

1 COMMITTEE: Environment
2 POLICY: Radioactive Waste Management (*Joint with the*
3 *Agriculture and Energy 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

120 NCSL urges Congress and the Administration/DOE to:

- 121
- 122 • Expeditiously research, develop and license a high-level waste/used nuclear fuel
123 disposal facility at a technically and scientifically suitable site.

- 125 • In the event it is deemed necessary either to select another potential high-level
126 waste/used nuclear fuel repository site, a second repository, interim storage sites, or
127 recycling facilities, keep states informed, consult with them to ensure they play an
128 integral role in the determination of site selection criteria and obtain state consent
129 before locating facility.
- 130
- 131 • Enact legislation to classify annual funding from the Nuclear Waste Fund as
132 mandatory spending and ensure that levels are adequate to meet the changing needs
133 of the program as DOE refocuses waste management efforts; funds should be isolated
134 for developing an interim storage site(s) and permanent repository.. It is critical that
135 the Nuclear Waste Fund be given spending firewalls that ensure that user fees
136 deposited in the fund will be used for nuclear waste management and will not be
137 subject to non-related federal discretionary spending.
- 138
- 139 • Direct DOE to expedite research, development and licensing for the recycling of
140 nuclear waste as a fuel for nuclear power plants and as a means to reduce the volume
141 of high-level waste/used nuclear fuel requiring final disposal in a permanent repository.
- 142
- 143 • Provide adequate and necessary funds to DOE for their used nuclear fuel
144 management program.
- 145

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

151

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

155

- 156 • Host states, through their executive and legislative branches, should be fully informed
157 and consulted at each step in the process of site selection, evaluation, planning and
158 development and licensing, and a facility should not be located without the fully
159 informed consent of that state.
- 160
- 161 • Volunteer host states with appropriate geologic features should be considered during
162 the site selection process for a long term repository.
- 163
- 164 • Congress and DOE should provide fair and equitable compensation for the life of the
165 project to state and local governments of host states. This should include funding of
166 independent oversight activities by the executive and legislative branches so that the
167 host state may participate in and conduct its own assessments of a proposed waste
168 repository site and disposal technology, as allowed in the federal act.
- 169
- 170 • The federal government should comply with state laws and regulations during the
171 process of site selection and characterization, and the construction, operation and
172 decommissioning of a waste repository, including those laws which implement
173 regulatory authority delegated by the federal government to the states under
174 environmental statutes.
- 175

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

180

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

183

184 **Interim Storage**

185

186 NCSL supports Congressional action to direct the Department of Energy to develop a plan to
187 take custody used nuclear fuel currently stored at reactor sites to both reduce costs that are

188 ultimately borne by the taxpayer and demonstrate that DOE can move forward in the near-
189 term with at least some element of nuclear waste management.

190

191 NCSL urges Congress and the administration/DOE to:

192

- 193 • Work closely with state legislatures, local governments and governors to bring about
194 interim storage for used nuclear fuel for the United States for a specific, limited period
195 of time.
- 196
- 197 • Create a process that includes working closely with the nuclear industry and interested
198 volunteer communities, localities and states.
- 199
- 200 • Pursue the development of one or two private Nuclear Regulatory Commission
201 licensed, interim storage facilities to which used nuclear fuel can be safely shipped
202 and stored until such time as a permanent repository is open and commercial nuclear
203 fuel recycling facilities are available.
- 204
- 205 • Develop financing mechanisms, using the Nuclear Waste Fund, to support interim
206 storage facilities.
- 207
- 208 • Determine the Department of Energy's role and responsibilities under the Nuclear
209 Waste Policy Act in moving used nuclear fuel, including fuel from decommissioned
210 plant sites, to interim storage facilities.

211

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

214

215 **Recycling**

216

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

219

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

222

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

227

228 **Transportation of Radioactive Waste and Used Nuclear Fuel**

229

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

235

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

242

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

251

- 252
- 253
- 254
- 255
- 256
- 257
- 258
- 259
- 260
- 261
- 262
- 263
- 264
- 265
- 266
- 267
- 268
- 269
- 270
- 271
- 272
- 273
- 274
- 275
- 276
- 277
- 278
- 279
- 280
- 281
- 282
- Assure transportation accident prevention through the use of superior drivers; carrier compliance with shipping contracts and all applicable federal, state and local regulations; independent safety inspections of drivers, vehicles and shipping containers; designation of safe parking areas during abnormal conditions; advance notice to the appropriate state and local agencies regarding shipments; and state access to information on shipments' status (i.e. real-time shipment tracking information where appropriate).
 - Apply special criteria to the shipment of high-level waste/used nuclear fuel, including the development of guidelines for routing when shipping by rail, the use of dedicated trains moving at safe speeds for rail shipments, safety inspections at origin and enroute, and full-scale testing of casks used for used fuel transport.
 - Consult with NCSL and the states on how to best communicate with and involve the general public and government officials as to shipment methods, accident prevention approaches, and emergency response plans.
 - Involve state, local and tribal governments in a meaningful manner in the development of cask designs, support facilities, transportation equipment and other elements of the transportation system.
 - Consult with all affected parties regarding cask compliance with radiation emissions standards. Because cask integrity and safety is of paramount concern in a transportation system, all affected parties must be involved in a consultation process including, but not limited to, states, local governments, Indian tribes, carriers, labor, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Department of Transportation, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the Environmental Protection Agency.
 - Encourage the use of dual-purpose (transportation and storage) and universal casks (transportation, storage and disposal) - or TADs (transportation, aging, and disposal) -

283 to reduce the handling of used fuel, and thus reduce the risk of mishaps and lessen
284 worker exposure,

285

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

289

290 **Waste Isolation Pilot Plant**

291

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

295

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

300

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

303

304 NCSL urges Congress and DOE to:

305

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

309

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

313

- 314
- Provide assistance to the host community to subsidize and maintain an independent
315 environmental monitoring and analytical laboratory to ensure public confidence and
316 safety.
- 317
- Provide assistance to corridor states and other affected states for highway
318 maintenance and improvements, emergency response training and equipment, and
319 public education.
- 320
- Streamline, replace or eliminate waste characterization procedures that are neither
321 required by law, nor bring scientific evidence as to the character of the waste, or
322 expose workers unnecessarily when alternative methodologies could be used.
- 323
- Provide a central confirmation facility at the waste site to assure the character of the
324 waste and give the states more direct oversight of the nature of the waste.
- 325
- Change the Land Withdrawal Act to accommodate a larger volume and activity of
326 waste and include transuranic waste between 10 and 100 nanocuries, commercial
327 transuranic waste and other orphan categories of waste appropriate for disposal at
328 WIPP.
- 329
- Change the Land Withdrawal Act to accommodate a larger volume and activity of
330 waste and include transuranic waste between 10 and 100 nanocuries, commercial
331 transuranic waste and other orphan categories of waste appropriate for disposal at
332 WIPP.
- 333