

1 COMMITTEE: Agriculture and Energy  
2 POLICY: Radioactive Waste Management (*Joint with the*  
3 *Environment Committee*)  
4 TYPE OF POLICY: Existing  
5

6 **Low-Level Waste**  
7

8 Congress mandated that the states assume total responsibility for providing commercial low-  
9 level waste disposal capacity with the passage and enactment of the Low-Level Radioactive  
10 Waste Policy Act 1980 and the Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Amendments Act of  
11 1985. These laws encouraged states to develop regional solutions to siting low-level  
12 radioactive waste disposal facilities. NCSL believes that states are best prepared to license  
13 and regulate low-level waste disposal facilities that operate within their borders in order to  
14 protect the health, safety and welfare of their citizens.  
15

16 Since passage of the Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Act of 1980 and the Amendments  
17 Act of 1985, many changes have occurred in the low-level waste public policy arena-changes  
18 in the industries and institutions that create low-level waste, and changes in state efforts to  
19 pursue development of low-level radioactive waste disposal facilities.  
20

21 State legislators have examined closely the market forces and new trends that have altered  
22 many state and compact perceptions of what is needed to efficiently manage low-level  
23 radioactive waste (LLRW) disposal. Legislators have identified the following reasons that  
24 many states and compacts have abandoned efforts to build disposal capacity:  
25

- 26 • decreasing volumes of LLRW nationwide;
- 27
- 28 • continued access to operational disposal facilities; and
- 29
- 30 • the numerous barriers that hinder development of disposal facilities, including higher  
31 development costs than projected.

32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62

South Carolina hosts a disposal facility in Barnwell that accepted low-level waste from generators in every state. Since June 30, 2008, acceptance was limited to organizations located in the Atlantic Compact Region, which includes South Carolina, Connecticut, and New Jersey. Washington State hosts a disposal facility that accepts waste from generators in the Northwest Interstate Compact and the Rocky Mountain Compact. Utah has licensed a private sector facility that also is open to generators across the country for Class A and lower low-level radioactive waste. Most states and compacts have slowed or stopped their work.

NCSL believes that the Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Act of 1980 and the Amendments Act of 1985, the federal laws which governs low-level radioactive waste management, no longer address adequately the conditions of the marketplace and state efforts to provide disposal for low-level waste.

NCSL urges Congress to review the Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Act and the Low-Level Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1985-especially Title II, the Omnibus Low-Level Radioactive Waste Interstate Compact Consent Act-to determine whether other options for disposal by regional compact or unaffiliated state are available. In doing so, Congress should:

- Rely upon the U.S. General Accountability Office reports, Low-Level Radioactive Wastes: States Are Not Developing Disposal Facilities (GAO/RCED-99-238, September 1999) and Low Level Radioactive Waste: Disposal Availability Adequate in Short Term, but Oversight Needed to Identify Any Future Shortfalls (GAO-04-604, June 2004), in order to:
- Analyze developments in the industries and institutions that generate low-level waste, such as waste minimization and volume reduction; and
- Examine state and compact efforts to develop disposal sites and the difficulties encountered by the host states.

- 63
- 64 • Continue to provide states both with support and flexibility in their efforts to provide  
65 generators with consistent access to low-level radioactive waste disposal to encourage  
66 and support alternative long term storage and disposal technologies, such as assured  
67 isolation.
- 68
- 69 • Maintain state and compact authority to limit/allow the import and export of waste to  
70 and from their state or region.
- 71
- 72 • Recognize that some states and compacts are concerned that future access to  
73 disposal facilities is uncertain and that these states and compacts may need  
74 alternative facilities in order to provide disposal and assured isolation to their  
75 generators.
- 76
- 77 • Acknowledge the role that licensed private disposal and assured isolation facilities can  
78 play in meeting generators' needs for safe, cost-effective disposal of low-level  
79 radioactive waste, while also recognizing and supporting state authority to regulate  
80 these facilities.
- 81
- 82 • Consider an evaluation of the feasibility of co-location of commercial disposal (or  
83 assured isolation) facilities at U.S. Department of Energy sites that would be licensed  
84 and regulated by the host states.
- 85
- 86 • Clarify in statute the responsibility of the federal government for federal waste, identify  
87 any federal waste that might be disposed at compact facilities, and ensure that any  
88 federal waste disposed of at compact or unaffiliated state facilities is subject to  
89 negotiation and the same laws, regulations, fees and requirements as nonfederal  
90 waste. (See DOE National Low Level Waste/Mixed Low Level Waste Disposition  
91 Strategy, 2006)
- 92
- 93 • Closely monitor the progress of the involved federal agencies with regard to the issue  
of mixed wastes, ensuring that a clear policy is defined and interagency differences

