
The

Radioactive Exchange®

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

INSIDE: MW Sets Export Fees..... pg. 2	the HLW Focus..... pg. 9
Congress Acts on Channahon..... pg. 3	HLW SCP Issuance Revised..... pg. 9
Wrap Up (LLRW)..... pg. 4	House Releases \$79 Mill To DOE.. pg. 11
Illinois RFP..... pg. 7	Wrap Up (HLW)..... pg. 12
LLRW Volume Disposal Update..... pg. 8	Calendar..... pg. 16
Reports Of Note (LLRW)..... pg. 15	
Centerfold -- LLRW Compact, Milestone Status Chart	

Volume 6 No. 15

September 1, 1987

DEFENSE TO PAY 14-19% OF HLW PROGRAM, UTILITY GROUPS SEEK COURT REVIEW

The Department of Energy (DOE) revised calculational method that will be used to determine the Department Program's (DP) contribution to the HLW program only assigns between 14%-19% of the Total System Life Cycle Costs (TSLCC) of the HLW system to the DP.

The revised methodology estimates that the DP contribution could range from a low of \$5.17 billion (1986 dollars) for HLW Tuff or Salt repository using the assumption the number of nuclear plants will increase and extended fuel burnup will be utilized (i.e., the Office of Energy Information Agency's upper reference case), to \$6.1 billion for a Basalt or Hard Rock repository in the case of no new nuclear plants and utilizing increased fuel burn up.

It is important to realize, as the FR notice states, that this contribution is still subject to appropriations. In actuality it is just a recommendation to Congress which could disagree with the assessment. (See **Court Action in the HLW Focus**)

LEGISLATIVE EFFORT TO WITHDRAW NORTH CAROLINA FROM SE COMPACT FAILS

Overcoming dogged efforts to enact a bill rescinding North Carolina's membership in the Southeast Regional LLRW Compact, Representative George Miller, Chairman of a key legislative committee and a SE Compact Commissioner, exhibiting the political skills of a master craftsman, marshalled the forces necessary to keep North Carolina in the regional compact and effect the passage of a bill to establish a state LLRW siting authority.

Though the opposition succeeded in obtaining approval of an amendment to the siting bill conditioning North Carolina's continued participation in the SE compact on adoption of party state withdrawal changes to the regional agreement, the key to the successful legislative effort was, as one observer put it, the "awesome legislative maneuverings of Representative Miller." According to one state official he just totally outmaneuvered the opposition. In fact, he was able to avoid a floor vote on specific legislative initiatives to rescind the NC membership by winning table motions on three separate occasions when the opposition was able to get rescinding legislation to the floor. (See **North Carolina**, pg. 2)

Edward L. Helminski, Publisher

P.O. Box 9528, Washington, D.C. 20016

202/362-9756

(Copyright © 1987 by Exchange Publications. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted by any means, without written permission of the publisher)

(North Carolina from pg. 1)

Compact Must be Changed

The amendment inserted in the siting bill by the opposition provides that thirty days after the commencement of operation of the second regional facility a party state may withdraw from the compact **only with the unanimous consent** of the compact Commission and with the consent of Congress. It also stipulates that the second regional facility shall operate for twenty years or until 32 million cubic feet is accepted. This language must be incorporated into the compact and ratified by every party state legislature by December 31, 1998 and finally by the Congress by January 1, 1992 in order for North Carolina to remain in the compact.

Engineered Burial Required

Prior to the adoption of the LLRW siting authority bill, including the above-cited conditions under which North Carolina would remain in the compact, the legislature also adopted a bill requiring the use of engineered barriers in the design of a disposal facility.

Provisions of the Siting Authority Bill

The siting authority bill, as finally adopted, was not the initial siting legislation reported out of the respective legislative committees earlier in the session. It is a bill put together by Representative Miller that eliminated all specific revenue raising provisions in order to avoid referring the measure to finance committees where it probably would have died.

The bill sets up the Authority as an autonomous entity within the Agency for Administration. The Board of Directors is to be comprised of fifteen members, five chosen by the Senate, five by the House, and five by the Governor. The Senate and House designated their members the day after the bill passed. The Governor is expected to name his appointees this week (August 31). The Authority, which is to be in full operation by November, 1987, is

given a great deal of discretionary authority over the development and operation of the LLRW disposal facility.

