**Questions**

**Considerations for locating storage facility sites**

1. Should the Administrator take into account, when considering candidate storage facility sites, the extent to which a storage facility would: (a) unduly burden a State in which significant volumes of defenses wastes are stored or transuranic wastes are disposed of; or (b) conflict with a compliance agreement requiring the removal of nuclear waste from a site or a statutory prohibition on the storage or disposal of nuclear waste at a site? Alternatively, should the State and other non-federal parties seeking to site a candidate storage facility be allowed to determine whether they are unduly burdened? Should the final consent agreement, which would be sent to Congress for ratification, contain an authorizing provision to amend any conflicting compliance agreement or statutory prohibition?

**Linkage between storage and repository**

2. Should the bill establish a linkage between progress on development of a repository and progress on development of a storage facility? If so, is the linkage proposed in section 306 of the bill appropriate, too strong, or too loose? If a linkage is needed, should it be determined as part of the negotiations between the state and federal governments and included in the consent agreement rather than in the bill?

**Separate process for storage facility siting**

3. Should the bill establish separate storage and disposal programs with clearly defined requirements for each, with any linkage negotiated in the consent agreement between the federal and non-federal parties, to allow the two program to run on separate, but parallel tracks, as proposed in the alternative section 305 (which would replace section 304(b)-(g) of the draft bill)?

4. To what extent should the siting and consensus approval process for spent fuel storage facilities differ from that for the repository? Should the Administrator be required to conduct sufficient site-specific research (referred to as “characterization” in the bill) on candidate storage sites to determine if they are suitable for storing nuclear waste or only on candidate repository sites to determine if they are suitable for geologic disposal of nuclear waste? Should the Administrator be required to hold public hearings both before and after site characterization (as required by current law in the case of the Yucca Mountain site) or only before site characterization?

**Complexity of repository and storage facility siting processes**

5. Should the siting process in section 304 of the draft bill be streamlined? If so, how?

**Governance of the Nuclear Waste Administration**

6. Should the new entity be governed by a single administrator or by a board of directors?

(a) If by a single administrator, should the administrator serve for a fixed term? If so, how long should the term of service be? Should the legislation prescribe qualifications for the administrator? If so, what should be the selection criteria?

(b) If by a board of directors, how many people should comprise the board and how should they be selected?

7. The Blue Ribbon Commission recommended establishment of both a board of directors for management oversight (whose “primary role ... is not to represent all stakeholder views, but rather to carry out fiduciary responsibilities for management oversight”) and “a larger and more widely representative stakeholder advisory committee.” The draft bill responds to these recommendations, first, by establishing a Nuclear Waste Oversight Board of senior federal officials and, second, by authorizing the Administrator to establish advisory committees. Should the Oversight Board and advisory committee be combined into a single body to perform both management oversight and stakeholder representation functions? Should the focus and membership of any advisory committees be established in the legislation or left to the Administrator?

8. Dr. Meserve testified in 2012 that representatives of stakeholders and public utility commissioners should be added to the Nuclear Waste Oversight Board. Would these additions make the Board better able to carry out its fiduciary oversight mission effectively?