
The

Radioactive Exchange®

To promote the exchange of views and information on radioactive waste management

INSIDE: Square Barrels for LLRW	pg. 3	the HLW Focus	pg. 13
Brokers', Processors', Association	pg. 4	Foreign Spent Fuel Transport	pg. 14
Surcharges On Sited Regions	pg. 5	Wrap Up (HLW)	pg. 14
LLRW Liability Study	pg. 6	OCRWM Milestones	pg. 16
Reactor Decommissioning	pg. 7	Meeting Notes	pg. 17
Wrap Up (LLRW)	pg. 8	Calendar	pg. 20
LLRW Disposal, State RFPS			

Volume 5 No. 15

September 30, 1986 (released Oct. 8)

GAO: LET STATES, TRIBES PARTICIPATE IN DOE INTERNAL HLW MEETINGS

WESTINGHOUSE-WEST VALLEY SET TO START UP NATION'S NEWEST LLRW DISPOSAL SITE

A "draft" of a soon-to-be-released GAO report examining state and tribal relations with the Department of Energy's (DOE) Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management (OCRWM) recommends that DOE allow states to participate in all internal coordination meetings on the selection and siting of the HLW repository as a means of building state and tribal confidence in the HLW program.

Within the next week or two the Department of Energy will officially publish in the **Federal Register** the already approved Finding Of No Signification Impact (FONSI) regarding the proposed disposal of on-site low-level radioactive waste at the Western New York Nuclear Service Center (WNYNSC) near West Valley, New York. The FONSI has been signed by DOE Assistant Secretary for Environmental Affairs, Mary Walker.

The draft reveals that the states and Tribes "have little confidence in DOE...have placed little creditability in the program...have grown to mistrust DOE and do not believe DOE when it says it can manage all of the technical problems associated with a repository." According to GAO if "the states and Tribes continue to feel disenfranchised from the... decisionmaking process and DOE's creditability remains low, the additional cost to the program could be very high." (See **GAO in the HLW Focus**)

This action will signal the start up of the newest LLRW disposal facility in the United States. The facility, located within the WNYNSC, will accept LLRW resulting from the site-cleanup activities for permanent disposal in a engineered shallow-land burial trench and in an above grade earth-mounded concrete vault. Class A will be interred in the engineered trench, Class B and C in the earth-mounded concrete vault. (See **Westinghouse** pg. 2)

FEDS, STATE, INDUSTRY, AIR KEY CONCERNS, UPCOMING ACTIONS AT 8TH DOE LLRW FORUM
...See Meeting Notes

(Westinghouse from pg.1)

Construction of the initial engineered trench is about complete and the expectation is that it will be ready to accept Class A waste in 50 gallon drums and box containers before the end of October -- very soon after the publication of the FONSI.

Facility Conforms to NRC Regs

Though the facility does not come under Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) regulation, it has been designed to conform to the "performance objectives of 10 CFR 61.44 and other selected portions of 10 CFR 61 which are considered applicable." 10 CFR 61 embodies the NRC regulations governing the development and operation of a commercial LLRW disposal facility.

FONSI Not Insignificant

DOE's "Finding of No Significant Impact" followed the completion and issuance of the necessary Environmental Assessment in April of this year. According to Don Adams, the DOE Health Physicist at the site, local community leaders and the public were kept involved and informed throughout the decisionmaking process. The comments filed and published with the release of the FONSI and EA do not reveal any outright opposition to the proposed action. The "engineered design" aspects of the disposal facility seem to have contributed to public acceptance along with the seemingly convincing analysis of the potential release of radioactivity off site.

Radioactive Releases Negligible

According to the FONSI "Because of the containment systems provided by the reference design, no releases of radioactivity are expected during the institutional control (100 years) with design integrity maintained." The calculated maximum effective dose equivalent which would be received by a member of the general public outside the WNYNSC "is estimated to be 0.01 mrem per year." The maximum dose for persons who may inadvertently intrude on the site and establish residence 100 meters away from the disposal area after the 100 year

institutional control period "is estimated to be 3.4 mrem per year." According to the FONSI these estimates are a small fraction of background radiation levels.

The predicted health effects of the proposed action are minimal. The estimated chance of one additional cancer death in 1000 years as a result of radioactivity released is 0.005.

The Class A Trench

As noted above the burial site will include an engineered trench for Class A waste. The engineered trench will be constructed so that dry active Class A waste will be emplaced within natural walls of impermeable clay. This will entail removal of approximately 9-11 feet of weathered till.