Included in the bill is a requirement, successfully inserted by opponents to North Carolina's membership in the compact, that a \$90 million trust fund be established to deal with the mitigation of adverse impacts of the facility.

The Authority is given the power to enter into arbitration with local communities to set the conditions under which a site will be developed and operated; to establish payment-in-lieu-of-taxes to the local host community; and provide funds to compensate for negative impacts, including the devaluation of private lands.

The bill sets out a timetable for site selection that calls for identification of suitable locations by December 1, 1988; three sites for characterization by August 1, 1989; site selection by November 15, 1990; and, the beginning of site operation by December 12, 1992. **

MIDWEST SETS LLRW EXPORT FEE TO COVER DISPOSAL SITE DEVELOPMENT

The Midwest Compact Commission at their August 18 meeting approved the establishment of an LLRW export fee to take effect in FY 88 to cover the pre-operational and development costs of a regional disposal facility. The fee will be assessed in a unique manner with utility generators providing the entire funding for these expenses as they are needed, while the non-utility contribution to cover these costs is to be deferred until the Midwest Regional disposal facility commences operations. The utilities are, in effect, "loaning" the non-utility generators the funds to cover their portion of the pre-operational costs and they will be paid back with interest once the regional facility is in operation.

The combined fee set for FY 88 is set at \$3,000,000. In subsequent years the total combined collected fees are not to exceed \$9 million. The contribution of each utility generator to meet this annual combined total fee is calculated by

multiplying this amount by each "utility's percentage share of total projected utility waste volume as set forth in the Regional Management Plan."

Non-Utility Deferred Contribution

For each fiscal year that the Commission levies export fees, the aggregate amount of export fees payable by non-utility generators is to be calculated by averaging the non-utility percentage shares of waste volume (measured in cubic feet) and waste radioactivity (measured in curies) disposed by all regional generators during the previous calendar year, as reported by the site operators. The non-utility average percentage, applied to the annual revenue requirement, will then yield the aggregate deferred amount of non-utility export fees. Payment of these non-utility export fees are to be deferred until facility operations commence.

When the regional facility opens the Commission will establish a schedule for payment of the non-utility export fees that were deferred, including a reasonable interest charge. The amount scheduled for collection each year is to be made a part of the Commission's annual budget surcharge levied on waste disposed at the facility. That part of the annual budget surcharge will be paid only by non-utility generators.

Rebate to Generators

The surcharge rebates that will be awarded for meeting the site development milestones of the LLRWPA will also be used to reimburse utilities for covering the pre-operational cost attributable to non-utility generators. Once the utilities have been so reimbursed, the remaining revenues from

the surcharge rebate received by the Commission will be distributed.

HOUSE NRC AUTHORIZATION INCLUDES PROVISION TO HALT CHANNAHON OPERATION

With Chem Nuclear's supercompactor already having started operation in their community, the citizens of Channahon, IL, supported by others opposed to Chem-Nuclear's waste processing activities at the facility approached Illinois Congressman Madigan about the possibility of Congressional action that could revoke NRC's license for the facility. He, in turn, raised the possibility of adding an amendment to NRC's authorization bill which was coming up for floor consideration on August 5. He discussed the matter privately with Interior staff at the Udall August 4 hearing on the Appalachian Compact and when the bill came up for floor consideration on the 5th he offered an amendment and it **passed**.

The amendment as adopted and included as Section 7 of the NRC Authorization states that:

"the Nuclear Regulatory Commission shall use such [authorized] sums as are necessary to suspend any byproduct, source, or special nuclear materials license granted in accordance with application dated June 20, 1986, to any low-level nuclear waste processing facility in Will County, Illinois, until such facility has obtained a special use permit for such facility under the I-3 zone classification laws of such county."

Similar action in the Senate is under consideration at this time. **

AT THE DISPOSAL SITES

The volume of LLRW accepted for disposal at **Beatty** in 1987 through July 31 has significantly increased over the past year's level. The volumes at Hanford are notably lower than last year at this time. Barnwell's is about the same. According to figures supplied by the respective state officials, the LLRW volumes accepted at three sites through July 31, 1987 are as follows: Barnwell - 499,387 cubic feet; Hanford - 270,175 cubic feet; Beatty - 152,943 cubic feet.

