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Climate Policy Strategies and Energy Transition – Nuclear Waste Governance in Comparison
High-level radioactive waste (HLW) situation in the United States:

• Complex
  – long history
  – large-scale
  – both civilian and military activities
  – terrorism concerns

• Governance in the US in general
  – multi-level
  – strong state's rights
  – variety of access and leverage points
Locations of Spent Nuclear Fuel and High-Level Radioactive Waste Destined for Geologic Disposal

Source: http://www.yuccamountain.org/usamap1.gif/
Present Policy for Storage of HLW

- >70,000 metric tons 3,000 tons added annually
- **Military**
  - Hanford Reservation (Washington)
    - 177 storage tanks -- multiple leaks 2013
  - Savannah River Plant (South Carolina)
- **Civilian**
  - 60,000 metric tons
  - 104 civilian nuclear reactors clustered at 65 facilities
    - 2 being decommissioned
    - 10 reactors at 9 locations already decommissioned
    - 63 “independent spent fuel storage installations” (ISFSIs) in 33 states
- **Total 126 locations**
  - Spent fuel pools ("wet pools") - 78% of total
  - Dry Cask Storage – 22% of total
Spent Fuel Pool

Source: http://noyonews.net/?p=7878
Dry Casks

Source: http://www.scientificamerican.com/blog/post.cfm?id=whatever-happened-to-plans-to-bury-2009-03-09
Waste Storage Concept

• Dry cask and wet pool storage
  – considered safe only for perhaps 100 years

• Geologic storage
  – need for tens of thousands to 1 million years
  – suitable sites
    • arid climate and low annual rainfall
    • remoteness from population centers
    • overall geological stability
    • "host rock" – a low permeability or water intrusion potential

• Department of Energy (DOE) to assess candidate sites
  – scoping ~120 sites
  – assessed in detail: 5 sites
  – 3 sites to be formally recommended by 1985.
  – second repository also to be designated

• 1987--NWPA amended:
  – open by 1998
  – restrict research to Yucca Mountain
    • (cost considerations)
Yucca Mountain

• 2002 DOE formally recommended opening Yucca Mountain Nuclear Waste Repository
  – Construction work—open 2017?
  – 2008 GW Bush Administration formal application to Nuclear Regulatory Commission for approval
Yucca Mountain – Location

Yucca Mountain – Location

Source: http://www.nei.org/corporatesite/media/filefolder/yucca_nevada_map.jpg
Yucca Mountain

Source: http://www.americainfra.com/article/yucca-mountain/
Nevada Test Site

Source: http://ndep.nv.gov/boff/atomic.jpg (left) and http://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/e/eb/NNSA-NSO-787.jpg (right)
Yucca Mountain

- Nye County, Nevada.
  - 150 km NW of Las Vegas
- "The most studied piece of real estate on the planet."
- igneous rock -- welded tuff
- Adjacent to former Nevada Test Site
- Issues:
  - earthquakes
  - volcanism
  - water intrusion
  - management issues (data falsification?)
- capacity 70,000 tons – to increase to 125,000 tons?
Yucca Mountain – Schematic

Source: http://pbadupws.nrc.gov/docs/ML0815/ML081560427.pdf, p. 103
Yucca Mountain – Waste Transportation Routes

Potential nuclear waste transportation routes would shuttle spent fuel through Kansas City and Memphis to reach Yucca Mountain under a mostly rail scenario. Public hearings will be held in the fall to select a rail corridor in Nevada including one proposed through Caliente.

Source: http://www.nevadanews bureau.com/tag/blue-ribbon-commission/
$15 billion already spent on research, construction & preparation

• However, Candidate Obama and Harry Reid opposed
  – 2009 Obama budget:
    • "The Yucca Mountain program will be scaled back to those costs necessary to answer inquiries from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, while the Administration devises a new strategy toward nuclear waste disposal." (OMB 2009, p. 65)
    • No clear explanation or rationale given

• March 2010 DOE "Motion to Withdraw"
  – advancements in science
  – lack of "broad public support"

• New funding cut off
President Obama and Senate Majority Leader Reid (D - NV)

Status

• Lawsuit brought by Washington and South Carolina
  – U.S. Federal Court of Appeals ruling August 13, 2013
  • in favor of the plaintiffs
  • NRC was “simply flouting the law”
  • must proceed with the processing of the DOE application for use of the YMNWR
    – only $11 million
Legal framework

• Federal:
  – Nuclear Waste Policy Act (NWPA)
  – Nuclear Waste Fund (NWF)
    – To fund eventual geologic storage
    – $9 billion used; $29 billion in fund; $750 million added annually
  – Other
    • *Energy policy, etc.*
      – Atomic Energy Act of 1954
    • *Environmental laws*
      – National Environmental Policy Act (1970; EIS)
      – Clean Water Act (1972);
      – Safe Drinking Water Act (1974);
      – Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (1976);
      – Toxic Substances Control Act (1976); and
      – CERCLA (1980 "Superfund")
Regulations Regarding Radioactive Wastes