94 are resolved. (See DOE National Low Level Waste/Mixed Low Level Waste  
95 Disposition Strategy, 2006)

- 96  
97 • Address the issue of the disposal of NORM and NARM (naturally occurring and  
98 accelerator produced radioactive material) waste and mixed waste, in particular with  
99 regard to reconciling the different regulatory actions of the Nuclear Regulatory  
100 Commission (NRC) and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

101  
102 NCSL will continue to provide assistance to the states during the development and  
103 implementation of low-level waste management activities. NCSL encourages the federal  
104 government to work with NCSL toward that end.

### 105 106 **High-Level Waste and Used Fuel Management**

107  
108 Congress passed the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, requiring the U.S. Department of  
109 Energy (DOE) to manage the program according to the process and schedule established by  
110 Congress. The success of this project requires public understanding and confidence, which is  
111 fostered by open communication and collaboration among all affected parties. To that end,  
112 Congress assigned DOE the responsibility to consult and cooperate with other federal  
113 agencies, state executive and legislative branches and affected Indian tribes.

114  
115 The Department of Energy missed the January 30, 1998 contractual deadline with utilities to  
116 begin accepting used nuclear fuel. In order to protect the integrity of the Nuclear Waste Fund  
117 against potential off-sets of the federal deficit, to expedite the timing of funding for DOE to  
118 refocus their efforts and eventually complete the licensing and construction of a repository,  
119 NCSL urges Congress and the Administration/DOE to:

- 120  
121 • Expediently research, develop and license a high-level waste/used nuclear fuel  
122 disposal facility at a technically and scientifically suitable site.
- 123  
124 • In the event it is deemed necessary either to select another potential high-level  
125 waste/used nuclear fuel repository site, a second repository, interim storage sites, or

126 recycling facilities, keep states informed, consult with them to ensure they play an  
127 integral role in the determination of site selection criteria and obtain state consent  
128 before locating facility.

129

130 • Enact legislation to classify annual funding from the Nuclear Waste Fund as  
131 mandatory spending and ensure that levels are adequate to meet the changing needs  
132 of the program as DOE refocuses waste management efforts; funds should be isolated  
133 for developing an interim storage site(s) and permanent repository.. It is critical that  
134 the Nuclear Waste Fund be given spending firewalls that ensure that user fees  
135 deposited in the fund will be used for nuclear waste management and will not be  
136 subject to non-related federal discretionary spending.

137

138 • Direct DOE to expedite research, development and licensing for the recycling of  
139 nuclear waste as a fuel for nuclear power plants and as a means to reduce the volume  
140 of high-level waste/used nuclear fuel requiring final disposal in a permanent repository.

141

142 • Provide adequate and necessary funds to DOE for their used nuclear fuel  
143 management program.

144

145 NCSL urges Congress and the Administration/ DOE to expeditiously identify a “Blue Ribbon  
146 Panel” and define a path forward for used nuclear fuel, including interim storage and a long  
147 term repository. The “Blue Ribbon Panel” should consult with local and state government  
148 officials throughout this process. Once the BRP reaches conclusions, they shall expeditiously  
149 define and implement a path forward for used nuclear fuel.

150

151 In an effort to clarify and enhance the role of host states in the high-level waste/used nuclear  
152 fuel repository site selection, characterization and licensing process, NCSL supports the  
153 following:

154

155 • Host states, through their executive and legislative branches, should be fully informed  
156 and consulted at each step in the process of site selection, evaluation, planning and

157 development and licensing, and a facility should not be located without the fully  
158 informed consent of that state.

159

160 • Volunteer host states with appropriate geologic features should be considered during  
161 the site selection process for a long term repository.

