will not be affected by salt dissolution for at least 4 million years.

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 its performance assessment, which involves 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). Plans for the application of this 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 stated that a thorough evaluation of the natural resources at Richton Dome has not been conducted. Specific concerns focused on the resource potential and present and future market values of hydrocarbons, salt, subsurface storage, minerals, sand and gravel, and geopressured/geothermal zones.

Response

The DOE has completed an assessment at Richton Dome to evaluate the resource potential for the following:

- Hydrocarbons (gas, oil, sulfur)
- Salt and the resultant void space for subsurface storage of petroleum products and compressed air
- Minerals
- Sand and gravel
- Geopressured/geothermal zones.

Assessment of drilling records and published literature indicates that no economically significant petroleum, sulfur, or geopressured or geothermal resources have been defined to be present. Future petroleum potential is highly speculative. Owing to the density of caprock coring and to very low sulfur contents, future sulfur production potential is negligible.

The demonstrated presence of salt, sand, gravel, and lignitic materials offers restricted potential for economic development as all of these materials are widely available in the region. The salt mass offers some potential for excavation by solution mining for the purpose of fluid storage. However, numerous other comparable features exist in the region. The presence of uranium resources near Richton Dome is highly speculative.

The DOE has modified Sections 3.2.8 and 6.3.1.8 of the EA text to include the results of these assessments.

Issue

One commenter noted that the locations of the sulfur exploration wells plotted on Figure 3-12 (Sulfur Exploration Well Locations) and Figure 4-9 (Location of Sulfur Exploration Wells) are not consistent.

Response

The DOE acknowledges that these two figures showing the sulfur well locations were not consistent. The locations of the sulfur exploration wells have been checked and corrected, using original well records, to revise the figure in Chapter 3. The Chapter 4 figure has been deleted.

C.4.1.1.9 Soils

Issue

One commenter stated that a discussion of soil conditions at some sites is lacking and should be provided.

Response

The available information on soils at the Richton Dome site is summarized in Section 3.2.9 of the EA. This information is adequate for the purpose of this document.

C.4.1.2 Hydrologic Conditions

This category addresses comments, questions and concerns on the accuracy or adequacy of the baseline hydrologic condition at the Richton Dome 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 categories: surface water, ground water, and current use. These smaller categories were selected to be closely aligned to specific sections of Chapter 3 of the EA.

Issues raised by the commenters include the following:

- Definition of hydrologic conditions using regional data
- Obsolete surface-water data
- Validity of the grouping of geologic formations into hydrologic units
- Rationale for ground-water model selection
- Hydrology of the caprock.

C.4.1.2.1 Surface Water

Issue

One commenter criticized the water quality information contained in the draft EA Table 3-15 (Surface-Water Quality Data from Selected U.S. Geological Survey Gaging Stations Near Richton Dome, Mississippi) as being old and poorly qualified. In addition, the commenter suggested that potential backwater effects and their influence on flood analyses for Thompson Creek and Beaver Dam Creek be included in the EA.

Response

Table 3-15 of the EA lists the average and range of data for a given period of record, collected by the U.S. Geological Survey at its gaging stations near Richton Dome. The data represent the best information on stream-flow and water quality available to the authors at the time of writing the draft EA. The data were obtained from the 1984 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency STORET files, which were referenced in the EA and are publicly available. Additional data have been added to the table on the number of samples in each range, helping to qualify the data.

Regarding the influence of backwater effects on flooding of Thompson Creek and Beaver Dam Creek, Section 3.3.1.3 of the EA summarizes the methods used in the referenced supporting document. The methods include estimating hydrologic

response characteristics of the watershed, and the parametric values included in the flood computations were conservatively estimated to produce high values of runoff and stream depths. Backwater effects were found to be insignificant in comparison with the probable maximum flood stages caused by site drainage alone.

C.4.1.2.2 Ground Water

Issue

Many commenters stated that the existing hydrogeologic data base was inadequate to support the description presented of the regional and local hydrogeologic regimes surrounding Richton Dome. The amount, type, and distribution of available data were questioned.

Response

The DOE believes that the existing hydrogeologic data base is adequate to support the level of description of the hydrologic regimes presented. However, the DOE has found that the existing hydrogeologic data base was not adequately documented in the draft EA. A table ("Summary of Primary Geohydrologic Data, Richton Dome") and supporting text documenting the amount and distribution of available hydrogeologic data have been added to Section 3.3.2.1. Primary hydrogeologic data (aquifer test, potentiometric level, and water use) for each hydrogeologic unit are listed in the table. Precipitation, evaporation, and streamflow data used for water budget analyses are noted in the text.

Issue

Several commenters questioned the validity of extrapolation of regional hydrogeological data to perform site-specific analyses or to define localized conditions in the Richton Dome vicinity.

Response

The DOE acknowledges that existing hydrogeologic data points are not evenly distributed throughout the area of investigation but believes that standard approaches to extrapolate data, where employed, were prudent and justifiable. Hydrogeologic data derived from existing non-DOE sources, as well as the DOE area characterization studies, were available to define localized conditions in the Richton Dome vicinity. The assessments of near-dome conditions were not based solely on extrapolation of regional data.

Modification of the text and addition of a table in Section 3.3.2.1 provide an expanded documentation of the type, amount, and distribution of available hydrogeologic data. The DOE has further modified Section 3.3.2.1 to identify and briefly describe techniques employed to extrapolate hydrogeologic data.

Issue

Several commenters questioned the validity of the grouping of geologic formations into regional hydrogeologic units.

Response

The DOE believes that the groupings of geologic formations into regional hydrogeologic units as presented are valid for the level of evaluation considered and are supported by the available data. The text of Section 3.3.2.1.1 has been modified and expanded to better document the validity of the hydrogeologic units identified.

Issue

A few commenters were concerned that the hydrogeology of the caprock at Richton Dome was improperly and inadequately described. Specifically, it was stated that an assumption that caprock is impermeable and serves as a barrier to salt dissolution is invalid.

Response

The DOE has added a concise description of the present understanding of the hydrogeology of the caprock at Richton Dome to Section 3.3.2.1. This discussion was prepared using previous information and new data and interpretations not available when the draft EA was prepared (Werner, 1985a,b). The discussion includes extrapolated and direct and indirect estimates of caprock porosity, permeability, and flow potential.

Issue

A few commenters stated that inadequate treatment was given to the potential for movement of ground water through domal salt via anomalous zones, fractures, or porous inclusions. Concern was expressed that the assumption of Darcian flow was too conservative.

Response

There is no direct evidence that features such as those noted by the commenters exist within Richton Dome. Sections 3.2.3.2.4 and 3.2.6.1.2 of the EA have been expanded to include a discussion of anomalous zones, their implications for hydraulic connection to the dome exterior, and the potential for their presence in Richton Dome. Section 6.3.1.1 of the EA has also been revised, based on these assessments. Specifically, the review has shown that fluids in domal salt mines are generally isolated and of limited volume. Furthermore, the potential for encountering pathways for fluid movement is low.

Issue

One commenter noted the occurrence of shallow saline ground water in the Richton Dome vicinity and questioned the potential effect of the salinity on agricultural use of the water.

Response

The commenter addresses an existing condition (i.e., shallow saline ground water) described in Section 3.3.2.3 of the EA. The effects of salinity on agricultural productivity and water quality are addressed under Section 4.4 of the EA.

Issue

A commenter stated that the rationale for and explanation of differences in type and application of the two numerical ground-water flow simulation models discussed are inadequate.

Response

The DOE has modified Section 3.3.2.2, Modeling, to include a brief description of each numerical model, the purpose for which each was implemented, the geographical area of model coverage, and the use of output data about regional hydrologic characterization and performance assessment.

C.4.1.2.3 Current Use

Issue

Several commenters requested additional data on surface- and ground-water supplies and users for the region.

Response

The water supply and use data in Section 3.3.3 were reviewed, and additional data were used to further describe regional and local water supplies and users. These data represent the best available data at the time of the EA preparation. The EA notes that in some cases these data are limited; however, they meet the requirements of 10 CFR 960.3-1-4-2 for nomination of sites as suitable for site characterization.

Issue

One commenter questioned the statement in the EA Section 3.3.3 which noted an expected drop in water use by the year 2000.

Response

The statement regarding water use in the year 2000 was modified to indicate that water withdrawal rates are expected to decrease. Additional information was then added to indicate that water consumption rates are expected to increase.

Issue

Commenters felt that the volume of project-related water would reduce the quantity of groundwater available to local users and that water would be transported to Perry County.

Response

Water use by the repository was reviewed in light of its volume and source. A table entitled "Nuclear Waste Repository Characteristics, Richton Dome" in Section 5.1 of the EA lists the water requirements for repository construction and operation: 1.1 million gallons per day, and 0.38 million gallons per day, respectively. As also noted in the table, this water will come from a nearby offsite well field, and thus will not require "transport" to the site. Compared with the 1980 water use data (listed in the table entitled "Water Use in 1980 for the Vicinity of Richton Dome, Mississippi") for the 12-county vicinity of the site, the repository water requirements represent much less than 1 percent of the 1980 value. In Section 5.2.2.2 it is stated that ground-water withdrawals for the repository should not affect local water wells. Consequently, the DOE concludes that it should be possible to meet repository water needs through the use of local water supplies.

C.4.1.3 Environmental Conditions

Commenters raised several issues relating to the EA presentation of baseline environmental conditions. Comments were made concerning the general adequacy of the environmental data base; specifically, the comments claimed that the data base was lacking in and relied on regional qualitative data for the production of environmental resource impacts. Issues pertained to the adequacy of the data base for accurately predicting impacts on the following:

1. Land Use. Commenters questioned the adequacy of the descriptions of local homes and farms as well as Camp Shelby operations.

2. Ecosystem Impacts. Commenters requested more information concerning indigenous species and habitats that occur in the vicinity of the Richton Dome site.

3. Air Quality/Noise Data. Commenters requested more data on climatological and background sound level conditions.

4. Aesthetic/Cultural Impacts. Several comments were centered on the need for clarification of descriptions of aesthetic, cultural, and historical resources in the area.

A more detailed discussion of these, and other related issues, occurs in the following CRD sections: 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, and C.4.1.3.6. These sections relate to specific parts of Chapter 3 of the EA.

C.4.1.3.1 Land Use

Issue

Some commenters indicated that the assessment of urban development over the dome was inadequate because houses and farms not identified in the EA are said to be present in the area. Some commenters stated that road and rail access routes to Camp Shelby were not identified in the EA.

Response

The data base contained in Section 3.4.1 of the EA (Land Use) is based in part on interpretation of color infrared aerial photography taken by the DOE and has been found by the DOE to be an adequate reflection of housing and urban development at the present time. Aerial photography is an acceptable means of identifying structures and land patterns. Section 3.4.1 of the EA discusses the urban development within the dome area. In addition, Section 3.6.3.1 discusses housing development for the area and Section 6.2.1.2.3 specifically identifies the number of dwellings over the dome. Thus, no change to Section 3.4.1 and Section 3.6.3.1 of the EA has been made due to these issues. Section 3.4 of the final EA, however, has been expanded to include discussion of Camp Shelby operations and access routes to training areas.

C.4.1.3.2 Ecosystems

Issue

Several commenters were concerned that sensitive habitats, specifically acid bogs and other wetlands in the vicinity of the Richton Dome site, were either ignored altogether or inadequately described. The Leaf River, identified in the EA as being under study as a National Wild and Scenic River, was also singled out as requiring a more detailed description.

Response

The DOE has reviewed the description of habitat types, including acid bogs and wetlands, and concludes that the level of detail is sufficient for purposes of describing the habitat types found in the vicinity of the Richton Dome site. The DOE performed a thorough literature review and reconnaissance-level field surveys to support the EA. Consultations were also held with the Fish and Wildlife Service. Additional, more detailed descriptions of habitats and inventories of indigenous species are found in the referenced documents.

The draft EA incorrectly indicated that the Leaf River was under study as a National Wild and Scenic River. EA Section 3.4.1 has been corrected to describe the two portions of De Soto National Forest south of the site that have been designated as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System. These are as follows: approximately 1,847 hectares (4,560 acres) along an 8-kilometer (5-mile) section of Black Creek in Perry County, and 380 hectares (940 acres) along the Leaf River in Greene County. Both areas are more than 8 kilometers (5 miles) from the Richton Dome site. Black Creek is in a different watershed. Sections 4.2.1 and 5.2 describe any potential impacts to these areas.

Issue

Several comments pertained to the coverage of threatened and endangered species. Specific areas of concern include the following:

- An incomplete coverage of all protected species, including those not generally having national visibility
- The presence of the red-cockaded woodpecker in the vicinity of the site
- The presence of the yellow-blotched sawback turtle in the Leaf River, and the American alligator in the vicinity of the Tallahala and Bogue Homo Creeks
- The potential presence of the indigo snake, bald eagle, and gray bat in the area
- The use of an obsolete list of State-protected species.

Response

Information on protected species in the EA is based on the most recent and available literature. The DOE has initiated consultations with the Fish and Wildlife Service and has obtained updated information regarding threatened and endangered species.

Section 3.4.2.3 of the EA indicates that the red-cockaded woodpecker may be present in the Richton Dome vicinity. Information utilized by the DOE indicates

that the species wanders extensively throughout its range and is readily observed by many people. The species, however, is most vulnerable to destruction of nesting habitat, of which there is thought to be little in the vicinity of the site because of recent timber cutting activities.

The presence of the American alligator in the vicinity of the Tallahala and Bogue Homo Creeks was reported in Section 3.4.2.3 of the draft EA. However, review of the available literature has not confirmed the presence of either the yellow-blotched sawback turtle in the Leaf River or the potential presence of the indigo snake, bald eagle, or gray bat in the site area.

The DOE has received an updated list of State-protected species and this information has been included in Section 3.4.2.3.

Issue

One commenter objected to the statement that due to the relatively high elevation of the potential repository site, level of recent disturbance (clear-cutting), and lack of perennial streams or other water bodies, the number and diversity of aquatic species within the restricted area and dome area overall are expected to be low.

Response

The DOE has reviewed the comment and continues to support the statement found in Section 3.4.2.2. First, there are no perennial aquatic habitats known to occur in the immediate vicinity of the proposed surface facility, and secondly, this area has been clear-cut and, thus, heavily disturbed. The DOE has modified the EA to refer specifically to only those areas on the dome where site development is likely to occur and which do not include any wetlands at the lower elevations surrounding the dome.

C.4.1.3.3 Air Quality and Weather

Issue

Several commenters stated that climatological data are inadequate, and that discussion of severe weather, particularly hurricane occurrences, needed to be expanded.

Response

Existing climatological data presented in Section 3.4.3 of the EA are considered adequate to describe regional climatic means and extremes for the purposes of environmental assessment. Data have been extracted from official records from Hattiesburg and Jackson. It is also the DOE's opinion that wind,

stability class, and other data presented in the EA, based on records from the Jackson National Weather Service Station, are adequate because of the similarity of terrain and general proximity to the site.

The DOE has improved consistency in presentation of information in Section 3.4.3 of the EAs. Specifically, the discussion of severe weather, particularly hurricane occurrences, has been expanded. From 1886 to 1984, 45 tropical storms and hurricanes entered Mississippi, virtually all of which would have affected weather conditions in the Richton Dome area. Because hurricanes lose strength as they move inland from the coast, the greatest concern for inland areas like Richton Dome is possible flooding due to excessive rainfall. In recent years, several major hurricanes have passed close to the Richton Dome area, specifically Camille (August 1969) and Frederick (September 1979).

C.4.1.3.4 Noise

Issue

Commenters stated that background sound-level data are inadequate.

Response

A site reconnaissance has shown the area's land-use and existing noise sources to be typical of areas with documented noise baselines (Wyle Laboratories, 1971). An ambient of L_{dn} = 35 dBA is assumed for the isolated rural homes in the site vicinity, whereas a L_{dn} = 45 dBA is assumed for the town of Richton and the transportation corridor. These values are expected to be conservative, based upon the character of the various land uses in the site vicinity. Therefore, the DOE has determined that noise values based on the site reconnaissance and published data are adequate for the purposes of environmental assessment.

C.4.1.3.5 Aesthetic Resources

Issue

Some commenters expressed disagreement with a statement in the EA that suggested that the Richton Dome area does not possess any aesthetically unique features.

Response

The EA discusses Aesthetic Resources in Section 3.4.5 and states that the Richton Dome area "is not unique to the surrounding area." This, however, was not meant to imply that the Richton Dome area does not have any aesthetically

pleasing features, only that the dome area is similar in appearance to surrounding regions. Impacts to aesthetic resources are discussed in EA Sections 4.2.1.7 and 5.2.6. No modifications to the EA were made as a result of this comment.

C.4.1.3.6 Archaeological, Cultural, and Historical Resources

Issue

Two commenters stated that the cultural resources data base was inadequate. Specifically, both commenters pointed out the need for cultural resources field surveys of the proposed site. One commenter also called for a more up-to-date historical narrative of the surrounding area in order to "understand the context of the project study area's economic, political, or social development."

Response

The DOE has evaluated the cultural resources data base contained in EA Section 3.4.6 and has determined it is adequate for purposes of environmental assessment.

The DOE is negotiating a Programmatic Memorandum of Agreement (PMOA) with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the Mississippi State Historic Preservation Officer. Implementation of the stipulations of the PMOA will avoid or satisfactorily mitigate the potential adverse effects of this project on historic and cultural properties.

C.4.1.3.7 Background Radiation

No comments were received.

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 Richton Dome site. This category corresponds to comments received in Section 3.5 of the EA.

Issue

One commenter was concerned that the unique local problems associated with the rail system (i.e., heavy daytime and recreational transportation patterns) were not adequately addressed.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated Section 3.5.2 of the EA and has determined that the data base is sufficient to meet the requirements of 10 CFR 960.3-1-4-2 for nomination of sites as suitable for site characterization. If a repository were located at this site, the majority of rail lines would require upgrading or construction along an existing railway right-of-way; no unusual construction difficulties are expected. The use of appropriate construction techniques would allow for the safe construction and operation of the railroad, and the installation of crossing protection would ensure that hazards to motorists are minimized.

In addition, Section 4.1.3.1.10 of the EA describes studies to be conducted during site characterization, and Sections 5.1.2, 5.3.1, and 5.3.3 describe plans and improvements to existing highways and railroads to support repository development.

C.4.1.5 Socioeconomic Conditions

This category addresses comments, questions and concerns on the accuracy or adequacy of the baseline socioeconomic conditions at the Richton Dome 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 categories as follows: population, economic conditions, community services, social conditions, government and fiscal conditions, and miscellaneous. These smaller categories have been selected to be closely aligned to specific sections in Chapter 3 of the EA.

Issues raised by commenters include the following:

- Lack of data for several areas
- Lack of emphasis in certain areas
- The need for a quality of life index
- The need to consider a larger area surrounding the site.

Issue

A few commenters stated that the data base should have included the tier of counties along the Gulf of Mexico.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated Section 3.6 of the EA and has determined that no changes are required. The study area used in the EA analysis was selected based on those areas which would experience greatest in-migration; this area was determined to be within an 80-kilometer (50-mile) radius of the site, based on data from projects of a similar nature. Also, documented work-related commuting

patterns in the region do not indicate that residents from the Gulf counties would commute the 145 kilometers (90 miles) (by major route) to the Richton Dome site.

Issue

Some commenters stated that the socioeconomic data base neglects to include existing data in such areas as recent history, culture, community attitudes, economic impacts of the project to date, and expected economic impacts.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated the data and has expanded the text of the EA to include information on recent history, culture, and community attitudes. Section 3.6.4 has been expanded and social impacts identified are included in Sections 4.2.2 and 5.4.4. Economic impacts are covered in Sections 4.2.2 and 5.4.2.

Issue

Some commenters stated that the data base report which preceded the EA is inadequate.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated the data in this report and has updated the information base so that it includes additional information on local history, culture, and community attitudes. This supplemental material appears in Section 3.6.4, Section 4.2.2, and Section 5.4.4.

C.4.1.5.1 Population

Issue

Some commenters stated that characterization of the population located around the site should be treated more thoroughly in the EA.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated the data on characterization of population around the site and has expanded the text of Section 3.6.1.4 of the EA. The EA contains tabular data on the age, sex, and racial characteristics of the population for study area counties. The text of Section 3.6.1.4 has been supplemented by including an additional description of these characteristics of the population.

Issue

Some commenters stated that the methodologies for calculating population density, trends, and forecasts should be improved.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated the methodology used in calculating population density and determined that no modifications to the method are needed. Dividing the number of people in a county by the total square miles is an acceptable method for obtaining population densities. If, for example, the density for Perry County is calculated without the National Forest acreage, there would be no change to the analysis in Chapter 6. The population density for Perry County without the 625 square kilometers (252 square miles) of National Forest land within its borders would be 9.5 persons per square kilometer (24.7 persons per square mile).

In the EA, trends and forecasts used for counties were taken from the Southern Planning and Development District and the Mississippi Research and Development Center. Projections for the year 2005 were extrapolated from Mississippi Research and Development Center projections. Discrete city projections were not available (see BNI, 1984, ONWI-499, for pertinent references concerning the forecasts).

Issue

One commenter stated that more emphasis should be placed on rural population since much of the growth will take place outside municipal boundaries.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated the gravity model and determined that no modifications are required. The EA analysis assumes that most new residents will locate in existing cities as that has been the trend in the past. The model allocated 15 percent of the in-migrants to small communities and rural areas. However, the DOE acknowledges that not all new development may be in existing communities. This was exemplified by the increase in the number of mobile homes located outside of several existing communities which were associated with the construction of the Leaf River plant.

C.4.1.5.2 Economic Conditions

Issue

Some commenters suggested that the economic activity sections of the data base should be expanded to include basic and service components, manufacturing types, unemployment, and input/output analysis.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated Section 3.6.2 of the EA and has determined that it is adequate for nomination of a site as suitable for characterization under 10 CFR Part 960.3-1-4-2. Employment by category, unemployment, and income trends are presented in tabular form and reference is made to more detailed data available in the data base report (BNI, 1984, ONWI-499).

C.4.1.5.3 Community Services

Issue

A few commenters stated that more data are needed about law enforcement and sewage treatment services.

Response

Additional information has been obtained from the City of Laurel and Jones County. The Jones County information substantiated the EA material, and Section 3.6.3 has been supplemented with information on Laurel's sewage treatment facilities.

C.4.1.5.4 Social Conditions

Issue

A few commenters stated that more data are needed on local history, culture, and social conditions.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated the data and has expanded Section 3.6.4 of the EA by adding data on local history, culture, and social structure. Social impacts identified are included in Section 4.2.2 and Section 5.4.4.

Issue

One commenter stated that the EA should have included an index of quality of life or social well being.

Response

The DOE has reviewed the information contained in the EA and has determined that the inclusion of data on local culture and social structure permits an

improved description of the quality of life in the region. However, a detailed index of quality of life or social well being has not been calculated for the EA, as such an index is not necessary for a comparison of potentially acceptable sites.

C.4.1.5.5 Government and Fiscal Conditions

No comments were received.

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 Richton Dome 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 categories as follows: field activities, exploratory shaft, other activities, and alternative activities. These smaller categories have been selected to be closely aligned to specific sections of Chapter 4 of the EA.

Issues raised by the commenters include the following:

- Inadequate geotechnical studies
- Poorly planned site characterization activities
- Exploratory shaft
- Methods for the disposal of salt and salt-contaminated material
- Worker health and safety
- Inadequate ecological field program
- Details of land ownership, land leasing, and compensation plans.

C.4.2.1 Field Studies

Issue

Some commenters stated that geotechnical studies, which are planned to evaluate the possibility of ongoing dissolution, are inadequate.

Response

Sections 4.1.1.1.5 and 4.1.1.1.10 describe the geotechnical investigations identified to address the possibility of ongoing dissolution at Richton Dome. Specifically, during site characterization the saline anomaly activity will consist of sampling water wells to determine the existence of anomalous chloride concentrations. Based on the results of this work, further investigations, i.e., electrical resistivity and/or borings may be performed to delineate the

possible extent of any anomaly. Data pertinent to the dissolution issue will be obtained from many of the other planned field activities, such as overdome stratigraphic boreholes, and engineering design boreholes. Should any of these other studies suggest the existence of ongoing salt dissolution, an appropriate set of confirmatory activities will be developed.

Issue

A few commenters stated that some site characterization activities were poorly planned and that some additional activities were needed. In particular, it was stated that (1) the location of seismic stations is not adequate to detect microseismic activity associated with the Wiggins Anticline and the Pickens-Gilbertown Fault Zone, (2) the applicability and scheduling of the hole-to-surface resistivity survey with respect to other tests requires clarification, and (3) an assessment of the potential effect of oil wells on dissolution is needed.

Response

The DOE has expanded the proposed microseismic network array (presented in the draft EA) to include additional seismic stations along major structural features and has revised Section 4.1.1.1.9 of the EA (text and figures) accordingly.

The DOE acknowledges that the hole-to-surface resistivity survey method can be used successfully only to investigate the overdome sediments and that this technique will only be an adjunct to other stratigraphic investigative methods. The DOE has modified Section 4.1.1.1.10 of the EA text to clarify the applicability and scheduling of the hole-to-surface resistivity survey.

The DOE has determined that the first phase of the assessment of the dissolution potential represented by oil wells will be limited to checking drilling records and will not require field work. Should other studies (e.g. hydrogeochemical sampling) suggest that dissolution is occurring around existing wells, an appropriate set of confirmatory field studies will be developed. Therefore, the DOE believes that no modification of the field studies section of the EA is required.

C.4.2.2 Exploratory Shaft

Issue

Commenters were concerned with the final disposition of the sediment detention basin if the site is not selected for the repository. Suggestions were made that final disposal options include provisions for converting the pond to a farm pond or wildlife habitat.

Response

If the site is to be decommissioned, the DOE will restore the site to its original condition, as best as possible. Specific restoration measures and possible alternative uses of certain site features (such as the water retention ponds) will depend on the nature of the final exploratory shaft facility design, and on discussions with appropriate State and Federal authorities. For the purpose of the EA, the decommissioning plans presented in Section 4.1.2 are considered illustrative of the types of restoration activities that would take place.

Issue

Commenters expressed concern about the methods to be employed for the disposal of salt and salt-contaminated material resulting from ESF construction. One commenter questioned the veracity of previous communications with the Mississippi Department of Natural Resources officials regarding the volume of salt that could be disposed off site. Comments were also received regarding the amount of salt and salt-contaminated waste which the project would produce.

Response

Salt and salt-contaminated materials may be disposed of at facilities licensed to accept and handle these materials or by alternative means. A study to identify waste disposal options using existing facilities was prepared for planning purposes. The disposal facilities indicated in Section 4.1.2.6 of the EA can lawfully accept the type and volume of waste that must be properly disposed of as a result of site characterization activities. If one or more of the facilities permitted to dispose of nonhazardous waste is not available, a hazardous waste landfill can be used. The estimated volume to be disposed of appears in Section 4.1.2.6 and provides an indication of the space needed for disposal. The short term adverse effects of transportation are described in Sections 4.1.2.6 and 4.3.4.2.

Disposal in an existing facility, subject to the procedures required by the Mississippi Department of Natural Resources - Bureau of Pollution Control, is a feasible method. Although possible disposal areas are identified in Section 4.1.2.6, it must be noted that it does not imply that the facility has made a commitment to accept the waste. Nor is there any indication that the identified facility will be able to accept the waste when plans for disposal are settled. A decision on selection of disposal facilities for various types of waste will be made as necessary during site characterization.

The amount of material generated by excavation of the shafts and underground layout of the ESF is based on the required size of the openings, overbreak allowance, and bulking factor. The volume disposed of is dependent on the compaction of backfill. Estimates of the excavated volume generated and the residual amount after backfill can vary substantially.

Although salt is not considered a hazardous material, disposal could have an environmental impact if the selected sanitary landfill is improperly constructed. The waste disposal study summary (Parsons Brinckerhoff/PB-KBB, 1984) qualifies an acceptable landfill as one which includes "proper drainage, proper soil conditions, deep water table, adequate capacity, and the ability to satisfy special conditions such as installation of liners." A properly constructed, permitted, and licensed landfill will prevent the leachate from mixing with underground drinking water sources.

Issue

Several commenters were concerned that the worker health and safety analyses were not consistent between the EAs. Additional comments questioned the adequacy 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 the Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA) regulations to the DOE contractors.

Response

The DOE agrees 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 the various 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 become 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 MSHA's report covered 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.

The DOE has reexamined Section 4.1.2.2.2 of the EA addressing the applicability of MSHA regulations to the DOE and concluded that the text adequately addresses the issue.

Issue

Several commenters expressed concern that no exploratory excavation is planned in the repository storage area where the high-level waste is to be placed. Concerns were also raised regarding the importance of understanding the type, number, and location of subsurface anomalies. In addition, commenters had questions on the shaft construction methods and the lack of incorporation of recent guidance on developing the ESF with two conventionally constructed shafts.

Response

Sections 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 have been clarified as to the types of studies which will be conducted to evaluate the salt stock at the repository horizon. It is felt that the planned underground tests will adequately characterize the rock mass across the dome interior. This is based on the knowledge that salt domes, especially those of the Interior Salt Basins, tend to have broadly uniform composition and mechanical properties. Section 3.2.3.2 presents an evaluation of the potential for anomalous conditions of various types to occur in Richton Dome. The DOE acknowledges that anomalous conditions may exist in the dome interior (e.g., pressurized gas pockets or recrystallized salt). Horizontal drilling from the exploratory shaft underground facility will be used to identify any major "anomalous zones." However, no program of exploration will be able to identify all potential anomalies in any rock type. Careful probing in advance of all repository excavations will be utilized to give advanced warning of the location and nature of any anomalies. With this information, appropriate construction activities or layout modifications can be implemented.

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, as follows:

- Worker safety
- Flexibility to expand subsurface areas to collect additional host rock information
- Demonstration of the freezing technology
- Ability to prepare detailed shaft maps of overdome strata and caprock which will guide repository shaft-sealing design

- Lower cost and enhanced construction schedule.

Section 4.1.2 has been revised to reflect the new shaft construction plans.

Issue

Several commenters questioned the decision process that would be used to determine if the exploratory shaft facility is to be incorporated into the repository (if the site is selected).

Response

The DOE is still evaluating the need/desirability of incorporating the exploratory shafts into the repository. A final decision will only come from evaluation of site characterization information. At present the DOE is developing shaft designs to the same stringent standards that would be applied during repository construction.

C.4.2.3 Other Activities

Issue

Many commenters stated that the ecological field program of Section 4.1.3.1.2 was inadequate in that the program as presented would not collect sufficient data to meet the program goals of establishing an environmental baseline and of monitoring for impacts of site characterization activities. Specifically, the following six concerns were noted:

1. The field design referenced NUREG-0555 (NRC, 1979), but NUREG-0555 is not an adequate basis for the design of a field program.

2. The nature of the studies proposed in Section 4.1.3.1.2 appears to be too broadly constructed to identify impacts (i.e., impacts will occur without being noticed by the field program).

3. The scope of the field program is too limited in terms of extent, duration, and intensity.

4. Staffing allocations to the field program appear to be inadequate to conduct the program that is necessary.

5. The environmental program should be conducted in advance of site-disturbing activities. This will allow a baseline to be established prior to disturbance.

6. A rate of soil erosion cannot be determined from a standard soil survey.

Response

The DOE believes that the EA should present environmental site characterization plans at a level that is sufficient to indicate generally the types of activities planned and the level of impacts that will probably accrue to the environment. Section 4.1.3 of the EA has been revised to provide some additional clarity and specificity.

The detailed plans for the conduct of environmental and socioeconomic field work will be provided to affected Federal and State regulatory agencies. Comments by these agencies on the plans will be used in the revision and finalization of the study plans. The public comments provided on the plan synopses in the draft EA are also helpful.

Following are responses to the six specific comments:

1. NUREG-0555 (NRC, 1979) is a guide by which environmental field activities necessary to satisfy NRC requirements for nuclear power plants are presented. This material has been used as one of several sources for study plan design.

2. The study plans will be modified to identify site characterization impacts, as directed by applicable Federal and State regulatory agencies. At present, the study plan designs are intended to monitor incipient impacts in water quality (sedimentation, salt, and oil/grease contamination) and in salt uptake through the ecosystems. If other impact monitoring is warranted, the study designs will be altered.

3. Study plans will be reviewed by the applicable Federal and State regulatory agencies. Comments by these agencies will be used in the revision and finalization of the study plans.

4. Staffing levels have been reviewed and modified to the latest available estimates of staff necessary to conduct the environmental program.

5. Windows of time, wherein environmental data collection can be conducted avoiding activities that would significantly disrupt findings, are provided in the schedule. These periods of time are believed sufficient to collect data that confirm predictions developed from the EA data bases, and to provide for permits for activities on the scale of site characterization. If the applicable Federal and State agencies determine that more extensive data are required, the DOE will reschedule affected site characterization activities.

6. A standard soil survey is one component in the field program. The program includes measuring precipitation, infiltration, and grade, all of which are components of the method to measure soil erosion.

Issue

One commenter stated that the EA is inadequate because the DOE has failed to clearly state details of its land ownership, land leasing, and compensation plans.

Response

In Section 4.1.3.3 of the EA, the DOE has specified that it plans to purchase 28 hectares (68 acres) for the exploratory shaft and purchase or lease 2,222 hectares (5,489 acres) for protection of the site as a repository. Figure 3.2 of the EA locates the boundaries of the ESF and the controlled area.

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 Richton Dome site. This category corresponds to comments received on Section 5.1 of the EA.

Issues raised by the commenters include the following:

- Compliance with the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 USC Sections 10101-10226)
- The disturbed zone
- Inadequate analysis of rock mechanics
- Uncertainties associated with geologic anomalies
- Analysis of potentially adverse conditions
- Lack of detail presented on the two-phase concept
- Repository layout plans and requirements
- Repository security
- Nuclear safety
- Waste package concerns

- Shaft sealing
- Safety hazards during retrieval
- Uncertainties associated with rock mechanics aspect of retrieval
- Disposal of excess salt from the repository
- Monitoring the repository.

Issue

One commenter states that the DOE has not complied with the Nuclear Waste Policy Act (NWPA) (42 USC Sections 10101-10226) requirement for a detailed statement of the suitability of the site for characterization because knowledge of the geological conditions at Richton Dome is insufficient. Several commenters raised the following related issues:

1. The bottom of the existing core hole (MRIG-9) is 247 meters (810 feet) above the repository horizon.

2. The exploratory shaft facility (ESF) will be no closer than 1,982 meters (6,503 feet) to the first high-level waste placed and no closer than 3,659 meters (12,005 feet) to the last canister to be placed.

3. In the phased repository the first waste will be placed when development is still 1,067 meters (3,501 feet) from the last room where high-level waste will be placed. The subsurface area will not be explored when waste placement is committed.

4. There has been insufficient evaluation of the extent of the dome and the location and extent of anomalous zones.

Response

Site characterization is the process whereby detailed knowledge of the subsurface at Richton Dome will be gained. The information currently available shows no reason that the site should not be considered further, and is consistent with the requirements of 10 CFR 960.3-1-4-2 for nomination of sites as suitable for site characterization.

The potential for the occurrence of anomalous zones within Richton Dome is described in EA Section 3.2. The implications of various types of anomalous features to repository construction and waste isolation are discussed in Section 6.3. Site-specific data from more than 70 over-dome and near-dome borings give no indication of anomalous conditions within the dome. Definition of the geometry of the dome is based on gravity data from 4,500 stations in a 2,331-square-kilometer (900-square-mile) area, constrained by 13 seismic

reflection profiles and information from 50 wells. The level of accuracy from this information is considered sufficient for the purpose of the EA.

Knowledge of the extent of salt stock at the repository level will come from testing during site characterization. Tests to assess rock homogeneity and the presence of major "anomalous zones," as described in Sections 4.1.1 and 4.1.2, will include horizontal drilling with associated geophysical soundings (e.g., radar or cross-hole seismic). Additionally, drilling in advance of repository room excavation will locate smaller anomalous features, possibly resulting in modification of the underground layout. The emplaced waste canisters will be retrievable for a period of at least 50 years (Section 5.1.3.3), allowing removal should conditions warrant.

Issue

One commenter stated that the draft EA has not adequately evaluated the following issues:

1. The Richton Dome is a massive body of halite, but based on past mining experience, significant anomalies may be present. No discussion or evaluation is presented on the potential presence of geologic anomalies which might be encountered in the Richton Dome site.