- "Licensing requirements for Land Disposal of Radioactive Waste" (1960);
- "Disposal of High-Level Radioactive Wastes in Geologic Repositories" (1990);
- "Disposal Standards for Long-Lived Waste" (1992);
- "Radiation Protection of the Public and the Environment" (1993);
- "Public Health and Environmental Radiation Protection Standards for Yucca Mountain, Nevada" (1998);
- "General Guidelines for the Recommendation of Sites for Nuclear Waste Repositories" (1999);
- "Disposal of High-Level Radioactive Waste in a Geologic Repository at Yucca Mountain, Nevada" (2000);
- "Nuclear Safety Management" (2001);
- "Conduct of Operations Requirements for Nuclear Facilities" (2001), among others
Information policy and participation

– Freedom of Information Act (FOIA)
– Administrative Procedures Act (APA)
– National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)
– etc.
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1 opportunity to participate in this dialog, we want to
2 also allow DOE to recognize that it's been nearly
3 going on four years perhaps that we haven't met, so
4 it makes it very difficult for us to provide
5 information on a rail transportation system that's
6 being evaluated or going to be developed through the
7 EIS.
8
9 We believe that the comment period should be
10 extended for the tribal governments to provide
11 additional comments to the process and request that
12 that be extended by 90 days.
13
14 Secondly, we are a bit concerned that no
15 contractors have been identified to provide the EIS,
16 as is typically customary.
17
18 Thirdly, we believe that the American Indian
19 Rider Subgroup should be permitted to develop a
20 resource document for reference to and inclusion as
21 appropriate in the final EIS, the draft EIS. We
22 would hope and suggest that as recommended previously
23 in the resource document to the EIS dated February
24 1998 that systematic ethnographic studies that deal
25 with the misperception analysis of the proposed
26 transportation corridor be implemented and properly
27 evaluated.
28
29 The rail shipments that would be coming
Compensation

• Price-Anderson Nuclear Industries Indemnities Act (1957)
  – extended to 2025

• regulates liability for civilian nuclear facilities
  – created a "no-fault" insurance fund ($12.6 billion in 2011) to supplement mandated industry-purchased private insurance coverage of $375 million per facility
    • "American Nuclear Insurers (ANI)" insurance pool
      – 60 U.S. private insurance companies.

• would also cover transportation incidents
Insurance – Price-Anderson Act

Nuclear Insurance Under The Price-Anderson Act

Total Pool: $11,975 million

- Private Insurance (First Tier)
- Industry Self-Insurance (Second Tier)

Owners of nuclear power plants pay for $375 million private insurance. If a nuclear accident surpasses this amount, each plant pays up to $111.9 million into a second tier insurance pool.

• "Claims can include any incident (including those that come about because of theft or sabotage) in the course of transporting nuclear fuel to a reactor site; in the storage of nuclear fuel or waste at a site; in the operation of a reactor, including the discharge of radioactive effluent; and in the transportation of irradiated nuclear fuel and nuclear waste from the reactor." (NRC 2011)
Institutional Framework

• Regulatory functions
  – Nuclear Regulatory Commission – develops regulations
  – Environmental Protection Agency – establishes environmental standards
  – Department of Energy
    • Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management (OCRWM) – closed
  – Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board (NWTRB) -- provides technical assistance to DOE
  – Department of Transportation

• State-level agencies

• Nuclear power industry
  – Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI)

• Courts
Regulation

U.S. Department of Energy

Environmental Protection Agency

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Protecting People and the Environment
State and local level

• Nevada:
  – 1987-8: Bullfrog County
  – State veto exercised -- overridden by Congress
  – Nye County
    • Nuclear Waste Repository Project Office (NWRPO)
Blue Ribbon Commission on America’s Nuclear Future (BRC) – 2010-2012

• Recommendations included:
  – permanent deep geological facilities should be developed
  – a new organization should be established to provide oversight
  – "consent-based approach"
    • "all affected levels of government (local, state, tribal, etc.) must have, at a minimum, a meaningful consultative role”
  – decisions should be "science-based"
Public Opposition

LETTER TO THE EDITOR:

Yucca Mountain? Not at any price

Mamie Glorioso, Las Vegas
Thursday, Aug. 22, 2013 | 2:03 a.m.

Wake up, Nevada. First our country used you as a nuclear testing ground, causing a lot of people to get cancer, and now the government wants to store hazardous waste.

It’s about time our state and our governor tell the United States government where to go. Not this time. We’ve already paid our dues. Go find another place to destroy.

Our governor should tell them that those waste trucks will never cross our borders. Our lives and the lives of our children are worth fighting for.

And for those who feel we should do it for the right price, let me ask you: What price is enough for your life and the lives of your loved ones?

Another Potential Site?  
DOE Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP)

Source: http://www.americainfra.com/article/yucca-mountain/
WIPP Supporters – Carlsbad, New Mexico

The Last Word?

• Asked what he thought about the August 2013 U.S. Court of Appeals ruling, Harry Reid said:
  – “….some really bad judges...produced a 2-1 decision requiring the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to license Yucca Mountain. Their opinion means nothing. Yucca Mountain is dead. It’s padlocked. There’s nothing going on there." (Velotta 2013)
Lessons Learned

• Potential for intervention and veto opportunities by political actors
  • Allows rejection of "scientific consensus"

• No clear guidelines or criteria for making next decisions

• Prevailing tacit political consensus:
  • neither expand nor reduce nuclear power generation
  • not actively address and solve the long-term waste disposal issue
  • ...likely continued state of limbo

• Is this Success or Failure of Governance?
  • Is it a “lack” of governance?
Thank you for your attention.

Contact Information:
Richard Forrest
Free University of Berlin
raforrest@gmail.com