Voids between the containers of waste will be backfilled with pea gravel. Layers of unweathered till, gravel, clay and a geotech fabric will be used in between layers of containers and to form the trench cap.

The trench will be of traditional slope design to afford water removal via sump pumps. A continuous monitoring system will be installed. This was one key requirement requested by the local community.

The amount of Class A to be disposed of in the engineered trenches is approximately 9,200 cubic meters but is of very low curie content.

The Earth-Mounded Vault

The earth-mounded vault structure for the disposal of B and C waste is not unlike the French earth-mounded concrete bunker. It was designed by Westinghouse with technical support from Dames and Moore.

The structure will consist of a concrete floor with concrete side walls, covered by a Butler building while the waste is being emplaced. The area where it will be constructed will be "graded" to remove the weathered till allowing the concrete floor to be placed on the unweathered till and the

concrete sidewalls to be constructed above this new grade level.

The earth mound will be nearly level on top and will have 25 percent side slopes. A 3.9 m thick cover composed of compacted clay, gravel and riprap will be placed over the waste, once emplaced, to inhibit water infiltration and to protect the waste from erosion penetration by plants, animals and inadvertent human intrusion.

The design of the structure and the B and C waste forms allow for "recoverability" of the waste, a factor valued by the host community.

A New Waste Container

The West Valley Disposal Facility will not only be the newest disposal facility but also be the first to use **Square Barrels** as containers for solidified Class B and C waste. The DOE reports that eventually the square barrels will also be used for Class A dry active waste (Congratulations to Jim Greaves of Packaging Specialities -- See related story below).

The square barrel allows 25 percent more waste to be placed in the same "volume" that would be occupied by the standard 55 gallon cylindrical barrel, decreasing the "drum" void space, and thereby the problem of subsidence.

Westinghouse West Valley Services placed the very first order for the Packaging Specialities Inc. of Columbus, Ohio, square Barrel. A few have already been delivered to the site for testing. The expectation is that 10,000-15,000 will be purchased over the period of a year. For Class B and C waste the container will be delivered with a six inch diameter opening to accept a Portland Cement waste slurry. **

USING LLRW TO FILL THE VOIDS BETWEEN 55 GALLON DRUMS -- THE SQUARE BARREL

In 1983 a small Cleveland, Ohio metal container company specializing in developing unique metal containers began to develop, using their own resources, a square metal container for the transport of

nuclear submarine torpedo tail sections. However, in the midst of development, the company discovered that the Navy found an alternative container for the tail sections. With a good deal of time and money already invested in the manufacture of the square container, the company began looking about for another commercial market. Then along came an individual who pointed in the direction of nuclear waste disposal and -- EUREKA! -- the square 71 gallon barrel for the containerization of low level radioactive nuclear waste was born!

Now, after a couple of years of persistent traipsing to LLRW meetings, waste processing vendors and government agencies to demonstrate the disposal efficiency of the container, Jim Greaves (the person who originally recognized the value of this container for the disposal of LLRW, and is now with Packaging Specialities Inc., the company which developed it) has succeeded in making the first square barrel sale to Westinghouse-West Valley Services for use in the West Valley Nuclear Services on-site burial facility.

WVNS has already received a couple of the square barrels for testing and, if everything proceeds according to schedule, an order for over 10,000 of the containers is forthcoming (See Related Story on Front Page).

Disposal Capacity Efficiency

Packaging Specialities, Inc.'s (PSI) square barrel has been designed to "circumscribe" the diameter of the traditional 55 gallon drum currently used for disposal. The result is that the "voids" resulting from stacked 55 gallon drums are now almost filled with radioactive waste, not pea gravel or grout. The barrel's use provides an almost 25 percent increase in burial facility, and storage or transport capacity.

DOT Certification Under Way

Testing to obtain Department of Transportation 7A container certification for the PSI square barrel is now underway at Mound Laboratory. Once certified the barrel will be available for the transport of Class A dry active waste.

Credit For Volume Efficiency

An interesting facet of the use of the square barrel is how disposal operators will assess the per barrel disposal fee. The container will allow 10 cubic feet of waste to be stored or disposed of in the same space 7.5 cubic feet of waste now occupies thereby increasing the per disposal barrel cost on a volume basis. However use of the square container will relieve the operator from much of the burden of backfilling the voids. Subsidence due to voids will be much less of a problem. Thus, all other factors being equal, the overall decrease in operating costs due to using the square barrels should result in some "credit" to the generator, even though more volume is emplaced for disposal.