The volume of waste being set to Beatty is averaging between 20,000 to 25,000 cubic feet per month and at that rate Beatty may reach its 1987 cap of 300,000 cubic feet by mid-December. Under LLRWPA provisions Beatty may close its gates at that time.

The aggregate volume of waste accepted during the first seven months of 1987 portends another possibility that overall annual waste volumes delivered for disposal during this year will be less than the volume of the past year. If the rate of waste acceptance over the past seven months remains the same for the next five, the 1987 total volume will be around 1,582,000 cubic feet as compared to 1,812,000. Where is all that waste going?

IN NEW YORK

The **New York State Department of Environmental Conservation** has issued draft regulations accompanied by a draft environmental impact statement setting forth the minimum characteristics for the state's LLRW disposal method and disposal facility.

This is only the first set of draft regulations to be released and only covers the selection of a disposal method and facility. Draft regulations governing financial assurance will be released in November 1987. Operations and closure regulations will be released by December 1, 1988. The first of seven public hearings on the draft regulations is scheduled for September 28 at the Albany Public Library Auditorium. The last is on October 8 in

White Plains. Written comments as well as oral statements are solicited. The comment period closes on October 19, 1987. Copies of the Drafts can be obtained from Louis M. Concra, Jr., Director of Regulatory Affairs, NY State Department of Environmental Conservation, 50 Wolf Road, Albany, NY 12233-1010.

The released draft regs follow the federal requirement but include additional restrictions as dictated by the recently enacted NY State siting law. Included among the criteria that must be considered in the selection of a site and disposal method is the ability to recover buried LLRW. The regulations also specify current population density restrictions (i.e., no site shall be located within town or cities having at least 1,000 individuals per square mile as defined in 1980 census), and also prohibit siting a facility in areas where significant population growth is projected. Specific criteria are set out for alternative disposal methods, including above ground and mined disposal.

IN APPALACHIA

The Appalachian Compact has been introduced in the Congress. On August 4 Interior Chairman Udall held a hearing on ratification legislation, HR 3025. Immediately after hearing testimony from the States of Delaware and Pennsylvania he reported the bill out of his Committee. The next step in the House is up to Energy and Commerce which should act in a similar manner.

The bill was introduced in the Senate by Senator Roth as S 1551. It was referred to the Judiciary Committee where it will probably be held until action on the new California Compact clears up.

IN THE CENTRAL STATES

Negotiations toward executing a final contract with US Ecology as the designated LLRW disposal site operator continue in the Central states. So far no serious hitches have developed.

Though all Central state legislatures have

gone home without taking any action to rescind their membership in the compact there remains some anxiety regarding the **State of Kansas**. It is expected that the Governor will have to call a special legislative session in the state to deal with various problems, including highway taxes. And, once such a special session is convened, the legislature agenda is open to any initiatives. The likelihood of another legislative attempt to pull the state out of the regional compact is a distinct possibility, if not a certainty.

IN THE CENTRAL MIDWEST

As a result of public workshops on the **Illinois** proposed LLRW disposal facility site selection process, the Illinois Department of Nuclear Safety is in the process of making changes in the selection procedures. According to state officials, as a result of concerns raised at the workshops, more efforts will be devoted in the preliminary phases of site selection on safety and environmental aspects of prospective sites to ensure that preliminary site judgments are made on the basis of site safety not economics. This will mean more intensive safety and environmental studies in the first phase and will result in delay of the selection of the final four sites to be characterized until the early winter of 1988.

From the reports received from the state it still appears that several counties continue to express interest in hosting a disposal facility, though others have notified the Department of their opposition.

On September 9 through 16 a delegation of community leaders accompanied by **Central Midwest Compact Chairman Clark Bullard** will visit the LLRW disposal facility in France at the state's expense. A group recently toured the Barnwell site, after which some county official participants expressed an interest in further studying the possibility of hosting the regional disposal site.

IN THE MIDWEST

At their August 18 meeting the Midwest Compact Commission adopted a policy position indefinitely postponing any action on hosting a national forum to discuss the status of the compacts. The Commission received very little support from other state officials to convene such a meeting. The initial request that the Commission host a forum came from Michigan, the designated host state (See EXCHANGE, Vol. 6, No. 14).