2. Reported data indicate that the salt has a "low" coefficient of thermal expansion of the host rock, and also salt may have a relatively high thermal expansion coefficient in comparison to other rocks such as tuff or basalt.

3. The mining methods are proven techniques in a salt dome, and require no engineering measures beyond reasonably available technology.

4. No discussion or evaluation of the effects of repository-induced thermomechanical loading on geologic anomalies is presented.

5. The Richton Dome is said to be capable of accommodating the stresses expected from disposal operations. No discussion or reference is presented in order to demonstrate the range of values over which the stress could vary. There is no discussion or evaluation presented on variation or stresses due to disposal operations.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated the data and has modified or expanded the text of the EA where appropriate.

The potential for anomalous conditions being present in Richton Dome is discussed in Section 3.2. The implication of such anomalies to waste isolation is evaluated in Section 6.3 under the heading, "Analysis of Potentially Adverse Conditions." The evaluation includes roof falls, rapid closure rates, hydration

or dehydration, thermally induced fractures, brine migration, and anomalous zones, etc.

The DOE agrees with the commenter on the higher values for thermal coefficient of expansion for salt in comparison to tuff and basalt or other rocks. The text of Section 6.3 has been clarified on this point.

The DOE believes that mining technology is proven around the world to deal with potentially difficult geologic anomalies in salt. Salt domes, both with reported anomalous features and without, have been successfully mined in this country for over 100 years. The techniques described in Sections 4.1 and 5.1 are considered adequate to construct a repository in Richton Dome.

The statement that the Richton Dome is capable of accommodating the stress expected from the repository is based on the analysis of EA Section 6.3. Because of salt ductility, the stresses in the dome will be lithostatic except for local stress concentrations within a few meters of the excavations. The DOE believes no modification to the EA is required with regard to variation of stresses.

Issue

One commenter was critical of statements in Section 3.2.6.1.1, Geomechanical Properties of Overburden, and in Section 5.1, The Repository. Specifically, the commenter noted the following:

1. The DOE has not based site characterization on geomechanical evaluations of site-specific information.

2. The engineering feasibility studies rely heavily on previous, non-site-specific engineering data.

3. A general explanation of the appropriateness of non-site-specific data is requested for inclusion in Chapters 3 and 5.

Response

Engineering judgment has been used to apply likely geomechanical properties to known overdome stratigraphic descriptions. This is a reasonable approach and commonly practiced for preliminary site selection of surface and subsurface structures in any geologic media.

The text of the draft EA, specifically Table 3-4, "Estimated Geomechanical Characteristics of the Overburden, Richton Dome," states that estimates are based on limited data.

The information presented in the EA is considered sufficient to meet the requirements of 10 CFR 960.3-1-4-2 for nomination of sites as suitable for site characterization.

Issue

One commenter noted the following with regard to the disturbed zone at the Richton Dome:

1. Extension of the disturbed zone as a result of excavation in salt (mechanical disturbance) is reported to be less than 1 meter (3.3 feet) rather than 1 to 2 meters (3.3 to 6.6 feet) (Golder Associates Inc., 1985, Volume II, Appendix II, Special Problems IV, pp. 26 and 30).

2. Extension of the disturbed zone due to gas blowouts and gas outbursts is not mentioned. These zones are much more extensive than ones made mechanically (Acres American, Inc., 1977).

3. The mining of salt develops a jointing that extends back into the salt for several meters. This extension has not been determined (Golder Associates Inc., 1985, Volume II, Appendix II, p. 32b).

4. The disturbed zone in the salt due to mining activities is stated by Kupfer to have a significant porosity and permeability (Golder Associates Inc., 1985, Volume 11, Appendix II, page 33).

5. Extent of damage to salt rock walls and back caused by mining processes should be discussed in detail within appropriate sections of the EA document.

Response

The DOE's position on the issue of disturbed zones is summarized as follows:

1. Mechanical disturbance of the rock wall does not necessarily imply degradation of system performance. The DOE has conducted a literature survey on case histories of evaporite mines and found that the extent of mechanical disturbance was from 1.2 to 6.5 meters (3.9 to 21.3 feet) irrespective of depth, composition, and location of mines (Golder Associates, Inc., 1985).

2. The mechanical disturbance of rock can be addressed as part of normal design and operating practice. The natural disturbance zones in domal salt are the result of gas blowouts and mainly reported from mines of Louisiana (Belle Isle, Cote Blanche, etc.). Section 3.2 presents an evaluation of the potential for such features to occur in Richton Dome. The implications of these features to repository construction are discussed in Section 6.3.

3. It is acknowledged that over a limited extent, mechanically disturbed salt has increased permeability. However, plastic deformation of salt can be expected to seal excavation-induced fractures.

4. The mechanical disturbance can be controlled or reduced either by controlled blasting (drill and blast technique) or by modification of excavation machinery such as continuous miners.

Issue

One commenter stated that the EA is inadequate in the analysis of rock mechanics. Specifically, it was suggested that the following issues 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/rock bolt in regard to rock bolt performance
- Alternative scenarios for repository support requirements for prevention of roof falls.

Response

The DOE has examined the EA with regard to rock mechanics and notes that while these concerns are valid, they are beyond the scope of the EA document. Therefore, the DOE believes that no modification to the EA is necessary. It should be noted that the DOE plans to conduct the following investigations during the site characterization phase:

1. The effect of induced thermal loading on roof and rib failure will be examined.
2. An investigation into the testing and thermomechanical analysis of salt rock/rock bolt in regard to rock bolt performance will be conducted.
3. Roof-support field studies. Repository support requirements are site-specific. Currently roof support needs can only be estimated based on cored drill holes. During the construction of the ESF, a better estimate and prediction of roof support requirements can be made.

Issue

One commenter is concerned with uncertainties associated with geologic anomalies (such as shear zones, gas pockets, etc.) which are encountered in salt mines. These anomalies are not subjected to the thermal conditions that could be expected in the repository.

The availability of engineering measures to account for expected adverse conditions in the repository is uncertain.

According to the commenter, the potentially adverse conditions at Richton Dome should be considered without site-specific rock characteristics data.

Response

The DOE has examined available site-specific and relevant generic information for Richton Dome and has incorporated recent studies into Sections 3.2.3.2 and 3.2.6 in the EA. The information consists of studies of anomalous zones in Gulf Coast salt domes, caprock features, and overdome structure and stratigraphy at Richton Dome, discontinuities of various rock masses including salt, and heterogeneities and impurities in domal salt.

Engineering measures which are available to account for anomalous zones include detection (advance drilling, seismic surveys) followed by avoidance of the anomalous zones. During site characterization, subsurface geologic data will be factored into the repository design process.

Due to uncertainties over the amount of maintenance that might be required for underground workings in a repository and the possibility of gassy conditions, the DOE has found a potentially adverse condition is present under 10 CFR 960.5-2-9(c)(3).

Issue

One commenter states that the analysis of potentially adverse conditions with regard to geomechanical properties (salt creep) findings (Section 6.3.3.2.3) and subsurface conditions (maintenance of passageways) (Section 6.3.3.2.3) are inconsistent in the following ways:

1. Extensive maintenance of the subsurface openings during repository operation and closure is predicted and expected in geologic anomalies such as shear zones and inclusions within the dome.

2. Extensive maintenance may be required under induced thermal loading and in support of retrieval operations.

The commenter suggests that the DOE evaluate geologic anomalies as causes of extensive maintenance for subsurface openings in the Richton Dome site during construction and retrievability periods.

Response

The DOE agrees that maintenance requirements in subsurface workings at Richton Dome could be influenced by the presence of anomalous rock conditions. This would be true in any rock type. An additional study of anomalous

conditions known to occur in salt domes has been undertaken. This study is the basis of an expanded discussion of anomalous features in EA Section 3.2, and has allowed an estimate of the likelihood of finding certain types of features within Richton Dome. Section 6.3 evaluates the implications of several types of anomalous conditions on repository construction and operation.

The underground openings will slowly close due to salt creep. Slow continual creep of salt is not directly a problem; however, elevated temperatures due to the emplaced waste will result in higher than normal creep rates. This 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, perhaps, more intensive ground support measures.

The DOE position on retrievability is found in EA Section 5.1. The DOE is planning to resolve, as part of the repository design process, issues related to retrievability such as excavation machinery and methods dealing with thermally induced geologic anomalies such as pressure pockets, shear zones, etc., in the proof-of-principle demonstration period prior to licensing.

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.

The following were of specific concern:

- 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 affect socioeconomic considerations
- Differences in ground-water travel times due to possible reduction in thickness of the perimeter pillar area between the waste emplacement areas and dome edge.

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 for the purpose of an EA.

Since the draft EAs were issued, some additional detail on the two-phase concept has been produced; in addition, the DOE Mission Plan (DOE, 1985, DOE/RW-0005) has been issued which gives additional direction 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 impact analyses presented in this table are based on engineering parameters (called "source terms") which were developed for each of the two repository concepts on a site-specific basis. The purpose is to present an understanding that the repository designs are still evolving, to illustrate differences which could occur as the design process matures, and to 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 nonsite-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, Vols. I-V) 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 is not known, but the designs were based on accepted commercial design practice.

3. The impacts of the increased ventilation requirements on the HEPA filtering system have not been fully analyzed. 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 exploratory shaft facility (ESF) will be incorporated into a repository. If the ESF facility is ultimately used as part of the repository, the ESF shaft seals, and other shaft components, must meet the same requirements imposed on other repository shafts.

5. Salt quantities shipped off site and the salt pile size differ between the reference concept and the current two-phase concept. The effects of these differences are presented as impacts in Table 5-1 in Section 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 separate ventilation systems are employed for each type of operation. Therefore, an accident in either the development (mining) area or emplacement area should not affect the safety of the other.

9. The restricted areas 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, utilizing site-specific information from characterization studies.

11. The discussions of possible socioeconomic impacts from the different design concepts are addressed in Table 5-1.

12. Ground-water travel times have remained the same because the perimeter pillar thickness has remained the same among the concepts presented.

Issue

Two commenters were concerned that the Richton Dome repository surface facilities were positioned in an attempt to keep all facilities as far from the town of Richton as possible, thereby avoiding disqualification due to proximity to a population center. A further concern was that the surface facilities were a "nonoptimal" arrangement as a result of an attempt to circumvent Section 112A of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 USC Sections 10101-10226).

Response

Several criteria have been applied in selecting the site of the proposed surface facilities at Richton Dome; one of these is the desirability of maximizing the distance between the facilities and the town of Richton. Other criteria related to thickness and characteristics of caprock and overdome sediments, potentially flood-prone areas, wind direction, and highway and rail access. No significant design advantages would be achieved by moving the surface facilities closer to the town. These concepts are preliminary in nature and representative of a repository at Richton Dome. During site characterization, considerable design work will be done on both the surface and subsurface layouts. A revised table has been added to EA Section 5.1, which portrays variations in repository design that could occur in the future.

Issue

A few commenters noted that repository layout plans (surface and subsurface) and requirements for controlled area dimensions cannot be determined with any degree of accuracy without considerable site characterization efforts. Therefore, in all phases of development, the impact of the repository on the environment, and on other activities in the region, must be addressed. The extent of land acquisition will also be affected.

Response

The DOE has examined the EA with regard to the impact of the repository on environment and concludes that the information provided in the EA is consistent with the requirements of 10 CFR 960.3-1-4-2 for the nomination of a site as suitable for characterization.

Final definition of repository layout (surface and subsurface) and the requirements for controlled area dimensions will occur at a site after consider-

able site characterization work has been done. This definition will be the basis for developing the Environmental Impact Statement required to accompany a repository licensing application. Also, final definition of controlled area requirements will govern the extent of required land acquisition.

Issue

One commenter expressed concerns over repository security; specifically, whether measures (including training) would be taken to avoid conflicts between repository operations and other activities, such as training on military reservations. Another concern was the possibility of terrorist attacks and provision of safeguards to protect the nuclear waste.

Response

The DOE has reviewed the EA in light of the commenter's concerns. Repository operations will be conducted to avoid conflicts with existing activities. Section 5.2 of the EA discusses the likely effects of a repository on land use around Richton Dome; specifically, it looks at possible impacts to operations at Camp Shelby and finds them to be minimal.

From the viewpoint of a terrorist attack, access to waste will be very difficult during the operational and decommissioning periods. The surface facility will be adequately protected with fences and manned security, and the massive waste containers and special means of remote handling requirements make nuclear waste a poor and difficult target for terrorists. The NRC Rule 10 CFR 60.21 requires that the license application for a repository contain a description of the security plan for protection against radiological sabotage.

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 the EA Section 5.1.2 to include work hours from which specific numbers of injuries and fatalities can be calculated. The DOE has provided these work hour estimates to correspond with work force estimates already provided.

Issue

One commenter was concerned about the nuclear safety of the repository. Specific concerns were addressed toward the availability of properly trained workers who will handle nuclear materials at the repository.

Response

The DOE has reviewed the commenter's concern about repository safety and availability of qualified workers to handle nuclear materials and presents the following response.

All of the legislation and regulations proposed by Congress, the DOE, and the NRC are focused on the near-term and far-term safety of the repository. Before and after an operating license is granted by the NRC, safety must be demonstrated, first through analysis and then by strict compliance to operating procedures. Workers must be thoroughly trained to meet repository operating procedures or an operating license will not be granted. An important element in this training process involves handling simulated nuclear materials to ensure that any problems with either equipment or personnel are discovered and corrected before a license to handle actual nuclear materials will be granted.

In summary, all workers at the repository who will handle nuclear materials will be required to have extensive training specific to the task requirements of the facility. Before a license is granted, a demonstration of safety procedures will be required by the NRC.

Issue

Several commenters noted that the following waste package concerns are applicable to all EAs:

1. The total number of packages, receipt rates, and receiving facilities differ in each EA. This should be the same for all sites, consistent with the Mission Plan (DOE, 1985, DOE/RW-0005).

2. Assumptions regarding the emplacement of waste packages should be the same for all sites and consistent with the Mission Plan (DOE, 1985 DOE/RW-0005).

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 differs among the EAs. Any differences from a common base design should be explained.

5. Although nearly 75 percent of the waste packages will be transuranic (TRU) wastes, no TRU-package design information is presented. The DOE should consider presenting an analysis of waste package performance based on emplacement of TRU packages.

Three specific comments regarding the Richton Dome site are as follows:

1. The containers are to be designed to contain contamination for only 1,000 to 10,000 years, while the half life of radioactive materials is in excess of 100,000 years. This appears unacceptable.

2. The number of canisters required to contain the waste and the number of acres required to contain those canisters should be discussed.

3. The form in which the nuclear waste is stored and the research being done to find and develop new and safer methods of disposal should be discussed.

Response

The DOE has reexamined 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-base 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). 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 DOE has revised the EA to include a description of contact-handled TRU waste packages (remote TRU packages are assumed to be similar to defense high-level waste [DHLW] packages). A final TRU waste package design is not available at this time.

It is correct that some of the long-lived actinide radioactive materials have half-lives in excess of 100,000 years. The DOE, however, is designing a waste package to meet the requirements established by the NRC and the EPA. These requirements include:

- Virtual containment for 300 to 1,000 years
- Controlled release (1 part in 10,000) for 10,000 years.

The rationale for establishing these requirements is given in the applicable regulations, 10 CFR Part 60 and 40 CFR Part 191.

The containment requirement is based on the fact that at the end of this period the fission products will be reduced to very low levels and the heat pulse resulting from emplacement will be over. After 10,000 years, the level of radioactivity will be no more than that existing in natural uranium ore bodies. Geologic characteristics at the site are not expected to change suddenly to affect releases after that time.

It will take approximately 74,000 packages of all types (TRU, spent fuel, high-level waste) to contain the wastes planned for a single repository and a subsurface area of approximately 809 hectares (2,000 acres) will be required to contain the canisters. The DOE believes that no modification to the current EA text is necessary.

All radioactive materials to be disposed of in the repository will be solidified; no radioactive liquids will be deposited. The waste forms vary between the types of waste to be disposed. Spent fuel is in the form of oxide pellets; reprocessed waste is blended with borosilicate glass; and TRU waste may include contaminated laboratory items, clothing, etc. All waste forms will be placed into containers prior to emplacement in the geologic repository. Research is continuing to investigate alternative waste forms.

In 1980, the DOE released its final Environmental Impact Statement for Management of Commercially Generated Radioactive Waste (DOE, 1980, DOE/EIS-0046F, Vols. 1, 2, 3). In this EIS, the DOE conducted a detailed evaluation of numerous alternative disposal concepts before formally adopting deep-mined disposal as the preferred option. The DOE continues to maintain a low level of involvement with other countries in a program to evaluate subseabed disposal. It is beyond the scope of the EA to review evaluations of disposal alternatives.

Issue

Two commenters stated that the discussions on shaft sealing in the EA inadequately address the following concerns:

- An analysis of the impact of using different shaft construction techniques for the exploratory shaft and the repository shafts
- The evidence to support the extent of the disturbed zone around openings
- Effects of ground freezing on shaft sinking and the site
- Response of seismic motion on shaft seals
- Thermal effects
- How large-hole drilling will minimize hydraulic connections between water-bearing strata and salt deposits.

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 activities 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 subsidence or differential stresses. Seismic effects predominantly result in near-surface ground motions and seal systems, particularly the postclosure seals, are effectively isolated from seismic effects due to their depth.

As noted in Chapter 4.1.2 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 exploratory shafts will be used in the design of the repository shafts if the site is selected for a repository.

Ground freezing, as a method for sinking shafts through aquifers (water-bearing formations), is a well-proven technology that has been demonstrated around the world (Djahanguiri, 1984). Effects of ground freezing on the site will be investigated during site characterization and results will be presented in the license application if the site is selected for repository construction.

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. Grout can be pumped through access holes in the liner to seal off the leaks before any significant hydraulic connection behind aquifers occurs.

Issue

Some commenters noted that the extent of the disturbed zone needs to be defined realistically, and that it may have significantly greater extent than reported in the EA.

Specifically, commenters mentioned thermomechanical 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

The DOE has considered the issue and clarified the related discussion in Sections 5.2 and 3.2 of the EA. Section 6.3 has been modified to reflect the following discussion. The DOE has reviewed the data and found that in some cases modifications are required. The DOE has revised Appendix 6A to clearly state that only a preliminary and conservative description of the "disturbed zone" is given. Also, 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 approximately 15 meters (49.2 feet). The DOE has also revised the EA text for clarity and to include a review of available generic information.

Regarding the statement that uplift will cause significant fracturing of overburden, changes in flow paths that will greatly shorten estimated travel times of radionuclides, and will 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 reevaluated the data on salt decrepitation and expected thermal expansion and found no change of the EA is required.

Laboratory testing indicates confined domal salt specimens characteristic of Richton Dome start decrepitation (disaggregation) at temperatures in excess of 500 C (932 F). Maximum waste canister surface temperatures will likely not exceed 300 C (572 F), not 1,500 C (2,732 F) as incorrectly asserted by one commenter. The design basis temperature for the repository of 250 C (482 F) is well below the measured decrepitation value.

Issue

One commenter stated that while the draft EA (Section 6.3.3.2.3) identifies the geomechanical factors in the vicinity of the canister which could influence retrieval, uncertainties about geochemical (sic) factors in areas away from the waste canisters are not adequately addressed.

Specific issues raised are as follows:

1. Operations in high temperatures will pose ventilation, mining, and potential radiological safety problems.

2. Operations may require sophisticated remote mining, rock handling, and possibly roof support installation equipment which has not been developed.

3. This equipment may require cooled and shielded enclosures for the operator and all support personnel.

4. Operators will need to be trained to use this equipment under repository retrieval conditions.

5. The discussion does not cover the effect of the potential presence of anomalies on retrieval.

Response

The DOE concurs that operations in high temperatures during reexcavation for retrieval will pose ventilation and mining problems. Operation of excavation equipment at high ambient temperatures will require large amounts of cooling, remote equipment operation, operator isolation by cooled enclosure, or some combination of these. Support of rock, which may be weaker at these temperatures than it was on first mining, may require much more stringent ground support measures than those used during construction.

The DOE concurs that the equipment needed for remote control or high-temperature conduct of remining and ground support has not been developed for this specific application. This equipment is to be designed, developed and tested during the proof-of-principle demonstration period prior to licensing.

Training of operators is considered a part of equipment development. Detailed discussions of these operational issues require in situ information and are beyond the scope of the EA; the DOE believes that no change in the EA is required.

Issue

One commenter stated that Section 6.3.3.2.3 appears to understate the difficulties and safety hazards likely to be encountered during retrieval. This is based on three specific issues.

Significant portions of the salt surrounding the waste room will be subjected to temperatures greater than 100 C (212 F) within 5 to 10 years after emplacement. Extrapolating strength data suggests that the unconfined compressive strength of the salt will be reduced to less than 10 megapascals (MPa) at 100 C (212 F). Assumptions made about the stress field suggest an in situ stress of about 10 to 15 MPa. The commenter states that this may require cooling or support measures during reexcavation.

The commenter states that uncertainties in the thermal decrepitation of the Richton Dome salt have not been addressed. Because of difficulties in preparing test samples, the decrepitation tests were probably performed on samples stronger than average in situ salt. Tests were performed on unloaded samples. The commenter believed that it is possible that thermal decrepitation will be more severe for the in situ rock salt around the canister holes.

The commenter stated that brine migration may change the position or orientation of the canister. If a brine-filled cavity develops around a waste package the package may shift, causing complications in overcovering.

Response

For purposes of response, this comment is addressed as three separate issues.

The DOE concurs with the commenter's evaluation of strength reduction by elevated temperatures in the salt near the canisters. Remining of waste rooms may entail significant amounts of salt cooling or support measures. These reexcavation techniques will be designed and tested as part of the proof-of-principal test program. No revision of the EA is required.

The DOE does not concur that there is an increased potential for thermal decrepitation, nor is it likely to seriously impact retrieval operations. Thermal decrepitation is a phenomenon directly related to the moisture content. Richton Dome salt is considered to be a dry salt having less than 1 percent by weight of moisture; therefore, the potential for decrepitation is unlikely.

The DOE does not concur that brine migration has the potential to significantly alter the location or orientation of the canister. A waste package

0.89 meter (2.92 feet) in diameter and 3.7 meters (12.14 feet) long has a lateral surface of 10.35 square meters (111 square feet). Predicted brine accumulation at the commercial high-level waste (CHLW) package surface in 50 years is 0.15 cubic meter (5.3 cubic feet) or less. This corresponds to a brine thickness of less than 1.5 centimeters (0.6 inch). No revision of the EA is required.

Issue

One commenter stated that Section 5.1.3.3 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, salt ductility, access drift support designs, maintenance, personnel radiological safety, etc., which will also be impacted by retrievability have not been addressed.

This commenter further stated that the greater creep tendency for Richton Dome salt at elevated temperatures 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, as required by 10 CFR 60.111, will influence design decisions other than to backfill waste rooms. Section 5.1.3.3 simply states that backfill will not be placed until the ability to retrieve waste packages has been demonstrated. In fact, such ability will be demonstrated during the proof-of-principle demonstration period prior to licensing. Section 5.1.3.3 of the EA has been modified to more specifically address retrievability.

Section 5.1.4.2 of the final EA has been expanded to include a discussion of backfill and includes a reference (Kelsall, et al., 1985, BMI/ONWI-562) which discusses the salt ductility issue.

Based on the creep data presently available, the Richton Dome salt appears to have a somewhat greater tendency to creep at elevated temperatures (Pfeifle et al., 1983, ONWI-450). 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 temperature 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 should not dictate repository design. The effect of greater creep rate at elevated temperature will make retrievable operations more costly and more difficult, requiring, for example, a sizeable amount of overexcavation to maintain sufficient offering height during overcoring. It is not expected, however, to affect the feasibility of the repository construction. No change in the EA is required.

Issue

One commenter states that the hot, radioactive, vapor-laden, stressed environment that surrounds the canisters will preclude retrieval since no technology exists for manned equipment or remote-controlled equipment that can operate in this environment and locate, free, and retrieve canisters, nor is such technology likely to be developed in the required time frame. While precooling will provide a locally more manageable environment, the EA has not presented a precooling scenario.

Response

The DOE agrees that a precooling scenario has not been presented in the EA. The specifics of methods and machinery for retrieval are still being developed by the DOE as part of the repository design process. Although it has not been determined for certainty that precooling will be necessary for retrieval, a retrieval approach which utilizes precooling is probable.

The DOE does not agree that the technology needed is unavailable or unlikely to be developed in the required time frame, and notes that retrievability was demonstrated 15 years ago in salt at a test facility at Lyons, Kansas (Bradshaw and McClain, 1971, ORNL-4555). Retrievability issues have been further studied at a test facility at Avery Island, Louisiana (Van Sambeek et al., 1983, ONWI-190(5); Waldman and Stickney, 1984, BMI/ONWI-529). The revised EA Section 5.1 clarifies the DOE's commitment to design, develop, and demonstrate the necessary methods and machinery prior to licensing.

The DOE does not agree with some of the commenter's assumptions regarding the retrieval environment and notes that salt creep will close the air gap and provide a brief (3- to 4-year) period of stresses higher than lithostatic on the canister surface only if the open hole emplacement scheme described in the EA is used. Other emplacement modes, including one utilizing steel or concrete sleeves to line the boreholes, are being evaluated by the DOE as part of the repository design process. If the emplacement mode described in the EA is used, the stresses on the canister will lock it in place, requiring overcovering for removal. This technology has not been demonstrated under the conditions of retrieval but is similar enough to existing methods (e.g., boring large holes in concrete) to give confidence that it can be used for retrieval.

Canister movement due to "mobilization" of the salt is not implied by the discussion in the EA and is not anticipated since the maximum temperature of the canister (designed to be 250 C [482 F]) is well below the 800 C (1,472 F) melting temperature of salt. Movement due to creep is limited to twice the gap between the hole wall and the canister (5.5 centimeters [2.16 inches] for spent fuel from pressurized-water reactors (SFPWR), see EA Table 6-28) since all creep is directed radially inward. The potential for movement through increased plasticity of salt from brine migration is discussed in a previous response.

With regard to a "vapor-laden" atmosphere, Kendorski et al. (1984, NUREG/CR-3489) discusses the potential for release of hydrogen-3, carbon-14, and

potassium-85 but makes no mention of iodine-129. These can be released to the atmosphere only in the event of a breached canister and in the case of overcoring, only if the salt below the canister in the overcoring barrel is fractured (Kendorski et al., 1984, NUREG/CR-3489, p. 77). While radioactive gases and volatiles must be planned for by providing either a shielded operator compartment or complete remote control operation of the overcovering equipment, it is not part of the normal operating conditions assumed for retrieval.

Reconstituted backfill will pose no greater problem than initial excavation of the salt except possibly for ground support of the weakened, hot, in situ salt.

Total brine accumulation during the retrieval period is expected to be 0.15 cubic meter (5.3 cubic feet) for the CHLW package and 0.04 cubic meter (1.41 cubic feet) for the SFPWR package (EA Figure 6-8), which is not inconsistent with the commenter's inflow figures. Nothing in Martinez and Kumar (1979) leads to an expectation of higher inflow rates than those predicted in the EA. The BRINEMIG code uses the empirical equation of Jenks and Claiborne (1981, ORNL-5818) to predict velocities. Martinez and Kumar (1979, pp. 226-236) apparently believes that this gives a maximum velocity.

Steam at a temperature of up to 250 C (482 F) does present a serious hazard to overcovering and reexcavation. One approach is to provide operator isolation or remote control operation during retrieval of wastes.

Issue

One commenter stated that the evaluation of qualifying conditions with regard to the suitability of the host rock for accommodation of the underground facility without causing undue hazard to personnel (EA Section 6.3.3.2.1) is inadequate with respect to retrieval because it does not address the uncertainties regarding reexcavation of storage rooms and relocation of waste canisters.

Specifically, there are no data or analyses cited to support the expectation that retrieval can be accomplished without undue hazard and with reasonably available technology. Uncertainty related to the possibility of breaching a waste package has not been addressed.

Response

The DOE does not agree that reexcavation of storage rooms and relocation of waste canisters cannot be accomplished without undue hazard and with reasonably available technology. The DOE notes, for example, that retrievability was demonstrated in salt at Lyons, Kansas, 15 years ago (Bradshaw and McClain, 1971, ORNL-4555) and retrievability issues have been studied further at Avery Island, Louisiana (Van Sambeek et al., 1983, ONWI-190[5]; Waldman and Stickney, 1984, BMI/ONWI-529).

Reexcavation of waste rooms is more difficult than initial excavation because of operation in a high-temperature environment and in providing adequate stability in rock which has been subject to creep and strength reduction at high temperature.

Operation of excavation equipment at high ambient temperatures may require large quantities of cooling, remote operation of the equipment, operator isolation in a cooled equipment cab, or some combination of these measures. Providing stability in mining weakened rock requires considerable caution and may require extensive artificial support but is part of routine mining practice. As stated in EA Section 6.3, these measures, while costly, will be possible with reasonably available technology and without undue hazard.

Relocation of canisters can be accomplished by any or a combination of several available techniques including radioactivity, magnetic fields, earth-penetrating radar, and precise surveying from monuments outside the area of most severe creep (since the problem is not movement of the canisters relative to a fixed frame but movement of points of reference).

Relocation of canisters can also be simplified with other emplacement modes, specifically the use of steel or concrete sleeves to live emplacement holes, which are presently being evaluated by the DOE as part of the repository design process.

The DOE concurs that the uncertainty related to the possibility of breaching a canister has not been addressed in the EA, nor is it appropriate to do so until a site-specific waste package design and emplacement mode are adopted. This possibility will be considered in the design of retrieval machinery and methods to be demonstrated before licensing. From a viewpoint of personnel safety, this may require remote operation of overcovering or shielding of the cooled operator enclosure mentioned above.

Issue

One commenter stated that the EA has not adequately discussed uncertainties associated with the rock mechanics aspects of retrieval. Concern was expressed that retrieval operations could be significantly affected by adverse conditions created by elevated temperatures, especially in a heterogenous host rock.

Specifically, the commenter was concerned with the following:

1. No discussion was presented 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.

2. Retrievability discussions do not sufficiently consider the potentially adverse effects associated with heterogeneities of the rock mass and elevated temperatures, such as reduced rock strength, accelerated creep, pressurized gasses surrounding the waste canisters, and hot brine flow.

3. Blowouts of naturally occurring gas pockets due to strength reduction should be discussed.

4. Room stability must be maintained.

5. Canisters must be located and removed.

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 re-excavation of backfilled waste rooms. Reexcavation will, as noted, be primarily in reconsolidated backfill which will be quite homogeneous. Backfill emplacement will be evaluated during a 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 partially resisted by the recompacting fill. The amount of closure will be approximated by the in-place porosity of the emplaced fill which cannot be determined until 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 stability will be designed and tested as required as part of the proof-of-principle test program. No revision of the EA is required.

The DOE concurs with the commenter that high temperatures (a peak of 296.2 C [565.2 F] at the CHLW waste package surface 5 years after emplacement (see EA Table 6-30) coupled with inhomogeneities in the in-situ salt of the borehole wall may cause some problems in removing, and perhaps in locating, canisters. However, it is unlikely for there to be significant buildups of hot brines around a waste canister in a domal salt. Section 6.4 of the EA has been changed to include an analysis of the effects of hydrogen gas. These effects are expected to be minimal. With regard to naturally occurring gas blowouts, such features (if present) will develop during the rapid stress release following initial room excavation. As such, they are not expected to be a hazard to retrieval operations.

The draft 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 temperatures 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 the waste package. This emplacement mode, however, is only one 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. Overcoring can be done with more-or-less conventional drilling equipment consisting of an annular drill bit similar to those used for drilling large-diameter holes in concrete.

A variety of location techniques are available including surveying from permanent monuments located outside the high temperature area, metal detectors, radioactivity, and earth penetrating radar, which when used by themselves or in combination can provide sufficiently accurate position data to reduce the safe overcoring diameter to an acceptable size.

Section 5.1.3.3 has been revised in the EA to present the DOE's current position and status on the retrievability issue.

Issue

A few commenters stated that the disposal of excess salt from the repository has not been sufficiently analyzed. Specific concerns include the following:

- The salt pile crust formation and behavior under varying conditions
- The salt pile behavior during conditions of high winds (tornados and hurricanes), heavy rain, or flood
- The performance of the salt pile liner over the repository's lifetime
- The degree of salt dispersal that occurs when the salt is moved from the salt pile to the transport carriers, and during transport
- Doubling the size of the salt pile if defense wastes are added to the civilian waste, and the amount of salt that will be mined
- Guaranteeing the installation and continuous operation of safety measures for preventing salt escape
- The impact of the lack of rainfall for 4 to 6 weeks on washing away and dilution of salt
- The use of calcium to nullify the effect of salt
- The selection of the salt disposal option
- Salt is the only "medium" that melts in water, and lack of a shaft which penetrates the surface 2,000 feet below sea level through salt

- Conflicting statements in the EA about the method of salt disposal to be selected

- The DOE's assurance that salt disposal to landfills will be to landfills that have permits for salt in the quantities required using sound construction and operation practices.

Response

The DOE has conducted a qualitative study on the nature of the salt pile crust at the Waste Isolation Pilot Project (WIPP). Tentative conclusions from this study are presented in EA Sections 4.2 and 5.2 but are summarized here.

1. Formation of the crust occurs very shortly after deposition of salt on the pile.

2. Formation of the crust probably requires that moisture be present in the range of 70 to 75 percent, a very common condition in southern Mississippi.

3. Thickness of the crust is significant and will support heavy loads.

4. The top portion of the crusted salt pile contains many hollow regions.

The DOE believes that a tornado at the Richton Dome is possible (although the likelihood of a tornado path being coincident with the salt pile is very small). The DOE has not conducted an analysis of the effect of a tornado on the salt pile, but damage to the pile should be minimal if a crust has formed. If a significant crust had not formed on some parts of the pile, salt would be blown about and probably dispersed over a wide region.

A hurricane at the Richton Dome is likely during operation of the repository. Some wind damage might occur, especially to uncrusted salt, and rainfall could be expected to be heavy. It can be envisioned that a 160-kilometer-per-hour (100-mile-per-hour) wind could pick off sheets of rainwater from the top of the pile. A small portion of the site is in the Probable Maximum Flood (PMF) area. The salt pile is above the PMF in the reference design.

The DOE has examined the EA with regard to disposal of excess salt and has revised the Executive Summary (Section 5) to show that no method of salt disposal has been selected.

The DOE has reviewed information available on liner performance and concludes that few data are available upon which to base an analysis of liner performance over the lifetime of the repository. 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.

Based on the DOE analysis related to the development and nature of the crust on the salt pile at WIPP, 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, significant amounts of fine salt would probably be produced during handling and transport, and some would be dispersed in the area near the processing facilities and along roadways even though the material would be transported in covered hopper cars.

The DOE acknowledges the concern expressed about the conditions at Richton Dome where no precipitation may occur over a period of from 4 to 6 weeks and, thus, windblown salt or salt spills may not be diluted sufficiently to avoid environmental damage. As part of salt pile management, the DOE may choose to spray a mist of water on the pile and thereby enhance salt crust development during dry spells. As indicated in EA Sections 4.2 and 5.2, it is anticipated that the quantities of windblown or spilled salt will be negligible. Any environmental effect will be small in terms of the total area involved.

Regarding the concern about the possibility that disposal of defense wastes would result in more salt to be excavated and a larger salt pile, although design of the repository has not been completed, it would be designed to contain a given metric tons of uranium (MTU) equivalent. If a repository is to be designed for disposal of a given MTU equivalent, then less salt will be excavated when defense wastes are included in the kinds of wastes to be disposed. The reason for this effect is that canisters of defense waste produce less heat and therefore may be more densely emplaced.

Regarding the question about the installation and operation of systems to prevent escape of salt, the DOE will provide the equivalent of a guarantee by the use of quality assurance and quality control measures during the design and construction phase of the exploratory shaft facility and of the repository, as well as the adherence to strict operating procedures during the operational and decommissioning phases of the repository.

Assurance has been requested from the DOE that calcium materials will be used to nullify the effect of fugitive salt on soils. In the event of significant contamination of soil by salt, the feasibility of restoration by addition of calcium will be considered by the DOE. It should be noted that this mitigative measure may not be the most economical in some cases.

Before the DOE plans to dispose of excess salt in landfills it will assure that the operators have acquired the proper permits to accept salt in the quantities required and use proper construction methods and operational practices.