The West Valley Square Barrels

West Valley Services will initially use the PSI Square Barrel as containers for their solidified Portland Cement Class B and C waste. They also report that they definitely have plans to use the square barrel as a Class A disposal container. PSI is actively involved in completing fabrication development of an open top square barrel to be used for inserting Class A dry active waste.

Orders Being Taken

Large-scale fabrication capacity for the square barrels has been developed by PSI. Jim Greaves, however, made it clear that the company does not intend to push output at the expense of quality control. He emphasized that "tight quality control of the fabrication process is the top priority." For more information on the square containers or to place orders contact Jim Greaves at (216) 271-7988. **

LLRW BROKERS, PROCESSORS FORM TRADE ASSOCIATION

During the Spectrum '86 Niagara Falls Decommissioning Conference executives from several Low-Level radioactive waste broker firms and waste processing com-

panies met to form a new trade association appropriately named -- **The Nuclear Waste Brokers and Processors Association.**

At a press conference-cocktail reception Scott Dam, of Babcock & Wilcox, the group's first elected President, explained that the "waste brokers and processors are an important link in the radwaste management network." He emphasized that the objectives of the Association are to "utilize its unique position in the radioactive waste management system to facilitate communication between the generators, the disposal operators, state and federal regulatory agencies and the compacts."

The other newly elected officers of the Association and members of the Board of Directors are: Vice President and President-elect - John Tekin of RADIAC; Treasurer - Dan Caulk of RSO; Secretary - Steve Black of Teledyne Isotopes; At-Large-Members of the Board of Directors - Robert Gallagher of Applied Health Physics (3 year term); James Bell of ADCO (2 year term); Ben Warren of Quadrex HPS (1 year term).

The companies directly involved in developing and founding the Association in addition to those represented by the elected officers include: NDL; Scientific Ecology Group; RAMP Industries; US Ecology; Chem Nuclear; Pacific Nuclear; INS; and Westinghouse-Hittman.

Membership Requirements

According to proposed Articles of Incorporation and By-Laws (which the Association expects to finalize at their next planned meeting during the American Nuclear Society Conference in Washington, D.C.), active membership with full voting privileges is restricted to "corporations, firms or organizations which hold a license to possess radioactive material for the purposes of storage, processing and-or volume reduction." Two other classes of membership have been established: Associate Membership to accommodate the participation of other firms, corporations, and organizations (e.g, utilities, industrial and medical waste generators) who do not

qualify for Active Membership; and Affiliate Membership for individuals who have an interest in radioactive waste brokering or processing.

For more information on the Association contact one of the Officers: Scott Dam (804) 385-3368; John Tekin (718) 963-2233; Steve Black (201) 664-7070; or Dan Caulk (301) 953-2482. **

DOE RETURNS SURCHARGE REBATE FUNDS FROM SE, RM REGIONS TO WA STATE

The Washington State Department of Ecology received a letter during the past week informing them that DOE was returning to the State the twenty-five percent rebate of the ten dollar surcharge collected from generators residing in the Southeast (SE) and Rocky Mountain (RM) regions. The rebate money was forwarded to the Department for deposit in the "Escrow Fund" set up by the Low-level Radioactive Waste Policy Amendments Act.

The letter stated that since the SE and RM regions are not unsited regions under the provisions of the LLRWPA, they do not have to meet the Act's required site development milestones. It further explains that DOE is only authorized to rebate funds from the Escrow Account to unsited states or regions that are judged to be in compliance with the Act's milestones. Since the SE and RM regions are not required to meet this criteria there is no way DOE can determine their compliance and thus rebate funds from the Escrow Account. The money forwarded by the State of Washington from the surcharge collected from generators within these regional compact is, therefore being returned. According to DOE the total amount is around \$10,000.

Collection of Surcharge Unchallenged

The most interesting facet of DOE's letter to Washington is that it completely ignores the question of whether the State of Washington has the authority under the LLRWPA to collect the \$10.00 surcharge from generators residing in regions or states that have operating burial facilities -- sited regions as defined in the LLRWPA.

The EXCHANGE contacted Northwest Compact Executive Director Elaine Carlin, and raised the issue. Ms. Carlin justified the State's action on the following basis:

- the principal intent of the LLRWPA is to encourage the disposal of LLRW in regional compact facilities. Applying the \$10.00 surcharge to out-of-region waste accepted at the Hanford facility is in keeping with this intent;
- The State Executive Order implementing the provisions of the LLRWPA signed by the Governor authorizes the Department of Ecology to collect the \$10.00 surcharge from **out-of-region generators**. No distinction is made between sited or unsited regions.