162

163 • Congress and DOE should provide fair and equitable compensation for the life of the  
164 project to state and local governments of host states. This should include funding of  
165 independent oversight activities by the executive and legislative branches so that the  
166 host state may participate in and conduct its own assessments of a proposed waste  
167 repository site and disposal technology, as allowed in the federal act.

168

169 • The federal government should comply with state laws and regulations during the  
170 process of site selection and characterization, and the construction, operation and  
171 decommissioning of a waste repository, including those laws which implement  
172 regulatory authority delegated by the federal government to the states under  
173 environmental statutes.

174

175 Our mutual interest requires a timely and thorough scientific investigation of any proposed  
176 candidate site to determine its suitability as a high-level waste/used nuclear fuel repository.  
177 Therefore, NCSL urges Congress to clarify the manner in which the national high-level waste  
178 program will be carried out consistent with all states' (including the host state's) interest.

179

180 DOE should continue to work with NCSL and similar organizations in an effort to ensure that  
181 state legislators are included in each step of the process.

182

### 183 **Interim Storage**

184

185 NCSL supports Congressional action to direct the Department of Energy to develop a plan to  
186 take custody used nuclear fuel currently stored at reactor sites to both reduce costs that are  
187 ultimately borne by the taxpayer and demonstrate that DOE can move forward in the near-  
188 term with at least some element of nuclear waste management.

189 NCSL urges Congress and the administration/DOE to:

190

191 • Work closely with state legislatures, local governments and governors to bring about  
192 interim storage for used nuclear fuel for the United States for a specific, limited period  
193 of time.

194

195 • Create a process that includes working closely with the nuclear industry and interested  
196 volunteer communities, localities and states.

197

198 • Pursue the development of one or two private Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
199 licensed, interim storage facilities to which used nuclear fuel can be safely shipped  
200 and stored until such time as a permanent repository is open and commercial nuclear  
201 fuel recycling facilities are available.

202

203 • Develop financing mechanisms, using the Nuclear Waste Fund, to support interim  
204 storage facilities.

205

206 • Determine the Department of Energy's role and responsibilities under the Nuclear  
207 Waste Policy Act in moving used nuclear fuel, including fuel from decommissioned  
208 plant sites, to interim storage facilities.

209

210 If off-site interim storage of used nuclear fuel is enacted by Congress, the timeframe for  
211 storing such waste at interim storage sites should be no longer than 25 years.

212

## 213 **Recycling**

214

215 Recycling high-level waste/used nuclear fuel should be a radioactive waste management  
216 priority. NCSL encourages Congress and the Administration to:

217

218 • Develop a high-level waste/ used nuclear fuel recycling policy that indicates that  
219 recycling is a priority waste management strategy.

220

- 221       • Allow funding for appropriate recycling actions from the Nuclear Waste Fund,  
222           including those that accomplish initiation of high-level waste/used nuclear fuel  
223           recycling to reduce the volume of waste requiring final disposal in a permanent  
224           repository.

225

## 226   **Transportation of Radioactive Waste and Used Nuclear Fuel**

227

228   DOE is responsible for transporting high-level waste/used nuclear fuel to the proposed  
229   repository (or any interim storage site or recycling facility) as well as for shipments of  
230   transuranic waste to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP). To assure a technically superior  
231   transportation system and to help attain public confidence in the safe transportation of  
232   nuclear waste, NCSL urges Congress and DOE to:

233

- 234       • Comply with states' ability to assess reasonable fees which fund activities connected  
235           to the safe routine transportation of and emergency response to high-level waste/used  
236           nuclear fuel shipments. DOE should seek to enter into a memorandum of  
237           understanding with each corridor state to spell out responsibilities, liability,  
238           compensation, response time, cleanup, shipping, planning and other duties connected  
239           with emergency situations.

240

- 241       • Provide opportunities and funding for training of state and local emergency responders  
242           to radiological accidents that are coordinated with ongoing programs for emergency  
243           preparedness. DOE is encouraged to continue discussions with states and affected  
244           parties on how to meet the Section 180(c) requirements of the NWPA that require  
245           technical assistance and funding for training of state and local public safety officials  
246           along routes for DOE shipments of high-level waste/used nuclear fuel with respect to  
247           safe routine transportation of these materials and emergency response situations.  
248           States anticipate DOE's publication of 180(c) policies in the federal register.