The Compact Commission's Host State Selection Committee is hosting a special closed meeting with Michigan officials in September to continue discussions on the host state agreement document.

IN THE ROCKY MOUNTAIN WEST

The **Rocky Mountain Compact** has relocated its offices to 1675 Broadway, Suite 1900, Denver, Colorado 80202, Phone: (303) 825-1912.

IN THE NRC

In early August Hugh Thompson, NRC's Director of Material Safety and Safeguards, and Winston Porter, EPA's Assistant Administrator for Solid Waste, jointly issued a "Guidance on a Conceptual Design Approach for Commercial LLRW and Hazardous Waste Disposal Facilities." The intent of the document is to allow the development of designs for disposal facilities for mixed LLRW that fully meet "EPA's regulations covering minimum technology requirements for liners and leachate collection systems and NRC's requirements for minimization of contact of waste with water while also assuring long-term stability and avoidance of long term maintenance."

Both agencies committed to developing and issuing the guidance to ensure that states and compacts could proceed to develop new LLRW disposal facilities while awaiting release of final EPA locational standards for disposal facilities that would accept EPA regulated hazardous materials. The lateness of the expected release of these locational standards conflicts with the

need for states and regional compacts, currently without operating disposal facilities, to have new LLRW disposal facilities in operation, or arrange for an alternative means of disposal for their respective generators' waste by 1993.

Principal Design Concepts The key element of the agreed upon joint design concept is that mixed LLRW is to be placed "above the original ground surface in a tumulus that would be blended into the disposal site topography." The design incorporates two liners and a leachate collection system above and between the liners. A leak detection tank and leachate collection tank are to be encircled by a berm that controls surface water runoff from precipitation. Drainage pipes in the upper primary collection system are to be incorporated to collect any leachate that could possibly develop above the top flexible membrane liner and below the emplaced waste. Leachate collected from the upper primary system would drain through the pipes to the primary leachate collection tanks. Leachate collected by the lower leachate collection system would drain into a leachate detection tank.

The design of the cover, which is to be added at closure, is intended to minimize post-closure water filtration; function with minimum maintenance; promote drainage and minimize erosion; and have a permeability "less than or equal to the permeability of any bottom liner system."

Possible Acceptable Variations The guidance allows that "variations" on the described design approach may be acceptable. The list of possible variations includes placement of mixed LLRW in "an engineered concrete vault, a polymer-impregnated concrete vault, or double-lined high integrity containers that are hermetically sealed."

Copies of the Guidance document can be obtained by writing: Dr. Sher Bahadur, Division of LLRW Management and Decommissioning, MS 623-SS, USNRC, Washington, D.C., 20555. **

IN THE INDUSTRY

LN Technologies is offering a waste evaporator system for sale. The system, which is skid mounted, consists of a LUWA vertical wiped film evaporator with associated pumps, tanks, heat input skid and control panel. The unit is commonly used for the volume reduction of heat sensitive/fouling materials, viscous products and radioactive wastes. For more information, please call Ted Sonntag (803) 256-4355.

Roy F. Weston, Inc. was selected by the EPA for negotiation of a contract to provide support for remedial planning activities at uncontrolled hazardous waste sites in EPA's Region V which includes the states of Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin. The probable value of the contract including all options is expected to be approximately \$200 million.

To fulfill the contract work scope, Weston will provide site-specific project management, remedial planning, design, and implementation, and other technical assistance. Negotiations are scheduled over the next few months with final contract award anticipated in early 1988.

Duke Power Company has awarded contracts to **Hydro Nuclear Services, Inc.** for three dry active waste segregation/volume reduction systems. Hydro Nuclear's DAW system is a semi-automated, microprocessor-controlled system that separates conventional waste and recoverable items from actual dry active waste materials. The system is designed to process 35 barrels of material during an eight-hours shift. The systems are being installed at each of Duke Power's three operating nuclear power stations -- Catawba, Oconee, and McGuire. The systems for Catawba and Oconee are in-plant systems while the system for McGuire is a mobile configuration housed in a custom-fabricated modular enclosure measuring 24 by 50 feet. Installed in July, the Catawba system is operating. The McGuire and Oconee systems are scheduled for installation in October and November, respectively.