The DOE recognizes that salt dissolves in water but notes in EA Section 3.2 that Richton Dome does not appear to have experienced significant dissolution for 25 million years. The relationship of the repository with respect to sea level is not considered pertinent. However, presence of water (aquifers) immediately above and surrounding the dome is pertinent to radioactive waste transport and is discussed in EA Sections 6.3 and 6.4. The DOE further notes that existing commercial mines in salt domes are currently operating below sea level (e.g., Avery Island, LA). Shaft construction in salt domes is a well established technology.

Issue

A commenter wanted to know if the repository would be monitored to detect radioactive releases into the ground water. A second concern related to the evacuation plans for the Richton area and for how long such evacuation plans would be required.

Response

The current NRC position regarding repository monitoring is contained in 10 CFR Part 60, Disposal of High-Level Radioactive Wastes in Geologic Repositories. 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 a 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.

An evacuation plan will be required to be prepared and approved by the NRC prior to issuance of a license to accept nuclear materials. This plan will remain in effect until the repository is permanently closed.

C.4.4 CHAPTER C.4 REFERENCES

C.4.4.1 References Listed by Author

Acres American, Inc., 1977. National Strategic Oil Storage Program, Weeks Island Mine Geotechnical Study, Vol. 2 of 2, U.S. Federal Energy Administration, Washington, DC.

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.

Bechtel Group, Inc., 1981. NWTS Conceptual Reference Repository Description (CRRD), Vol. II, Facility and Systems Description, ONWI-258, prepared for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

Bechtel Group, Inc., 1981. NWTS Conceptual Reference Repository Description (CRRD), Vol. III, Criteria, Bases, Special Studies and Codes, ONWI-258, prepared for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

Bechtel Group, Inc., 1981. NWTS Conceptual Reference Repository Description (CRRD), Vol. IV, Drawings, ONWI-258, prepared for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

Bechtel Group, Inc., 1981. NWTS Conceptual Reference Repository Description (CRRD), Vol. V, Alternate Concepts and Facilities Impacts, ONWI-258, prepared for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

Bechtel National, Inc., 1984. Socioeconomic Data Base Report for Mississippi, ONWI-499, prepared for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

BGI, see Bechtel Group, Inc.

BNI, see Bechtel National, Inc.

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.

Carothers, William W., and Yousif K. Kharaka, 1978. "Aliphatic Acid Anions in Oil-Field Waters - Implications for Origin of Natural Gas," The American Association of Petroleum Geologists Bulletin, Vol. 62, No. 12, pp. 2441-2453.

Djahanguiri, F., 1984. Memorandum from Djahanquiri 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.

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.

ETC, See The Earth Technology Corporation.

Garrels, Robert M., and Charles L. Christ, 1965. Solutions, Minerals, and Equilibria, Freeman, Cooper & Company, San Francisco, CA, pp. 209-225, and 255.

Golder Associates, Inc., 1985. Assessment of Character and Extent of Mechanical Disturbance for Underground Openings in Salt, 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.

Holdahl, Sanford R., and Nancy L. Morrison, 1974. "Regional Investigations of Vertical Crustal Movements in the U.S., Using Precise Relevelings and Mareograph Data," Tectonophysics, Vol. 23, No. 4, pp. 373-390.

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.

Jenks, G. H., and H. C. Claiborne, 1981. Brine Migration in Salt and Its Implications in the Geologic Disposal of Nuclear Waste, ORNL-5818, prepared for U.S. Department of Energy by Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Union Carbide Corporation, Oak Ridge, TN.

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.

Kelsall, P. C., J. B. Case, D. Meyer, J. G. Franzone, and W. E. Coons, 1985. Schematic Designs for Penetration Seals for a Repository in Richton Dome, BMI/ONWI-562, prepared by D'Appolonia Consulting Engineers, Inc. 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.

Law Engineering Testing Company, 1982. Gulf Coast Salt Domes Geologic Area Characterization Report, Mississippi Study Area, Vol. VI, ONWI-120, prepared for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

Law Engineering Testing Company, 1982. Gulf Coast Salt Domes Geologic Area Characterization Report, Mississippi Study Area, Vol. VII, Appendix, ONWI-120, prepared for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

LETCo, see Law Engineering Testing Company.

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.

Lindberg, Ralph D., and Donald D. Runnells, 1984. "Ground Water Redox Reactions: An Analysis of Equilibrium State Applied to Eh Measurements and Geochemical Modeling," Science, Vol. 225, pp. 925-927.

Martinez, J. D., and M. B. Kumar, 1979. "Mechanisms of Migration of Formation Waters in Salt Domes," Ch. IV-H in Institute for Environmental Studies, An Investigation of the Utility of Gulf Coast Salt Domes for the Storage or Disposal of Radioactive Wastes, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA, pp. 221-236.

McCulley, Bryan L., John W. Thackston, and Lynne M. Preslo, 1984. Status Report: Geochemical Interactions Between Ground Water and Paleozoic Strata, Gibson Dome Area, Southeastern Utah, prepared by Woodward-Clyde Consultants for 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.

Mullin, Clayton W., 1982. Draft Geology of the Caprock and Salt Stock of the Richton Salt Dome, prepared by Georgia Institute of Technology for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

NRC, see U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, 1984. Performance Assessment Plans and Methods for the Salt Repository Project, BMI/ONWI-545, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

ONWI, see Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation.

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.

Parsons Brinckerhoff/PB-KBB, 1984. Exploratory Shaft Facility Report on Wastes, Disposal Options, and Issues, prepared for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH, in preparation.

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. Preliminary Constitutive Properties for Salt and Nonsalt Rocks From Four Potential Repository Sites, ONWI-450, prepared by RE/SPEC Inc. for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

Russell, C. Winston, 1984. Hydrological/Geochemical Search for Sandstone-Type Uranium Deposits in Forrest, Jones, Perry and Eastern Lamar Counties, Southeastern Mississippi, Report on Research Project MMRI # 83-11S, Department of Geology, University of Southern Mississippi, University, MS.

Stearns-Roger Engineering Company, 1979. National Waste Terminal Storage Repository No. 1, 21 vols., prepared for U.S. Department of Energy, Oak Ridge Operations Office, Oak Ridge, TN.

Stearns-Roger Services Inc., 1981. Engineering Feasibility Studies for Candidate Salt Domes: National Waste Terminal Storage Repository No. 1, Special Study No. 5, ONWI-283, prepared for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

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.

Tammemagi, Hans Y., Marc C. Loken, John D. Osnes, and Ralph A. Wagner, 1985. A Compilation of Data for Thermomechanical Analyses of Four Potential Salt Repositories, ONWI-364, prepared by RE/SPEC Inc. for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

The Earth Technology Corporation, 1985. Geodetic and Geomorphic Analysis of Uplift in the Gulf Coast Region, prepared for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH, in preparation.

U.S. Department of Energy, 1980. Final Environmental Impact Statement, Management of Commercially Generated Radioactive Waste, DOE/EIS-0046F, Vol. 1, Washington, DC.

U.S. Department of Energy, 1980. Final Environmental Impact Statement, Management of Commercially Generated Radioactive Waste, DOE/EIS-0046F, Vol. 2, Appendices, Washington, DC.

U.S. Department of Energy, 1980. Final Environmental Impact Statement, Management of Commercially Generated Radioactive Waste, DOE/EIS-0046F, Vol. 3, Summary, Public Comments and Hearing Board Report, Washington, DC.

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. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 1979. Environmental Standard Review Plans for the Environmental Review of Construction Plant Permit Applications for Nuclear Power Plants, NUREG-0555, 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.

Waldman, Henry, and Randall C. Stickney, 1984. Measured Data From the Avery Island Site C Heater Test, BMI/ONWI-529, prepared by RE/SPEC Inc. for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

Werner, M., 1985a. Assessments Pursuant to EA Comments on Overdome Faulting and Lineaments in the Neardome Area, draft technical memorandum, prepared by The Earth Technology Corporation for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH, August 30, in preparation.

Werner, M. L., 1985b. Evaluation of the Structure and Stratigraphy Over Richton Dome, prepared by The Earth Technology Corporation for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH, in preparation.

Workman, Audrey L., and Jeffrey S. Hanor, 1985. "Evidence for Large-Scale Vertical Migration of Dissolved Fatty Acids in Louisiana Oil Field Brines: Iberia Field, South-Central Louisiana," 1985 Gulf Coast Association of Geological Societies Transactions, in review.

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; 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.

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 ensure the health and safety of the public and the quality of the environment. This section corresponds to Sections 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 the postclosure period and the ability to isolate the waste from the hydrologic system.

Issues raised by the commenters include the following:

- Direction of ground-water flow near the dome
- Uncertainties of the flow parameters
- Possible contamination of potable water supplies.

Issue

Several commenters stated that the direction of ground-water flow in and near the dome must be treated with uncertainty due to anomalous zones and other possible subsurface features.

Response

The DOE has revised Section 3.2.3 to more fully evaluate the potential for anomalous zones within Richton Dome to provide an adequate understanding of the nature, occurrence, and ramifications of the presence of such anomalous zones. Based on the conclusions drawn from this evaluation, the most likely ground-water travel path within the dome remains as presented in the draft EA. Travel times presented in the EA are substantially longer than the Nuclear Regulatory Commission criteria of 10,000 years. Furthermore, the predicted travel distances in 10,000 years are contained within the 244-meter (800-foot) buffer zone of the salt dome. The presence of possible anomalous zones along the flanks of the dome do not affect the interior ground-water flow path and travel time, but may affect exterior flow paths and travel times. However, the presence and nature of such features is unknown.

Uncertainties in travel time calculations from the disturbed zone to the edge of the dome are quantified by sampling from the distributions of flow parameters through the Latin Hypercube Sampling Method (Iman and Conover, 1982, NUREG/CR-2350). The DOE has revised EA Section 6.4.2.3.5, in response to these comments, to include the quantification of this uncertainty.

Issue

Several commenters stated that the uncertainties of the flow parameters contributed to uncertainties about ground-water flow directions and velocity.

Response

To address the uncertainty about flow directions outside the dome and along its flanks, sensitivity studies (Metcalfe and Andrews, 1984) were conducted by varying total dissolved solids which alters fluid density and hydraulic conductivity in the near-dome model. By varying these parameters, both upward and downward flow were produced. However, when realistic flow parameters were used, a prominently downward flow was observed.

A sensitivity study (Metcalfe and Andrews, 1984) of the impact of the dome hydraulic conductivity on flow within Richton Dome was done by comparing Darcy velocities. It was found that varying the dome hydraulic conductivity did not alter the gradient within the dome, as changes to the Darcy velocities are accounted for entirely by variations made to hydraulic conductivity. Hence, the uncertainties associated with the dome ground-water velocities are within the range of uncertainty for the dome hydraulic conductivity. The DOE has revised EA Section 6.4.2.3.5 in response to these comments.

Issue

Several commenters have expressed concern over possible contamination of potable water supplies at the dome from wastes emplaced in the repository.

Response

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has established stringent standards for releases of radionuclides from a repository. Part of the licensing process for any repository will be the requirement that DOE demonstrate that such standards can be met at the site. Section 6.3.1.1 indicates that travel distances in 10,000 years are contained entirely within the salt stock. Outside of the dome, flow paths are not expected to be towards potable water supplies; rather, they are expected to be predominantly downward from the repository to nonpotable deep brine aquifers (Metcalfe and Andrews, 1984). The DOE has made revisions to EA Section 6.4.2.3.5 to discuss uncertainties associated with the expected flow path.

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 the 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/migration, geochemical evidence of postdepositional dissolution, and geochemical modeling. None of the EA revisions regarding any of these issues alters the outcome of the waste package performance calculations, which are summarized briefly below.

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). Dome salt generally has a very low water content and is essentially impermeable (Tien et al., 1983, pp. 207-211; and ETC, 1984, ONWI-511, p. 26). Site-specific water content data are not available for Richton Dome salt; however, Roedder and Chou (1982, pp. 2-8) suggest that a water content of 0.1 weight percent is a conservatively high value for domal salts. To assure that brine volumes are not underpredicted, the waste package performance calculations for Richton Dome (Section 6.4.2.3.3) assume an initial brine content of 0.5 volume percent. Both fluid inclusion (thermally-migrating) and intrusive brines are expected to be low-magnesium (about 120-130 milligrams per liter) sodium chloride types.

Issues

Commenters were concerned about radionuclide mobility/migration. It was stated that the calculations of radionuclide release presented in the EA may be in error.

Response

The DOE notes that the question of radionuclide mobility/migration can be broken down into the following four areas of specific concern: oxidation/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 and has revised Sections 3.2.7, 6.3.1.2.2, and 6.3.1.2.3 accordingly. This evidence suggests that the at-depth chemical environment is sufficiently reducing for uranium and other actinide species to be in their less soluble, less mobile, reduced states (e.g., tetravalent uranium).

Reduced forms of carbon (organic material), iron (pyrite), and sulfur (elemental sulfur) are known to be present in the Richton Dome caprock (Drumheller et al., 1982, ONWI-277). The salt stock also contains minor amounts of pyrite and organic matter (Drumheller et al., 1982, ONWI-277). Fluid inclusions in the host salt contain hydrocarbons, with mean occluded methane contents of 0.64 microliters per gram (Mullin, 1982, p. 37; Drumheller et al., 1982, ONWI-277). Ground water surrounding the dome contains methane, ethane (Drumheller et al., 1982, ONWI-277), and sulfide (Section 3.2.7.3) and is considered to be chemically reducing (LETCo, 1982, ONWI-120, Vol. VII, p. C-3-13). Sedimentary units adjacent to the dome contain lignite, pyrite, siderite, and glauconite. Garrels and Christ (1965, pp. 209-224) show that the presence of siderite indicates a system with an Eh probably less than -100 millivolts. Russell (1984, pp. 19-20) reports Eh values averaging less than -17 millivolts in formation fluids from the Upper Aquifer unit. Lindberg and Runnells (1984) point out that obtaining reliable Eh measurements in ground water is problematic; however, the presence of redox-sensitive species such as sulfide and methane can provide at least a qualitative guide to the redox status of water. At these lower redox potentials expected in the lower HSU, redox-sensitive radionuclides are expected to be stable in their lower oxidation states.

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 brines (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 to minimize any associated adverse effects.

The potential for transport of radionuclides as complexes with organic chemical species has been reevaluated in Section 6.3.1.2.2. Site-specific organic geochemical data are not available for either deep formation fluids adjacent to the dome or for the host halite. However, acetate and other low molecular weight aliphatic acid anions are common anaerobic breakdown products of sedimentary organic matter, and it would not be surprising if they occurred in ground water in the domal setting. For example, short-chain aliphatic acid anions have been identified in deep brines from the Palo Duro Basin in Texas (Means and Hubbard, 1985, BMI/ONWI-578) and have been tentatively identified in formation fluids from the Leadville Limestone underlying the Paradox Basin in Utah (McCulley et al., 1984). Carothers and Kharaka (1978) identified short-chain aliphatic acid anions in ground water from the Houston and Corpus Christi areas of Texas, with acetate concentrations ranging up to 1,200 milligrams per liter. Acetate and propionate predominate in deep ground waters from the Iberia oil-field in south-central Louisiana, with concentrations ranging up to 66 and 44 milligrams per liter, respectively (Workman and Hanor, 1985). While organic geochemical data on deep domal brines are lacking, if short-chain aliphatic acid anions are the principal organic species present, then significant radionuclide

complexation would not be expected (Means and Hubbard, 1985, BMI/ONWI-578). Richton Dome salt stock and formation fluids adjacent to the dome contain hydrocarbons, including methane and ethane (Drumheller et al., 1982, ONWI-277). The radiolysis of these organic gases will likely form polyethylene and formic acid, in addition to carbon dioxide and water (Lind, 1961; Gray, 1984). None of the expected radiolytic by-products possess significant radionuclide complexation characteristics. The speciation and amount of organic matter contained in Richton Dome halite as inclusions and possible effects on radionuclide complexation have not yet been evaluated.

Colloids may enhance the transport of radionuclides in ground water under some conditions. Section 6.3.1.2.2 of the EA has 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 geologic substrates. The applicability of this phenomenon to radiocolloid transport in a salt repository needs to be further established.

The draft EA briefly stated in Sections 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 strata, which contain clay minerals, lignite, and glauconite (Drumheller et al., 1982, ONWI-277); however, present data are insufficient to permit a quantitative assessment of this phenomenon. Since no credit for sorption is taken in the performance assessment calculations (Section 6.4.2), no further adverse effects from repository-related processes are possible. Data collected during detailed site characterization will address the extent to which radionuclide adsorption 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 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.

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 expanded upon the discussion of evidence for postdeposition dissolution in Sections 3.2.5.7, 6.3.1.2.2, and 6.3.1.6 of the revised EA. An analysis of the timing of caprock formation at Richton Dome is presented in Section 3.2.5.7. The caprock appears to have been completely formed by late Oligocene time, and there are no indications of ground-water movement through the caprock since that time. Discussion in Section 6.3.1.6 concludes that there is no evidence of significant Quaternary dissolution at Richton Dome and no evidence that continued dissolution, even at unlikely maximum rates, will lead to a loss of waste isolation within 10,000 years after repository closure. This evaluation was based on (1) evidence for the long-term (greater than 25 million years) hydrologic stability of the site; (2) consistently slow (less than 6 centimeters (2.4 inches) per 1,000 years and more likely less than 3 centimeters (1.2 inches) per 1,000 years dissolution rate estimates based on reasonable geologic constraints and conservative assumptions; and (3) the buffer zone of salt and anhydrite caprock, which is estimated to be at least 244 meters (800 feet), that will separate the repository from the nearest aquifer. Based on maximum dissolution rate estimates, the repository will not be affected by salt dissolution for at least 4 million years.

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 its performance assessment, which involves 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). Plans for the application of this 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.5.3 ROCK CHARACTERISTICS

This category addresses those comments and questions concerning the behavior of salt and other rock under repository conditions at the Richton Dome

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 discontinuities, heterogeneities, and impurities on rock mass behavior
- Discussion of rock/soil properties measurements
- Variations between laboratory/in situ test behavior and rock mass behavior
- Repository geoengineering-related design concerns
- Performance of seals in the shaft
- Discussion of coupled-effects performance scenarios
- Definition of the extent of the disturbed zone
- The fitness of salt domes as a host rock for radioactive waste
- Inconsistency in the references
- The presentation of the variation of the thermal conductivity with temperature.

Issue

Many 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 can be categorized as follows: near-surface faults overlying domes, anomalous zones, joints and fractures in caprock, gas and brine pockets, rock mass property anisotropy, subsurface faults, and uncertainty with respect to dome boundaries.

Response

The DOE has examined available site-specific and relevant generic information for Richton Dome and has incorporated recent studies to establish a basis for response. The information consisted of studies of anomalous zones in Gulf Coast salt domes, caprock features, the structure and stratigraphy over Richton Dome, discontinuities of various rock masses including domed salt, heterogeneities and impurities in domal salt, and a recently completed reevaluation of dome geometry.

The information has been assessed to consider the effects of discontinuities, heterogeneities, and impurities on rock mass behavior and rock mass

characteristics (categorized as near-surface faults, anomalous zones, joints and fractures in caprock, gas and brine pockets, rock mass property anisotropy, subsurface faults, and uncertainty with respect to dome boundaries). The assessment also included an examination of these effects on repository post-closure performance.

The DOE has clarified Sections 3.2.6 and 6.3.1.3 in response to this issue.

Issue

Several commenters indicated that the rock/soil properties measurements presented may vary in several ways and that these should be discussed. These properties may vary between laboratory/in situ test behavior to the rock mass behavior or they may vary among various locations, even if general characteristics appear quite similar. The source of these variations may be due to any of the following and should be addressed:

- Variations because of natural spatial variation from place to place, lack of a statistically representative number of measurements, or technical uncertainties in making extrapolations
- Variations between laboratory/in situ test measurements and rock mass behavior for a single location because of natural spatial variation, the effects of the scale of the area or specimen tested as compared to a large rock mass, or lack of statistically representative/spatially representative measurements.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated the existing site-specific data and examined additional generic data to address the variability of rock and soil property measurements. Generic data for caprock and salt from laboratory studies have been used to assess data variability from location to location. Site-specific core log data have been assessed to clarify the relationship between laboratory data and the large-scale behavior of materials. Additional site-specific in situ and laboratory data will be obtained during site characterization to address variations between laboratory and in situ measurements.

Based on the data discussed above, the DOE has clarified the discussion in Section 6.3.1.3 to address data variability and uncertainties and the relationship to postclosure repository conditions.

Issue

A few commenters noted that a number of repository geoengineering-related design concerns require addressing, specifically, the effects of backfill on subsidence.

Response

The DOE has considered the issue and clarified the discussion in Sections 5.2.1 and 3.2.6 of the EA. The postclosure implications are discussed in Section 6.3.1.3.

Backfilling the rooms will reduce the amount of room closure and ultimately the amount of subsidence as measured at the surface. Because of possible high rates of room deformation, consideration is being given to backfilling the disposal rooms as soon as possible. Apart from reducing the overall subsidence at the surface, early backfilling will provide increased room stability should reentry become necessary.

In the short term, backfill will have a minor effect on the elevation of the ground surface. This is because insufficient time will have passed for subsidence to be complete and because any subsidence will be countered by thermal expansion of the rock mass due to heating by the waste packages. In practice, the combined effects of backfilling and salt creep into the underground workings will reduce the maximum uplift effect after about 1,000 years to below 0.8 meter (2.6 feet), and reduce the final amount of surface subsidence after the repository has cooled down.

In the postclosure time frame of greater than 50 years, the effect of backfill on subsidence and the elevation of the ground surface will become increasingly more significant. As the repository temperature begins to decrease towards normal ambient in situ temperature, backfill will provide its major contribution. This should occur at time spans greater than 5,000 years after emplacement.

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.

Response

The DOE has considered the issue and clarified the discussion in Sections 3.2.6 and 5.2.1 of the EA. The postclosure implications are discussed in Section 6.3.1.3.

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 is to prevent access of surface and aquifer water to the repository level and vice versa. The first type (used during construction) is a preclosure seal whereas the second type (backfill) is a postclosure seal.

Regarding the concerns 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. 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. Also, plastic flow of salt into void spaces will tend to seal off potential flow paths within a short time. Given that the sealed shafts will be located large distances 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 real question in the postclosure time frame is whether any radionuclide transport will occur if they do leak. The shaft-system will likely not contribute significant quantities of water to the repository, and therefore is not expected to contribute to the release of radionuclides.

The thermal pulse from the repository has been estimated to be 1 to 2 C (34 to 36 F) at the base of the shaft after 1,000 years (Kelsall et al., 1985, BMI/ONWI-562). This small temperature change should have a negligible effect on the stability and deformation of the shaft, as well as a minimal effect on the shaft seals. Accordingly, this issue is not considered in the EA.

Issue

A few commenters indicated 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, thermo-hydrologic effects on the engineering properties of the rock mass, thermo-mechanical effects on the engineering properties of the rock mass (e.g., fracture healing), 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 the discussion in Sections 5.2.1 and 3.2.6 of the EA. The postclosure implications are discussed in Section 6.3.1.3.

Regarding concerns that brine inclusions might move away from the waste package and become 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. This has been observed experimentally but 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; therefore, this mechanism is not expected to contribute significantly to

radionuclide release. Pressure gradients may be important to intergranular flow. Jenks (1979) originally proposed the use of his equation for both intergranular and intragranular flow based on experimental observation. Attempts to validate this theory using data from the Salt Block II brine migration experiment show that reasonable agreement with the data is obtained.

The use of the threshold gradient case as the expected condition was questioned. Reevaluation of this issue indicated 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 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 and they will not pose a threat to the workers or the general public. No thermal decrepitation of the tested salt samples occurred up to a temperature of 500 C (842 F) (Senseny, 1983, ONWI-9[83-1]), 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). Consequently, a disqualifying condition does not exist.

The question raised by one commenter is whether closure will be due entirely to creep or whether other mechanisms, such as slabbing or spalling, will dominate. The latter situation would be harder to deal with in terms of tunnel maintenance, support, and mine safety. Room-scale calculations performed by Wagner (1985, ONWI-300, Figure 3.3) using a viscoelastic constitutive model, indicated that vertical closure along the roof-floor centerline would approach 0.35 meter (1.15 feet) in 5 years for 5.5 x 5.5-meter (18 x 18-foot) rooms in Richton Dome salt. In existing salt mines, openings up to 9.1 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

- Uplift caused by thermal expansion of the rock mass due to heating by the waste packages

- Subsidence caused by the creep of the salt into the underground workings.

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. After some tens of thousands of years, when the repository has cooled down, the subsidence effect will result in a small amount of overall permanent subsidence of less than 1 meter (3.3 feet).

Performance assessment room closure scoping calculations are currently being done that account for fractures and discontinuities in overlying strata as well as creep of the salt.

Issue

Some commenters noted that the extent of the disturbed zone needs to be defined realistically.

Response

The DOE has considered the issue and clarified the discussion in Sections 5.2.1 and 3.2.6 of the EA. The postclosure implications are discussed in Section 6.3.1.3.

For the purposes of the present discussion, no attempt has been made to evaluate the relative deleteriousness of the respective types of disturbance on waste isolation. Rather, an enumeration of the potential disturbing processes is discussed. The major disturbances appear to initially be mechanical due to excavation but, later, thermal disturbances come into play.

Mechanical responses due to disturbance consist of the following: 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.

Thermal responses due to disturbance consist of the following: change in thermal gradient, change in thermal flux, change in temperature, change in thermal properties of the rock mass due to temperature change, and uplift of the overlying rock mass due to thermal expansion.

The DOE has reviewed the data on extent of mechanical disturbances and found that, in some cases, some modifications are required. The DOE will, as suggested by one reviewer, clearly state in the introduction that Appendix 6A gives only a preliminary and conservative description of the "disturbed zone."

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 15 meters (49.2 feet). It was correctly noted that other evidence supported

estimates of a disturbed zone due to excavation ten times greater than presented in the EAs. 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. The DOE has also revised the EA text for clarity and included a review of available generic information.

Regarding concerns that EA estimates of uplift will cause significant fracturing of overburden, changes in flow paths that will greatly shorten estimated travel times of radionuclides, and will 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.

Questions about whether salt "heated by radioactivity" would retain its self-healing properties allude to thermal decrepitation and effects of irradiation on the mechanical properties of salt. The DOE has reevaluated the data and found no change of the EA is required.

Laboratory testing indicates confined salt specimens typical of Richton salt decrepitate (disaggregate) at about 500 C (842 F). Maximum expected salt temperatures at the waste package surface will likely not exceed 300 C (592 F), not 1,500 C (2,732 F) as incorrectly asserted by one commenter. Because the maximum salt temperature drops considerable (below 250 C [482 F]) within a few feet of the waste package surface, the repository (pillars and room openings) will be designed for a maximum of 250 C (482 F). The repository design maximum of 250 C (482 F) is well below the decrepitation point and well above the maximum temperatures attained in the floor, pillar, and roof of the repository. Gamma radiation will affect only the first few inches of salt around a waste package and will not adversely affect repository performance.

The DOE has performed new calculations and rewritten the text of Appendix A for added clarity with regard to thermohydrologic effects.

Issue

A reviewer stated that salt domes are unfit as a host rock for radioactive waste.

Response

At this time, the DOE does not have any evidence to disqualify salt domes from being considered as potentially suitable host rock for a nuclear waste repository. The evaluation of expected salt dome performance as a repository is provided in Chapter 6 of the EA.

Issue

A commenter noted an inconsistency in the references for the range of unconfined compressive strength for caprock.

Response

The DOE has corrected the typographical error in the summary table of rock characteristics in Section 6.3.1.3 to show a lower value of the caprock unconfined compressive strength of 71.2 megapascals.

Issue

A commenter noted an incorrectly referenced table.

Response

The DOE has corrected the incorrectly referenced table in Section 6.3.1.3.2 of the EA.

Issue

A commenter noted an incorrect range for thermal conductivity in Table 6-9, and it was recommended that the variation of the thermal conductivity with temperature be presented.

Response

The DOE has corrected the range for thermal conductivity in Section 6.3.1.3 of the EA text. The variation of thermal conductivity with temperature is presented in Figure 3-21 (Thermal Conductivity of Halite, Richton Dome) of the EA.

Issue

A commenter noted an incorrect referencing of Table 5-2.

Response

The DOE has corrected the reference in Section 6.3.1.3 of the EA text.

Issue

A commenter noted that the coefficient for thermal expansion of salt is high relative to other potential repository host media.

Response

The DOE has corrected Section 6.3.1.3 of the EA text to show a high coefficient of thermal expansion relative to other potential repository host media.

Issue

A commenter was uncertain whether the disturbance range of 10 meters (33 feet) in the table on page A-7 of Appendix 6A was the size of the thermal-hydrologic disturbed zone or the extra distance traveled in 10,000 years due to heat effects.

Response

As stated on page A-6, paragraph 3, of Appendix 6A, the ground water is predicted to travel 10 meters (33 feet) or less from the repository in 1,000 years while flow is influenced by the waste-induced heat.

C.5.4 CLIMATE CHANGES

This category is concerned with general changes in climate which might occur after repository closure at the Richton Dome site. This category corresponds to comments received on Section 6.3.1.4 and related sections.

Issues raised by the commenters include the following:

- Misquotation of a siting guideline.

Issue

Two commenters noted a misquotation of a DOE siting guideline (i.e., the qualifying condition for the Postclosure Technical Guideline for Climatic Changes [10 CFR 960.4-2-4]).

Response

The DOE acknowledges the guideline was misquoted and has corrected Section 6.3.1.4 of the EA so the guideline reads the same as that presented in the most current version (December 6, 1984) of 10 CFR Part 960.

C.5.5 EROSION

This category addresses general concerns related to erosion at the Richton Dome site. This category corresponds to comments received on Section 6.3.1.5.

Issues raised by the comments include the following:

- Flooding and coastal erosion.

Issue

A commenter stated that a rise in sea level caused by melting of the ice caps could inundate the site, causing flooding and coastal erosion and compromising site integrity.

Response

The DOE examined and evaluated available data related to sea level change due to melting of the ice caps during preparation of the draft EA. No evidence is available suggesting that the earth's glacial ice has ever melted completely. A complete carbon-dioxide-induced melting of the world's glaciers has not been envisioned. The DOE has modified Sections 6.3.1.4 of the EA text to clarify this rationale for selecting a particular value of maximum sea level rise from the many estimates that have been published.

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 Richton Dome 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:

- Misquotation of a siting guideline
- Uncertainties in the evidence about dissolution
- Additional investigation of the geologic and tectonic setting.

Issue

One commenter noted a misquotation of the DOE siting guidelines (e.g., the potentially adverse condition for the Postclosure Technical Guideline for Dissolution [10 CFR 960.4-2-6]).

Response

The DOE acknowledges the guideline was misquoted and has corrected EA Section 6.3.1.6 so the guideline reads the same as that presented in 10 CFR Part 960.4-2-6.

Issue

Many commenters stated that uncertainties in the evidence about dissolution require that the findings be reexamined against the Dissolution Guideline (10 CFR 960.4-2-6). Existing data, it was stated, should be reevaluated to develop alternative data interpretations with an associated uncertainty analysis for the geologic, hydrologic, and geochemical characteristics of Richton Dome that may relate to dissolution.

Response

The DOE has prepared a more thorough and integrated analysis of the dissolution issue in Sections 3.2.5.7, 3.2.7 and 6.3.1.6. Additional analyses not available when the draft EA was prepared have been incorporated; in particular, analyses of caprock structure and mineralogy, characteristics of the salt/caprock interface, and a reevaluation of hydrologic borings previously considered to show an anomalous salinity down gradient of the dome. Alternative hypotheses of dissolution mechanisms and rates are presented in Section 6.3.1.6 and compared to site-specific features. It is shown that even the most conservative approach to dissolution results in a prediction of no significant impact on repository isolation.

Issue

A few commenters suggested that additional investigations of the geologic and tectonic setting of Richton Dome should be required before accurate conclusions about the potential for the effects of dissolution can be drawn. Some said it is not possible to arrive at accurate conclusions given the existing data base.

Response

The DOE has expanded its discussion of tectonics in Sections 3.2.5 and 6.3.1.7 to include an evaluation of structural features within the salt dome that might enhance the potential for dissolution. The results of two new studies of caprock and overdome stratigraphy based on information of over 70 overdome and near-dome borings are incorporated. Wells in the near-dome area, which were reported to contain anomalous salinities, have been reexamined. The evidence provides no basis to indicate that significant dissolution related to domal or near-dome structures is occurring.

C.5.7 POSTCLOSURE TECTONICS

This category addresses those comments relating to seismicity, faulting, and other tectonics issues concerning the Richton Dome 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:

- More discussion of overdome faults
- Relationship between the Phillips Fault and Richton Dome
- More consideration needs to be given to the New Madrid Fault
- Inclusion of soil amplification in the ground-motion calculations
- Likelihood of an earthquake
- Incorrect statements about historic record of seismicity
- Approach to tectonic analysis
- Seismic design requirements for a repository
- Evaluation of major fault lines adjacent to the dome
- Instability of Richton Dome
- The historic record for seismicity.

Issue

Some commenters stated that there should be more discussion of overdome faults that may affect dome stability or may be indicative of dome instability.

Response

The DOE has rewritten the text for Sections 3.2.5.1, 3.2.5.6, and 6.3.1.7.2 to present the results of more detailed analyses. The EA text indicates that overdome faults, rather than affecting dome stability, have been caused by dome growth. Faults have been identified in the deep subsurface on the northern flank of Richton Dome. These faults developed as a result of dome growth; lack of offset of strata above these faults indicates recent dome stability. Two faults which (as a result of area characterization studies) were postulated in the overdome sediments have been shown to be the result of incorrect correlation of geophysical logs with well numbers. A recent reevaluation (Werner, 1985a) indicates that although several laterally traceable units (identified from geophysical logs) occur at different elevations in different borings, the elevation differences are consistent with gentle arching over the salt stock; that is, the same unit appears at a higher elevation in borings at the crest of the dome than in borings closer to the edge of the salt stock. Werner (1985b) postulated arching during deposition of the Hattiesburg Formation based on lithologic data from both shallow area characterization borings and sulfur exploration borings. Werner also concluded that the arching ceased prior to deposition of the Citronelle Formation, and that the faults, if they exist, do not appear to offset the base of the Citronelle.

Issue

One commenter stated that the relation between the Phillips Fault and Richton Dome is unknown.

Response

The Phillips Fault is clearly separated from Richton Dome and does not involve the dome. However, the trend of the fault is similar to that of the dome and the salt ridges from which domes have risen. Both features may ultimately be shown to be related to the same early salt deformation process. The DOE has revised EA Sections 3.2.5.1 and 6.3.1.7 for clarity in response to these comments.

Issue

Several commenters stated that not enough consideration is given to the New Madrid Fault, which, they stated, runs through Mississippi dangerously close to the site.

Response

The DOE has rewritten the text of Sections 3.2.5.1 and 3.2.5.2 for clarity. The EA uses the current interpretation from the U.S. Geological Survey and the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) sponsored studies that place the closest approach of the fault zone about 250 miles (400 kilometers) north-northwest of the site. No faulting hazard at the site is expected from the New Madrid Fault zone, only ground motion from large earthquakes which might originate within the fault zone. EA Section 6.3.1.7 evaluates the seismic hazard at the site from this and other seismic sources.

Issue

One commenter noted that the NRC calculations for expected ground accelerations, using equations cited in Section 6.3.1.7, yield different results than those given in the text.

Response

The DOE has reviewed the calculations and has revised the text to show that the 0.14-gravity value was calculated using Nuttli and Herrmann (1981) equations, which update and replace their earlier (1978) work. The estimates for maximum earthquakes are unchanged, and they are still cited from the 1978 paper. The DOE has revised EA Section 6.3.3.4.2 in response to this comment.

Issue

A few commenters stated that soil amplification should be included in the ground-motion calculations.

Response

The DOE has augmented the text to acknowledge soil-column effects and to indicate that the soil-column effects, either amplification or attenuation, depend on site-specific data that are not available. However, the estimated ground motions are moderate, and the local soil columns are not known to be unusual. Therefore, the soil-column effects are not expected to change ground motions to levels that are unacceptable from an earthquake engineering viewpoint. The DOE has revised EA Section 6.3.1.7 in response to this comment.

Issue

One commenter stated that the two preceding issues, ground acceleration and soil-column amplification, demonstrate that potentially adverse conditions (c)(2) on Tectonics (10 CFR 960.4-2-7 and 10 CFR 960.5-2-11) are present.

Response

The DOE has reviewed the text and has determined that the two preceding issues do not require the findings to be changed. These issues represent data needs and points to be clarified; they do not demonstrate the presence of potentially adverse conditions. The DOE therefore believes no modification of the EA is required.