249

- 250       • Assure transportation accident prevention through the use of superior drivers; carrier  
251           compliance with shipping contracts and all applicable federal, state and local  
252           regulations; independent safety inspections of drivers, vehicles and shipping



253 containers; designation of safe parking areas during abnormal conditions; advance  
254 notice to the appropriate state and local agencies regarding shipments; and state  
255 access to information on shipments' status (i.e. real-time shipment tracking information  
256 where appropriate).

257

258 • Apply special criteria to the shipment of high-level waste/used nuclear fuel, including  
259 the development of guidelines for routing when shipping by rail, the use of dedicated  
260 trains moving at safe speeds for rail shipments, safety inspections at origin and  
261 enroute, and full-scale testing of casks used for used fuel transport.

262

263 • Consult with NCSL and the states on how to best communicate with and involve the  
264 general public and government officials as to shipment methods, accident prevention  
265 approaches, and emergency response plans.

266

267 • Involve state, local and tribal governments in a meaningful manner in the development  
268 of cask designs, support facilities, transportation equipment and other elements of the  
269 transportation system.

270

271 • Consult with all affected parties regarding cask compliance with radiation emissions  
272 standards. Because cask integrity and safety is of paramount concern in a  
273 transportation system, all affected parties must be involved in a consultation process  
274 including, but not limited to, states, local governments, Indian tribes, carriers, labor, the  
275 Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Department of Transportation, the Occupational  
276 Safety and Health Administration, the Federal Emergency Management Agency and  
277 the Environmental Protection Agency.

278

279 • Encourage the use of dual-purpose (transportation and storage) and universal casks  
280 (transportation, storage and disposal) - or TADs (transportation, aging, and disposal) -  
281 to reduce the handling of used fuel, and thus reduce the risk of mishaps and lessen  
282 worker exposure,

283

- 284       • Encourage development and the funding of state emergency management  
285           communications centers in corridor states and host states to enhance emergency  
286           preparedness and response along designated routes.

287

## 288   **Waste Isolation Pilot Plant**

289

290   In accordance with Public Law 96-164, the Department of Energy designed the Waste  
291   Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) as the first permanent repository for defense generated  
292   transuranic (TRU) waste.

293

294   The Waste Isolation Pilot Plant Land Withdrawal Act (PL 102-579), passed by Congress in  
295   1992, allows for further testing and experiments to determine the viability of radioactive waste  
296   disposal in deep geologic salt formations as recommended by the National Academy of  
297   Sciences in 1955.

298

299   WIPP received its first shipment of contact handled TRU waste on March 26, 1999. All  
300   shipments to date have been made without radiological release.

301

302   NCSL urges Congress and DOE to:

303

- 304       • Appropriate adequate funds and direct the Department of Energy and the  
305           Environmental Protection Agency to expedite their respective responsibilities under  
306           Public Laws 96-164 and 102-579.

307

- 308       • Implement through DOE, a compensation program that recognizes equity  
309           considerations for state and local governments hosting a TRU waste repository and  
310           the federal government's obligation to provide such compensation.

311

- 312       • Provide assistance to the host community to subsidize and maintain an independent  
313           environmental monitoring and analytical laboratory to ensure public confidence and  
314           safety.

315

- 316
- Provide assistance to corridor states and other affected states for highway  
317 maintenance and improvements, emergency response training and equipment, and  
318 public education.
- 319
- Streamline, replace or eliminate waste characterization procedures that are neither  
320 required by law, nor bring scientific evidence as to the character of the waste, or  
321 expose workers unnecessarily when alternative methodologies could be used.
- 322
- Provide a central confirmation facility at the waste site to assure the character of the  
323 waste and give the states more direct oversight of the nature of the waste.
- 324
- Provide a central confirmation facility at the waste site to assure the character of the  
325 waste and give the states more direct oversight of the nature of the waste.
- 326
- Change the Land Withdrawal Act to accommodate a larger volume and activity of  
327 waste and include transuranic waste between 10 and 100 nanocuries, commercial  
328 transuranic waste and other orphan categories of waste appropriate for disposal at  
329 WIPP.
- 330
- 331