Duratek Corp has been awarded a contract to process low-level radioactive waste water at the Fort Calhoun Station operated by **Omaha Public Power District** of Omaha, Nebraska. Duratek's full service processing began in May. The full service processing package includes demineralization with the Duratek Enhanced Volume Reduction (EVR) Processing System and Durasil ion-selective exchange media. Based on laboratory testing of the Fort Calhoun waste stream, Duratek projects that this combination may produce waste volume reductions of up to 95 percent over demineralization services using other types of ion exchange media. To complete the service package, Duratek will prepare expended media for disposal with the Duratek Heat-Enhanced Dewatering (HED) System and provide packaging for disposal of the dewatered waste product. Fort Calhoun is the fourteenth utility to contract with Duratek for EVR equipment and the ninth to establish a full service contract. For more information contact

Donald Burroughs, Manager, Marketing Services, Duratek Corp. (301) 474-2100.

ON THE MOVE

Dr. Richard J. Slember, general manager of the nuclear fuel business unit, has been elected a vice president of the Westinghouse Electric Corporation. As vice president and general manager of the nuclear fuel business unit, Dr. Slember will continue to be responsible for the supply and delivery of nuclear fuel products and services to customers in both the commercial and government sectors. Dr. Slember joined Westinghouse in 1955 as an engineer at the Bettis Atomic Power Laboratory and subsequently served in a variety of engineering management positions in the advanced reactors division, nuclear equipment divisions and nuclear technology division before being named General Manager of the strategic operations division in 1980. **

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF NUCLEAR SAFETY

The Illinois Department of Nuclear Safety (INDS) will issue a Request for Proposal within the next few weeks for a contractor to design, construct, and operate a low-level radioactive waste (LLW) disposal facility in Illinois.

With the assistance of Battelle Memorial Institute and Hanson Engineers, Inc., IDNS is now conducting a search for alternative facility sites. Four sites will be characterized, and the Director of IDNS intends to select the site to be developed before January 1, 1990. IDNS will select the contractor to develop and operate the facility early in the alternative site characterization process in order to provide an opportunity for that contractor to work closely with the affected communities. IDNS is interested in receiving proposals from contractors highly qualified to design, construct, operate, monitor, and close a LLW disposal facility in Illinois, and invites expressions of interest in the project. Disposal by shallow-land burial is prohibited by law in Illinois.

Prospective proposers should notify IDNS of their interest by mail, by providing the name, address, and telephone number of a designated contact person to: Dr. John Cooper, Manager, Office of Environmental Safety, Department of Nuclear Safety, 1035 Outer Park Drive, Springfield, Illinois 62704.

LLRW Volume Disposal Update

LLRW ACCEPTED FOR DISPOSAL AT BARNWELL, BEATTY AND HANFORD

Through June 1987
(Volumes in Cubic Feet)