Issue

One commenter stated that the EA has not shown there is little likelihood of an earthquake in the area.

Response

The DOE has reviewed the text and believes that no modification of the EA is required. The site selection is based not on showing there is little likelihood of an earthquake in the area, but on showing there is acceptably low likelihood of earthquake damage to facilities that are designed to resist earthquakes. The data do show a low level of seismic activity in the geologic setting of the site. Seismic design criteria will assume that earthquakes up to a maximum credible earthquake will occur.

Issue

One commenter stated that the EA contains incorrect statements in Section 6.3.1.7 about the adequacy of the historic record of seismicity, about the stability of spatial patterns of seismicity, and that the lack of geologic evidence proves a lack of faulting.

Response

The DOE has rewritten the text for clarity, and has indicated that the seismicity data are extremely useful indicators of the current tectonic environment, but cannot be used alone. The earthquake analysis must include all available seismic, geologic, and tectonic data. The statement about temporal stability of seismicity patterns has been removed. Geologists have sought to find evidence of young faulting in the geologic setting. The lack of such evidence is consistent with an interpretation that young faulting is absent but does not provide absolute proof. Additional studies will be required prior to licensing a site; however, current evidence is sufficient to meet the requirements of 10 CFR 960.3-1-4-2 for nomination of sites as suitable for site characterization. The DOE has revised EA Section 6.3.1.7 in response to these comments.

Issue

One commenter stated that the approach to tectonic analysis differs from that of the NRC.

Response

The NRC has yet to release a position on seismo-tectonic analysis for a nuclear waste repository. The DOE will respond to an NRC approach to tectonic analysis when it is released. In the interim, the DOE is developing its own position on seismo-tectonic analysis which will be used to guide site characterization activities. The DOE believes no modification of the EA is required.

Issue

Several 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 motions at the site are moderate in relation to design levels for other nuclear facilities. The DOE has revised EA Section 6.3.3.4.3 in response to this comment.

Issue

One commenter stated that the salt dome is likely to still be moving upward, making it unstable.

Response

The DOE has rewritten the text of Sections 3.2.5.6 and 6.3.1.7.2 to present the results of a new evaluation of dome stability by Werner (1985b). This study indicates that young (Plio-Pleistocene) geologic strata overlying the dome appear to be undisturbed by faulting or local uplift. These undisturbed beds indicate the dome has not been moving upward in the past two million years.

Issue

A few commenters stated that there are major fault lines adjacent to the dome, and within the geologic setting, which have been incompletely evaluated.

Response

The DOE has rewritten the text to clarify the nature had of the known faults near Richton Dome. None of these faults is known to have had any activity during the Quaternary Period (the past 2 million years). There is a fault (F-7, not a major fault) shown in Figure 3-14 along the northwest flank of the dome and extending north-northwest. Geologic data show that this fault has not been active since Eocene (about 50 million years ago). The DOE has revised the EA in Sections 3.2.5.1 and 6.3.3.4.3 (1) in response to this comment. The finding in Section 6.3.3.4.3 (1) has been corrected to reflect the absence of any active faulting in the geologic setting.

Issue

One commenter stated that Richton Dome is unstable and has documented movement in the last 10,000 years, as evidenced by erosional exposure of the Citronelle Formation.

Response

The DOE has rewritten the text of EA Section 6.3.1.7 for clarity and has indicated that regional uplift, rather than domal uplift, appears to account for the erosional exposure of the Citronelle Formation. The Citronelle Formation is Pleistocence in age and is older than 10,000 years; it is exposed in hills over the dome. The important evidence to indicate young dome movements would be any folding, faulting, or thinning of the Citronelle over, or near, the dome. Field evidence available at this time does not indicate any deformation or depositional thinning.

Issue

One commenter stated that the historic record for seismicity is too brief for the DOE to make a valid judgment (Section 7.2.1.7) about whether the recurrence of historic events would affect repository containment.

Response

The DOE has reviewed EA Chapter 7 and has determined that no change in this finding is required by this comment. The potentially adverse condition (2) for the postclosure guideline for Tectonics (10 CFR 960.4-2-7) specifies that the historic record itself should be used; it does not indicate consideration of the duration of the record. However, analyses for several other guidelines in Sections 6.3.1.7 and 6.3.3.4 do consider limitations of the historic seismicity record and combined the seismicity data with geologic and tectonic data.

Issue

One commenter stated that the program schedule does not provide enough time for adequate additional seismic monitoring called for in the discussion of the potentially adverse condition (3) in Section 7.2.1.7.

Response

The DOE has reviewed the text and determined that no modification of Section 7.2.1.7 is required by this comment. However, Section 3.2.5.2 has been modified to indicate more clearly that the purpose of additional seismographic monitoring is to give supplementary data on the current tectonic environment and to characterize any microearthquake activity. Monitoring can indicate current stress fields and loci of stress release, but by itself cannot prove faults are inactive because some fault processes can occur in cycles on time scales of thousands of years. Monitoring will begin as soon as a potential site is identified and will continue as long as a site is being considered, or as long as a repository is operated.

C.5.8 HUMAN INTERFERENCE (NATURAL RESOURCES)

This category addresses problems of potential human interference, particularly those related to exploitation of natural resources, after closure at the Richton Dome site. This category corresponds to comments received on Section 6.3.1.8 and related sections.

Issues raised by the commenters include the following:

- Concern about the drilling of sulfur and petroleum exploration wells

- Potential for natural resources
- Potential for human intrusion
- Potential for hydrocarbons, brine production, and salt dome utilization
- Impacts of future intrusion of boreholes
- Effectively warning future generations
- Estimation of the size and orientation of the controlled area.

Issue

A few reviewers were concerned that sulfur and petroleum exploration wells drilled over and adjacent to the site may have created a potential for dissolution pathways that has not been adequately addressed. In particular, and contrary to information in the EA, Shell Masonite 23-7 may have penetrated the salt stock at the repository.

Response

The DOE has added an integrated evaluation of dissolution potential to EA Sections 3.2.5.7 and 6.3.1.6. This evaluation includes the potential effects of boreholes at the site in the context of the hydrologic conditions. Information about Shell Masonite 23-7 has been obtained from the records of the State Oil and Gas Board. The presence of this well as a penetration of the salt stock near the flank of the dome also has been incorporated into analyses of groundwater flow paths in Section 6.3.1.1, and the potential for human interference in Section 6.3.1.8. The 10,000-year travel paths are found to be contained well within the planned 244-meter (800-foot) buffer zone.

Issue

A few commenters noted that ground water as a natural resource leading to potential human interference is not sufficiently recognized in the draft EA. This is of particular importance because data presented do not demonstrate that flow paths to the accessible environment pass through ground water having greater than 10,000 parts per million of total dissolved solids. Furthermore, shallow aquifers are presently being used near the site.

Response

Section 6.3.1.8 has been revised to specifically call out ground water over and around Richton Dome as a natural resource. Future development of these shallow aquifers is shown to have no impact on fluid movement within the dome

and will not alter the expected travel paths. Any fluids from the edge of the repository to the accessible environment at the dome flank will be saturated with respect to salt. Furthermore, the 10,000-year travel distance is within the 244-meter (800-foot) wide buffer zone around the edge of the repository.

Issue

Many commenters suggested that the potential for natural resources at the site has been insufficiently addressed and the potential for human intrusion is understated. The potential for hydrocarbons, brine production, salt dome utilization, and other mineral resources should be described.

Response

The DOE has completed an updated mineral resource evaluation of the region around Richton Dome. Appropriate modifications have been made to the EA text (Sections 3.2.8, 5.2.1.3, and 6.3.1.8); salt, petroleum, solution mining, lignite, uranium, and storage space are evaluated. The results of this study indicate no additional potential for resource exploration/exploitation at the site than was described in the draft EA. An expanded discussion of land control requirements and site markers has also been added to Section 6.3.1.8.

Issue

One commenter expressed the concern that the EAs do not specify the nature of the "incompatible" activities that would be excluded from the controlled area.

Response

A brief statement defining land control requirements during the operations phase (referencing 10 CFR 60.121) has been added to the text. Examples have been given of the types of activities (deep drilling, solution mining, hydraulic fracturing) that would be categorically excluded. The discussions have been added to Sections 3.2.8, 5.2.1.3, and 6.2.1.1.1, and 6.3.1.8, as appropriate. Reference has been made to Chen and Raines' (1985) delineation of desirable limits of the controlled area.

Issue

Some commenters noted that the impacts of future intrusion of boreholes at a salt site (or in the site vicinity) have not been assessed.

Response

Harper and Raines (1985), Monti and Gupta (1984), and Walters (1975) have been cited in respect to observed and modeled examples of salt dissolution effects related to boreholes in salt and possible radionuclide releases resulting from drilling directly through the repository (Section 6.3.1.8). Analysis of borehole closure from salt creep in relation to possible dissolution has been added to the EA text (Section 6.3.1.8). An investigation of borehole effects upon salt units associated with oil exploration has been added to the EA text (Section 6.3.1.8). These additional analyses confirm that there is little potential for loss of isolation from the site due to simple borehole intrusion. The requirements of 10 CFR 60.2 regarding site markers is also addressed in Section 6.3.1.8. The NRC considers that human intrusion at a site is not a credible scenario if a suitable marker system exists and knowledge of a repository and its contents has been transmitted to future generations.

Issue

A few commenters expressed concern that the DOE cannot demonstrate that marking the site will effectively transmit a warning to future generations.

Response

A brief discussion has been added to Section 6.3.1.8 of the EA regarding passive site markers and records dissemination that may be used to tell future generations of the nature of the site. The requirements of 10 CFR 60.51 as they relate to establishment of site markers and records dissemination are discussed. Reference is made to several studies of types of marking systems and the likelihood of records maintenance by future generations. Although the DOE does not have to adopt a specific marker design until it applies for a license to construct a repository, these studies indicate that long-term site marking is feasible.

Issue

Several commenters suggested that the size and orientation of the controlled area may have been underestimated, especially when consideration is given to alternative flow paths and gassy-mine designs that could increase the size of underground workings.

Response

An explicit rationale has been developed for definition of the controlled area by Chen and Raines (1985). The DOE will control the area over the salt stock, thus maintaining dome integrity from such activities as solution mining. The evidence does not indicate that additional control external to the controlled area will be necessary to prevent adverse activities that could

significantly affect repository integrity. With respect to alternative flow paths, Section 6.3.1.1 concludes that the most conservative 10,000-year travel distance is well within the 244-meter (800-foot) buffer zone surrounding the repository.

C.5.9 POSTCLOSURE SITE OWNERSHIP AND CONTROL

This category concerns issues relating to ownership and control of the site at Richton Dome, Mississippi, after it has been used as a repository. This category corresponds to comments received on EA Section 6.2.1.1 and related sections.

Issues raised by the commenter include the following:

- Controlling access to Mississippi State Highway 42
- Controlling access in case of an accident.

Issue

Citing the DOE postclosure guideline on site ownership and control (10 CFR 960.4-2-8-2) and the Richton Dome EA Section 6.2.1.1, one commenter suggested that there should be some discussion of how access to Mississippi State Highway 42, which runs across the site, will be controlled, and who will be responsible for controlling it in the event of an accident at the repository.

Response

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) regulations (10 CFR 60.121) require both the geologic repository operations area and controlled area to be located in and on lands that are either acquired lands under the jurisdiction and control of the DOE, or on lands permanently withdrawn and reserved for DOE use. These lands are to be held free of all significant encumbrances (10 CFR 60.121[a][b]). "Incompatible activities" are to be restricted within the controlled area following permanent closure (10 CFR 60.2). Accordingly, if the Richton Dome site is selected for repository development, the DOE is likely to seek to obtain ownership and control of that segment of the road that transects the site. It is currently envisioned that the highway will, in turn, be leased back, or a suitable limited easement granted, to the State for continued highway use; but this later arrangement would be subject, of course, to an NRC determination that such usage is not considered "incompatible" with preclosure controlled area activities. Should road usage be deemed a compatible activity, the DOE will make appropriate emergency response arrangements with the State.

C.5.10 POSTCLOSURE SYSTEM GUIDELINE

This category addresses questions related to the overall performance assessment for a repository at the Richton Dome site. Comments addressed Section 6.4.2, Preliminary Postclosure Performance Assessment and Section 6.3.2, Postclosure System Guideline.

Issues raised by the commenters include the following:

- Engineered barrier system providing long-term containment.

Issue

Many commenters questioned whether the engineered barrier system and site can provide long-term containment and isolation and 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 Richton Dome site. Comments are particularly related to Section 6.4.2 (Preliminary Postclosure Performance Assessments).

Issues raised by the commenters include the following:

- Reliability of the package lifetime predictions
- Inconsistencies in tables showing radionuclide concentrations

- Stresses around the waste package
- Boundary stresses
- Creep and thermal expansion on external pressures
- Stress components caused by generated hydrogen
- Estimates of the disturbed zone
- Evaluation of the effects of horizontal anomalous zones
- Salt heated by radioactivity
- Moving of waste canisters
- Reliability of computer radiation fields
- Estimation of corrosion rates, leach rates, and solubilities
- Analysis of the various types of waste forms and packages
- Uncertainties in brine composition
- Estimates of initial water content
- Brine inclusions
- Verification, validation, and documentation for all codes
- Uncertainties and assumptions regarding BRINEMIG
- Uncertainty about thermal conditions, data, and models
- Concern over contamination of potable water
- Effects of perturbations
- Inclusion of sensitivity and uncertainty analysis
- Potential disruptive effects of earthquakes
- Erosion, volcanic eruptions, and impacts of meteorites
- Drilling of natural resources by future generations
- Human intrusion
- Performance of shaft seals and liners
- Failures around salt mine shafts.

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 EA predictions use the data currently available and are considered preliminary. The text in Section 6.4.2.3.3 of the EA discusses nonuniform corrosion and the DOE has expanded this Section to further clarify use of uniform corrosion for the EA purposes.

Issue

A few comments 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, in relation to the final EPA regulation 40 CFR Part 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 final 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 the figure entitled "Stress Boundary Conditions at Waste Package Midplane" in Section 6.4.2.3.3 of the EA are conservative by more than the 25 and 35 percent 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 the figure entitled "Stress Boundary Conditions at Waste Package Midplane" 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 could be 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. The figure entitled "Effect of Brine Rate on Corrosion of the Over-

pack" 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 or other design measures adopted as appropriate.

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 (Prij 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 commenter 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 by 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 likely be relieved 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 estimate of the disturbed zone to 15 meters (50 feet), and that (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 meters (33 feet) represent 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 distance travelled due to the effect of heat on flow). However, note that the previous issue and response described the DOE's revised estimate of the disturbed zone to include possible additional contribution from mechanical disturbance in the vertical direction.

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 should 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 large brine pockets 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). 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 the 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 815 C (1,500 F). 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 indicates confined salt specimens start decrepitation (disaggregation) at temperatures ranging from 260 to 370 C (500 to 698 F). Tests of domal salt indicate decrepitation at 500 C (842 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 Work Group, 1983, ONWI-483) indicates that the 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-137, S.257). Second, experimental evidence from Project Salt Vault (Bradshaw and McClain, 1971, Figure 11.74a) and Avery Island (Van Sambeek et al., 1983, ONWI-190[5], Figure 25) show waste canister 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-450, pp. 30-35) of salt even under heated conditions would prevent the canisters from sinking. Pfeifle et al. (1983, ONWI-450, 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 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

A few commenters questioned whether the computer 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 in Section 6.4.2.3.3 titled "Radiation Fields at Waste Form - Overpack Interface" and "Radiation Fields at Waste Package - Material 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 et al., 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).

Issue

Many commenters questioned (1) whether the environment immediately surrounding the waste package is sufficiently predictable to estimate the corrosion rates, leach rates, and solubilities for use in calculations; (2) whether 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) whether waste package performance during the preclosure period and immediately after closure can be ignored.

Response

The DOE has examined the pertinent data and believes no modification of the EA is required. This examination is discussed briefly in the following paragraphs.

In advance of site characterization, it is generally not possible to prove conclusively or to assure that the waste package performance at the site will meet the applicable regulations concerning waste package corrosion and radionuclide release rates because the corrosion rates, leach rates, and solubilities in the brine to be encountered are too uncertain. Indeed, one purpose of the EA is to show that a design exists that can meet the regulations with reasonable values of those parameters. As site characterization proceeds (if Richton Dome is chosen for characterization), the uncertainty in the parameters will decrease, but it is possible that the expected values may shift in a way that would require design changes to ensure compliance with the regulations.

Nevertheless, for this site, there is at least an order of magnitude of difference between the thickness of the container wall and the thickness corroded, even if unlimited brine were available at the repository temperature. The quantity of brine available by thermal migration is insufficient by an order of magnitude to uniformly corrode through the corrosion allowance. If corrosion proves to be highly nonuniform or the brine volume greatly underestimated, the brine is still not expected to provide enough water which, when saturated with radionuclides (even without taking into account that most of the water in the brine could be destroyed by reaction), would violate the release rates and the accumulated release regulations except for the most soluble elements.

This conclusion is not changed, even with an order of magnitude increase in solubilities. It therefore appears that the regulations will be substantially met provided that no water comes in from outside the dome.

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 analysis of only SFPWR and CHLW waste forms because they generate more thermal power, produce higher radiation fields, contain higher inventories of radionuclides than defense high-level waste or TRU and are, therefore, sufficient to discriminate between the suitabilities of different sites for waste repositories. The Mission Plan (DOE, 1985, DOE/RW-0005, 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 stated that uncertainties in brine composition, especially with respect to a much higher magnesium content, should be considered in estimating waste package performance. Commenters also said a high-magnesium intrusion brine scenario should be considered as a realistic possibility.

Response

Site-specific brine compositions are not well known at present. They can only be determined as part of site characterization. Magnesium has been identified as having an important effect on corrosion rates in brines. Corrosion data are presently available only at two magnesium contents, so predictions were made using these values. It is very likely that the site-specific values eventually obtained will not match the magnesium contents for which data are available; however, it is very unlikely that a more corrosive brine will be obtained than the high-magnesium brine for which corrosion data are available.

As is pointed out in other issues in this section related to waste package performance, some uncertainty can be tolerated in the corrosion rates. If better information shows that the corrosion rates are much higher than those used in the EA, the respository and waste package designs will be modified appropriately. The corrosion rates could be lowered, for example, by lowering the thermal loading in the waste packages, or by placing a magnesium scavenger in the packing surrounding the package if magnesium is determined to be a problem. Alternatively, the corrosion allowance around the waste package could be increased, or a more corrosion-resistant material could be used in the waste package design.

The intrusion brine scenario assumes an infinite quantity of brine to be available, passing through the repository. Intrusion brines are expected to be of low-magnesium content because large amounts of flowing water would not have the opportunity to saturate with respect to magnesium. Although not considered a likely scenario, calculations were made for unlimited high-magnesium brine for all sites. The results are provided by Jansen (1985). If a reason is found for expecting a large amount of high-magnesium brine at the repository horizon, a waste package will be designed to accommodate this.

According to issues related to geochemistry, there is no evidence to suggest that high-magnesium content brines are expected at the domal salt sites. The reference to Hubbard et al. (1984) has been replaced by an appropriate reference.

Although the brine composition of a thermally migrating brine is not expected to change during migration, it is recognized as being theoretically possible. This has not been considered in modeling because of its unlikely nature as well as a lack of direct evidence (experimental data).

An additional comment was that the DOE should have performed a more demonstrably conservative analysis. Conservatism was not always a goal in the detailed analyses. Rather, the aim of the analyses presented in the EAs was to determine whether the sites warranted further consideration. The very conservative analyses using unlimited quantities of high-magnesium brine provide an indication that this site is acceptable even in the very unlikely event of large quantities of high-magnesium brine being present.

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 0.5 volume percent, which was assumed for the site in waste package performance assessments, is not a nonconservative number. 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 in Jansen (1985).

Large brine pockets may be encountered during site characterization. Areas containing brine pockets would either be mined around during site development or drained by advanced drilling. 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, but it is not clear 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 make 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 very 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 will 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 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 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.

Issue

Some commenters stated that uncertainties and assumptions regarding BRINEMIG and application of its results should be considered in more detail in Section 6.4.2.3.2 of the EA.

Response

The DOE recognizes that the BRINEMIG code is built on assumptions about brine movement which do not realistically describe the movement of brine in salt. The uncertainties and assumptions for the BRINEMIG code are discussed here; therefore, no revision was made to Section 6.4.2.3.2 of the EA. 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 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, any expected package lifetime could be achieved even in a high-magnesium brine by providing a sufficient corrosion allowance in the waste package by design.

The DOE reviewed the contention that brine migration models are predicting over a million liters of water and a mushy brine solution at the waste package.

A concern was that the canisters would move in this brine-salt "mush." The DOE is unaware of any modeling effort which has predicted that a million liters of water would reach a waste package. The highest numbers obtained with the BRINEMIG code are on the order of 1,000 liters (264 gallons), which would be consumed in a corrosion reaction with the waste package. No pool of brine is ever expected to surround a waste package. The salt surrounding the package is expected to remain solid, although it will creep, and the waste packages are expected to remain essentially immobile.

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 temperature. 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 for bedded salt were also compared with the STEALTH and SPECTROM-41 results. The comparison would have been much closer if Richton Dome had been modeled because the nonsalt stratigraphy used for beds is not appropriate for domal salt. 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, was 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 Electric Corporation, 1983, ONWI-242, Tables 1-2 and 1-3), and baseline repository inventory and design parameters (SCC, 1984, Tables 5-1, 2, and 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, 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, 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 predicted maximum 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 26 C (47 F) to 32 C (48 F) per kilometer (0.62 mile) depth (LETCo, 1983, ONWI-289 p. 13). For a bedded salt formation with much larger variation on the thermal gradient, the ambient at-depth temperature varied by about 3 C (37 F) (Dutton, 1980, Figure 39). Therefore, the uncertainty in ambient temperatures appears to have little effect on calculated temperatures at this site. 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, p. B-137, S-257) gives the melting temperature of pure salt as 801 C, (1,474 F), which is far in excess of any maximum expected salt temperatures in a repository.

The DOE has reviewed the concern that nuclear waste will heat the salt and may cause brine flow 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) will prevent convection from occurring within the salt. Second, the major movement of brine due to temperature gradients will likely be toward, 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 90 meters (295 feet) for any salt site in the Gulf Coast Salt Dome Basin, which is still short of the planned 244-meter (800-foot) perimeter salt pillar. 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 816 C (1,500 F) 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 waste package will not exceed about 420 C (788 F). In addition, Loken et al. (1984) 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 is not expected to begin below 500 C (932 F) for domal salt, will affect only a small volume of salt at most.

Issue

Several commenters stated that the direction of flow near the dome must be treated with uncertainty due to anomalous zones and other possible subsurface features. Others stated that flow parameters were uncertain. Several commenters expressed concern over contamination of potable water supplies at the

domes. Also, a few commenters were concerned that the 244-meter (800-foot) buffer zone would not be maintained in the repository design.

Response

The DOE has revised Section 3.2.3.2 to more fully evaluate the potential for anomalous zones within Richton Dome to provide an adequate understanding of the nature, occurrence and ramifications of the presence of such anomalous zones. Based on the conclusions drawn from this evaluation, the most likely ground-water travel path within the dome remains as presented in the draft EA. Travel times presented in the EA Section 6.3.1.1 are substantially longer than the 10 CFR 960 favorable condition criterion of 10,000 years. Furthermore, the predicted travel distances in 10,000 years are contained within the 244-meter (800-foot) buffer zone of the salt dome. The presence of possible anomalous zones along the flanks of the dome do not affect the interior ground-water flow path and travel time, but may affect exterior flow paths and travel times. However, pressure and nature of such features are unknown.

Uncertainties in travel time calculations from the disturbed zone to the edge of the dome are quantified by sampling from the distributions of flow parameters through the Latin Hypercube Sampling Method (Iman and Conover, 1982, NUREG/CR-2350). In response to these comments, the DOE has revised EA Section 6.4.2.3.5 to include the quantification of this uncertainty. A sensitivity study (INTERA, 1984, ONWI-502) of the impact of the dome hydraulic conductivity on flow within Richton Dome was done by comparing Darcy velocities. It was found that varying the dome hydraulic conductivity did not alter the gradient within the dome, as changes to the Darcy velocities are accounted for entirely by variations made to hydraulic conductivity.

The 244-meter (800-foot) minimum perimeter pillar (buffer zone) between the repository workings and the dome flank is a current design basis. The DOE sees no reason at this time to decrease this distance; any future decision to do so would require demonstration of no significant impact on repository isolation or worker safety.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has established stringent standards for releases of radionuclides from a repository. Part of the licensing process for any repository will be the requirement that DOE demonstrate that such standards can be met at the site. Section 6.3.1.1 indicates that travel distances in 10,000 years are contained entirely within the salt stock. Outside of the dome, at repository depth, flow paths are not expected to be towards potable water supplies; rather, they are expected to be predominantly downward from the repository to nonpotable deep brine aquifers (Metcalfe and Andrews, 1984). The DOE has made revisions to EA Section 6.4.3.2.5 to discuss uncertainties associated with the expected flow path.

Issue

A few commenters stated that the effects of perturbations such as tectonics and climatic and geomorphic changes on hydraulic properties need to be addressed. Several commenters also stated that the near-dome hydrology is complex and not understood.

Response

The DOE has reviewed this issue and believes no modification of the EA is required. While it is acknowledged that near-dome hydrology is complex, to meet the requirements of 10 CFR 960.3-1-4-2 for site nomination the hydrology and subsurface have been adequately characterized for the purpose of the EA. With respect to perturbations, the probability of severe tectonic or geomorphic disturbances in this site area is relatively low, as discussed in Sections 3.2.2 and 3.2.5. Consequently, such disturbances are not included in expected behavior and were not analyzed for the EA. The DOE chose to use an "expected conditions" analysis 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-502), 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 analyses would not provide additional confidence that the postclosure technical guidelines can be met. The purpose of the EA is to determine whether a site is suitable for nomination under 10 CFR 960.3-1-4-2. 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 waterproofing 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) 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 is discussed 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 that would invite intrusion.

The DOE (1980, 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 (1983, 10 CFR 60.2) indicates 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(1); INTERA, 1985, BMI/ONWI-553; DOE, 1983). These studies provide a calculational basis for demonstrating that when realistic conditions are assumed for ground-water flow and chemistry, waste solubility, and site geometry, then releases are well below the 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 consequently, confidence in their effectiveness may be 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 the bond between the seal and host rock, and effects on radionuclide transport have been addressed in various DOE reports. 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-405; 1985, BMI/ONWI-562) and Parsons-Brinckerhoff (1983, ONWI-497) have not ignored this issue. Gureghian et al. (1983, ONWI-494) chose to assume 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-497) provide 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-562, 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. Similar behavior is expected for Richton Dome. 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 conditions, that the massive amounts of dissolution required to uncover any waste could occur around the shafts. For example, SCC (1984) locates all of the shafts large distances from emplaced 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-405 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 the Cypress Creek Dome 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/day, the amount of dissolution will be small. If the sedimentation of impurities during any dissolution was considered, the base of the shaft seal system could likely plug and block a flow path that had been developed during dissolution.

In conclusion, any 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, and/or construction methods similar to those intended for waste isolation in salt as described by Kelsall et al. (1985, BMI/ONWI-562) and Parsons-Brinckerhoff (1983, ONWI-497). 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 real question 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 one year after waste has been emplaced (Stearns-Catalytic, 1984, 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, p. 211). The permeabilities are often below the resolution of the testing apparatus (Tien et al., 1983, 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, 1981, 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, 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

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.

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.

Carothers, William W., and Yousif K. Kharaka, 1978. "Aliphatic Acid Anions in Oil-Field Waters - Implications for Origin of Natural Gas," The American Association of Petroleum Geologists Bulletin, Vol. 62, No. 12, pp. 2441-2453.

Carslaw, H. S., and J. C. Jaeger, 1959. Conduction of Heat in Solids, 2nd edn., Oxford University Press, New York, NY, pp. 10-11.

Chen, C. P., and G. E. Raines, 1985. Technical Basis for High-Level Waste Repository Land Control Requirements (Palo Duro Basin, Paradox Basin, and Richton Dome), draft, prepared for the U.S. Department of Energy by Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

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, May.

DOE, see U.S. Department of Energy.

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, 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.

ETC, see The Earth Technology Corporation.

Garrels, Robert M., and Charles L. Christ, 1965. Solutions, Minerals, and Equilibria, Freeman, Cooper & Company, San Francisco, CA, pp. 209-225, and 255.

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.

Harper, William V., and Gilbert E. Raines, 1985. "Probabilistic Analysis of Human Intrusion in a High Level Nuclear Waste Repository in Salt Using Draft EPA Assumptions," in C. M. Jantzen et al., eds., Scientific Basis for Nuclear Waste Management VIII, Materials Research Society Symposia Proceedings, Vol. 44 (November 26-29, 1984, Boston, Massachusetts), Materials Research Society, Pittsburgh, PA, pp. 499-506.

Hubbard, N., D. Livingston, and L. Fukui, 1984. "The Composition and Stratigraphic Distribution of Materials in the Lower San Andres Salt Unit 4," in G. L. McVay, ed., Scientific Basis for Nuclear Waste Management VII, Vol. 26, Elsevier Scientific Publishing Company, New York, NY, pp. 405-415.

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.

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 and Local Ground-Water Flow Modeling for Richton Dome, Mississippi, ONWI-502, 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, 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.

Jansen, George, Jr., Gilbert E. Raines, and John F. Kircher, 1984. "Performance Analysis of Conceptual Waste Package Designs in Salt Repositories," in Gary L. McVay, ed., Scientific Basis for Nuclear Waste Management VII, Vol. 26, Elsevier Science Publishing, Inc., New York, NY, pp. 445-454.

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, D. Meyer, and W. E. Coons, 1982. Schematic Designs for Penetration Seals for a Reference Repository in Bedded Salt, ONWI-405, prepared by D'Appolonia Consulting Engineers, Inc., for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

Kelsall, P. C., J. B. Case, D. Meyer, J. G. Franzone, and W. E. Coons, 1985. Schematic Designs for Penetration Seals for a Repository in Richton Dome, BMI/ONWI-562, prepared by D'Appolonia Consulting Engineers, Inc. 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.

Law Engineering Testing Company, 1982. Gulf Coast Salt Domes Geologic Area Characterization Report, Mississippi Study Area, Vol. VII, Appendix, ONWI-120, prepared for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

Law Engineering Testing Company, 1983. Geothermal Studies of Seven Interior Salt Domes, ONWI-289, prepared for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

LETCo, see Law Engineering Testing Company.

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.

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.

Lindberg, Ralph D., and Donald D. Runnells, 1984. "Ground Water Redox Reactions: An Analysis of Equilibrium State Applied to Eh Measurements and Geochemical Modeling," Science, Vol. 225, pp. 925-927.

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.

McCulley, Bryan L., John W. Thackston, and Lynne M. Preslo, 1984. Status Report: Geochemical Interactions Between Ground Water and Paleozoic Strata, Gibson Dome Area, Southeastern Utah, prepared by Woodward-Clyde Consultants for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH, in preparation.

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.

Metcalfe, Douglas E., and Robert E. Andrews, 1984. Second Status Report on Regional and Local Ground-Water Flow Modeling for Richton and Cypress Creek Domes, Mississippi, prepared by INTERA Technologies, Inc., for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH, in preparation.

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 Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH, in preparation.

Mullin, Clayton W., 1982. Draft Geology of the Caprock and Salt Stock of the Richton Salt Dome, prepared by Georgia Institute of Technology for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, 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.

ONWI, see Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation.

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.

Parsons Brinckerhoff/PB-KBB, 1983. Exploratory Shaft Facility Preliminary Designs - Gulf Interior Region Salt Domes, ONWI-497, 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. Preliminary Constitutive Properties for Salt and Nonsalt Rocks From Four Potential Repository Sites, ONWI-450, 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.

Roedder, E., and I-Ming Chou, 1982. A Critique of "Brine Migration in Salt and Its Implications in the Geologic Disposal of Nuclear Waste," Oak Ridge National Laboratory Report 5818, by G. H. Jenks and H. C. Claiborne, U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 82-1131, U.S. Department of the Interior, Reston, VA.

Russell, C. Winston, 1984. Hydrological/Geochemical Search for Sandstone-Type Uranium Deposits in Forrest, Jones, Perry and Eastern Lamar Counties, Southeastern Mississippi, Report on Research Project MMRI # 83-11S, Department of Geology, University of Southern Mississippi, University, MS.

Sass, J. H., Arthur H. Lachenbruch, and E. P. Smith, 1983. Thermal Data from Well GD-1, Gibson Dome, Paradox Valley, Utah, U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 83-476, U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, DC.

SCC, see Stearns Catalytic Corporation.

Senseny, Paul E., 1983. "Task 2: Laboratory Studies," in "Repository Design Analysis," Technical Progress Report for the Quarter 1 October - 31 December, 1982, ONWI-9(83-1), Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH, pp. 88-89.

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, Gulf Interior Region, Richton Dome 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.

The Earth Technology Corporation, 1984. Comments on a Letter by George D. DeBuchananne (U.S. Geological Survey) Regarding the Use of Salt Domes for High-Level Waste Disposal, BMI/ONWI-511, prepared for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

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.

U.S. Department of Energy, 1980. Statement of Position of the United States Department of Energy in the Matter of Proposed Rulemaking on the Storage and Disposal of Nuclear Waste (Waste Confidence Rulemaking), PR-50, 51(44 FR 61372), DOE/NE-0007, Washington, DC.

U.S. Department of Energy, 1983. Waste Isolation Pilot Plant Safety Analysis Report, Albuquerque Operations Office, Albuquerque, NM, pp. 3.2-35 and 36, about salt deposition.

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.

Wagner, Ralph A., 1985. Comparison and Evaluation of Field and Numerical Results from the Site A Heater Test at Avery Island, ONWI-300, prepared by RE/SPEC Inc. for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

Walters, Robert F., 1975. "Salt Beds in the Subsurface in Russell, Lincoln, Ellsworth, Barton and Rice Counties, Central Kansas," Part I of Salt Dissolution in Oil and Gas Test Holes in Central Kansas, prepared for U.S. Energy Research and Development Administration by Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Union Carbide Corporation, Oak Ridge, TN.

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.

Werner, M. L., 1985a. Evaluation of the Structure and Stratigraphy Over Richton Dome, prepared by The Earth Technology Corporation for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH, in preparation.

Werner, M., 1985b. Assessments Pursuant to EA Comments on Overdome Faulting and Lineaments in the Neardome Area, draft technical memorandum, prepared by The Earth Technology Corporation for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH, August 30, in preparation.

Westinghouse Electric Corporation, 1983. Brine Migration Test for Asse Mine, Federal Republic of Germany: Final Test Plan, ONWI-242, prepared for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

Workman, Audrey L., and Jeffrey S. Hanor, 1985. "Evidence for Large-Scale Vertical Migration of Dissolved Fatty Acids in Louisiana Oil Field Brines: Iberia Field, South-Central Louisiana," 1985 Gulf Coast Association of Geological Societies Transactions, in review.

C.5.12.2 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.

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

The objective of this guideline is to ensure the selection of a repository site that will minimize risk to the public and permit compliance with EPA and NRC regulations.

Issues raised by the commenters include the following:

- Adequacy of meteorological data and accident scenarios
- Proximity of the community to Richton Dome.

Issue

A few commenters stated that the meteorological data and the accident scenarios used are not adequate for the guideline analysis.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated the use of meteorological data from Jackson, Mississippi, and believes that no revisions to the EA are required. These data are considered to be representative of the Richton Dome meteorologic conditions because of the proximity of the Jackson weather station and the lack of severe intervening topography or major bodies of water. The level of information presented is consistent with the requirements of 10 CFR 960.3-1-4-2 for site nomination.

The accident calculations analyzed in Section 6.4.1.4 were based on accident events developed for the final Environmental Impact Statement (DOE, 1980, DOE/EIS-0046F, Chapter 5). These events relate directly to "system failures," as requested in the comments; therefore, the DOE believes that no EA revision is required.