When the provision of the LLRWPA exempting sited state generators from the surcharge was raised: [Section (d)(1) "Surcharges.--The disposal of any low-level radioactive waste under this section (other than low-level radioactive waste generated in a sited compact region) may be charged a surcharge by the State in which the applicable regional disposal facility is located..."] the Compact Executive Director again emphasized the overall intent of the entire Act.

She further stated, when asked by the EXCHANGE, that the State Attorney General's Office had offered a legal opinion regarding the relevance of the parenthetical phrase in the above quoted provision of the LLRWPA and found it "contrary to the overall purpose of the Act."

Similar Views in Other Sited Regions

Rocky Mountain Compact officials provided a similar, but not identical, view on the assessment of the out-of-region site-use surcharge. Whether or not generators from sited regions would be assessed a surcharge apparently would depend on the amount of waste received. At this point, however, no waste has been accepted at the Beatty Facility from either the Southeast or Northwest region.

Interstate Commerce Implications?
-- AN EXCHANGE ANALYSIS

The State of Washington's action and any further surcharge levied by other host states on generators in sited-regions depends on the interpretation of what powers Congress granted to states to interfere with the interstate commerce of waste management, and how and when the powers so granted could be exercised.

It is quite clear that on January 1, 1993 the regional compacts have the authority to impose import restrictions on out-of-region waste delivered for disposal at their respective regional disposal facilities. The currently operating host states also have the power to stop accepting waste during the intervening years -- from now to 1993 -- once the site volume cap stipulated in the LLRWPA is reached. In addition, during this intervening period Congress specifically limited any other interstate commerce actions by the compacts or host states, to imposing set surcharges and penalties on the unsited regions or states and prohibiting access if stipulated milestones are not met.

The current host states would not have been able to levy the surcharges on out-of-region generators and not do the same to in-region generators if Congress had not specifically authorized such action. This would have been a violation of the "nondiscriminatory provisions" of the Interstate Commerce statutes.

Though one would have to agree with the State of Washington that the Congress' overall intent of the Act is to encourage regional disposal, the law also reflects Congress' intent to allow the host states and compacts to establish regional interstate commerce restrictions gradually over time and not to be granted that full authority until January 1, 1993. The imposition of a surcharge on the sited region generators would therefore seem to go beyond the states "timely" assumption of interstate powers as authorized under the LLRWPA. **

**LLRW LIABILITY INSURANCE STUDY
LAUNCHED BY WASHINGTON STATE**

Within the next few weeks LLRW generators, transporters, brokers and waste processors who use the Hanford Disposal Facility should be receiving a letter from the State of Washington's Department of Ecology requesting actual copies of their general liability insurance agreement now in force. The request for the actual policies is the first step of a comprehensive legislatively-mandated study of liability insurance available to cover the packaging, transport, storage, treatment and disposal of LLRW. The Ecology staff decided to request the actual policies, rather than develop a survey vehicle, in order to assure consistency of their analysis.

In addition to completing a review of the existing coverage carried by the various elements of the LLRW management industry, the Department will carry out a risk assessment study regarding the operation of the Hanford burial site. The risk assessment will probably involve the use of an outside contractor. A Request-for-Proposals (RFP) to carry out this task is expected to be issued in the coming months. For more information write Elaine Carlin, NW Compact Committee, Department of Ecology, LLRW Management Program, Mail Stop PV-11, Olympia, WA 98504. **

**US ECOLOGY NARROWS SEARCH FOR LLRW
DISPOSAL SITE IN CALIFORNIA**

An "exclusion and high-avoidance" screening of 18 basins in three California counties has removed large tracts of land from consideration as possible sites for the disposal of the state's low-level radioactive waste (LLRW). According to Ronald K. Gaynor, Vice President and Project Manager for US Ecology "Potential sites still remain in each of three counties -- Inyo, Riverside and San Bernardino. By the end of the year, " added Gaynor, "we expect to identify three to five specific sites, which will then undergo detailed testing."

US Ecology refined the list of potential siting areas to the current 18 desert basins earlier this year, following an initial

screening conducted by the California Department of Health Services. It then began a more detailed screening process to identify those specific areas within each basin to be excluded from further study, or to be highly avoided.

Exclusionary Criteria

Tracts have been excluded for either technical reasons -- flood or earthquake fault hazards -- or because of land use restrictions. Automatically ruled out are national monuments and state parks, military bases, areas recommended by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) for wilderness preservation, wildlife preserves, scientific study areas, and the entire East Mojave National Scenic Area.