	<u>June</u>	<u>Year to Date</u>		<u>June</u>	<u>Year to Date</u>
Northeast			Rocky Mountain		
Connecticut	2,230.90	15,679.60	Colorado	155.10	785.10
New Jersey	3,423.60	21,316.20	Nevada	0.00	0.00
	<u>5,654.50</u>	<u>36,995.80</u>	New Mexico	0.00	0.00
			Wyoming	0.00	0.00
				<u>155.10</u>	<u>785.10</u>
Appalachian			Western III		
Pennsylvania	8,554.70	58,544.40	South Dakota	0.00	0.00
West Virginia	0.00	0.00	Arizona	0.00	4,006.60
Maryland	8,875.70	13,653.40		<u>0.00</u>	<u>4,006.60</u>
Delaware	120.00	667.50			
	<u>17,550.40</u>	<u>72,865.30</u>			
Southeast			Northwest		
Georgia	1,027.20	9,920.08	Idaho	0.00	1.50
Florida	1,696.50	23,221.10	Washington	4,200.50	22,181.30
Tennessee**	11,215.80	73,219.90	Oregon	5,192.30	37,878.00
Alabama	4,469.70	37,990.50	Utah	0.00	0.00
N. Carolina	5,267.20	40,513.70	Alaska	0.00	0.00
S. Carolina	9,073.00	56,667.40	Hawaii	0.00	1,707.80
Mississippi	1,617.50	7,354.20	Montana	37.50	38.20
Virginia	10,546.00	32,908.45		<u>9,430.30</u>	<u>61,806.80</u>
	<u>44,912.90</u>	<u>281,795.33</u>			
Central States			Unaligned		
Arkansas	3,961.20	4,265.50	Rhode Island	114.60	434.90
Louisiana	618.00	9,297.60	Vermont	386.00	2,990.90
Nebraska	2,338.50	13,047.40	New Hampshire	0.00	367.50
Kansas	728.00	2,806.50	Maine	366.00	2,546.50
Oklahoma	3,090.00	29,988.20	New York	6,924.50	33,210.80
	<u>10,735.70</u>	<u>59,395.20</u>	Massachusetts	4,227.50	23,982.60
			Texas	4,801.00	22,540.60
Central Midwest			North Dakota	0.00	2.90
Illinois	19,156.40	89,310.70	California	6,647.40	40,119.00
Kentucky	0.00	175.70	Puerto Rico	0.00	0.00
	<u>19,156.40</u>	<u>89,486.40</u>	D.C.	112.50	135.00
				<u>23,579.50</u>	<u>126,330.70</u>
Midwest			TOTAL:	137,736.00	798,525.43
Wisconsin	1,089.50	3,448.00	(May total)	115,139.00	660,789.43
Indiana	0.00	1,282.40			
Iowa	2,371.00	12,426.10			
Ohio	1,092.00	7,649.70			
Michigan	1,330.90	13,607.60			
Minnesota	227.80	8,682.50			
Missouri	450.00	17,961.90			
	<u>6,651.20</u>	<u>65,058.20</u>			

**The LLRW Volumes reported from Tennessee and possibly small volumes from a few other states may include waste delivered by generators in other states to a TN-based regional processing facility and then shipped to Hanford, WA for disposal. We are working with site operators to correct the figures.

(Court Action from pg. 1)

NARUC, EEI Seek Court Action

The DOE in issuing the final version of the methodology rejected formal petitions by the National Association of Regulated Utility Commissioners (NARUC) and the Edison Electric Institute (EEI) requesting that DOE institute a formal rulemaking to establish the Defense fee allocation methodology. EEI and NARUC received formal letters rejecting their petition just a day or so prior to the release of the revised methodology. An EEI spokesman said that the group does plan to file to overturn the action. It may take the utility group a month or so to obtain the necessary concurrence of all utility interests involved. Meanwhile NARUC could file suit in Washington, D.C. Federal District Court by Tuesday, September 1, to stop the action and petition the Courts to require the DOE to proceed with a formal rulemaking.

Revisions to Initial Proposal

The calculational methodology finally agreed upon by the Department revised the preferred version published in the December 2, 1986 Notice of Inquiry (NOI) in the Federal Register incorporating:

- changes made to the TLSCC structure as a result of more detailed information on various program costs and the manner in which the costs of the Monitored Retrievable Storage (MRS) facility were taken into account;
- three instead of two cost account designations: direct costs, which are identifiable and assignable to either defense high level waste (DHLW) or

commercial HLW; common variable costs, which are also directly assignable; and common unassigned costs, which are cost components of TLSCC not included in the other two categories, and are not readily identifiable with any particular system parameter.

Determination of DP Share

In order to determine the DP share of the common variable cost elements the DOE developed cost sharing factors based upon piece count and areal dispersion. Piece Count is the ratio of DHLW packages placed in the programs waste-handling buildings to the total number of packages placed in the buildings. Areal Dispersion is the ratio of repository area required for DHLW to the total disposal. It may be measured by the proportion of the mined volume in the disposal areas that is attributed to DHLW.
**

DOE REVISES PROCESS FOR ISSUING SITE CHARACTERIZATION PLANS

On August 27 OCRWM Director Ben Rusche agreed to revise the process for the issuance of the HLW Repository Site Characterization Plans (SCPs) to allow for simultaneous issuance of "consultation drafts" of the SCPs for the three potential sites (Hanford, WA, Yucca Mt., NV, Deaf Smith County, TX) on January 8, 1988; establish an intensive interactive consultation program with the states and Tribes on the drafts, then commence a 90 day public comment period on the final versions. Along with revising the SCP issuance process the OCRWM will also concurrently release the HLW site Environmental and Socioeconomic Monitoring and Mitigation Plans (MMPs).