Issue

A few commenters stated that the proximity of the community of Richton should be an overriding factor and disqualify the site.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated the analysis for the Population Density and Distribution guideline (10 CFR 960.5-2-1) presented in the EA, Section 6.2.1.2, and concludes that no EA changes are warranted in the findings. This guideline (10 CFR 960.5-2-1) contains a potentially adverse condition (PAC) for proximity to highly populated areas or to areas having at least 1,000 individuals in an area 1.6 kilometer by 1.6 kilometer (1 mile by 1 mile) as defined by the most recent decennial count of the U.S. census. The DOE has found this PAC to be present due to the proximity of the site to the town of Richton (EA Section 6.2.1.2.3). The DOE has found that the site is not disqualified pursuant to the disqualifying condition in 10 CFR 960.5-2-1(d)(1) because surface facilities of the repository will not be "located in a highly populated area" (EA Section 6.2.1.2.4). In addition, the DOE has found that the site is not disqualified pursuant to the disqualifying condition contained in 10 CFR 960.5-2-1(d)(2) because surface facilities of the repository will not be "located adjacent to an area 1.6 kilometer by 1.6 kilometer (1 mile by 1 mile) having a population of not less than 1,000 individuals...". Section 6.2.1.2.3 of the EA indicates that the town of Richton, with a population of 1,205, is located 4 kilometers (2.5 miles) from the repository surface facility. The DOE has established the size of the restricted area to ensure that populations beyond the fenced boundary will not experience radiation doses in excess of the limits established by the NRC and the EPA in 10 CFR Part 60 and 40 CFR Part 191, respectively (see EA Section 6.4.1). As discussed in the EA analysis of the guideline qualifying condition, 10 CFR 960.5-2-1(a), the radiation dose rate to individuals in any highly populated area and in the unrestricted area is conservatively projected to be well below regulatory limits. Therefore, due to the distance of the surface facilities from the town of Richton and the projection of radiation dosage well below regulatory limits, the DOE has determined that the evidence supports a finding that the site is not disqualified....".

C.6.2 SITE OWNERSHIP AND CONTROL

This category responds to questions and concerns expressed about the ownership and control of the site at Richton Dome, Mississippi. The category corresponds to comments received on Section 6.2.1.3 and related sections.

Issues raised by the commenter include the following:

- Purchasing of land 2.6 kilometers (1.6 miles) beyond the controlled area
- Residential and landowners displacement.

Issue

One commenter stated that the DOE should be required to purchase the property of persons living up to 1.6 kilometers (1 mile) beyond the eventual controlled area if they so choose.

Response

Pursuant to applicable Federal requirements, the repository controlled area must be located on lands either under the DOE's jurisdiction and control or lands permanently withdrawn and reserved for its use (10 CFR 60.121[a]). There is no mandatory land ownership or control requirement beyond this area. The DOE is obligated, however, to establish appropriate control outside of the controlled area as necessary to prevent adverse human actions that could significantly reduce the geologic repository's ability to achieve isolation (10 CFR 60.121[b]). If the DOE or the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) determine that such additional controls are necessary at Richton Dome, the DOE will establish the requisite degree of control. The rights DOE acquires may take the form of appropriate possessory interests, servitudes, or withdrawals from location or patent under general mining laws (10 CFR 60.121[b]). While the DOE does not currently believe that land outside the controlled area identified in the EA will have to be acquired, it cannot absolutely rule out possible additional land acquisitions beyond the controlled area. Whether this proves necessary, and whether it takes the form of residential purchase, cannot be presently determined. In any event, there is no legal or technical justification for acquisition of property outside the controlled area as requested. Also, DOE policy does not allow acquisition of more land than is necessary to meet program needs.

Issue

Two commenters were concerned about residential and landowners displacement during the site characterization phase and the limited land for relocation within Perry County. In a similar vein, two other commenters questioned whether the controlled area required at the repository development stage would encompass and displace the population of the town of Richton.

Response

The DOE intends to minimize the necessity for residential displacement and to make just and fair compensation to current 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 and relocation assistance requirements.

Provisions exist in the Nuclear Waste Policy Act (42 USC Section 10101-10226) and Federal implementing regulations for continued and extensive State

and local government and public involvement during the course of the site selection and repository development stage. In the final analysis, however, selection of a repository site will depend on a balancing of numerous safety-related and other factors, particularly those contained in the DOE siting guidelines, which include considerations of site population characteristics.

Land requirements for the site characterization program are described in the EA, Section 4.1.3.3. The exploratory shaft site will require approximately 28 hectares (68 acres). The DOE plans to purchase the surface and subsurface rights to this land. There are no residences within this area (see EA Section 4.2.2). In order to preserve licensability of the site if chosen for repository development, the DOE expects to protect a 2,222 hectare (5,489 acre) area by leasing or purchasing surface and subsurface rights or by acquiring some lesser adequate interest (see EA Section 4.1.3.3). The DOE may permit surface owners to continue to conduct their present actvities.

The town of Richton is located approximately 4 kilometers (2.5 miles) from the projected repository restricted area boundary (EA Section 3.4.1). For repository development purposes, a fenced restricted area for support buildings and repository surface facilities of 165 hectares (407 acres) and an underground operations area of about 820 hectares (2,020 acres) is estimated. The size of the controlled area is conservatively estimated to be 2,222 hectares (5,489 acres). The residential population within the dome area is approximately 140, based on estimated 50 homes and average household size of 2.8. No residences exist within the proposed restricted area boundary (see EA Section 4.2.2). Chen and Raines (1985) provide the rationale for concluding that the DOE must control an area of land equal to the dome boundary at the repository to prevent incompatible activities such as solution mining. Land controls beyond this area are not expected based on current analyses. Under the current conservative analysis, the controlled area would encompass a small southwest segment of the town of Richton. Based on available information, it appears that a few people reside within this area.

C.6.3 METEOROLOGY

This category addresses concerns about the adequacy and content of the meteorological analysis of the site at Richton Dome, Mississippi. This category corresponds to comments received on Section 7.3.1.1.3 and related sections.

Issues raised by the commenters include the following:

- Inadequacy of meteorological analysis
- Ground-based inversion frequency and frequency of low wind speed conditions
- Potential flooding.

Issue

Approximately two-thirds of the commenters on this section stated that the meteorological analysis of the site was inadequate and, therefore, questioned the finding of the meteorological guideline (10 CFR 960.5-2-3). Specifically, commenters noted that extrapolation from regional meteorological data for a determination of onsite characteristics was not sufficient for the area, where there can be large local variations.

Response

The DOE has examined the meteorological data as presented in the EA Section 3.4.3. These data indicate that fair consistency in such data exists over the region and give no indication that anomalous meteorological behavior would be expected at the site location. The evidence presented is in accordance with 10 CFR 960.3-1-4-2 for site nomination. Therefore, the DOE believes that the guideline finding is correct and no modification of the EA is necessary.

Issue

Commenters stated that no information was provided in the draft EA on ground-based inversion frequency and the frequency of low wind speed conditions which affect the potential ground-level releases expected at the site. Insufficient information was provided to support the finding that a favorable condition exists at this site.

Response

The DOE has addressed the concerns over ground-based inversion frequency and the frequency of low wind speeds in Section 3.4.3 of the draft EA. Additional detail on the input data generated by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration has been added and can be found in references to the backup document for radiological calculations (Section 6.4.1). The DOE believes that the guideline finding is correct and no modification of the EA is required.

Issue

Approximately one-third of the commenters stated that flooding was not dealt with sufficiently in the description of the site. Specifically, it was stated that there was no description of potential flooding, the measures to be used to mitigate flood damage, or the effectiveness of these mitigative measures.

Response

The DOE has addressed flooding potential in Section 3.3.1.3 of the EA. The implications for flooding at the site are evaluated in Sections 6.3.3.1.3 and

6.3.3.3. Investigation of the data indicates that mitigation of flood damage can be achieved by locating critical surface facilities above the probable maximum flood area. Therefore, the DOE believes no modification of the EA is necessary.

C.6.4 OFFSITE INSTALLATIONS AND OPERATIONS

This category corresponds to questions regarding Section 7.3.1.1.4 and related sections of the Richton Dome EA.

Issues raised by the commenters include the following:

- Impacts of current and proposed airspace restrictions
- Impacts of waste transport-related closures
- Impacts of Camp Shelby on the project's boundary.

Issue

One commenter stated that the draft EA did not address impacts of current and proposed airspace restrictions on the project and did not address impacts of waste transport-related road closures on existing and proposed training activities at Camp Shelby, nor impacts of Camp Shelby on the project's possible 10-kilometer (6.2-mile) controlled area boundary.

Response

Section 6.2.1.5 of the EA has been revised to specifically address the impacts of current and proposed airspace restrictions on the project. Section 4.2.1.1 of the EA describes the possible impact of site characterization on Camp Shelby training activities. These impacts are projected to be minimal. The airspace for the De Soto Military Operations Area (MOA), which overlies the southernmost part of the controlled area, defines a layer between 153 meters (500 feet) and 3,048 meters (10,000 feet) within which air traffic is restricted intermittently. Because the surface facility of the proposed repository lies well outside of this airspace, no conflicts between repository operations and the MOA are expected. Section 6.2.1.1 of the EA describes expected land control requirements, including the controlled area. These are not expected to have a negative impact on Camp Shelby operations.

C.6.5 SYSTEM GUIDELINE - PRECLOSURE RADIOLOGICAL SAFETY

This category responds to concerns regarding overall radiological safety during repository operation at the Richton Dome site. These concerns were expressed after review of Section 7.3.1.2 and related sections.

Issues raised by the commenters include the following:

- Advanced notification of controlled releases of radionuclides
- Radiological limits too high
- Additional attention given to potential accidents, emergency protection plans, and follow-up studies.

Issue

Almost all commenters were concerned with the risk from radiation. Several commenters noted that repository operations place the surrounding population at risk and requested advance notification of controlled releases of radionuclides from the repository.

Response

Federal radiation safety standards (10 CFR Part 60 and 40 CFR Part 191) exist to protect the health and safety of the public from undue risk. The repository will be a licensed facility subject to these standards.

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 (DOE, 1985, DOE/RW-0005), 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 very small radon releases from the salt mined during construction, and from handling accidents, since waste preparation would occur at the MRS.

Notification of unusual repository operations would be made according to an emergency response plan to be developed during the licensing phase.

Issue

Several commenters noted that radiological limits are too high because a "one rad exposure per person to a population of one million would be expected to produce 100 extra cases of leukemia and 160 genetically abnormal children in the first generation."

Response

Existing data on the health risks of low level exposure is quite consistent and predicts approximately 200 health effects per million man-rem. For documentation of this fact, the CBEIR reference in Chapter 3 should be consulted.

Issue

Several commenters suggested that potential accidents, emergency protection plans, and follow-up studies should receive additional attention.

Response

Section 6.2.1.2 of the EA discusses the Population Density and Distribution guideline (10 CFR 960.5-2-1). A factor that was considered and discussed in the evaluation of this preclosure radiological safety System 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 of the EA is warranted.

C.6.6 ASSESSMENT OF PRECLOSURE PERFORMANCE

This category responds to questions about preclosure radiological assessment of the Richton Dome site. This information corresponds to Section 6.4.1 and related sections.

Issues raised by the commenters include the following:

- Inconsistent accident scenarios
- Incomplete normal operational source terms
- Expanded foodstuffs analysis.

Issue

Several commenters stated that accident scenarios and source terms analyzed were not shown to be consistent, bounding, complete, or conservative.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated accident scenarios and rewritten Section 6.4.1.4 to address consistency, 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 final EA. For routine operational analyses, changes in the radiological calculations have been made to bring Section 6.4.1 into greater agreement with repository operations described in Section 5.1.3.

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 rewritten Section 6.4.1 and the suggested wording that the actual repository performance would probably prove better than predicted has been added to Section 6.4.1 of the final EA.

Issue

A commenter stated that the foodstuffs analyses should be expanded.

Response

The DOE has reexamined the data on foodstuffs and the analyses were redone. The EA text in Section 6.4.1 has been revised using more detailed information from State agencies.

Issue

One 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 at this stage of the program. The DOE has therefore not revised the EA text to include additional estimates of probability or "risk assessments."

C.6.7 CHAPTER C.6 REFERENCES

C.6.7.1 References Listed by Author

Chen, C. P., and G. E. Raines, 1985. Technical Basis for High-Level Waste Repository Land Control Requirements (Palo Duro Basin, Paradox Basin, and Richton Dome), draft, prepared for the U.S. Department of Energy by Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

DOE, see U.S. Department of Energy.

U.S. Department of Energy, 1980. Final Environmental Impact Statement, Management of Commercially Generated Radioactive Waste, DOE/EIS-0046F, Vol. 1, Washington, DC.

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.

C.6.7.2 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.

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 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 the 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:

- Impacts of site characterization on the physical environment
- Salt impacts
- Ecosystem impacts
- EA adequacy
- Adverse effects on Camp Shelby
- Effectiveness of mitigation measures presented
- Impacts of temporary increases in turbidity and sediment loads
- Results of stream channel diversions
- Objections to the use of Waste Isolation Pilot Plant data
- Suspended particulate concentrations exceeding the National Air Quality Standards
- Clarification of noise analysis
- Potential contamination of ground water
- Uncertainties with respect to shaft sealing
- Negative economic impacts

- Limited coverage of social impacts
- Negatively affected community service.

These issues are discussed in the sections that follow.

C.7.1.1 Effects on the Physical Environment

Environmental concerns for the Richton Dome site, related to site characterization, were expressed on the topics of land use, ecosystems, air quality, aesthetic conditions, noise, and water quality.

Commenters raised several issues relating to the impacts of site characterization on the physical environment of the region. Specific issues included: salt impacts, ecosystem impacts, Camp Shelby impacts, and impacts on other environmental factors. General comments were also made which concerned the adequacy of data and interpretations in the EA. These issues are summarized as follows:

1. Salt Impacts. Many commenters were concerned with the potentially adverse impacts of fugitive dust or salt emissions and their dispersal into air or water, or onto land. Commenters felt that salt mining and storage procedures would not preclude dispersal of fugitive salt.

2. Ecosystem Impacts. Commenters were concerned with the impacts of site characterization activities on wetlands as well as aquatic and terrestrial biota in the vicinity of the site. Commenters also felt that the discussion of impact mitigation and site restoration was inadequate.

3. Camp Shelby Impacts. Commenters questioned the ability of Camp Shelby to continue in light of the potential effects of site characterization activities on maneuver areas and access routes for the military post.

4. Other Environmental Factors. Specific comments were received concerning the issues of noise, transportation, utilities, and radionuclide levels, as follows:

   a. Commenters requested expansion and clarification of noise and air impacts and mitigation measures.

   b. Commenters requested expansion and clarification on local transportation and utility resources.

   c. Commenters requested more information concerning the levels of radionuclides around the salt dome.

5. EA Data and Interpretation 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 the concern that measures to mitigate impacts could not be adequately planned prior to onsite disturbances if environmental studies occur concurrently with site characterization activities.

A more detailed discussion of these, and other related issues, occurs in the following CRD sections: C.7.1.1.1, C.7.1.1.2, C.7.1.1.3, C.7.1.1.5, C.7.1.1.8, and C.7.1.1.9.

C.7.1.1.1 Land Use

Issue

Several commenters stated that site characterization activities may adversely affect Camp Shelby's ability to function as a major U.S. Mobilization Station of the United States Army. Specifically, commenters were concerned about the possible land use conflicts that would arise by using the same access routes used by Camp Shelby.

Response

The DOE has added text to Section 3.4.1 of the EA that presents additional information on Camp Shelby operations. An analysis of the effect of site characterization activities on the use of Camp Shelby is presented in Section 4.2.1.1 of the EA. Adverse impacts on the operations of the camp are not expected since the access routes to Camp Shelby (primarily U.S. Highway-98 and Mississippi State Highway-29) and the access routes to the potential repository site (U.S. Highway-42 and Mississippi State Highway-15) are different.

Issue

Several commenters questioned the effectiveness of mitigation measures presented in the salt impact discussion in Chapter 4 of the EA.

Response

The DOE has added a new section (Section 4.4) to the EA that expands the discussion of salt impacts on the environment. The effectiveness of mitigation measures has been verified and included in the text of this section. Impacts from salt handling will be minimal due to measures taken to control salt drift.

C.7.1.1.2 Ecosystems

Issue

Two commenters were concerned that the impacts of temporary increases in turbidity and sediment loads to intermittent streams in the vicinity of the site were not adequately addressed. In addition, the means to mitigate such impacts need to be addressed.

Response

Section 4.1.1 stated that the construction of access roads would be kept to a minimum by using existing routes when available. Location of test sites and the activities at the test sites have also been planned to minimize disturbance to wetlands. Additional detailed descriptions of impacts to wetlands have been included in Section 4.2.1.2, and a discussion of alternatives to the proposed action has been added to Section 4.1.1. The DOE has consulted with the Fish and Wildlife Service regarding wetland value assessments.

The DOE expects some impacts to occur for which widely used and generally successful mitigating engineering measures are available. Many of these measures, such as sediment ponds and runoff retention basins, are discussed in Sections 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 of the final EA.

Issue

Three commenters suggested that any stream channel diversions would result in permanent rather than temporary impacts to all aquatic biota in the existing channel. It was suggested that this activity be identified in Section 4.2.1.2.2 as the primary cause of impact to aquatic resources rather than "land clearing activities."

Response

The impacts of stream rechannelization will be dependent on the amount of rechannelization required, the present condition of those stretches of the streams, and the indigenous biota. The DOE has revised Section 4.2.1.2.2 to indicate that a large percentage of the biota will be permanently lost. However, stream channelization will be kept to a minimum, and a thorough characterization of the affected streams will help in designing a mitigation program to allow biotic colonization of the diversion within a reasonable time frame. In addition, the DOE response pertaining to wetlands assessments made in the previous "response" also apply to this issue.

Issue

One commenter objected to the use of data from the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) site and the Gnome Project test site to draw inferences about salt impacts at the Richton Dome site, which is in a humid environment. Another commenter was concerned that windblown salt would adversely affect commercial timber resources in the region.

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:

1. In arid environments, as referenced by the WIPP and Project Gnome data, natural crusting of stockpiled salt will occur within 1 to 4 hours, depending on its moisture content. This crusting will occur at an accelerated rate in the humid environment of the Gulf region. It is unlikely that measurable amounts of salt will reach the environment from the crusted salt pile.

2. Due to the use of runoff retention ponds designed for 500-year storm events, saline water will remain on site.

3. Airborne salt will be generated only from ventilation exhaust stacks, at transfer points in salt transport, at the working face of the salt pile, or from evaporation-recrystallization of saline water left in the retention ponds.

4. Salt deposition modeling and experience at numerous power plants suggest that airborne salt drift attenuates (falls out) so rapidly that it cannot be accurately measured more than 1.6 kilometers (1 mile) from its point of discharge. In a high rainfall area such as Mississippi, salt build-up is unlikely, thus, there would be no impact to the forest ecosystem.

C.7.1.1.3 Air Quality

Issue

Several commenters noted that estimated total suspended particulate concentrations exceed the National Ambient Air Quality Standards. This is inconsistent with the Chapter 6 conclusion that "air quality impacts are acceptable because they are less than permitted levels even for fugitive dust."

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 total suspended particulates (TSP) are presented in Table 4-19. As shown, concentrations are less than National ambient standards.

C.7.1.1.4 Aesthetic Conditions

Issue

Some commenters expressed disappointment with a statement in the EA that suggested that the Richton Dome area does not possess any aesthetically unique features.

Response

The EA discusses aesthetic resources in Section 3.4.5 and states that the Richton Dome area "is not unique to the surrounding area." This, however, was not meant to imply that the Richton Dome area does not have any aesthetically pleasing features, only that the dome area is similar in appearance to surrounding regions. Impacts to aesthetic resources are discussed in EA Sections 4.2.1.7 and 5.2.6. No modifications to the EA were made as a result of this comment.

C.7.1.1.5 Noise

Issue

Several commenters stated that the noise analysis needs to be clarified about instantaneous impacts from major intrusive sources of noise such as blasting. It was also stated that more detail about the impact analysis, including noise sensitive receptors and mitigation measures, should be presented.

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). Sensitive receptors are limited to a few nearby residences during exploratory shaft construction, except during a 6-12 day period of daytime blasting when portions of the town of Richton could be affected. The extent of the blasting noise effects depends on wind and temperature, depth of the shaft, and the

nature of the activity at the receptor point. The results are presented in the EA in terms of an average day in a suburban setting. Noise from borehole drilling associated with geotechnical field studies could affect nearby residents, including portions of the community of Richton, for periods of up to six months.

Possible mitigation measures are presented that could reduce noise levels. Where it was necessary to use assumptions regarding modeling inputs, these were purposely made in a conservative fashion to avoid understating the noise impact. For example, noise attenuation due to pine forests existing in the area was not considered.

C.7.1.1.6 Archaeological, Cultural, and Historical Resources

No comments were received.

C.7.1.1.7 Radiological

No comments were received.

C.7.1.1.8 Water Quality

Issue

A few commenters expressed concern about the potential contamination of ground water with salt, specifically, that information is needed on the reliability and effectiveness of the liner and effects due to dissolution. One commenter requested information on the rate of production and the amount of waste, fresh, or saline waters that will be produced over the life of the project, and a discussion of the disposal of waste streams. It was suggested that a qualitative assessment of salt impacts be made where quantitative data are unavailable. Another commenter stated there was a need to address impacts for the case where the salt pile was involved in a flood. Finally, one commenter said there was a need to address downstream impacts to the Leaf Wilderness Area.

Response

Section 4.2.1.4.2 of the EA has been revised to include additional details regarding the double liner for the salt pile as well as the leakage detection and recovery system to mitigate potential ground-water impacts. The design criteria for the salt pile have been established to maintain control of the salt even during a flood event. No impacts beyond those already described are

expected to result from a credible flood event. The details of waste generation and disposal have been revised and updated and are presented in Sections 4.1.2.6 and 4.2.1.4. The DOE has revised Section 4.2.1.4 to include a more detailed analysis of the impacts of salt and has concluded that increases in surface or ground water salinity will be insignificant.

Regarding the Leaf Wilderness Area, additional information has been placed in Section 3.4.1 locating the wilderness area relative to the site. The Leaf Wilderness Area is located on a backwater tributary of the Leaf River, approximately 11 river kilometers (7 river miles) from the Richton Dome site. Since it is located on a backwater portion of the river, wastes would have to travel either upstream (for surface transport) or up gradient (for ground-water transport) to affect the area. Because this is unlikely, and because of the distances involved and the mitigation measures planned (see Sections 4.1.2 and 5.1.2), project related ground- and surface-water impacts are not expected.

Issue

One commenter stated that the uncertainties with respect to shaft sealing should be stated and assumptions qualified in evaluations.

Response

Additional details regarding shaft sealing techniques and experience were added to Section 4.1.2, and additional information which reassessed impacts due to shaft seal leakage was added to Section 5.2.2.2.1. Based on this additional detail and information, the DOE has concluded that there should be no adverse ground-water quality effects due to shaft seal leakage, either during site characterization or repository construction and operation.

C.7.1.1.9 Transportation and Utilities

No comments were received.

C.7.1.2 Effects on Socioeconomic Conditions

Socioeconomic concerns for the Richton Dome site, related to site characterization, were expressed by commenters who wished to emphasize possible impacts on site-area communities.

Issue

A few commenters stated that the negative economic impacts of site characterization should receive more emphasis in this section.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated the data and has determined that no modification of the EA text is required.

Due to the relatively small number of employees, short duration of the project, and relatively low in-migration expected during site characterization, negative economic impacts should be limited. For example, negative impacts on small businesses resulting from increased competition with larger businesses should not develop at this phase of the project.

Issue

A few commenters stated that social impacts have received limited coverage, and that some of these impacts cannot be mitigated.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated the EA and has expanded the description of social structure and culture in Sections 3.6.4 and 4.2.2.

Issue

A few commenters stated that community services, including housing, and State and local finances, would be negatively affected by the project.

Response

The DOE has reviewed the data and has determined that no modification to the EA is required. In Table 4-27, the EA states that the town of Richton will need additional housing and two additional teachers. As described in Section 5.4.5.1, all general units of local government that include the site in their jurisdictions would be eligible to receive grants-equal-to-taxes during site characterization. Also described in this section are impact mitigation funds and potential problems with front-end financing.

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 Richton Dome site were expressed on the topics of land use, ecosystems, air quality, noise, radiological impacts, and water quality.

Issues raised by commenters include the following:

- Potential effects of repository construction and operation
- Salt impacts
- Ecosystem impacts
- Camp Shelby impacts
- Effects of repository activities on land use
- Impacts to wetlands and wetland resources
- Exceeded National Ambient Air Quality Standards
- Clarification of noise analysis
- Transportation, handling, and waste packaging of krypton-85 and iodine-129
- Potential for surface-water and ground-water contamination.

Several issues were raised with regard to the potential effects of repository construction and operation on the environmental quality of the region. Specific issues included: salt impacts, ecosystem impacts, Camp Shelby impacts and impacts on other environmental factors. General comments were also made about the adequacy of the EA. These issues are summarized as follows:

1. Salt Impacts. Many commenters were concerned with the potentially adverse impacts of fugitive dust or salt emissions and their dispersal into air or water, or onto land. Commenters felt that salt mining and storage procedures would not preclude dispersal of fugitive salt.

2. Ecosystem Impacts. Commenters were concerned with the impacts to the De Soto National Forest, wetland resources, and the protected species in the vicinity of the site. Commenters also felt that the discussions of impact mitigation and site restoration should be upgraded.

3. Camp Shelby Impacts. Commenters questioned the ability of Camp Shelby to continue functioning in light of the potential effects of repository activities on maneuver areas and access routes to the military post.

4. Other Environmental Factors. Specific comments, as follows, were received concerning the issues of noise and cultural resources and impacts on recreational resources:

   a. Commenters requested expansion and clarification of noise impacts and mitigation measures.

b. A commenter questioned the application of the Natural Heritage Law of 1978 for Mississippi to cultural resources.

A detailed discussion of these, and other related issues, occurs in the following CRD sections: C.7.2.1, C.7.2.2, C.7.2.3, C.7.2.5, and C.7.2.8.

C.7.2.1 Land Use

Issue

Many commenters were concerned about the effect of repository activities on land use near the Richton Dome. Specifically, commenters mentioned the following concerns:

1. Federal responsibility for both property and people is extremely high within any realistically sized circle (area of possible contamination) around the proposed site.

2. The site is too close to public lands such as the De Soto National Forest.

3. There may be long-term environmental impacts from the salt pile on site. Variations in wind speed and extremes in rainfall may create severe salt-induced impacts beyond the 61-meter (200-foot) buffer strip cited in the EA. Also, during periods of extended drought, affected terrestrial and aquatic areas could be significantly impacted by excess salt.

4. There may be long-term impacts to Camp Shelby, including potential interference with personnel mobilization in case of National emergency or war and restrictions to maneuverability due to blockage of rail and road access to training areas.

5. The EA does not address impacts on prime farmland.

Response

The expected effects of the project on human health and safety are addressed in Sections 6.2.2.1, and 6.4.1. The radiation dose rate to individuals in all areas outside the restricted area (surface facility) of a repository is conservatively projected to be well below regulatory limits. The impacts of nuclear waste transportation are described in EA Appendix A. The assessment of transportation safety in Section 6.2.1.8 shows minimal risk to the public.

Repository impacts to the De Soto National Forest have been addressed in Section 5.2.3 of the EA. No significant impacts are expected to components of the National Forest from repository-related activities.

The EA discussion of salt impacts has been reviewed and expanded in Section 4.4. The DOE has modified the EA to include new information about climatic conditions that could potentially cause significant salt-management problems.

Under humid conditions that occur in southern Mississippi, a salt crust of considerable thickness will build up on the salt pile effectively stopping wind dispersal, even from large storms. High winds and rain may result in the blowing of sheets of brine (with a concentration of up to 15,000 parts per million). If the height of the salt pile is about 9.1 meters (30 feet), the bulk of this brine will be redeposited within less than 91 meters (300 feet) of the pile. Any environmental effect will be small in terms of the total area involved.

The DOE has expanded EA Section 5.2.3 to include an assessment of how repository operations will affect Camp Shelby. Topics addressed include the Army's ability to mobilize as well as restrictions to road access and air space. The DOE believes that, considering the routes to be used for local transport to the repository and the many alternative routes to Camp Shelby, conflict with military operations is extremely unlikely.

Section 3.4.1 contains a discussion of prime farmlands in the dome area. Potential effects on prime farmland are addressed in Sections 4.2.1.1 and 5.2.3 of the EA.

C.7.2.2 Ecosystems

Issue

Several commenters were concerned with impacts to wetlands and wetland resources due to repository construction and operation. Specific concerns include the following:

- Impacts to the Leaf Wilderness area, located approximately 8 kilometers (5 miles) southeast of the site
- Impacts to freshwater and saltwater fisheries resources in the Gulf region
- Mitigation of the loss of 6.5 hectares (16 acres) and damage to 1.2 hectares (3 acres) of wetlands as required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 USC Sections 661-666c)
- Recolonization of channelized streams resulting in less productive aquatic habitat.

Response

The DOE has added references related to the Leaf Wilderness area to Section 3.4.1 of the EA. It had been designated in November 1984 and could not

be included in the draft EA. The DOE has determined that the Leaf Wilderness Area is on a side branch of the Leaf River and is not expected to be affected by any possible runoff from the site which may find its way into the Leaf River.

Although the second concern listed above was not specific on the source of impacts, the DOE has reviewed the assessment in Section 5.2.4.2 and has determined that the relative isolation of the site with respect to major fisheries, its lack of direct access to major streams (there are only intermittent streams adjacent to the site), and the extensive measures to be employed in controlling runoff would not result in a measurable release in contaminants likely to affect existing fisheries.

As stated in Section 6.2.1.6 of the final EA, the DOE has initiated consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service under the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 USC Sections 661-666c). As a result of these consultations, the DOE will make every effort to avoid wetlands altogether. If wetlands are affected, impacts will be mitigated to the extent possible using standard engineering practices. Where destruction of wetland cannot be avoided, compensation in the form of wetland purchase and preservation is an acceptable practice. Such compensation would be coordinated with both the FWS and State natural resource agencies.

The DOE has stated in Section 5.2.2.1 that only drainage courses that are seasonably wet would be channelized. These are not permanent, free-flowing stream habitats. In addition, channel relocation is not expected to be extensive. Channelization procedures approved by the U.S. Department of Transportation and based on extensive experience will be utilized.

Issue

One commenter maintains that the red-cockaded woodpecker has been identified at the dome site and that nest cavities have also been identified and may be currently inhabited. The commenter required clarification of whether the extensive land clearing activities mentioned in the EA were ongoing or will be created by construction of the repository. The commenter suggested that the site be disqualified under 10 CFR 960.5-2-5 (Environmental Quality) due to the presence of the red-cockaded woodpecker.

Response

The DOE has stated in Section 5.2.3.1 that much of the dome has been clear-cut with the rest to be harvested before repository development would begin. Most of the area being considered for the repository and its associated access routes is within commercial forest scheduled for harvesting.

Initial consultations with the Fish and Wildlife Service have established that if any habitat used by a protected species is present on the site, such habitat would be avoided in siting the repository. If the site or access routes appear to be located in appropriate red-cockaded woodpecker nesting habitat, the

Richton Dome site would not be disqualified. In this event, the DOE would either move the site or redesign site facilities to avoid adversely affecting the habitat.

C.7.2.3 Air Quality

Issue

Several commenters stated that estimated total suspended particulates will exceed the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). It was stated that this is inconsistent with the Chapter 6 conclusion that "air quality impacts are acceptable because they are less than permitted levels even for fugitive dust."

Response

The DOE has modified EA Section 5.2.5 based on a reanalysis of air quality impacts using new emission rates. Results presented in Section 5.2.5.3.2 indicate that estimated offsite concentrations of total suspended particulates (TSP) will be less than the primary and secondary standards during all phases of the repository program.

C.7.2.4 Aesthetic Conditions

No comments were received.

C.7.2.5 Noise

Issue

A commenter stated that the noise analysis needs to be expanded and clarified so that instantaneous impacts from major sources of noise (such as blasting) are included. In addition, the commenter believed that the impact analysis requires more detail about noise sensitive receptors and mitigation measures.

Response

The DOE has revised the noise analysis and discussion to clarify blasting impacts (Section 5.2.7). Where it was necessary to use assumptions regarding modeling inputs, these were purposely made in a conservative fashion to avoid underestimating the noise impact. For example, noise reduction effects resulting from pine forests existing in the area were not considered.

Sensitive receptors are limited to a few nearby residences during repository construction and operation except during periods of blasting when larger areas would be affected. During shaft sinking, blasting will occur on about 12 days. Blasting will be conducted during the daytime.

Possible mitigation measures are presented which could reduce noise levels.

C.7.2.6 Archaeological, Cultural, and Historical Resources

No comments were received.

C.7.2.7 Radiological

Issues

Some commenters recommended the EA state explicitly that dose calculations are site-specific.

Response

The DOE has incorporated the suggested wording into the second paragraph of Section 6.2.2.1.2.

Issue

Some commenters noted that transportation, handling, and waste packaging of separated krypton-85 and iodine-129 were not detailed and could be an important consideration in operation and accidental source terms.

Response

The repository operations described in Sections 5.1.1 and 5.1.3 do not discuss the acceptance for disposal of separated krypton-85 and iodine-129. Although spent fuel containing krypton-85 and iodine-129 is defined as high-level waste, separated krypton-85 and iodine-129 are not defined as high-level waste. The DOE does not have any plans for disposal of these separated isotopes at a high-level waste repository so that no modification of the EA is required.

C.7.2.8 Water Quality

Issue

Several commenters stated that some impacts were inadequately addressed or not addressed at all. Specific assessments that were considered to be inadequate include the impacts of a breached retention pond on local streams and ground water (through the loss of long-term integrity of retention pond liners) and the potential for contamination of aquifers by drilling into and excavating the salt dome. Impacts that were considered not addressed include the potential for surface-water and ground-water contamination due to the disposal of excess salt in landfills and the impacts that a flood would have on salt storage piles. It was also indicated that the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) was not referenced in the regulatory compliance tables under floodplains/wetlands regulations.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated the current data base and has revised the following areas in the EA:

1. Water quality impacts due to either the failure of pond liners or a breached retention pond have been addressed in more detail in Section 5.2.2. Impacts are not expected to be significant. The DOE has reexamined the discussion of ground-water contamination (Section 5.2.2.2) and has determined it to be acceptable for environmental assessment purposes. Drilling (described in Section 4.1.1) will comply with all State requirements to prevent contamination of freshwater aquifers by deeper saline waters. Salt excavation during repository construction, described in Section 5.1.1, will follow accepted engineering practices designed to prevent cave-ins.

2. Salt disposal options have been discussed, along with the rationale for their consideration in Section 5.1.3.4.

3. Mined materials disposal and transportation related impacts have been discussed in Section 5.2.10.

4. Impacts of floods on the salt storage piles have been discussed to the extent that storm runoff will be captured in a retention pond designed to accommodate a 100-year event or other design criteria stipulated by applicable Federal or State agencies (Sections 5.1 and 5.2.2). Section 5.2.2.1.1 was revised to include additional detail supporting the conclusion that water quality degradation should be minor.

5. Jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers under floodplains regulations has been included in Section 6.2.1.6.

C.7.3 EXPECTED EFFECTS OF TRANSPORTATION

Preclosure repository issues relating to transportation for the Richton Dome site are discussed in this section.

Issues raised by commenters include the following:

- Plans for upgrading Mississippi State Highways 15 and 42
- Lack of definition of nuclear waste transportation corridors
- Concern over the radiological consequences of nuclear waste accidents
- Lack of adequate analysis regarding transportation of excess salt.

The DOE has sorted the numerous transportation comments received into two categories: general and site-specific. General comments have been judged to apply 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 subject to individual viewpoints, the reader is encouraged to review this section 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.

Discussion 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 transportation 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-related transportation, such as repository access route construction and the impacts of repository operation on the local transportation environment, are discussed below.

In addition to the sorting described above, the 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 general response Section C.2.4.1 because of the similarities between the general and site-specific issue topics.

Issue

Several commenters felt that more study is needed on the rebuilding of the abandoned railroad planned for access to the site. Also, it was noted that the plans and related costs for upgrading Mississippi State Highways 15 and 42 need to be included.

Response

Sections 5.1.2.2 and 5.3.2 of the EA have been revised to include the additional information on plans and costs for upgrading highways and railroads. Additional detailed studies as outlined in Section 4.1.3.1.10 of the final EA will be done during site characterization to allow for further environmental impact versus cost tradeoff studies. The siting process is not compromised because the availability of acceptable railroad and highway access routes which satisfy the qualifying condition in the siting guidelines has been established.