Locations regarded as high-avoidance areas include existing cultivated lands or property under agricultural development, plus all BLM Wilderness Study Areas in the California Desert Conservation Area. These areas are to be studied before wilderness recommendations are made. Two basins, Sheephole (San Bernardino County) and Saline (Inyo County) are entirely covered by exclusion and high-avoidance factors. High-avoidance areas will be further considered only in the event no suitable sites are available in the remaining areas.

Public Hearings Underway

US Ecology is currently holding a series of public meetings in the three desert counties to explain the "exclusion" and "high-avoidance" criteria. Vice President Gaynor emphasized that because many technically suitable sites still remain, public views on preferred site locations will weigh heavily in the selection process.

Basins Under Consideration

The 18 basins in Inyo, San Bernardino and Riverside Counties are: Bristol Lake, Broadwell, Cadiz, Coyote Lake, Cronese,

Danby, Ford Dry Lake, Mesquite Hills, Pahrump, Palen, Panamint, Saline, Searles Lake, Sheephole, Silurian Lake, Silver Lake, Soda Lake and Superior Lake. US Ecology officials believe that within these basins they can find specific locations that meet all state and federal regulatory requirements. Among those requirements are low population density, lack of potential for future growth, sufficient geotechnical data to permit full environmental monitoring and analysis, low rainfall, and avoidance of flooding, earthquake and unstable slope hazards. **

CHEM NUCLEAR STARTS RESEARCH REACTOR DECOMMISSIONING AT VIRGINIA TECH

Chem-Nuclear started work last week on decommissioning an ARGONAUT research reactor at Virginia Technological University in Blacksburg, Va. This is the second reactor decommissioning project that Chem-Nuclear has undertaken during the past year. In June the South Carolina-based disposal and waste services company completed the decommissioning and dismantling of a TRIGA reactor for Northrop Corporation. As the turnkey contractor for both efforts, Chem-Nuclear was responsible for all aspects of the decommissioning, from dismantling and waste and fuel transport, to disposal and NRC termination of the license.

Waste for Disposal

The dismantling and decommissioning of the 1 MW Northrop TRIGA reactor resulted in approximately 4,300 cubic feet of LLRW, primarily activated concrete and steel reinforcing bars. The fuel from the reactor was shipped by Chem-Nuclear to three other research facilities. The total cost of the project was about \$1.25 million.

The decommissioning of the Virginia Tech reactor is expected to produce about 1,800 cubic feet of LLRW and cost in the neighborhood of \$500,000. The dismantling and decommissioning should be completed by mid-December of this year. **

Wrap Up (LLRW)

STATE COMPLIANCE WITH LLRWPA

The Department of Energy (DOE) has "officially" determined that all the non-sited compacts consented to by Congress (Central States (CS), Midwest (MW), Central Midwest (CM), Northeast (NE), and the Appalachian Compact) and the states of Texas, Massachusetts, New York and Maine are in compliance with the July 1, 1986 milestone set in the Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Amendments Act (LLRWPA) and will receive the 25 percent rebate of the surcharges collected from their respective regional or state generators. [EDITORS NOTE: The July 1, 1986 milestone requires that a state be a member of a compact, enact legislation to site a disposal facility, or have the Governor certify that the state intends to develop a disposal facility.]

The DOE has requested further information from **Arizona** and **South Dakota** regarding their joint Compact. **Rhode Island** has also been requested to explain the enactment of a compact with **Massachusetts**, when Massachusetts has informed DOE that it is "going alone." **Vermont** has been determined to be out of compliance. No determination of compliance has been made for **North Dakota**, **Puerto Rico** and **New Hampshire** since no surcharge funds have been deposited in the Escrow Fund from generators within these states.

The milestone compliance determinations were made by the Department in order to decide on the respective Compact and State requests for their rebate from the surcharge monies deposited in the LLRWPA "Escrow Fund". **California**, as this issue went to print, interestingly enough has not yet requested their rebate. When the request is made DOE will judge the State in compliance and forward their rebate of the surcharge.

AT THE DISPOSAL SITES

-- The Facts and an EXCHANGE Perspective

Prior to the enactment of the LLRWPA many were expressing the belief that the volume disposal caps set for the operating LLRW burial sites would cause a disposal capacity crisis for LLRW generators. In

fact, somewhat of a "business crisis" may be occurring, not because of lack of disposal capacity but because a lack of waste!

