levels in the performance of the engineered barriers. That range of performance levels shall vary by at least a factor of 10 above and below the engineered-barrier performance requirements set forth in 10 CFR 60.113, and the range considered shall be identical for all sites compared. The comparisons shall assume equivalent engineered barrier performance for all sites compared and shall be structured so that engineered barriers are not relied upon to compensate for deficiencies in the geologic media. Furthermore, engineered barriers shall not be used to compensate for an inadequate site; mask the innate deficiencies of a site; disguise the strengths and weaknesses of a site and the overall system; and mask differences between sites when they are compared. Releases of different radionuclides shall be combined by the methods specified in appendix A of 40 CFR part 191.

(f) The comparisons specified in paragraph (e) of this section shall consist of two comparative evaluations that predict radionuclide releases for 100,000 years after repository closure and shall be conducted as follows. First, the sites shall be compared by means of evaluations that emphasize the performance of the natural barriers at the site. Second, the sites shall be compared by means of evaluations that emphasize the performance of the total repository system. These second evaluations shall consider the expected performance of the repository system; be based on the expected performance of waste packages and waste forms, in compliance with the requirements of 10 CFR 60.113, and on the expected hydrological and geochemical conditions at each site; and take credit for the expected performance of all other engineered components of the repository system. The comparison of isolation capability shall be one of the significant considerations in the recommendation of sites for the development of repositories. The first of the two comparative evaluations specified in the paragraph (e) of this section shall take precedence unless the second comparative evaluation would lead to substantially different recommendations. In the latter case, the two comparative evaluations shall receive comparable consideration. Sites with predicted isolation capabilities that differ by less than a factor of 10, with similar uncertainties, may be assumed to provide equivalent isolation.

[66 FR 57334, Nov. 14, 2001]

§ 960.3–2 Siting process.

The siting process begins with site screening for the identification of potentially acceptable sites. This process was completed for purposes of the first repository before the enactment of the Act, and the identification of such sites was made after enactment in accordance with the provisions of section 116(a) of the Act. The screening process for the identification of potentially acceptable sites for the second and subsequent repositories shall be conducted in accordance with the requirements specified in §960.3–2–1 of this subpart. The nomination of any site as suitable for characterization shall follow the process specified in §960.3–2–2, and such nomination shall be accompanied by an environmental assessment as specified in section 112(b)(1)(E) of the Act. The recommendation of sites as candidate sites for characterization shall be accomplished in accordance with the requirements specified in §960.3–2–3.


§ 960.3–2–1 Site screening for potentially acceptable sites.

To identify potentially acceptable sites for the development of other than the first repository, the process shall begin with site-screening activities that consider large land masses that contain rock formations of suitable depth, thickness, and lateral extent and have structural, hydrologic, and tectonic features favorable for waste containment and isolation. Within those large land masses, subsequent site-screening activities shall focus on successively smaller and increasingly more suitable land units. This process shall be developed in consultation with the States that contain land units under consideration. It shall be implemented in a sequence of steps that first applies the applicable disqualifying conditions to eliminate land units on the basis of the evidence specified in
§ 960.3–2–2 Nomination of sites as suitable for characterization.

From the sites identified as potentially acceptable, the Secretary shall nominate at least five sites determined suitable for site characterization for the selection of each repository site. For the second repository, at least three of the sites shall not have been nominated previously. Any site nominated as suitable for characterization for the first repository, but not recommended as a candidate site for characterization, may not be nominated as suitable for characterization for the second repository. The nomination of a site as suitable for characterization shall be accompanied by an environmental assessment as specified in section 112(b)(1)(E) of the Act. Such nomination shall be based on evaluations in accordance with the guidelines of this part, and the bases and relevant details of those evaluations and of the decision processes involved therein shall be contained in the environmental assessment for the site in the manner specified in this subpart. The evidence required to support such evaluations and siting decisions is specified in §960.3–1–4–2.

§ 960.3–2–2–1 Evaluation of all potentially acceptable sites.

First, in considering sites for nomination, each of the potentially acceptable sites shall be evaluated on the basis of the disqualifying conditions specified in the technical guidelines of subparts C and D, in accordance with the application requirements set forth in appendix III of this part. This evaluation shall support a finding by the DOE that such sites is not disqualified.

First, in considering sites for nomination, each of the potentially acceptable sites shall be evaluated on the basis of the disqualifying conditions specified in the technical guidelines of subparts C and D, in accordance with the application requirements set forth in appendix III of this part. This evaluation shall support a finding by the DOE that such sites is not disqualified.