Issue

A number of commenters expressed concern over the lack of definition of nuclear waste transportation corridors to be used in the State. Also, there were numerous comments related to the poor condition of highways and railroads. Specifically, commenters expressed concern over the many bridges of limited capacity, the heaving clay (Yazoo clay) problems under certain roads, the frequent flooding problems, and the adverse accident experience in the State. Several commenters cited the need for more information on cost of improvements to the existing transportation network, including maintenance costs and source of funding.

Response

The DOE believes that the existing transportation network has been sufficiently studied for this point in the siting process and is adequate to support repository operations with the improvements outlined in Section 5.1.2.2 and 5.3.2 of the EA. Such improvements would be developed in cooperation with State and local officials during site characterization. Traffic patterns, accident experience, incremental increases in traffic volume, traffic controls, and other impact-mitigation measures will be studied in more detail, particularly in the town of Richton and the vicinity.

Nuclear waste related traffic will enter the State via the Interstate Highway System and, primarily, via the Southern (SOU) and Illinois Central Gulf (ICG) mainline railroads, and will stay on those routes until reaching Laurel. The new repository railroad and upgraded Mississippi State Highway 15 (to the new access road) would be used for the remaining link to the repository.

The DOE has expanded the discussion in Section 4.1.3.1.10 of the EA to include transportation studies to be carried out during site characterization to provide more detailed evaluation of upgrading needed on Mississippi State Highways 15 and 42. These studies will include evaluation of the existing highway design criteria and road conditions and the effect of local soil conditions. The highway evaluation will include a study of U.S. Highways 49 and 98, including the costs of upgrading the bridges with limited capacity, if plans change to include use of these routes for nuclear waste traffic. The need for reconstruction of the railroad on the abandoned right-of-way between Laurel and Beaumont will be studied in greater detail. 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

Many commenters indicated direct or indirect concern over the radiological consequences of various types of nuclear waste transportation accidents. The EA was cited as not addressing possible radiation exposure of people and contamination of land and water resources, nor 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 expressed fear of a nuclear waste transportation accident resulting in a nuclear disaster. Others stated that transportation through cities such as Hattiesburg, Jackson, Vicksburg, and Meridian is just too risky. Barge transport through Gulfport was also considered an unacceptable risk. In general, commenters indicated there is inadequate overall assurance that the DOE has accurately assessed the adequacy of cask integrity, the level of transportation safety, the capability of emergency response in the event of an accident, and the amount of contamination should a cask fail.

Response

The DOE recognizes that many of the concerns relate to the amount of aggregation that results when all accidents are expressed as a single risk number. Accordingly, the DOE has modified Appendix A to provide additional details on various types of accidents and the consequences of such accidents. The overall risk assessment given in Appendix A has been updated to include additional scenarios and more recent data. Additional studies are being conducted by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. As information from these studies becomes available, it will be incorporated in the transportation assessments to be performed during detailed site characterization. If, as a result of NRC studies, the NRC promulgates new cask safety standards, such cask standards will be used by the DOE. Until the results of such 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.

Preliminary consideration of barge transport into the Gulf area has also been done. The additional studies are discussed in Section C.2.4.1 of this appendix and results are included in Appendix A. Additional information is also provided in Appendix A on casks to be used for all modes, and cask testing and certification.

Emergency response plans are the responsibility of State and local officials. The DOE will work diligently with responsible Federal agencies and local agencies to ensure that adequate response capability will be in place and maintained during the period of waste receipt. Further information on emergency response is provided in Sections C.2.4.1, 6.2.1.8, and Appendix A of the EA.

Issue

A few commenters cited conflicts with Camp Shelby operations that would result from road closing following a nuclear waste transport accident.

Response

The DOE has concluded that no changes to the EA are required in response to this comment. The DOE believes that, considering the routes to be used for local transport to the repository and the many alternative routes to Camp Shelby, conflict with Camp Shelby operations is extremely unlikely, even in the event of such an accident. Only closure of U.S. 49 and U.S. 98 would cut off direct access to Camp Shelby, and these routes are not planned for use by nuclear waste traffic to the site.

Issue

A few commenters indicated that the DOE's evaluations of the site against the siting guidelines and related findings were not clear or were lacking in supporting data and information. In addition, a number of commenters disagreed with the conclusion of number-one ranking of the Richton Dome site in terms of economic favorability.

Response

In response to these comments, 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 the comparison with other sites, reference to Chapter 7 is made. Ranking of sites has been reviewed and appropriate revisions, including justification, have been made.

Issue

A number of commenters cited a 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/railroad loads of salt over prime farmland or into waterways. 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 EA.

C.7.4 EXPECTED EFFECTS ON SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS

Preclosure repository issues related 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 Richton Dome site were expressed on the topics of population density and distribution, economic conditions, community services, social conditions, and fiscal conditions and government structure.

Issues raised by the commenters include the following:

- Socioeconomic guidelines
- Citizens living within a 48-kilometer (30-mile) radius
- Displacement of citizens
- Improvement of population forcasts
- Estimates of labor force for the project
- Effects on the economy
- The project's impact on the natural resource industries
- Impact on local economy
- Land values
- Impacts on community service
- Lifestyle of in-migrants
- Impact of the "fear factor"
- Impact of planned disruptions on individual families
- Mitigation planning
- Added cost of road repairs
- Evaluation of preclosure environment
- Transportation System Guideline.

Issue

A few commenters stated that the socioeconomic guideline does not contain enough disqualifying conditions, and that it does not specifically consider social impacts.

Response

The DOE issued the Final Siting Guidelines (DOE, 1984) (10 CFR Part 960) on December 6, 1984, following concurrence by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Appendix IV to the Guidelines lists information to be used in nominating sites as suitable for characterization.

C.7.4.1 Population Density and Distribution

Issue

Some commenters stated that not enough emphasis has been placed on impacts to those citizens who live within areas of high population density near the site and to those within the highly populated area included in a 48-kilometer (30-mile) radius.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated the data and has determined that no modification of the EA is required. The EA focuses on high-population areas in two major aspects of its analysis. First, radiation dose calculations consider population density and distribution in order to ensure that public risk is minimized. In these calculations, an 80-kilometer (50-mile) radius from the site is specified. Second, the EA considers areas which are calculated to accept the most in-migrants based on the gravity model. Using these considerations, the DOE has evaluated the impacts to the communities of Richton, Laurel, Petal, and Hattiesburg, which are described in Section 5.4 of the EA.

Issue

A few commenters stated that the EA should specify which citizens will be displaced by the project and that it should discuss compensation in addition to market value payments.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated the data and has determined that no modification of the EA is required. Section 6.2.1.2 of the EA specifies the location of residents who may be displaced by the repository phase of the project. Compensation would be governed by the "Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970" (42 USC Section 4601 et seq.), which requires the DOE to offer fair market value for acquired property. Section C.6.2 has a further elaboration of site ownership and control.

Issue

One commenter stated that population forecasts could be improved by comparing changes over time in the site area with statewide trends and projections.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated the data and has determined that the discussion of this issue is satisfactory. The population forecasts were obtained from the Southern Mississippi Planning and Development District and the Mississippi Research and Development Center. Estimates for 2005 have been extrapolated from these data bases. The Socioeconomic Data Base Report for Mississippi (BNI, 1984, ONWI-499) contains these statewide trends and projections.

Issue

One commenter stated that the estimates of labor force for the project do not reflect real-life uncertainties and that a reassessment of these figures will affect population impacts.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated the data and has determined that the discussion in the EA is appropriate. The labor force figures are a best-available estimate. The impacts calculated from the labor force estimates are based on conservative estimates. The conservatism used in making impact projections covers the likely range of real-life uncertainties and tends to overstate impacts that may result from project activities. These assumptions are discussed in Section 5.4 of the EA.

C.7.4.2 Economic Conditions

Issue

Some commenters stated that effects on the economy of the Gulf Coast should be included in the analysis of economic impacts.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated the data and has determined that no modifications to the EA are required.

No economic impacts are anticipated for the Gulf Coast. The eight county study area would receive the majority of economic impacts because this is the primary area of in-migration. Some project expenditures may be made in the Gulf Coast counties and worker wages may be spent in this area, but specific dollar amounts are not known at this time. The possibility of purchases made and wages spent outside of the general region is discussed in Section 5.4.2 of the EA.

Issue

A few commenters stated that the project's impact on the natural resource industries of timber production and salt mining will be more negative than indicated in the EA.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated the data and has determined that impacts on these industries are adequately treated in the EA.

The loss from commercial production of all forest land in the Richton Dome area would represent 0.15 percent of all forest land in Perry County.

As indicated in Section 3.2.8.2 of the EA, Richton Dome does contain salt with high purity at a shallow depth. However, as described in this section, there are many other domes in the Gulf Coast area with shallow salt deposits, which indicates that the Richton Dome does not provide a unique salt resource.

Issue

A few commenters stated that the analysis of the project's impact on the local economy should also include an examination of policies of local economic planning agencies, required local labor skills, and the percentage of local repository purchases.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated the EA data and text and has determined that a modification is not required.

The Socioeconomic Data Base Report for Mississippi (BNI, 1984, ONWI-499) contains a general description of economic development planning for the study area and was used as background data for the EA text.

As described in Section 4.2.2 of the EA, specific development policies would be part of the mitigation planning, which would be initiated during site characterization.

The availability of local labor skills was calculated by examining mining and construction employment within commuting distance of the site. The calculation of the percentage of workers who would have to in-migrate during construction is based on an examination of similar sized projects. The estimates are a realistic and conservative case and are found in the documentation of ONWI's Population In-Migration Model (Goldsmith, 1984). This percentage is also included in Table 5-24 and Section 5.4.2 of the EA.

The estimate of 5 percent of repository purchases made locally is based on experience with other large construction projects.

Issue

A few commenters stated that the notion that land values will increase as industrial development replaces agriculture is unsound.

Response

The DOE has reviewed the EA and has determined that no modification is required.

The EA addresses both positive and negative impacts of the repository. Consequently, both positive and negative impacts on land values are considered. As is stated in Section 5.4.2.3 of the EA, land values could increase as industrial development near the site replaces agriculture; land values could decrease if the repository is perceived negatively and industrial development is discouraged.

C.7.4.3 Community Services

Issue

One commenter stated that most services are located in incorporated areas and much of the new growth will take place outside of these areas. Therefore, it was noted that assessing the impact of new population on the adequacy of services is invalid.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated the data and has determined that no EA modification is required. As the EA analysis and past trends indicate, most new growth (about 85 percent) will take place in major towns because these areas offer the greatest number of amenities to attract new workers. The analysis does distribute 15 percent of all in-migrants to smaller towns and rural areas.

Issue

Some commenters stated that impacts on community services will be worse than is indicated in the EA due to current service inadequacies in such areas as medical, water and sewer, protective services, and housing.

Response

The DOE has checked the data and has revised the EA to include updated data on sewage treatment capacity in Laurel in Section 3.6.3.7. Current service inadequacies for hospitals (Section 3.6.3.3), housing (Section 3.6.3.1), and

protective services (Section 3.6.3.5) are described and considered in calculating repository-related impacts. These sections of the EA contain the most current documented data available at this time.

Issue

One commenter stated that more information is needed about local government's ability to pay for services, revenue sources of local governments, and a systematic plan for mitigation.

Response

The DOE has reviewed the data and has expanded Section 5.4.5.1 and 4.2.2 of the EA to include additional information about grants-equal-to-tax payments and the DOE grants to States for mitigation.

During repository construction and operation phases, two types of funding are authorized by the Nuclear Waste Policy Act (NWPA) (42 USC Sections 10101-10226). The NWPA requires the DOE to make grants-equal-to-tax payments which would have been levied if the repository were a private facility. The NWPA also authorized the DOE to make grants to the States for mitigation planning and for assistance in the implementation of mitigation measures.

C.7.4.4 Social Conditions

Issue

A few commenters stated that it is incorrect to assume that the lifestyle of in-migrants will blend into the local culture.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated the data and has expanded the discussion of social conditions in Section 5.4.4 of the EA. As described in this section, repository operations workers would be more likely to blend into regional lifestyles than construction phase workers because most of the former in-migrants would be making a long-term commitment to live in the area.

Issue

A few commenters stated that the EA inadequately assesses the impact of the "fear factor" on the local population.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated the EA material and has determined that no modifications of the EA are required. The EA will not include an analysis of the "fear factor." Fear of the project is not an evaluation criterion under the Final Siting Guidelines (10 CFR Part 960). Other types of social impacts, however, are evaluated.

Issue

One commenter stated that the EA inadequately assesses the impact of planned disruptions on individual families.

Response

The DOE's reevaluation of the data indicates that no modification is needed. The EA states in Section 6.2.1.2, that based on the presence of 50 homes on the dome, up to 140 people could be displaced by the project. The specific number of people displaced will depend on the specific location of the controlled area. All displaced residents will be eligible for assistance under the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (42 USC Section 4601).

C.7.4.5 Fiscal Conditions and Government Structure

Issue

A few commenters stated that mitigation planning should take place early in the siting process.

Response

The DOE has reviewed the comments and has determined that no modifications to the EA are required. Mitigation planning will occur prior to the awarding of financial assistance grants as authorized by the Nuclear Waste Policy Act. The timing of such planning will be determined through consultations with State and local officials and private citizens. The mitigation process and funding arrangements are described in Section 5.4.5.1 of the EA.

Issue

One commenter stated that if the dome is acquired for a site, local governments will lose revenues which would have accrued from taxes levied on those lands.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated the EA and has determined that no modification of the EA text is required. As described in Section 5.4.5.1, under the grants-equal-to-taxes program, which is authorized in the NWPA (42 USC Sections 10101-10226), the DOE will give grants to units of general government at the site; thus, although it is true that lands withdrawn from the private sector will reduce tax payments, alternative payments will be made from the Nuclear Waste Fund.

Issue

A few commenters stated that the added cost of road repairs stemming from the facility will place a financial burden on the county.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated the data and has expanded the text in Section 5.4.5 to discuss the use of the DOE assistance funds for the improvement of public services. Some road upgrading will be done by the DOE during facility construction. These activities are discussed in Sections 5.1.2 and 5.1.3 of the EA. Impact mitigation payments will be paid by the DOE, as stipulated in the NWPA. Mitigation funds could be allocated to repair road damage resulting from project traffic, offsetting the financial burden to a unit of local government.

C.7.5 SYSTEM GUIDELINE

The purpose of the preclosure System Guideline (10 CFR 960.5-1[2]), 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 Richton Dome site.

Issue

The DOE received numerous comments on its evaluation of the Preclosure System Guideline (10 CFR 960.5-1[2]) Environment, Socioeconomics, and Transportation, and the analyses supporting the guideline evaluation. Commenters also challenged the accuracy and adequacy of evaluations and data which support the DOE findings for the Environmental Quality guideline 10 CFR 960.5-2-5 (EA Section 6.2.1.6), Socioeconomic Impacts guideline 10 CFR 960.5-2-6 (EA Section 6.2.1.7) and Transportation guideline 10 CFR 960.5-2-7 (EA Section 6.2.1.8). A significant issue that has been identified by many commenters which specifically relates to this System Guideline finding for the Richton Dome site are proposed DOE actions which may affect access to the firing ranges and training facilities of Camp Shelby and thus

adversely effect the mobilization capacity of the camp and the mission of the United States Army.

Commenters were also concerned that exploratory shaft seal leakage and borehole drilling will lead to ground-water contamination and that the practical engineering measures on which the assessment relies to mitigate impacts from salt storage should be discussed.

Response

Specific issues raised for Camp Shelby impacts were presented previously in CRD Sections C.6.4, C.7.1, C.7.2, C.7.3, and C.7.4. Direct and secondary socio-economic impacts associated with Camp Shelby modifications are specifically addressed by the Socioeconomic Impacts guideline (10 CFR 960.5-2-6) (EA Section 6.2.1.7). Specific impacts to camp mobilization, restrictions to road access and air space, and blockage of firing ranges are addressed in EA Section 6.2.1.5 and 6.2.1.6. These analyses are based on additional information obtained by U.S. Army representatives.

In the final EA, Section 6.2.2.2 has been expanded to include a summary discussion from a system perspective of how repository operations will affect the Army's use of Camp Shelby and concludes that these are measures the DOE could implement (which could adversely affect Camp Shelby's operations and training) to protect the public and environment from potential hazards posed by radioactive waste disposal. In addition, as presented in EA Section 4.2.1.1, access to the Camp's operations and facilities will not be hindered because the DOE will not use the Camp's main access roads for site characterization or repository purposes.

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 Section 4.1.2 and 5.1.3.4. Impacts from salt, based upon effective application of these measures, are discussed in Sections 4.2.1.11 and 5.2.10.

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 proved 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 and Table 6-8 of the final EA.

The DOE has determined that the 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

Bechtel National, Inc., 1984. Socioeconomic Data Base Report for Mississippi, ONWI-499, prepared for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

BNI, see Bechtel National, Inc.

DOE, see U.S. Department of Energy

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.

U.S. Department of Energy, 1984. "Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982; General Guidelines for Recommendation of Sites for Nuclear Waste Repositories; Final Siting Guidelines," (10 CFR Part 960), Federal Register, Vol. 49, pp. 47714-47770, Washington, DC, December 6.

C.7.6.2 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.

Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, 16 USC Secs. 661-666c.

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 Mississippi Laws

Natural Heritage Law of 1978 for Mississippi, Miss. Code Ann. Secs. 49-5-141 to 49-5-157 (Supp. 1983).

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 Richton Dome site conceptually suitable for locating a nuclear waste repository when factors are considered that assess the ultimate cost of the repository. These factors are discussed in the EA section comparing the sites on the basis of preclosure guidelines that discuss the ease and cost of siting, construction, operation, and closure (Section 7.3.3).

C.8.1 SURFACE CHARACTERISTICS

Issue

One commenter noted that the draft EA acknowledged minor and infrequent flooding and that mitigative measures during construction and operation will be taken to overcome the potential impact. However, the guideline addresses flooding at the site and not engineering practices for control. Therefore, the conclusions that the favorable condition is present and that the potentially adverse condition is not present should be reevaluated.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated the data and analyses in Sections 6.3.3.1.2 and 6.3.3.1.3. As discussed in Section 6.3.3.1.2, the terrain is generally flat and well-drained in the area, and therefore the favorable condition remains present. However, a stringent interpretation of current site conditions leads to the conclusion that the potentially adverse condition is present. The EA has been changed in Section 6.3.3.1.3.

C.8.2 ROCK CHARACTERISTICS

There was concern expressed by a number of reviewers about rock characteristics that could affect the constructability of a repository. Further information on factors that could affect constructability is developed in parts of Chapters 3 and 6 of the EA, which deal with rock characteristics at the site.

Issues raised by the commenters include the following:

- Variations in rock and soil property measurements
- Effects of discontinuities, heterogeneities, and impurities on rock mass behavior
- Repository geoengineering-related design concerns

- Retrievability of waste canisters
- Performance of seals in the shaft
- Coupled-effects performance scenarios
- Disturbed zone needs.

Issue

Several commenters indicated that the rock and soil property measurements presented may vary in several ways and that these need to be discussed. These properties, commenters stated, may vary from laboratory/in situ tests to the rock mass behavior or they may vary among various locations, even if general characteristics appear quite similar. Commenters stated the source of these variations may be any of the following and should be addressed:

- Variations from location to location because of natural spatial variation from place to place, lack of a statistically representative number of measurements, or technical uncertainties in making extrapolations
- Variations from laboratory/in situ test measurements to rock mass property for a single location because of natural spatial variation, the effects of the scale of the area or specimen tested as compared to a large rock mass, or the lack of statistically representative/spatially representative measurements.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated the existing site-specific data and examined additional generic data to address the variability of rock and soil property measurements. Generic data for caprock and salt from laboratory studies have been used to assess data variability from location to location. Site-specific core log data have been assessed to clarify the relationship between laboratory data and the large-scale behavior of the materials.

Based on the data referenced above, the DOE has clarified Sections 3.2.6 and 6.3.3.2 to address data variability and uncertainties, and the impact on preclosure repository conditions including design, construction, and operation.

Issue

Several 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: near-surface faults overlying domes, anomalous zones, joints and fractures in caprock, gas and brine pockets, rock mass property anisotropy, subsurface faults, and uncertainty about dome boundaries.

Response

The DOE has examined available site-specific and relevant generic information for Richton Dome and has incorporated recent studies to establish a basis for response. The information consisted of studies of anomalous zones in Gulf Coast salt domes, caprock features, overdome structure and stratigraphy at Richton Dome, discontinuities of various rock masses including salt, and heterogeneities and impurities in domal salt.

The information has been assessed to consider the effects of discontinuities, heterogeneities, and impurities on rock mass behavior and rock mass characteristics (categorized as near-surface faults, anomalous zones, joints and fractures in caprock, gas and brine pockets, rock mass property anisotropy, subsurface faults, and uncertainty about dome boundaries). The assessment also included an examination of these effects on preclosure repository conditions and considerations including design, construction, and operation.

The DOE clarified Sections 3.2.6 and 6.3.3.2 in response to this issue.

Issue

Some commenters stated 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 dome, the feasibility and effectiveness of roof support techniques, allowable thermal load, maintenance of subsurface openings, and gas mitigation methods.

Response

The DOE has considered the issue indicated and clarified Sections 5.1 and 3.2.6 of the EA. The preclosure implications are discussed in Section 6.3.3.2.

The limited lateral extent of the Richton Dome could place some constraint on repository design. Current information indicates that the repository can be developed on one level in the Richton Dome. If gassy mine design features are included, the lateral extent of the subsurface will probably increase. This may require expansion to a two-level repository. Additional repository levels increase the complexity of the design but still allow a workable repository layout.

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 the possible roof stability concerns 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 the following: 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 agrees with these observations and has expanded and clarified the discussion in Sections 5.1 and 3.2.6 of the EA. The preclosure implications are discussed in Section 6.3.3.2 and are subject to the rationale that follows.

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, perhaps, 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 air gap 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, will 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 draft 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 temperatures 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 the waste package.

Overcoring can be done with more-or-less conventional drilling equipment consisting of an annular drill bit similar to those used for drilling large diameter holes in concrete. Because of room height limitations, overcoring will be two passes with the first pass drilling down to the elevation of the pintle. The core will then be removed before the second overcoring operation to liberate the waste package. This two-step procedure will also help to assure waste package location to prevent accidental damage to the waste package. This overcoring technology will be demonstrated during the proof-of-principle period prior to license application.

A variety of location techniques are available including surveying from permanent monuments located outside the high temperature area, metal detectors, radioactivity, and earth penetrating radar, which when used by themselves or the combination can provide sufficiently accurate position data to reduce the safe overcoring diameter to an acceptable size.

Other emplacement modes presently being evaluated by the DOE include the placement of single or multiple packages in horizontal holes drilled into the pillars between waste rooms and the use of steel or concrete sleeves to line either vertical or horizontal holes. These sleeves would be designed to withstand the induced stress levels in the salt and would reduce concerns about relocation of canisters and excavation for their retrieval.

Moreover, the potential for deleterious rock mass response to higher than ambient temperatures 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 changed to: "The evidence indicates that the favorable condition is <u>not</u> present."

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.

Response

The DOE has considered the issue and clarified the discussion in Sections 5.2.1 and 3.2.6 of the EA. In light of the issue, the postclosure implications are discussed in Section 6.3.1.3.

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. The process can be applied to soil or rocks that contain pore water or water in fractures.

Shaft sinking by the freezing method has been accomplished in salt domes. However, the strict sealing requirements for repository shafts would require a slightly different approach than has been 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/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 styles of shaft seals need to be recognized. One type will be installed during shaft construction to prevent 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 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 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 to 2 C (2 to 4 F) at the base of the shaft after 1,000 years (Kelsall et al., 1985 BMI/ONWI-562). This small temperature change should have a negligible effect on the stability and deformation of the shaft, as well as a minimal effect on the shaft seals. Accordingly, this issue is not identified as a concern in the EA.

Issue

A few commenters indicated that a number of coupled-effects performance scenarios need to be addressed more extensively; specifically, the thermochemical effects on the engineering properties of 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 mining subsidence versus uplift due to thermal expansion of the rock mass.

Response

The DOE has considered the issue indicated and expanded and clarified the discussion in Sections 5.1 and 3.2.6 of the EA. The preclosure implications are discussed in Section 6.3.3.2, subject to the observations that follow.

Several specific thermochemical concerns were mentioned by commenters. First, the possibility that brine inclusions might move away from the waste package 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. This mechanism is therefore not expected to contribute significantly to radionuclide release.

A concern was that 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. The temperature gradients in a repository would be too small to drive this type of migration.

Another criticism was that intercrystalline migration may be controlled by pressure gradients rather than temperature gradients, so that use of the Jenks' equation is inadequate. It is very likely that pressure gradients are important to intergranular flow. The use of this equation was originally proposed for both intergranular and intragranular flow based on experimental observation. Attempts to validate this theory using data from the Salt Block II brine migration experiment show that reasonable agreement with the data is obtained.

A statement was made by one commenter that 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 EAs will continue to label the threshold gradient case as the expected condition.

A few commenters were concerned about thermomechanical effects such as thermal decrepitation and fracture healing at Richton Dome. No thermal decrepitation of the tested salt samples occurred up to a temperature of 450 C (842 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 0.35 meters (1.15 feet) in 5 years for 5.5- by 5.5-meter (18- by 18-foot) rooms in Richton Dome salt.

The question raised by one commenter is whether closure will be due entirely to creep or whether other mechanisms, such as slabbing or spalling, will dominate. The latter situation was asserted to be harder to deal with in terms of tunnel maintenance, support, and mine safety.

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 initially 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.

Surface Subsidence and Uplift. There are two principal mechanisms affecting movements within the rock mass and elevation changes of the ground surface above the repository. These are as follows:

- Uplift caused by thermal expansion of the rock mass due to heating by the waste packages
- Subsidence caused by the creep of the salt into the underground workings.

Mining subsidence occurs in a timeframe 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. After several thousands of years, when the repository has cooled down, the subsidence effect will result in a small amount of overall permanent subsidence of less than 1 meter (3.3 feet).

Issue

Some commenters stated that the extent of the disturbed zone needs to be defined realistically. The major disturbances appear initially to be mechanical due to excavation, later thermal effects become significant.

Mechanical responses due to disturbances consist of the following and need to be addressed: fracturing due to excavation or excessive deformation; deformations 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

The DOE has considered the issue and clarified EA Sections 5.1 and 3.2.6. The preclosure implications of this issue have been considered in modifications to Section 6.3.1.3 based on the following discussion. 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 that in some cases some modifications are required. The DOE has clarified that the introduction to Appendix 6A gives only a preliminary and conservative description of the "disturbed zone."

It was noted that uplift could cause significant fracturing of overburden and changes in flow paths that could greatly shorten estimated travel times of radionuclides, and will 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.

It was also noted that other evidence supported estimates of a disturbed zone due to excavation ten times greater than presented in the EAs. It was 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 modify the EA conclusion as necessary.

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 (50 feet). The DOE has also revised the EA text for clarity and included a review of available generic information.

It was 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.

The DOE has reevaluated the data and found no change of the EA is required.

Loss of material properties in salt through irradiation is expected to occur for only a few centimeters (inches) away from the waste package. This is due to the rapid decrease in the radiation flux away from the waste. The loss of mechanical strength in the immediate vicinity of a waste canister is unlikely to affect overall repository performance. Thermal effects also will be limited. Tests of domal salt indicate decrepitation temperatures significantly higher than the design operating temperature for the waste package.

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 discussion of shear zones in the dome
- Potential problems and uncertainties with shaft construction
- Potential adverse and favorable conditions.

Issue

One commenter stated that the discussions on shaft sealing in the EA inadequately address shear zones in the dome. The conclusion that these zones will not create severe engineering problems is not supported by experience, according to the commenter.

Response

The DOE has expanded Section 3.2.6 to discuss the potential for various types of anomalous zones (including shear zones) to exist in the interior of Richton Dome. Based on studies of existing mines in the Gulf Coast region, Richton Dome is classified with the group of Gulf Coast salt domes for which no such major internal anomalies have been observed. Additional studies of mechanisms of salt dome growth and studies of the caprock and strata over Richton Dome tend to support the belief that the dome does not contain a major shear zone. Drilling of engineering design boreholes in advance of shaft construction will give early identification of zones where shaft sealing may be difficult. If need be, shaft locations will be moved to avoid identified anomalies.

Issue

One commenter stated that the potential problems and uncertainties associated with shaft construction by ground freezing and the effects of increased hydraulic conductivity around the shaft due to the freeze/thaw cycle were not adequately addressed in the EA.

Response

Ground freezing, as a method for sinking shafts through wet formations, is a well-proven technology that has been demonstrated around the world. Freeze depths up to 914 meters (3,000 feet) have been achieved in shaft sinking operations in North America and shafts constructed by this method have been successfully operated for many years (Djahanquiri, 1984). The freezing method appears to have minimal impact on mechanical properties, although clay partings may deform when frozen. If the freeze/thaw cycle results in increased permeability immediately adjacent to the shaft, the potential downward flow can be controlled by installation of a grout curtain or an impermeable keyway below the freeze region.

Issue

A commenter was concerned that, although the DOE acknowledges that a potential exists to flood portions of the Richton Dome site, the favorable conclusions about the potentially adverse condition (c) of Surface Characteristics, 10 CFR 960.5-2-8, and favorable condition (b)(2) of Hydrology, 10 CFR 960.5-2-10, are not supported in the draft EA.

Response

The DOE has reviewed the commenter's concerns about the favorable conclusions on site flooding in the draft EA and has modified the EA as follows:

The DOE has agreed to take a very strict interpretation of the potentially adverse condition (c) of Surface Characteristics, 10 CFR 960.5-2-8, and has changed the finding to read, "the evidence indicates that a potentially adverse condition is present." This is because a very small portion of the site at Richton Dome is located in the probable maximum flood (PMF) floodplain for the site (Figure 3-27). The DOE also believes that this portion of the site can be raised above the PMF floodplain by standard engineering practice (by filling), and that such engineering remedies are not likely to fail in the lifetime of the repository.

Similarly, the DOE has changed the finding for the favorable condition (b)(2) of Hydrology, 10 CFR 960.5-2-10, to read, "the evidence indicates that a favorable condition is not present."

C.8.4 PRECLOSURE TECTONICS

Questions relating to the performance of a repository at the Richton Dome 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:

- Potential adverse conditions
- Seismic design parameters
- Potential for seismicity.

Issue

A few commenters stated that the finding for the potentially adverse condition in part (2) of Section 6.3.3.4.3, based on 10 CFR 960.5-2-11 (Tectonics), may not be certain because the effects of soil amplification have not been considered.

Response

The DOE has rewritten the text for clarity and has indicated that the findings must be based on the most likely interpretation of the available evidence. Soil-column effects on ground motion, either amplification or attenuation, depend on site-specific data that are not available. However, the estimated ground motions are moderate, and the soil columns are not known to be unusual. Therefore, the soil-column effects are not expected to change ground motions to levels that are unacceptable from an earthquake engineering viewpoint. The DOE has revised the EA Section 6.3.3.4.3 in response to these comments.

Issue

Some commenters stated that: it is premature to commit to seismic design parameters at the EA stage; the ground-motion estimates should be labeled as conservative with refined estimates to be made later; and the method and criteria used for nuclear power plants are not appropriate for repositories.

Response

The DOE has rewritten the text for clarity and to indicate that the EA does not commit to the estimates as values for final design. The ground motion parameters are estimated to compare sites and identify potential problems. The text also indicates that the acceleration estimates are conservative because the analysis uses the more severe earthquakes when an assumption is required. The method and criteria for repositories are yet to be specified, but they can be expected to be derived from experience with other nuclear facilities and to be similar to those for power plants. The DOE has revised EA Section 6.3.3.4 in response to these comments.

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 Richton Dome 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, and in much of the Gulf Coast, suggests the absence of significant tectonism that could establish the conditions suitable for induced seismicity. 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.

C.8.5 SYSTEM GUIDELINE

The potential of the site for induced seismicity was discussed and questioned by several commenters. Seismic issues are related to discussions in Chapter 3 and 6 of the EA.

Issues raised by the commenters include the following:

- Extentions of the disturbed zone
- Gas blowouts and outbursts
- Extent of damage to salt rock walls and back.

Issue

One commenter noted the following with regard to the disturbed zone at the Richton Dome:

1. Extension of the disturbed zone as a result of excavation in salt (mechanial disturbance) is reported to be less than 1 meter (3.3 feet) rather than 1 to 2 meters (3.3 to 6.6 feet) (Golder Associates, Inc., 1985, Volume II, Appendix II, Special Problems IV, pp. 26 and 30).

2. Extension of the disturbed zone due to gas blowouts and gas outbursts is not mentioned. These zones are much more extensive than ones made mechanically (Golder Associates, Inc., 1985).

3. The mining of salt develops a jointing that extends back into the salt for several meters. This extension has not been determined (Golder Associates Inc., 1985, Volume II, Appendix II, p. 32b).

4. Disturbed zone in the salt due to mining activities is stated by Kupfer to have a significant porosity and permeability (Golder Associates Inc., 1985, Volume II, Appendix II, p. 33).

5. Extent of damage to salt rock walls and back caused by mining processes should be discussed in detail within appropriate sections of the EA document.

Response

The DOE has considered the issue and modified EA Sections 5.1 and 3.2. The preclosure implication of this issue have been considered in modifications to Section 6.3. Mechanical disturbance of the rock wall does not necessarily imply degradation of system performance. The DOE has conducted a literature survey on case histories of mechanical disturbance in evaporite mines (Golder Associates, Inc., 1985). As a result of these studies, the estimated extent of the disturbed zone has been increased to about 15 meters (50 feet).

Based on a thorough literature evaluation of anomalous conditions within salt domes, gas blowouts appear to be restricted to coastal domes of Louisiana (Belle Isle, Cote Blanche, etc.). The likelihood of such features being found within the Richton Dome is discussed in Section 3.2.

Issue

One commenter stated that the draft EA has not adequately evaluated the following issues:

1. The Richton Dome is a massive body of halite, but based on past mining experience, significant anomalies may be present. No discussion or evaluation is presented on the potential presence of geologic anomalies which might be encountered in the Richton Dome site.

2. Reported data indicate that the salt has a "low" coefficient of thermal expansion of the host rock, and also salt may have a relatively high thermal expansion coefficient in comparison to other rocks, such as tuff or basalt.

3. The mining methods are proven techniques in a salt dome and require no engineering measures beyond reasonably available technology.

4. No discussion or evaluation of the effects of repository-induced thermomechanical loading on geologic anomalies is presented.

5. The Richton Dome is said to be capable of accommodating the stresses expected from disposal operations. No discussion or reference is presented in order to demonstrate the range of values over which the stress could vary. There is no discussion or evaluation presented on variation or stresses due to disposal operations.

Response

The DOE has reevaluated the data and has modified or expanded the text of the EA where appropriate.

The potential for anomalous conditions being present in Richton Dome is discussed in Section 3.2. The implication of such anomalies to waste isolation is evaluated in Section 6.3 under the heading, "Analysis of Potentially Adverse Conditions." The evaluation includes roof falls, rapid closure rates, hydration or dehydration, thermally induced fractures, brine migration, and anomalous zones, etc.

The DOE agrees with the commenter on the higher values for thermal coefficient of expansion for salt in comparision to tuff and basalt or other rocks. The text of Section 6.3 has been clarified on this point.

The DOE believes that mining technology is proven around the world to deal with potentially difficult geologic anomalies in salt. Salt domes, both with reported anomalous features and without, have been successfully mined in this country for over 100 years. The techniques described in Sections 4.1 and 5.1 are considered adequate to construct a repository in Richton Dome.

The statement that the Richton Dome is capable of accommodating the stress expected from the repository is based on the analysis of EA Section 6.3. Because of salt ductility, the stresses in the dome will be lithostatic, except for local stress concentrations within a few meters of the excavations. The DOE believes no modification to the EA is required with regard to variation of stresses.

C.8.6 CHAPTER C.8 REFERENCES

C.8.6.1 References Listed by Author

Djahanguiri, F., 1984. Memorandum from Djahanquiri 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.

Golder Associates, Inc., 1985. Assessment of Character and Extent of Mechanical Disturbance for Underground Openings in Salt, prepared for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Mememorial Institute, Columbus, OH, in preparation.

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, D. Meyer, J. G. Franzone, and W. E. Coons, 1985. Schematic Designs for Penetration Seals for a Repository in Richton Dome, BMI/ONWI-562, prepared by D'Appolonia Consulting Engineers, Inc. for Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, OH.