Through August of this year Hanford and Barnwell had received 425,441 cubic feet and 657,109 cubic feet respectively. Hanford accepted only 46,709 cubic feet in August; Barnwell 79,892 cu. ft. If the waste acceptance for Hanford over the next four months averages what it has for the past eight, the year end volume disposed of at the facility would be down about 55 percent from the previous year intake of 1.4 million cubic feet. Barnwell would experience about half that decrease if the current trend continues. This all adds up to a potential decrease of waste delivered for disposal of somewhere around 75 percent to 80 percent!

This definitely amounts to a critical situation for the "business" of waste disposal. If this all has happened because of just a \$10.00 surcharge, what will happen when the levy is increased or when new sites are added?.

Volume reduction cannot account for the decrease. The waste processing firms are still struggling and no new major waste reduction facility has been started. Reduction at the source and deployment of long term storage options are the other factors that could account for the decrease. The States and industry should spend some time sorting this situation out now in order to get some real perspective on the amount of disposal capacity intended to be developed and the associated cost of the disposal business before someone puts up a store and the merchandise is priced so high a government subsidy is needed to help the customer buy the product -- a lot of excess regional disposal capacity!

The proposed utility reactor LLRW volume allocation schedule developed by the sited states under the criteria set out in the LLRWPA is still under review (See **Disposal Site Use Notification, EXCHANGE, Vol. 5, No. 9**). Ms. Carlin, Executive Director of the Northwest Compact informed the EXCHANGE that the comments received are being

analyzed and the allocations should be finalized in the coming months.

IN THE NORTHEAST

Denise Drace, Executive Director of the Northeast Compact Commission reports that a Request-for-Proposal (RFP) to assist the Commission in developing a Regional Management Plan should be released prior to the end of October. Firms interested in receiving the RFP should contact Denise at the Commission's new office: 55 Princeton-Heights Town Road, Princeton, NJ 08550. The telephone number is (609) 799-1193.

IN THE SOUTHEAST

The **North Carolina** legislature has authorized two independent studies -- one dealing with compact membership, the other with LLRW disposal regulation. The first will be conducted under the auspices of a newly established Joint Select Committee on Low-Level Radioactive Waste. The intent is to develop recommendations on the options available with regard to the management and disposal of the state's LLRW. Earlier this year a report completed by EBASCO, the NY-based consulting firm, outlined the pros and cons of various options open to the state, ranging from remaining in the SE Compact to going it alone. The Joint Select Committee on LLRW is primarily made up of members of the Joint Legislative Utility Review Committee plus six additional members from the legislature -- three from the House and three from the Senate. The Committee is cochaired by Representative Joe Johnson and Senator George Miller. Senator Miller is a SE Compact Commissioner.

The regulatory study is the responsibility of the LLRW Regulatory Study Committee established by the Legislative Research Commission. It will examine the state capacity to regulate a LLRW disposal facility, the possible need to set some regulatory criteria in legislation, and pending regulatory initiatives. The Regulatory Study Committee is cochaired by Senator Lura Tally and Representative John J. Hunt.

Currently, the state's Radiation Protection

Agency is considering a petition for rulemaking on LLRW disposal filed by the State's Conservation Council. The petition requested that the Agency consider regulations to ban the use of shallow-land disposal techniques for the burial of LLRW; require utilities to store their own waste on-site; and set specific criteria for a LLRW disposal facility. The recommendation for a regulation to require utilities to store their own waste on-site was rejected on the basis that such a requirement could only be issued by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

In an earlier edition of the EXCHANGE it was erroneously reported that legislation to rescind North Carolina's membership in the SE Compact was still active. The bill died in committee when the legislative session ended. However, legislative interest in reintroducing the measure upon the re-convening of the legislature remains.

IN THE CENTRAL STATES

The **Central States Compact Commission** has circulated a **draft RFP** that is intended to be issued to solicit proposals from contractors interested in developing and operating a Central States regional disposal facility. The Commission is scheduled to adopt the final RFP in November 1986 and issue it on December 1, 1986.

According to the procedures agreed to by the Central States Commission the RFP will request that proposals submitted by would-be contractors include sufficient detail on actual proposed sites **without** naming either the host state or the sites. Following the Commission's selection of the best proposal, the developer is then to name the state within which it will seek to license and develop the disposal facility. Selection of the contractor-developer is to be made in April, 1987, and the host state is to be named by the selected contractor in June, 1987.

IN THE CENTRAL MIDWEST

A **Request for Proposals (RFP)** from outside contractors has been issued by the **Central**