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
Alabama									
	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	--	--	--
			00155	00005B	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
	Leonard, R. Michael		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	--	--	--
Alaska									
	Matz, Mike		00306	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Wilkinson, Robert L.		00154	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
Arkansas									
	Schmidt, John & Adeline		00054	00001	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
Arizona									
	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.		00409	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Dankwort, Rudolf		00413	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00413	00002	----------	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
			00413	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Dugall, Dr. John C.		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
Arizona (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
Arizona (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	--	--	--
California									
	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)									
			00101	00005	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Ballsun, C.		00075	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00075	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00075	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Berke, Eleanor		00351	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00351	00002	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00351	00003	DC	C.7.2.4	C.7.2.5	--	--
			00351	00004	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
	Bock, A.J.	American Rock Art Research Assc.	01056	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01056	00002	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
			01056	00003	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
			01056	00004	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
	Bridenbecker, Robert H.	Southern CA Edison Co.	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	--	--	--
	Campbell, Todd		00267	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			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	--	--	--
	Carey, Patrick F.		00294	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	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
California (continued)									
			02104	00008	DC	C.7.1.1.4	--	--	--
	Durbin, Emily	Sierra Club	01221	00009	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Eggleston, Cathy		00491	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
	Fahlen, Dorothy		00389	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
	Foch, Jr., James D.		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

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
California (continued)									
			02701	00003	----------	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
	Schuster, Megan H.		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	--	--	--
			00133	00005	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Spotts, Richard		00184	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Stansfield, Elaine	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	--	--	--
			00059	00038	----------	C.2.8.1	C.2.8.2	--	--
	Swanson, John R.		00446	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Uhlar, Daniel J.		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	--	--	--
			00399	00005	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
	Wasson, Glenn E.		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	--	--	--
			00254	00013	----------	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Weatherwax, Robert K.	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
California (continued)									
			01366	00008	----------	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01366	00009	----------	C.3.3	--	--	--
			01366	00010	----------	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01366	00011	----------	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
	Webster, Donald B.		00613	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Woods, Nancy		00095	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Yasuda, Don		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	--	--	--
Colorado									
	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	--	--	--
	Anderst, Daryl		00318	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Andy, Charles		00562	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
Colorado (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
Colorado (continued)									
	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	--	--	--
			00563	00002	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
	Clark, Caroline		01349	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Cline, Andy		01175	00001	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
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

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
Colorado (continued)									
	Frankel, Miriam		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	Telluride Times	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
Colorado (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
Colorado (continued)									
	Jernigan, Richard		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.	Allied Bendix Aerospace	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	--	--	--

INDEX 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)									
			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	--	--	--
			00118	00007	----------	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
	Lehmann, Scott K.	Univ. of Colorado, Boulder	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
Colorado (continued)									
			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	--	--
	M., D.		00639	00001	----------	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
	Magyar, John and Mike		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
			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	--	--	--
	Major, Robert J.		00599	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Margolis, Barbara E.		00082	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00082	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Marsh, Tobin		00571	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00571	00002	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Marshall, Katherine J.		00548	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	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
Colorado (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	--	--	--
	Mcllellan, 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
Colorado (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
Colorado (continued)									
			00557	00005	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Pearson, Mark D.		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	--	--	--
	Salek, P.		01051	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Salk, Joy L.		00560	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Saunders, C.		00384	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
	Savoy, Lauret	Dept. Geological Sciences	00528	00001	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00528	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00528	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Scott, Steven K.		00304	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Shaw, Karyl L.		00605	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00605	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00605	00003	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Shineovich, Jan		00400	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
	Shinn, Joyce A.		01300	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01300	00002	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01300	00003	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01300	00004	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Slater, Mark		00406	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
Colorado (continued)									
			00406	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00406	00003	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Snyder, Harold and Roberta		00490	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00490	00002	DC	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
			00490	00003	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
	Somrak, Mary Jo & Michael		01379	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			01379	00002	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Spence, Robin E.		01564	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Spezia, John W.		00012	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00012	00002	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00012	00003	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			00012	00004	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00012	00005	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			00012	00006	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
	Spivak, Paul		00579	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00579	00002	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Stansberry, Donna		01192	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Stevenson, Angeline G.		00589	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00589	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Stewart, Carrie		00592	00001	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00592	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00592	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Stokes, Wendy L.		00284	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00284	00002	----------	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
	Street, Marianna		01050	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Strunk, Michael B.		00534	00001	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00534	00002	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			00534	00003	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00534	00004	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00534	00005	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Sucherman, Kathy		00147	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Sutton, Carolyn		00575	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00575	00002	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			00575	00003	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
	Sweeney, Chris		01045	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Tausehn, Guy		00576	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00576	00002	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Taylor, Larry M.	Interior Graphic Design	02105	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
Colorado (continued)									
			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
Colorado (continued)									
			01087	00002	DC	C.7.1	--	--	--
	Welch, Thomas E.		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	--	--	--
			02181	00003	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02181	00004	----------	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
			02181	00005	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
	Will, Dale		00458	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00458	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00458	00003	----------	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Williams, David R.		00538	00001	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
	Worthington, Michael		01105	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01105	00002	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Wurtz, Tom		02116	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Yanz, John & Bonnie		01308	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01308	00003	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Zinn, Sonya		01106	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01106	00002	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			01106	00003	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Zinn, Lennard		01174	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01174	00002	DC	C.7.4	C.7.2.4	--	--
Connecticut									
	Campbell, David		00087	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Ceraso/Huang, Jane/William	Yale Env. Litigation Program	00523	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			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
Connecticut (continued)									
	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	--	--
Washington, D.C.									
		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
Washington, D.C. (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
Washington, D.C. (continued)									
			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	--	--	--
	Berick, David	Environmental Policy Institute	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
Washington, D.C. (continued)									
			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	--	--	--
	Berick, David	Environmental Policy Institute	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
Washington, D.C. (continued)									
			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	--	--	--
	Berick, David	Environmental Policy Institute	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
Washington, D.C. (continued)									
			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	--	--	--
	Berick, Director, David	Environmental Policy Institute	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

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Washington, D.C. (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
			02061	00003	RN	C.6.4	--	--	--
	Blakey, L. H.	Department of Army Plan. Div.	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	--	--
	Blanchard, Bruce	U.S. Dept. of Interior	02123	00001	----------	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02123	00002	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02123	00003	DS	C.4.1.1	C.4.1.2	--	--
			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
Washington, D.C. (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
Washington, D.C. (continued)									
			02123	00066	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
			02123	00067	DS	C.6.1	--	--	--
			02123	00068	----------	C.3.3.2	--	--	--
	Blanchard, Bruce	U.S. Dept. of Interior	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

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Washington, D.C. (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
Washington, D.C. (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

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Washington, D.C. (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
Washington, D.C. (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

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Washington, D.C. (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
Washington, D.C. (continued)									
			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	--	--	--
	Blanchard, Bruce		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
Washington, D.C. (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
Washington, D.C. (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
Washington, D.C. (continued)									
			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	--	--	--
	Blanchard, Bruce	U.S. Dept. of Interior	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
Washington, D.C. (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
Washington, D.C. (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
Washington, D.C. (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
Washington, D.C. (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
Washington, D.C. (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
Washington, D.C. (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
Washington, D.C. (continued)									
			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	--	--	--
	Buren, Mindy A.	LeBoeuf, Lamb, Leiby, & MacRae	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
Washington, D.C. (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	--	--	--
			01037	00139	----------	C.7.3	--	--	--
	Davis, John G.	U.S. Nuclear Reg. Commission	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	--	--	--
			01039	00200	----------	C.2.7	--	--	--
	Davis, John G.	U.S. Nuclear Reg. Commission	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
Washington, D.C. (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
Washington, D.C. (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
Washington, D.C. (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

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Washington, D.C. (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
Washington, D.C. (continued)									
			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	--	--	--
			01040	00169	----------	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
			01040	00170	----------	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
	Davis, John G.	U.S. Nuclear Reg. Commission	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	--	--	--
	Davis, John G.	U.S. Nuclear Reg. Commission	01042	00009	----------	C.8.3	C.3.4.2.3	--	--
			01042	00011	----------	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01042	00012	----------	C.3.1	C.2.7	--	--
			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
Washington, D.C. (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
Washington, D.C. (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
Washington, D.C. (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

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Washington, D.C. (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
Washington, D.C. (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
Washington, D.C. (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
Washington, D.C. (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
Washington, D.C. (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
Washington, D.C. (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
Washington, D.C. (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
Washington, D.C. (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
Washington, D.C. (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.	U.S. Dept. of Energy	01677	00001	----------	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Hirsch, Allan	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	--	--

INDEX 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, D.C. (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
Washington, D.C. (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	--	--
	Hodel, Secretary Donald	U.S. Dept of Energy	01716	00001	----------	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Kearney, John J.	Edison Electric Institute	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	--	--	--

INDEX 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, D.C. (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
Washington, D.C. (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
Washington, D.C. (continued)									
			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	--
	Kearns, Artis		01440	00003	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01440	00004A	----------	C.2.8	--	--	--
			01440	00004B	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Magnees, III, Col. Thomas H.	Dept. of Army Corps of Engineers	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	--
			02697	00028	RN	C.4.3	--	--	--
	Martin, Terri	National Parks & Cons. Assoc.	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	--	--	--
			02195	00008	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			02195	00009	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Parker, Frank L.	National Research Council	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
Washington, D.C. (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	--	--	--
			02669	00017	----------	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
	Santman, L.D.	U.S. Dept. of Transportation	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	--	--	--
			01568	00025	DS	C.7.3	--	--	--
	Severance, Owen	Natl Parks & Conservation Assn.	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
Washington, D.C. (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
Washington, D.C. (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
Washington, D.C. (continued)									
			01238	00028	DS	C.4.1.1.9	--	--	--
			01238	00029	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01238	00030	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			01238	00031	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01238	00033	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Smith, David W.		00040	00001	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00040	00002	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Stennis, John	U.S. Senate	01680	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Swift, Congressman Al	U.S. House of Representatives	02617	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	C.7.2	--	--
			02617	00002	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02617	00004	----------	C.3.1	--	--	--
			02617	00005	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02617	00006	----------	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			02617	00010	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02617	00011	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Yeager, Brooks B.	Sierra Club	01239	00001	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01239	00002	----------	C.2.2	--	--	--
			01239	00003A	----------	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			01239	00003B	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01239	00004	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01239	00005	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01239	00006	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01239	00007	DC	C.7.1	C.3.1.3	--	--
			01239	00008	----------	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
			01239	00009	----------	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			01239	00013	----------	C.2.6.3	6.4	--	--
			01239	00014	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01239	00015	DC	C.4.2.1	C.4.1	--	--
Florida									
	Baez, Alberto	North Miami Senior High	02693	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.2.8	--
			02693	00002	DC	C.1.1.2	C.2.2	--	--
	Holloway, Mrs. Anita		00555	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00555	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Laping, Mrs. T.		00062	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00062	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00062	00003	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
Florida (continued)									
			00062	00004	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Votoe, Deborah		02691	00001	----------	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Williams,Jr., J.W.	Florida Power & Light Company	01556	00001	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
Georgia									
	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	--	--	--
Idaho									
	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	--	--	--

INDEX 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
Illinois (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	--	--	--
Indiana									
	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	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Kansas									
		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	--	--	--
Kentucky									
	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	--	--	--
Louisiana									
	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		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	--	--	--
	Bohlinger, L. Hall	LA Dept. of Environ. Quality	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	--	--	--
			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	--	--	--
	Bohlinger, L. Hall	Office of Air Qual. & Nuc. Eng.	02168	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02168	00002	----------	C.2.2	--	--	--
			02168	00003	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02168	00004	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02168	00005	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Bohlinger, L. Hall	Office of Air Qual. & Nuc. Eng.	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
Louisiana (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
Louisiana (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
Louisiana (continued)									
	Moore-Iverson, Fannie F.		00047	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Robertson, Bill	Webster Parish Police Jury	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	--	--	--
Massachusetts									
	Greene, Cathy C.		00656	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00656	00005	----------	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			00656	00006	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Greone, Alan		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
Maryland									
	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	--	--	--
Maine									
	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	--	--	--
Michigan									
	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
Michigan (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	--	--	--
Minnesota									
	Peterson, William V.		00134	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Schnabel, Daniel E.		00275	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00275	00004	----------	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
Mississippi									
	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
Mississippi (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	--	--	--
	Backstron, 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

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Mississippi (continued)									
	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
Mississippi (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
Mississippi (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

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Mississippi (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

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
Mississippi (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	--	--	--
			01702	00002	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Barsinew, M. J.	NPO/DOE	01723	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
Mississippi (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
Mississippi (continued)									
			01019	00005	RN	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
			01019	00006	RN	C.7.4.4	--	--	--
			01019	00007	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Blankenship, Dorothy M.		01762	00001	RN	C.5.6	C.4.1.1.5	C.7.2.8	C.6.1
	Blanton, Tom		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	--	--	--
			00989	00011	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Blessey, Mayor Gerald		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	--	--	--
			01697	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Blessey, Ann		01887	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Blessey, Mayor Gerald	City of Biloxi	01686	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Blessey, Mayor Gerald		02254	00001	RN	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
	Bograd, Jessie		01863	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Boland, Mrs. Michael J.		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
Mississippi (continued)									
			01618	00002	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Boland, Mike		01619	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Boland, Molly		01620	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Boland, Jon		01622	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Bolen, Jr., James E.		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	Christ Episcopal Day School	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

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Mississippi (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
Mississippi (continued)									
	Canizaro, Robert H.	AIA	01679	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Caranna, Cono		00938	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00938	00002	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00938	00003	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Carter, Amanda		01878	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Carter, Claudia		01879	00001	RN	C.5.1	--	--	--
	Carter, Mary F.		01937	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Cates, Arlene		01922	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Chipley, Dixie Wright		00979	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Chipley, Robert		00986	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Clement, Sheri		01798	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Cleveland, Mr. & Mrs Milton		01782	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Cochran, Senator Thad	CAND	01661	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Coffey, Dovin		00964	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00964	00002	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00964	00003	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Cole, Dorothy		00996	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00996	00002	RN	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00996	00003	RN	C.3.2	--	--	--
			00996	00004	RN	C.7.4	C.4.1.5	--	--
			00996	00005	RN	C.4.1.5	--	--	--
			00996	00006	RN	C.7.4.2	C.5.1	--	--
			00996	00007	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			00996	00008	RN	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			00996	00009	RN	C.4.1.5	C.7.4	--	--
			00996	00010	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00996	00011	----------	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			00996	00012	----------	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			00996	00013	RN	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
			00996	00014	RN	C.6.2	--	--	--
			00996	00015	----------	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			00996	00016	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00996	00017	RN	C.7.2.2	C.7.4.2	--	--
			00996	00018	RN	C.5.8	--	--	--
			00996	00019	RN	C.5.3	C.5.6	C.5.1	--
	Cole, Bonnie		01003	00001	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Cole, Dr. Edwin		01022	00001	RN	C.4.1.3.5	--	--	--
			01022	00002	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
Mississippi (continued)									
			01022	00003	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01022	00004	RN	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01022	00005	RN	C.7.2.8	--	--	--
	Cole, Bonnie		01323	00001	RN	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
			01323	00002	RN	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01323	00003	RN	C.7.2.3	--	--	--
	Cole, Dorothy G.	Perry County CAND	01282	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01282	00002	RN	C.3.2	--	--	--
	Cole, Dorothy G.		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		01942	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Collins, Stephen F.		02001	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Collins, Gloria C.		02002	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Collins, Terese P.		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
Mississippi (continued)									
	Collins, Daniel G.		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	Harrison County Bar Assoc.	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.		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	MS Assoc. of Supervisors	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		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	League of Women Voters	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
Mississippi (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
Mississippi (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
Mississippi (continued)									
			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	--	--	--
	Finn, Donald F. X.		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)									
	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
Mississippi (continued)									
	Ford, Jr., Robert		01797	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Forenand, Diane L.		01920	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Forsythe, Ron	Mississippi E & T Board	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.		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.	MS Psychologist Association	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		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	Richton Elementary School	01214	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Gollot, Senator	U. S. Senate	01699	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Gonzalez, Jennifer Crowell		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	DOE & DOT Nuclear Waste Division	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
Mississippi (continued)									
	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 H.		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
Mississippi (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	--	--	--

INDEX 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)									
	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
Mississippi (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.		02051	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Hughes, Inez		02058	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Humphrey, Cindy	Westinghouse	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	--	--	--

INDEX 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)									
			01627	00002	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Johnston, Elta P.	Junior League of Jackson, Inc.	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		00999	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Jones, Dorothy		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
Mississippi (continued)									
			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	--	--	--
	Jones, Frank		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		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	Richton Elementary School	01216	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Jones, Henry		01635	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Kallery, Mrs. Easton		01992	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Kanady/Shulman, Cathy/Ruth	MS Chapter Sierra Club	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
Mississippi (continued)									
	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
Mississippi (continued)									
	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	--	--	--
	Lloyd, Eva		01917	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Lofton, Mary Cruso		01767	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Loftus, Jeff		01656	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Loftus, John B.		01837	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Logan, Mrs. S. J.		02017	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Longino, Lewis		01939	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Lyman, India		01005	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Lyman, India		01645	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Mallgy, Betty W.		01948	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Mann, Carol		01033	00001	----------	C.2.7	--	--	--
			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	--	--	--
	Mann, Carol		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
Mississippi (continued)									
			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
Mississippi (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
Mississippi (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
Mississippi (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.		01626	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Peterson, Anne	City of Gulfport	01688	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Pickett, Jack & Jane		01990	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01990	00002	----------	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
	Pittman, Atty Genl, Edwin Lloyd	State of Mississippi	01369	00001	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			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	--	--	--

INDEX 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)									
			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	--	--	--

INDEX 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)									
			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
Mississippi (continued)									
	Richard, Everett C.		02027	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Richardson, Margaret		02011	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Roberts, Lloyd E.	City of Moss Point	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.		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.	MS Legislature	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	--	--	--
			01018	00006	RN	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01018	00007	RN	C.6.2	--	--	--
			01018	00008	----------	C.2.1.5	C.2.7	--	--
	Ruffin, Mary	Richton Elementary School	01215	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Sangrouber, Ruby		02004	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Satchfield, Charles		01903	00001	----------	C.3.8	--	--	--
	Scarbrough, B. R.		02034	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Schmidt/Chance, Richard C./J.Michael		01701	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Schroeder, Jewel		01978	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Schwartzman, Nina		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
Mississippi (continued)									
			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	--	--	--
	Schwartzman, Nina M.	MS Restaurant Assoc.	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
Mississippi (continued)									
			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
Mississippi (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
Mississippi (continued)									
	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

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Mississippi (continued)									
	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, Boby 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
Mississippi (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
Mississippi (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	--	--	--
Missouri									
	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	--	--	--
Montana									
	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
Montana (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	--	--	--
Nebraska									
	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
Nebraska (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	--	--	--
New Jersey									
	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	--	--	--
New Mexico									
	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	--	--	--

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
New Mexico (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	--	--	--
Nevada									
		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)									
			01427	00002	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Armstrong, Gail	Lincoln County	01411	00001	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01411	00006	----------	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
	Ballow, Thomas W.	St of NV, Dept of Agriculture	02651	00001	----------	C.2.4.2	--	--	--
	Barbano, Andrew		01453	00001	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01453	00002	----------	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			01453	00003	----------	C.2.8	--	--	--
	Bass, John	Beatty Town Advisory Comittee	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.	Beatty Town Advisory Council	00136	00001	----------	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
	Bass, John		01402	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01402	00002	----------	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			01402	00007	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Baughman, Mike		01449	00001	----------	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
			01449	00007	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			01449	00008	----------	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
	Bechtel, Dennis	Clark County Commission	01422	00002	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01422	00004	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01422	00006	----------	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01422	00008	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01422	00011	----------	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
	Benedickt, Patrick		01486	00002	----------	C.2.3	--	--	--
			01486	00005	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Bernard, Jackie		01461	00001	----------	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
	Bernard, M.		01462	00001	----------	C.2.6.3	--	--	--
	Bernheimer, Mrs.		01454	00001	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Bird, Marian J.		00266	00010	----------	C.2.4.3	--	--	--
			00266	00011	----------	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Bradbury, Audry		01420	00006	----------	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
	Bradhurst, Stephen T.	Nye County Planning Consultant	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
Nevada (continued)									
			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	--	--	--
			02671	00006	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Bukowski, Grace		00511	00003	----------	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			00511	00005	----------	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			00511	00008	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Bukowski, Grace		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	--	--	--
			01230	00021	----------	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
	Early, Ann		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		01466	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Ferraro, Mayor,	Boulder City City Council	01428	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Fulkerson, Mr. B.		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
Nevada (continued)									
			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	--	--	--
	Gary, Keneth		01405	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Gary, Jean		01406	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Gates, David A.	Dept. of Commerce	02658	00001	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Gregory, T		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	--	--	--
	Hall, Robert		01412	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Hammes, Babe		01409	00001	----------	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
	Hardy, James K.	Torok Expl.,Min.,& Constr. Co.	01110	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01110	00002	----------	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			01110	00003	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Harlan, Shirley		01432	00001	----------	C.2.4.3	--	--	--
	Harlan, Sirley J.	Cold Comfort Farm	01168	00001	----------	C.2.4.3	--	--	--
			01168	00003	----------	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			01168	00004	----------	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
	Hill, Ronald W.	Dept. of Transportation	02655	00001	----------	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			02655	00002	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			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	--	--	--
	Hock, Betty	NV Gen Fed Women's Clubs	00517	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Hock, Betty E.	NV. Gen Fed. of Women's Clubs	00139	00001	----------	C.3.4.2.4	--	--	--
			00139	00002	----------	C.3.4.2.4	--	--	--
	Hoke, M		01471	00002	----------	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			01471	00003	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Holmes, Richard B.	Dept. of Comprehensive Planning	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
Nevada (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
Nevada (continued)									
			01263	00148	----------	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01263	00149	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Holtz, Charles		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	--	--	--
	Kearns, Ardis		01581	00001	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01581	00002	----------	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
			01581	00003	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			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
Nevada (continued)									
	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	--	--	--
			00510	00006	----------	C.2.2	C.2.3	--	--
	Kretschmer, Theresa		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	--	--	--
			00514	00003	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Kulas, Kathy Ann		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

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Nevada (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
Nevada (continued)									
			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
Nevada (continued)									
			01481	00009	----------	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
	McKey, Mary		01480	00002	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01480	00003	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Mifflin, Martin	Water Resources Center	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	Lovelock City Council	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
Nevada (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)									
			02646	00061	----------	C.2.1.3	--	--	--
	Rader, Scott		01487	00002	----------	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
	Reinsehl, Toni		01421	00001	----------	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
	Reiss, B.		01464	00001	----------	C.3.4.2.1	--	--	--
	Robbins, E.		01477	00002	----------	C.7.3	--	--	--
	Robertson, J.		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

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Nevada (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
Nevada (continued)									
			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
Nevada (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
Nevada (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
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
Nevada (continued)									
			00519	00002	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00519	00003	----------	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			00519	00004	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Thomason, Jack	City of Las Vegas	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	--	--
	Trinko, Mark		01447	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	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	--	--	--
			01479	00006	----------	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
	Van Neuren, Heimi		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	--	--	--
	Watson, C.		01467	00004	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01467	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
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
New York (continued)									
			00093	00002B	DC	C.6.5	--	--	--
			00093	00003	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00093	00004	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
	Concra, Jr., Louis M.	NY State Dept. Envir. Conserv.	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	--	--	--
			01570	00010	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Constant, Robert L.	Donaldson, Lufkin & Jenrette	01583	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Copeland, Dr. Robert L.		00065	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00065	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Crocco, Vera B.		00423	00001	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
	Crocco, Evelyn A.		00459	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Diserlo, Matthew J.	Donaldson, Lufkin & Jenrette	01571	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Forster, James		00281	00001	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
	Hale, Mary		00355	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Hazel, James		00148	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00148	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Khan, Bebe		00360	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00360	00002	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			00360	00003	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00360	00004	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
	Le Roy, Mary		00112	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00112	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00112	00003	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Norr, Carol		00305	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Simon, Davis		01101	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Wakefield, D. Audrey		01285	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			01285	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			01285	00003	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
			01285	00004	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Walker, Jean		01551	00001	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01551	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
New York (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	--	--	--
North Carolina									
	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	--	--	--
Ohio									
	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	--	--	--
Oklahoma									
	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
Oregon									
	Adams, J. Ross & Lois H.		00543	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Amara, Mark & Margaret		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		01163	00002	----------	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
	Anonymous	KGW-TV	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	--	--	--
			02446	00003	----------	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
	Ashburn, Daniel	WWSSG	01363	00001	----------	C.2.6.3	--	--	--
			01363	00002	----------	C.2.6.3	--	--	--

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
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
Oregon (continued)									
			01280	00005	----------	C.2.4.3	--	--	--
			01280	00011	----------	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			01280	00012	----------	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			01280	00015	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Bickett, Gary		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	--	--	--
	Clagett, 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
Oregon (continued)									
			01241	00003	----------	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
			01241	00004	----------	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
			01241	00005	----------	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
	Coulter, Karen L.		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
Oregon (continued)									
			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
Oregon (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
Oregon (continued)									
			02503	00008	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Gilevich, Welsh, Shari, Manning		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	--	--	--
	Goldberg, Marshall		02480	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02480	00002	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02480	00006	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02480	00007	----------	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
	Griffith, W. R.		01156	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Griffith, Nigel		02477	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Hampton, Stephanie		02470	00004	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02470	00005	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02470	00006	----------	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
	Hampton, Stephanie	Town of Hammond	00676	00001	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Harris, Hope		00681	00002	----------	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
	Harris, Hope		02495	00003	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02495	00006	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02495	00007	----------	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
	Henningsgaard, Mayor Edith	Astoria City Council	02073	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02073	00002	----------	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			02073	00003	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Henry, David	WWSSG	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	--	--	--
			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
Oregon (continued)									
			01365	00013	----------	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
	Herdon/Hill, Co-chair, Ron/Alma	Rainbow Organizing Committee	00521	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00521	00002	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00521	00003	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00521	00004	----------	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			00521	00007	----------	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Hidden, William		02456	00002	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02456	00003	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Hollis, Jack F.		00456	00001	----------	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			00456	00002	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00456	00003A	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			00456	00003B	----------	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			00456	00004	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Holmes, Jenny		01289	00001	----------	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
	Howell, Mary L.		01293	00001	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01293	00002	----------	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Huette, 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	WWSSG	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	--	--	--
			01364	00006	----------	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
	Jackson, Johnny		02460	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02460	00003	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Jones, Rick & Kathy		01068	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Juelfs, Caerl Payne & Larry		01550	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Keller, Judith		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
Oregon (continued)									
	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
Oregon (continued)									
			02455	00009	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02455	00010	----------	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
	Lindberg, Mike	Office of Public Affairs	02618	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02618	00003	----------	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			02618	00004	----------	C.2.2	--	--	--
			02618	00005	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02618	00006	----------	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Lindsay, John	WWSSG	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		02466	00003	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Maduro, Gina		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
Oregon (continued)									
			02494	00014	----------	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02494	00015	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Marbet, Lloyd		02492	00002	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02492	00004	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02492	00005	----------	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02492	00006	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02492	00007	----------	C.2.5.1	--	--	--
	Margolis, William		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	--	--	--
	McManus, Jorge		02476	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			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		01553	00004	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Miller, Caroline		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
Oregon (continued)									
			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, Merryl		00611	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Mix, Merryl		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

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Oregon (continued)									
			02464	00004	----------	C.3.4.2.1	--	--	--
			02464	00005	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02464	00006	----------	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
	Palmer, Leonard		02468	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02468	00002	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02468	00003	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02468	00007	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02468	00008	----------	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
	Patawa, Elwood	Umatilla Indian Reservation	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
Oregon (continued)									
			00531	00004	----------	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			00531	00007	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			00531	00011	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00531	00012	----------	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
	Petersen, Gary & Family		01302	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Peterson, Nancy	House of Representatives	01352	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01352	00002	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01352	00006	----------	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
	Phelps, Anne		02489	00003	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Powell, Laura		02472	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			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	--	--	--
	Quinlan, Gordon		01291	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01291	00002	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Rathbun, R. Keaney & Dr. Susan		00500	00003	----------	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			00500	00004	----------	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
	Redfern, Roger		02453	00001	----------	C.2.5.1	--	--	--
			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	--	--	--
	Rhoads, Laurel		00262	00002	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Roy, Jeanne		02478	00001	----------	C.2.2	--	--	--
			02478	00002	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02478	00003A	----------	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
	Ruben, Barbara		00449	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Saltzman, Dan		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	--	--	--
	Schade, Dr. Charles P.	Multnomah County Oregon	00367	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
Oregon (continued)									
			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
Oregon (continued)									
	Wapato, Tim		02447	00003	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Webster, T. R.	Dept. of Health & Human Services	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	--	--	--
Pennsylvania									
	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

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Pennsylvania (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	--	--	--
South Carolina									
	Taylor, Reid		00091	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00091	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00091	00003	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
Tennessee									
	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-172

INDEX OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SALT SITES

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Tennessee (continued)									
			00071	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00071	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
Texas									
	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
Texas (continued)									
			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
Texas (continued)									
			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	--	--	--
	Anonymous		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	--	--	--

INDEX 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)									
			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
Texas (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	--	--	--
			00865	00003	DS	C.7.2.7	--	--	--
	Bair, Mrs. Nova S.		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)									
	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	--	--	--
			00177	00004	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Bledsoe, Jolene		02165	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02165	00002	----------	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			02165	00003	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Boatwright, Kenneth	TX Dept. of Agriculture	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
Texas (continued)									
			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	--	--	--
	Borchardt, Brian		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	--	--
			00697	00005	DS	C.7.4.4	--	--	--
	Borchardt, Mona		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	--	--	--
			00705	00008	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Borchardt, Brian		02129	00001	DS	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
			02129	00002	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02129	00003	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02129	00004	DS	C.7.2.8	C.7.2.1	--	--
			02129	00005	DS	C.7.4.4	--	--	--
	Borchardt, Mona		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	--
			02131	00007	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02131	00008	DS	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Boulter, Beau		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
Texas (continued)									
			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	--	--	--
	Boulter, Beau	Texas Representative	02124	00001	----------	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			02124	00002	----------	C.3.4	--	--	--
			02124	00003	----------	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			02124	00004	----------	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			02124	00005	----------	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			02124	00006	----------	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
	Bright, Eunice		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	C.4.3	--
			00710	00002	DS	C.5.7	--	--	--
			00710	00003	----------	C.2.7	--	--	--
			00710	00004	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
	Briscoe, Greg		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)									
			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	--	--	--
	Brody, Julie	Texas Department of Agriculture	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		00706	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Chedester, Barbara		00029	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Claire, Clendon B.		00376	00001	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00376	00002	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00376	00003	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
	Coleman, Jean		00375	00001	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00375	00002	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00375	00003	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
	Combest, Larry		00835	00001	DS	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			00835	00002	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00835	00003	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00835	00004	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00835	00005	DS	C.7.4.2	C.7.4.4	--	--
			00835	00006	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Combest, Larry		02137	00001	DS	C.7.2.8	C.3.1.3	--	--
			02137	00002	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02137	00003	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02137	00004	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02137	00005	DS	C.7.4.2	C.7.4.4	--	--
	Cominos, Nicholas		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
Texas (continued)									
			00892	00002	----------	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
			00892	00003	----------	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
	Cook, Joanne		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	--	--	--
			00847	00007	DS	C.6.1	--	--	--
			00847	00008	DS	C.6.6	--	--	--
	Cook, Joanne		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	--	--	--
			02144	00007	DS	C.6.1	--	--	--
			02144	00008	DS	C.6.6	--	--	--
	Cooper, Margaret		00857	00001	DS	C.7.4.4	--	--	--
			00857	00002	DS	C.7.4.4	--	--	--
			00857	00003	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Cooper, Margaret Owen		02152	00001	DS	C.7.4.4	--	--	--
			02152	00002	DS	C.7.4.4	--	--	--
			02152	00003	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Davis, Beverly		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	--	--	--
			00499	00006	DS	C.6.2	C.7.4.4	--	--
	Dawson, Marjorie		00695	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00695	00003	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Dawson, Marjorie Musick		02127	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02127	00003	----------	C.7.3	--	--	--
	Denko, Dr. John V.	Northwest Texas Hospital	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
Texas (continued)									
			01266	00003	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01266	00004	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Detten, Ralph		00868	00001	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
			00868	00002	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
	Devin, Delbert		00691	00001	----------	C.2.7	--	--	--
	Devin, Albert		00716	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	C.7.4.2	--	--
			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	--	--	--
			00885	00009	----------	C.3.4.2.1	--	--	--
	Downey, Margaret		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	--	--
	Ford, Melva		00010	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			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
Texas (continued)									
			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	--	--	--
	Forrest, Richard	Witherspoon, Aikin & Langley	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
Texas (continued)									
			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	--	--	--
	Frishman, Steve	Nuclear Waste Prgrms. Office	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 Prgrms. 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
Texas (continued)									
			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	--	--	--
	Frishman, Steve	Nuclear Waste Prgrms. Office	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
Texas (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

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Texas (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
Texas (continued)									
			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	--	--	--
	Frishman, Steve	Nuclear Waste Prgrms. Office	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	--	--	--
			02689	00007	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
	Frishman, Steve	State of Texas	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

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Texas (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
Texas (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
Texas (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
Texas (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
Texas (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
Texas (continued)									
			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
Texas (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	--	--	--
	Frishman, Steve	Nuclear Wste. Prgrms. Office	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	--	--	--

INDEX 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)									
			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
Texas (continued)									
			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	--	--	--
	Galbraith, Shirley		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	--	--	--
			02148	00004	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
	Garrett, Bryce		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	--	--	--
			00861	00005	DS	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Garrett, Bryce		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	--	--	--
			02155	00005	DS	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Gibbons, Lucille		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
Texas (continued)									
			00873	00012	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
	Gierisch, Bobby		00877	00001	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00877	00002	----------	C.3.4.4	C.2.1.1	--	--
	Gilliam, Winston E.		02111	00001	DS	C.5.11	--	--	--
			02111	00002	DS	C.5.10	--	--	--
	Givans, Cam		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	--	--	--
			00717	00011	----------	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
	Hancock, Don		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	--	--	--
			00869	00006	----------	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
	Hancock, Don		00884	00001	----------	C.2.7	--	--	--
			00884	00002	DS	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
			00884	00004	DS	C.7.1.1	C.7.1.2	--	--
			00884	00005	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			00884	00008	----------	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
	Hancock, Don	Landowners in Deaf Smith, Swisher	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
Texas (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
Texas (continued)									
			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	--	--	--

INDEX 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)									
			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	--	--	--

INDEX 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)									
			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	Texas Historical Commission	01747	00001	----------	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Hicks, Donald		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
Texas (continued)									
			00718	00009	----------	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00718	00010	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Jacobson, Robert		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	--	--	--
			00863	00005	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			00863	00006	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
	Jacobson, Robert	Panhandle Assoc Soil and Water	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	--	--	--
			02157	00005	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
	Jones, Cal		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	--	--	--
	Jones, Calvin K.	Holly Sugar Corporation	02142	00001	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02142	00002	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
			02142	00003	DS	C.4.1.5.2	--	--	--
			02142	00004	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
	Keith, Ronnie W.		00066	00001A	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00066	00001B	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Kent, Leonard		00841	00001	DS	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	--
			00841	00002A	DS	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			00841	00002B	DS	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	--
			00841	00003	DS	C.7.4.5	--	--	--
	Kent, Leonard	Vega Independent School District	00183	00001	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00183	00002	DS	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
	Kent, Leonard		02141	00001	DS	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			02141	00002A	DS	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
			02141	00002B	DS	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	--
			02141	00003	DS	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
	King, Carl		00856	00001	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00856	00002	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00856	00003	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			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
Texas (continued)									
			00856	00006	DS	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
			00856	00007	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
	Kirkpatrick, Ann		02136	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02136	00002	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
			02136	00003	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
	Kleinkauf, Kathleen		00506	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00506	00002	DS	C.5.1	C.5.11	--	--
	Kleuskens, Tonya		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	--	--	--
			00846	00019	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
	La Fever, Lou Ann		00011	00001	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00011	00002	DS	C.5.10	--	--	--
			00011	00003	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00011	00004	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Lamb, Angela		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)									
			00690	00009	DS	C.7.4.2	C.7.2.1	--	--
			00690	00010	DS	C.7.4.2	C.7.2.1	--	--
	Lamb, Angela K.	Department of Agriculture	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	--	--	--
	McClurg, Mary M.	J. N. Montgomery Farms	00536	00005	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			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	--	--	--
	McNeil, Marianne		00864	00001A	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
			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
Texas (continued)									
	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
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

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Texas (continued)									
			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, Ivye 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
Texas (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	--	--	--
			01076	00003	DS	C.7.4.2	C.6.5	--	--
	Pickering, George W.		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
Texas (continued)									
			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	--	--	--
	Richardson, Donald		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	--	--	--
			00860	00014	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Richardson, Larry		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
Texas (continued)									
			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	--	--	--
	Richardson, Wayne		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	--	--	--
	Richardson, Trace		02153	00001	DS	C.4.1.3.1	--	--	--
			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	--	--	--
			02153	00007	DS	C.7.1.1.1	--	--	--
	Richardson, Donald		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	--	--	--
			02154	00014	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Richardson, Larry		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	--	--	--
			02156	00006	DS	C.7.2.8	C.5.1	--	--
	Richardson, Monica		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
Texas (continued)									
			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	--	--	--
	Rike, John		00713	00002	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00713	00003	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00713	00004	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00713	00005	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Rike,III, John S.	First State Bank	02119	00001	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02119	00002	DS	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02119	00003	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Riley, Barbara L.		00008	00001	DS	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00008	00002	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00008	00003	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Schermbeck, Jim		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	--	--	--
	Shults, Regina		00896	00001	----------	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
	Southard, E.		01267	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	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
Texas (continued)									
			00872	00003	DS	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
	Steiert, Jim		02162	00001	DS	C.7.2.1	C.7.2.8	--	--
			02162	00002	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
			02162	00003	DS	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
	Taylor, Nancy		00374	00001	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00374	00002	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00374	00003	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
	Taylor, Roy and Evelyn		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	--	--	--
			00493	00014	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Thomas-Williams, Colonel Robert		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	--	--	--
			00858	00013	DS	C.5.8	--	--	--
			00858	00014	DS	C.4.3	--	--	--
			00858	00015	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Thomas-Williams, Colonel Robert		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
Texas (continued)									
			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		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	--	--	--
	Tooley, Wendell	The Tulia Herald	02132	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			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	--	--	--
	Vines, Theresa		00377	00001	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00377	00002	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00377	00003	DS	C.5.1	--	--	--
	Wallace, Dr. Wes		00891	00001	----------	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
			00891	00004	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Wenzler, Michael		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
Texas (continued)									
			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	--	--	--	--
	White, Governor Mark		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	--	--	--
			00879	00010	----------	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			00879	00011	----------	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
			00879	00012	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Whitson, Hollis		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	--	--
			00711	00007	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Whitson, Hollis		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	--	--	--
			00871	00008	DS	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00871	00009	DS	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
	Whitson, Hollis		00886	00001	DS	C.7.1.2	--	--	--
			00886	00002	----------	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
			00886	00003	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00886	00004	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00886	00005	DS	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
	Williams, Lawana		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
Texas (continued)									
	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	--	--	--
Utah									
		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)									
	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
Utah (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
Utah (continued)									
			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	--	--	--
	Bangerter, Governor Norman H.		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
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
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
Utah (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
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
Utah (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
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
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)									
			01392	00293	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01392	00294	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01392	00295	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
			01392	00296	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			01392	00297	DC	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01392	00298	DC	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01392	00299	DC	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01392	00300	DC	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01392	00301	DC	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01392	00302	DC	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01392	00303	DC	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01392	00304	DC	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01392	00305	DC	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01392	00306	DC	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01392	00307	DC	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01392	00308	DC	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01392	00309	DC	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01392	00310	DC	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01392	00311	DC	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01392	00312	DC	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01392	00313	DC	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01392	00314	DC	C.4.2.3	--	--	--
			01392	00315	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			01392	00316	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
			01392	00317	DC	C.7.1.1.1	--	--	--
			01392	00318	DC	C.7.1.1.1	--	--	--
			01392	00319	DC	C.7.1.1.1	--	--	--
			01392	00320	DC	C.7.1.1.1	--	--	--
			01392	00321	DC	C.7.1.1.1	--	--	--
			01392	00322	DC	C.7.1.1.1	--	--	--
			01392	00323	DC	C.7.1.1.1	--	--	--
			01392	00324	DC	C.7.1.1.1	--	--	--
			01392	00325	DC	C.7.1.1.1	--	--	--
			01392	00326	DC	C.7.1.1.2	--	--	--
			01392	00327	DC	C.7.1.1.2	--	--	--
			01392	00328	DC	C.7.1.1.2	--	--	--
			01392	00329	DC	C.7.1.1.2	--	--	--
			01392	00330	DC	C.7.1.1.2	--	--	--

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
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
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
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
Utah (continued)									
			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
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
Utah (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
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
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
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

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Utah (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
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
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
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
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
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
Utah (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	--	--	--

INDEX 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)									
			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	--	--	--

INDEX 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)									
			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
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
Utah (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

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Utah (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
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
Utah (continued)									
			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
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
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	--
	Barnes, Richard D.		02234	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02234	00002	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
Utah (continued)									
	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	--	--	--
			01143	00002	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
	Beener, Colleen		00074	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00074	00002	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00074	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00074	00004	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00074	00005	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
	Belka, Wayne		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	--	--	--
			00764	00005	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
	Belka, Wayne		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	--	--	--
			00928	00007	----------	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
	Black, Calvin		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)									
			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	--	--	--
	Black, Calvin	San Juan County Commission	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

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
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
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
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

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Utah (continued)									
			02637	00178	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			02637	00179	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			02637	00180	DC	C.7.2	C.2.4	C.7.1.1.4	--
			02637	00181	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			02637	00182	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			02637	00183	DC	C.7.1	C.7.2	--	--
			02637	00184	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			02637	00185	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			02637	00186	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			02637	00187	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			02637	00188	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			02637	00189	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			02637	00190	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			02637	00191	----------	C.3.4.2	--	--	--
			02637	00192	----------	C.3.4.2	--	--	--
			02637	00193	----------	C.3.4.2	--	--	--
			02637	00194	----------	C.3.4.2	--	--	--
	Bleiweiss, David		00142	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Boddie, Richard		02239	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Bortz, Steve		00934	00001	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00934	00002	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00934	00003	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Boyer, Mark		02230	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02230	00002	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02230	00003	DC	C.4.1.1	--	--	--
			02230	00004	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			02230	00005	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			02230	00006	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			02230	00007	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			02230	00008	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
			02230	00009	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
	Broman, Bruce		00542	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00542	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00542	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Brown, Cheryl Oberhansley		00465	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Brown, Brenda		02242	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Brunvand, Amy		00338	00001	DC	C.4.1.3.5	--	--	--
			00338	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
Utah (continued)									
			00338	00003	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Bryan, Julie		00771	00001	DC	C.3.1.2	C.3.1.3	--	--
			00771	00002	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00771	00003	DC	C.3.1.2	C.3.1.3	--	--
	Bryan, Julie		01237	00001	----------	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			01237	00002	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01237	00003	DC	C.3.1.2	C.3.1.3	--	--
			01237	00004	DC	C.3.1.2	C.3.1.3	--	--
	Budig, Michael		00779	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00779	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00779	00003	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00779	00004	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00779	00005	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			00779	00006	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Budig, Michael		02206	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02206	00002	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02206	00003	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Budig, Michael	Wasatch Mountain Club	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	--	--	--
			00486	00005	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Catlin, James		00785	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00785	00004	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00785	00005	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Catlin, James	Utah Chapter of the Sierra Club	02210	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02210	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			02210	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			02210	00005	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			02210	00006	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Cederquist, John		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)									
	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	--	--	--
			01343	00006	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Chesler, Bruce		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
Utah (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,		02260	00005	DC	C.2.7	--	--	--
	Day, Glenn		00736	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	DeLong, Scott M.		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
Utah (continued)									
			00811	00008	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Donaldson, Christie		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	--	--	--
			01085	00007	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
	Dondero, Thalia M.	Clark Cty Board of Commisioners	02089	00001	----------	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
	Dorsey, Bryan		00103	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00103	00002	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Dougherty, Nina		00554	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Dudek, Robert		00724	00001	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			00724	00002	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00724	00003	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
	Dudek, Robert A.	Utahns Against the Dump	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
Utah (continued)									
			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	--	--	--
	Eberhardt, Janice		02672	00001	----------	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02672	00002	DC	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02672	00003	DC	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02672	00004	----------	C.2.7	--	--	--
	Elegante, John C.		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	--	--	--
			00474	00012	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00474	00013	DC	C.5.10	--	--	--
	Elrod, Dale		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	--	--
			01297	00007	DC	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.2.4	C.4.1.3.6	--
	Emmerich, Kevin		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
Utah (continued)									
			00090	00003	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
	Erickson, Steve		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	--	--	--
			00776	00006	----------	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
	Ernstsen, Jerriam		02237	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Evans, David K.		02228	00001	----------	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			02228	00002	----------	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
	Fawn, Jessica		00731	00001	----------	C.2.1.5	--	--	--
			00731	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00731	00003	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Fernley, Norma M.		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
Utah (continued)									
	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		00126	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Galway, Lewis		00830	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00830	00002	----------	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			00830	00003	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00830	00004	----------	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			00830	00005	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Gelatt, Lee		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
Utah (continued)									
			00929	00003	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00929	00004	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00929	00005	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
	Goodwin, Russ		00759	00001	----------	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			00759	00002	----------	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			00759	00003	----------	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Goodwin, Russell		01224	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01224	00002	----------	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01224	00003	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01224	00004	----------	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Goodwin, Russell		02194	00001	----------	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			02194	00002	----------	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02194	00003	----------	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			02194	00004	----------	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
			02194	00005	----------	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Gosselin, Gilles		00744	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00744	00002	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
	Graham, Audrey		00741	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00741	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00741	00003	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			00741	00004	----------	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
	Graham, Audrey & Tim		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	--	--	--
			01171	00011A	DC	C.7.4	C.7.1.1.4	C.7.2.4	--
			01171	00011B	DC	C.7.2.1	--	--	--
	Graham, Tim		02253	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02253	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			02253	00003	DC	C.4.1.1.5	C.5.7	--	--
	Grandy, Lawrence		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
Utah (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	--	--	--
	Greenhalgh, Jennifer L.		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	--	--	--
	Grizzard, James		00757	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00757	00002	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00757	00003	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00757	00004	----------	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
	Guinn, E. P.		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)									
			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	--	--	--
	Harris, L. Kay		02245	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Hatch, Garn		00221	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Hatch, Garn		00827	00001	DC	C.7.4	C.7.2.4	--	--
			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)									
			00827	00003	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00827	00004	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
	Haun, Matthew		01154	00001	DC	C.7.4.1	--	--	--
			01154	00002	DC	C.7.1	--	--	--
	Hazen, Gary		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	--	--	--
			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	--	--	--
	Henrie, Dr. James Russell		02233	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Hines, Alesia		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	--	--	--
			00235	00005	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
	Holland, Dorothy		00043	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00043	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00043	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Hollinbeck, Rick		00930	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Holly, Troy		00804	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00804	00002	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00804	00003	DC	C.5.7	--	--	--
			00804	00004	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00804	00005	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
	Holt, Donna		02251	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02251	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
	Howard, Councilmember		02090	00001	----------	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
	Hoyal, Christina H.	Hoyal Construction, Inc.	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
Utah (continued)									
	Hunt, Jeffrey M.		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/		00356	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Ison, Daniel K.	AB City Policy Department	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)									
			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	--	--	--
	Jewett, Lawrence		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	--	--	--
			00770	00010	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
	Jewett, Lawrence		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	--	--	--
			02202	00010	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
	Johnson, Michael A.		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	--	--	--
			00614	00008	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Jorgensen, David M.		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
Utah (continued)									
			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	--	--	--
	Jorgensen, David		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	--	--	--
			00828	00006	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Karkut, James		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	--	--	--
	Kelleher, Mark		02249	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Kelling, Mitch	Grand Co. Econ. Dev. Council	00009	00001	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Keyser, Esther		00723	00001	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
	Kinnersley, Blanche		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	--	--	--
	Kirschner, Mike		00813	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00813	00002	DC	C.4.1.3	C.7.2	--	--
			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	--	--	--
	Kitchell, Kate ,		00739	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00739	00002	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
Utah (continued)									
	Klinkenberg, Chris M.		02247	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Knight, Charlotte		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	--	--	--
			00777	00005	DC	C.7.2.4	C.7.2.5	--	--
	Kobe, Kevin Joseph		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	--	--	--
			00809	00006	DC	C.5.10	--	--	--
			00809	00007	DC	C.7.1	--	--	--
			00809	00008	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Krueger, Heather		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	--	--	--
			00823	00014	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
	Lavalle, Lance		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	--	--	--
			00822	00005	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Lavdres, Peter		01298	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Lehman, Dale		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)									
			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	--	--	--
	Lehmann, Diane		00832	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00832	00002	----------	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
	Levine, Deborah		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		00781	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	C.7.2.5	--	--
	Lindahl, Alice M.		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
Utah (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
Utah (continued)									
			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	--	--	--
	Lockhart, William		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	--	--	--
			00761	00012	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Lockhart, William J.		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	--	--	--
			01261	00016	----------	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01261	00017	----------	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
	Lockhart, William J.		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
Utah (continued)									
			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	--	--	--
	Lockhart, William J.		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, Cordell		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
Utah (continued)									
			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	--	--	--
	Mangum, Todd		00797	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Mangum, Todd		02215	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Manning, Steven		00769	00001	DC	C.4.1.3.6	C.3.2	--	--
			00769	00002	DC	C.4.1.3.6	--	--	--
	Marder, Joyce		00762	00001	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
	Martin, Terri		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	--	--	--
	Mason, Patrice		00742	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Matheson, Scott M.	Utahns for Canyonlands	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
Utah (continued)									
			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	--	--	--
	Matheson, Scott M.		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	--	--	--
			00922	00002	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Maxfield, Cory		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
Utah (continued)									
			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	--	--	--
	Maxfield, Cory		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	--	--	--
			02218	00005	----------	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
	Mazurski, Madeline		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	--	--	--
			00748	00005	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	McCool, Susan		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
Utah (continued)									
			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	--	--	--
	McGraw, Don		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	--	--	--
			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	--	--	--
	McGraw, Don		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	--	--	--
			00807	00017	----------	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			00807	00018	DC	C.4.3	--	--	--
			00807	00019	----------	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
			00807	00020	----------	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
	McGraw, Don	Physics Department	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
Utah (continued)									
			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	--	--	--
	Meador, Bill B.	Grand County School District	00137	00001	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
	Meador, Bill B.		02092	00001	DC	C.4.1.5.3	--	--	--
			02092	00002	DC	C.7.4.3	--	--	--
	Meehan, William		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
Utah (continued)									
			02208	00011	DC	C.4.1.3.6	--	--	--
	Merrell, Harvey W.		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	--	--	--
			00734	00010	----------	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
			00734	00011	----------	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
			00734	00012	----------	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
	Merrell, Harvey W.		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	--	--	--
			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	--	--	--
	Merrell, Harvey W.		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
Utah (continued)									
			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	--	--	--
	Merrell, Harvey W.		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
Utah (continued)									
	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	--	--	--
	Minix, Casey		00790	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Mitchell, Dr. Jerry K.		00301	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			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	--	--	--
	Mitchell, Pat		00339	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			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
Utah (continued)									
			00747	00003	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
	Morrison, Stan		00127	00001A	----------	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			00127	00001B	DC	C.4.2.1	--	--	--
			00127	00002	DC	C.5.2	--	--	--
			00127	00003	DC	C.4.2.2	--	--	--
	Moseley, Mica		00467	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00467	00002	DC	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
	Mulvey, William E.		02232	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02232	00002	DC	C.5.7	--	--	--
	Mulvey, Debra Dellinger		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	--	--	--
			00831	00003	DC	C.7.1	--	--	--
	Norcross, Frances		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	--	--	--
	Norman, Robert		00728	00001	----------	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			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	--	--
	Norman, Robert R.		02098	00001	----------	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
Utah (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
Utah (continued)									
			01540	00022	----------	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01540	00023	----------	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
	Oram, Debbie		01344	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01344	00002	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01344	00003	DC	C.7.3	--	--	--
			01344	00004	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
	Oram, Debbie	Utahns Against the Dump	01340	00001	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			01340	00002	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			01340	00003	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01340	00004	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01340	00005	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01340	00006	----------	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
	Oviatt, Susan		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	--	--	--
	Oviatt, Charles G.		00628	00002	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			00628	00003	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			00628	00004	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Oviatt, Jack		02236	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Oviatt, Susan		02238	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Pass, Merlin R.		01242	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			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	--	--	--

INDEX 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)									
			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	--	--	--
	Paterson Jensen, Danielle Margie		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	--	--
	Paull, Stephen E.		02243	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Peterson, Dr. F. Ross		02226	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02226	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Petition		02100	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
		Don't Waste Utah Campaign	01118	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Pettis, Margaret		00772	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Pettis, Margaret		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	--	--	--
	Pickerell, Loretta		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
Utah (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	--	--	--
	Pickerell, 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
Utah (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
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
Utah (continued)									
			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	--	--	--
	Raines, Paula		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	--	--	--
	Raines, Paula		00818	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Rayle, Craig		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	--	--	--
	Redd, Mayor Keith		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

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Utah (continued)									
			00931	00009	DC	C.4.1.5.1	--	--	--
	Reece, Ron	Utah Audubon Society	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	--	--	--
			02114	00006	----------	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02114	00007	DC	C.7.1.1.5	C.7.2.5	--	--
	Relling, Mary V.		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	--	--
			02256	00005	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
	Remington, Bruce		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	--	--	--
			00756	00003	----------	C.3.1.3	--	--	--
	Riley, Brent	ROCPAC	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

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Utah (continued)									
			01391	00017	----------	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Riley, Brent C.	Respectors of Canyonlands PAC	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
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)									
			02710	00002	----------	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
	Salt, Jeff		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	--	--	--
			00820	00010	DC	C.6.3	--	--	--
	Salzberg, Sarah Rule		00102	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Schaffer, Ann		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	--	--
	Seed, Deeda		00758	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00758	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00758	00003	DC	C.7.2.6	--	--	--
			00758	00004	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
	Severance, Owen		00258	00001A	DC	C.4.1.3.4	--	--	--
			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
Utah (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

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
Utah (continued)									
			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	--	--	--
	Spurgin, Patrick	High Level Nuclear Waste Office	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	--	--	--

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Utah (continued)									
			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	--
			01296	00011	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01296	00012	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Steckel, Alex		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	--	--	--
	Stocks, Joe		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	--	--	--
			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	--	--	--
	Stocks, Mayor Tom		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	--	--	--
			00720	00004	----------	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
			00720	00005	----------	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			00720	00006	----------	C.3.4.1	--	--	--
	Sussman, Deborah		01317	00001	----------	C.3.1	--	--	--
	Terrana, Phyllis		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
Utah (continued)									
			00834	00005	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			00834	00007	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Terrana, Phyllis		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	--	--	--
	Thomas, Larry		01390	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			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	--	--	--
	Thompson, Patricia		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	--	--	--
			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	--	--
	Thompson-Hanson, Patricia A.		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	--	--	--
			02204	00008	DC	C.4.1.3.3	C.4.1.3.4	--	--
	Thurman, Dr. David J.	Physicians for Social Resp.	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	--	--	--
	Till, Thomas		00732	00001	----------	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			00732	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
Utah (continued)									
			00732	00003	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00732	00004	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Tippets, Terry		00789	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00789	00002	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00789	00003	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Tooley, John		01078	00001	DC	C.4.1.2.1	--	--	--
			01078	00002	DC	C.4.1.2.1	--	--	--
			01078	00003	DC	C.4.1.2.1	--	--	--
			01078	00004	DC	C.4.1.2.1	--	--	--
			01078	00005	DC	C.4.1.2.1	--	--	--
	Trittschuh, Travis		00738	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00738	00002	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			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	--	--	--
	Turner, Barbara		02244	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02244	00002	----------	C.7.3	--	--	--
	Unsworth, Alan		00817	00001	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00817	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00817	00003	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
	Valdez, Richard		00766	00001	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
			00766	00002	----------	C.2.1.3	--	--	--
			00766	00003	DC	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
			00766	00004	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
			00766	00005	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
	Valdez, Dr. Richard A.		02200	00001	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
			02200	00002	----------	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
			02200	00003	DC	C.4.1.3.2	--	--	--
			02200	00004	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
			02200	00005	DC	C.7.2.2	--	--	--
	Van Frank, Alison		00799	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00799	00002	----------	C.3.2	--	--	--
	Van Frank, Alison		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)									
			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	--	--	--
	Van Gundy, Douglas A.		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	--	--	--
	Walker, Carol		01065	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01065	00002	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01065	00003	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			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
Utah (continued)									
			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	--	--	--
	Walker, Grady		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	--	--	--
			02212	00010	----------	C.3.4.4	C.2.8.1	--	--
	Walker, Mrs. C. Barry		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	--	--	--
			00124	00006	DC	C.7.1.1	--	--	--
	Wallace, Anne		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)									
			00451	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Wallingford, Lucy		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	--	--	--
			00730	00005	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
	Warnick, Rick		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.	Utah Wilderness Association	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
Utah (continued)									
			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	--	--	--
	Werzinski, Ronald		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	--	--	--
			00727	00003	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
	White, Adell		02097	00001	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			02097	00002	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
			02097	00003	----------	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
	Wiggans, Tamara		00924	00001	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00924	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			00924	00004	----------	C.3.2	--	--	--
			00924	00005	----------	C.3.2	--	--	--
	Wilburn, Margaret		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
Utah (continued)									
			01393	00005	DC	C.5.1	C.4.1.2.2	--	--
	Willigan, J. Dennis		00765	00001	DC	C.7.4	--	--	--
			00765	00002	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00765	00003	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
	Willigan, Dr. J. Dennis		00765	00004	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
	Willigan, Dr. J. Dennis	The University of Utah	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	--	--	--
			02199	00004	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
	Wilson, Mayor Ted L.	Salt Lake City Corporation	02190	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Wolfe, Michael		01314	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			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	--	--
	Wright, Marilyn M.		00455	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Yasuda, Don		00746	00001	DC	C.7.4.2	--	--	--
	Young, Marianna		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	--	--
			01295	00007	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Zaccardi, Mike		00819	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00819	00002	----------	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
			00819	00003	DC	C.5.1	C.7.2.8	--	--
			00819	00004	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Zeisloft, John	Utah, High Level Nuclear Waste	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

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Utah (continued)									
			01394	00007B	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01394	00007C	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01394	00008	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01394	00010	DC	C.4.1.1.2	--	--	--
			01394	00011	DC	C.4.1.1.2	--	--	--
			01394	00012A	DC	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01394	00012B	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01394	00013	DC	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01394	00014	DC	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01394	00015A	DC	C.4.1.1.3	--	--	--
			01394	00015B	DC	C.4.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01394	00016	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01394	00017	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01394	00018	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01394	00019	DC	C.4.1.1.5	--	--	--
			01394	00020	DC	C.5.11	--	--	--
			01394	00021	DC	C.4.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01394	00022	DC	C.4.1.1.8	--	--	--
			01394	00023	DC	C.4.1.2.2	--	--	--
			01394	00024	DC	C.6.2	--	--	--
			01394	00025	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01394	00026	DC	C.5.3	--	--	--
			01394	00027A	DC	C.5.6	--	--	--
			01394	00027B	DC	C.5.7	--	--	--
			01394	00028	DC	C.5.8	--	--	--
			01394	00029	----------	C.2.7	--	--	--
			01394	00031	DC	C.4.2.1	--	--	--
			01394	00032	DC	C.4.1.1.1	--	--	--
			01394	00033	DC	C.5.1	--	--	--
			01394	00034	DC	C.4.1.2.2	C.4.1.1.2	--	--
	Zimmerman, John		00726	00001	----------	C.3.4.2	--	--	--
			00726	00002	----------	C.3.4.2.1	C.3.4.3	--	--
			00726	00003	DC	C.7.1.2	C.7.4	--	--
			00726	00005	----------	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			00726	00006	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
Vermont									
	Elton, Wallace		01070	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01070	00002	DC	C.7.2.4	--	--	--
			01070	00003	DC	C.7.2.5	--	--	--
Virginia									
	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	--	--	--
Washington									
		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	--	--	--

INDEX 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
Washington (continued)									
			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
Washington (continued)									
			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.		00239	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Ardaiz, Martha C.		00341	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Arter, Dennis R.	TICOMP	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
Washington (continued)									
			00190	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Bailey, Lyle C.		01299	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Bailie, Toni K.		01509	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Baker, Kris		00298	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Baker, George		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	Save The Resources Committee	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
Washington (continued)									
			02302	00002	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Beare, Dr. John A.	Social & Health Services	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	--	--	--
			01518	00017	----------	C.3.4.3	C.2.7	--	--
	Beckham, Ruth H.		00419	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Beglin, Janice A.		01588	00001	----------	C.2.6	--	--	--
			01588	00002	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01588	00003	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01588	00004	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Beglin, H. E.		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 Healh 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.		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	--	--	--
	Bishop, Warren A.	Nuclear Waste Board	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
Washington (continued)									
			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	--	--	--
	Bishop, Warren A.	WA Nuclear Waste Board	01496	00001	----------	C.2.7.1	--	--	--
			01496	00002	----------	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			01496	00006	----------	C.2.5.1	--	--	--
	Bishop, Warren A.		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
Washington (continued)									
			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	--	--	--
	Bishop, Warren A.	WA State Nuclear Waste Board	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
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
Washington (continued)									
			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
Washington (continued)									
			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
Washington (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
Washington (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
Washington (continued)									
			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	--	--	--
	Bishop, Warren A.		02357	00001	----------	C.2.7.1	--	--	--
			02357	00002	----------	C.2.2	--	--	--
			02357	00003	----------	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			02357	00008	----------	C.2.5.1	--	--	--
	Bissonnette, Joe		02281	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Black, Gloria		01082	00001	----------	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
			01082	00002	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Blackford, Irene		00670	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Blum, Dr. Peter		02406	00001	----------	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
	Boggess, Alva A.		00105	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Bogle, Julie		02552	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	C.7.4	--	--
			02552	00003	----------	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			02552	00004	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02552	00005	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Boldman, Susan		02568	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02568	00002	----------	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Bonifer, Lorrie		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	--	--	--
			01116	00004	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01116	00005	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Bosch, W. Bruce	Clark County PUD	01595	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Braudenberg, M.		01207	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Breithaupt, Steve		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
Washington (continued)									
			02539	00010	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02539	00011	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02539	00012	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Bringloe, Anne		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	--	--	--
			02334	00008	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02334	00009	----------	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			02334	00010	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Bringloe, Anne H.	The Sierra Club	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	--	--	--
	Broscious, Charles		02569	00001	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Brown, Mr. & Mrs. A. N.		00295	00001	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			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
Washington (continued)									
			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
Washington (continued)									
			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)									
	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	--	--	--
	Clausen, Phyllis		02501	00001	----------	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			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	--	--	--
	Cogle, S. J.		01538	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Cole, Byron & Family		00643	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00643	00003	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00643	00004	----------	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
	Colony, Stephanie		01103	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01103	00002	----------	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Connel, Bonnie		02295	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Cordes, Deanne		01112	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01112	00002	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01112	00003	----------	C.2.8	--	--	--
	Corey, Barbara		02372	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Corley-Wheeler, Nancy		01549	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Corvin, Scott A.		00274	00002	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Cory, Barbara		02345	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Cosby, Judith		01245	00001	----------	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
Washington (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
Washington (continued)									
			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
Washington (continued)									
			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	--	--	--
	Dilger, Bob		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	--	--	--
	Dodd, Celeste		02352	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Donovan, Mr. Virgil		02291	00002	----------	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
	Donnally, Lisa		02348	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Douglas, Hector		02338	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			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	--	--	--
	Douglas, Hector		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	--	--	--
	Downing, L. E.	Natl Assoc Retired Vet.	02571	00002	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02571	00003	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02571	00004	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Drakovich, Elizabeth		01587	00001	----------	C.3.1.1	--	--	--
			01587	00009	----------	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
	Draskovich, Libby		00466	00009	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Drew, Alice C.		00273	00002	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Eagle, WA State		00214	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Eaton, Clark	Int'l Trollers Coalition	02087	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	C.7.2	--	--
			02087	00002	----------	C.3.1.2	C.7.2	--	--
	Ebert, L. C.		00240	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00240	00002	----------	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
Washington (continued)									
			00240	00003	----------	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
			00240	00004	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Ebert, L.C.		00663	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00663	00002	----------	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
			00663	00003	----------	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
			00663	00004	----------	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
			00663	00005	----------	C.2.5.2	--	--	--
			00663	00006	----------	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			00663	00007	----------	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
	Ebert, L.C.		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	--	--	--
			00402	00006	----------	C.7.3	--	--	--
	Edwards, Bobby		02386	00001	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Eisenman, Marilyn		00110	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Eldridge, Les	Thurston County Commissioners	01501	00002	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01501	00003	----------	C.3.1.2	C.5.8	--	--
			01501	00005	----------	C.2.4.1	C.7.3	--	--
			01501	00006	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01501	00007	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Eldridge, Les		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	--	--	--
	Englehart, Cindy		02395	00003	----------	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
	Evans, Stephen		00291	00001	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Fiddler, Mary		00158	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
Washington (continued)									
			00158	00003	----------	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
	Fields & Aylward, Mary & John	University of Washington	01132	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01132	00002	----------	C.3.4.2.2	--	--	--
	Filby, Royston H.	WSU, Nuclear Waste Board	01528	00009	----------	C.5.11	C.5.11	--	--
	Foley, Chuck		02384	00001	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02384	00002	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02384	00004	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Ford, Lillian		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		02433	00003	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Foster, Dianne & Vincent		02084	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02084	00002	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02084	00003	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Fowler, Hugh A.	WA State, Dept. Emergency Mngt.	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.	WSU, Environmental Science	01522	00001	----------	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
	Frazier, C. Cheryl		01136	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Fresk, Gary		02335	00001	----------	C.2.7	--	--	--
			02335	00002	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02335	00003	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
			02335	00004	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02335	00005	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Fresk, Gary	Washington Waste Site Study Grp.	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
Washington (continued)									
			02333	00009	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02333	00010	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02333	00011	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Friedman, Albert		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	--	--	--
			02364	00010	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02364	00011	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Fry, Elaine		02531	00002	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02531	00003	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02531	00004	----------	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
	Fuller, Mayor Walline	City of Stevenson	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	--	--	--
			02336	00018	----------	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
	Garber, Loren	WASHPIRG	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
Washington (continued)									
			02367	00018	----------	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
	Gardner, Barbara A.		01169	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01169	00003	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01169	00004	----------	C.2.3	--	--	--
			01169	00006	----------	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
	Gardner, Barbara A.	Nuclear Waste Board	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
Washington (continued)									
			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
Washington (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, Kathryne 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
Washington (continued)									
			02419	00004	----------	C.2.8.3	--	--	--
	Hemphill, Jeanne T.		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	--	--	--
	Houff, Rev. William		02519	00001	----------	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02519	00002	----------	C.3.2	--	--	--
			02519	00003	----------	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
	Houff, Patty		02551	00002	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02551	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
Washington (continued)									
			02551	00004	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Houff, Dr. William Harper		02604	00002	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Houff, Dr. William Harper	Hanford Education Action League	02582	00001	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Houff, Dr. William Harper	Spokane Unitarian Church	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
Washington (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

STATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION	LETTER NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER	SITE	CLASSIFICATION FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
Washington (continued)									
			00685	00003	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00685	00007	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	King, Joseph E.	House of Representatives	01576	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01576	00002	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01576	00003	----------	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
	Kinne, Susan		00035	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00035	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00035	00003	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
	Kjolso, Mike		00686	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00686	00002	----------	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			00686	00003	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00686	00007	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Kriedler, Senator Mike	Washington State Senate	00418	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00418	00002	----------	C.2.8	--	--	--
			00418	00003	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00418	00004	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Krueger, Robert F.		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
Washington (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
Washington (continued)									
	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	--	--	--
	Lewis, Robin L.		00393	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Lewis, Lynne L.		00666	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00666	00002	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Liebeler, Penelope		02102	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Long, Bobbi Davis		01170	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01170	00002	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Lorenzo, A. Jane		00550	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Lunde, Barbara J.		00492	00001	----------	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
	Lutes, Joy L.		00512	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00512	00002	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00512	00003	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00512	00004	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Lutes, Joy		02325	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02325	00002	----------	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			02325	00004	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Lyon, James M.		00285	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Maag, Judith R.		00684	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00684	00002	----------	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			00684	00003	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00684	00007	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Maloney, Mrs. D. K.		00481	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00481	00002	DC	C.7.2	--	--	--
			00481	00003	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Mangan, Al		00094	00001	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Mangan, Al		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, Al		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
Washington (continued)									
			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	--	--	--
	Mangan, Al	HCRI	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.	Washington State University	00625	00006	----------	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Mayer, William H.	FEMA, RX	00255	00001	----------	C.2.7	--	--	--
			00255	00002	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	McAllister, Maxine		00682	00001	----------	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			00682	00002	----------	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			00682	00003	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00682	00007	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	McAllister, Susan		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
Washington (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
Washington (continued)									
			02544	00004	----------	C.2.2.1	--	--	--
			02544	00005	----------	C.2.3.2	--	--	--
	Mickelson, Amy		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
Washington (continued)									
			02331	00004	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Newell, Greg		00416	00001	----------	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Noll, Alice		02392	00001	----------	C.2.6.1	--	--	--
			02392	00003	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Novak, Terry		02526	00002	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Novak, Terry L.	City of Spokane	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
Washington (continued)									
			01121	00002	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Para, Molly J.		00535	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Parson, Janice		02266	00001	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Partain, Dr. William L.		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
Washington (continued)									
			02557	00003	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Pollet, Gerald		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	--	--	--
	Powell, Walbridge J.		02380	00001	----------	C.2.7	--	--	--
			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	--	--	--
			01499	00021	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Poyner, Mayor John	City of Richland	02301	00001	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			02301	00003	----------	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
Washington (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
Washington (continued)									
			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
Washington (continued)									
			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
Washington (continued)									
			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	--	--	--
			01273	00130	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01273	00136	----------	C.3.4.3	--	--	--
			01273	00138	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01273	00139	----------	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
	Saracino,Jr., Anthony V.		00349	00004	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Sauers, Jack		00250	00003	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Savage, Cathy		01155	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			01155	00002	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
			01155	00003	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Scherpelz, Robert I.		00675	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			00675	00002	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	Schmidt, Cynthia M.		00665	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	Schmidt, Bob		02280	00001	----------	C.2.3.1	--	--	--
			02280	00002	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			02280	00003	----------	C.2.1.2	--	--	--
	Schoen, Mayor George A.	Town of South Cle Elum	00238	00001	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			00238	00002	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
	Schultz, Stephen		01196	00001	----------	C.2.3.3	--	--	--
			01196	00002	----------	C.2.3	--	--	--
			01196	00003	----------	C.2.3	--	--	--
			01196	00007	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
	See, Molly		01327	00001	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			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		02268	00001	----------	C.2.1.1	--	--	--
	See, Elizabeth		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
Washington (continued)									
	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
Washington (continued)									
	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
Washington (continued)									
			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	--	--	--
	Thomas, Angelina Cory		01126	00001	----------	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
			01126	00002A	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01126	00002B	----------	C.3.1.2	--	--	--
			01126	00003	----------	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
			01126	00005	----------	C.2.4.1	--	--	--
	Thomas, James		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	--	--	--
			02512	00012	----------	C.2.7	--	--	--
	Thomas, James P.		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	--	--	--
			02575	00012	----------	C.2.8	--	--	--
	Tickner, Arthur L. and Wyn		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
Washington (continued)									
	Tisch, Shirley		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	House of Representatives	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		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	Tri-City Nuc. Industrial Council	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
Washington (continued)									
	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
Washington (continued)									
	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		02398	00001	----------	C.2.8.2	--	--	--
	Wilkinson, J.R.		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	--	--	--
			02584	00015	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02584	00016	----------	C.3.4.4	--	--	--
			02584	00017	----------	C.2.8.1	--	--	--
	Williams, Agatha		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
Washington (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	--	--	--

INDEX 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)									
			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 Al	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 Al		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
Washington (continued)									
	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	--	--	--
Wisconsin									
	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	--	--	--
Wyoming									
	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
Wyoming (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	--	--	--

☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1986-153-330