DOWNLOAD PDF LOW-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE POLICY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1985

Chapter 1 : Chapter RCW: RADIOACTIVE WASTE ACT

Low Level Radioactive Waste Policy Act of In response to the complex disposal issue, Congress passed the Low Level Radioactive Waste Policy Act of (P.L.), which established that each state was responsible for disposing LLRW generated within its boundaries.

The first set of incentives-the monetary incentives-works in three steps: The second set of incentives-the access incentives-authorizes sited States and regional compacts gradually to increase the cost of access to their sites, and then to deny access altogether, to waste generated in States that do not meet federal deadlines. United States et al. New Jersey, U. As relevant here, Congress may, under its spending power, attach conditions on the receipt of federal funds, so long as such conditions meet four requirements. Moreover, where Congress has the authority to regulate private activity under the Commerce Clause, it may, as part of a program of "cooperative federalism," offer States the choice of regulating that activity according to federal standards or having state law pre-empted by federal regulation. That would upset the usual constitutional balance of federal and state powers, whereas the constitutional problem is avoided by construing the Act as a whole to comprise three sets of incentives to the States. These incentives present nonsited States with the choice either of regulating waste disposal according to federal standards or having their waste-producing residents denied access to disposal sites. They are not compelled to regulate, expend any funds, or participate in any federal program, and they may continue to regulate waste in their own way if they do not accede to federal direction. With him on the briefs for petitioner in No. Premo II filed briefs for petitioner in No. Gerrard, Deborah Goldberg, and Patrick M. Snyder filed briefs for petitioner in No. Deputy Solicitor General Wallace argued the cause for the federal respondents in all cases. Milkman, and Jeffrey P. On the brief were Kenneth 0. Eikenberry, Attorney General of Washington, T. Delaney, Assistant Attorneys General, and by the Attorneys General for their respective jurisdictions as follows: Briefs of amici curiae urging affirmance were filed for the American College of Nuclear Physicians et al. The public policy issue involves the disposal of radioactive waste: The constitutional question is as old as the Constitution: It consists of discerning the proper division of authority between the Federal Government and the States. We conclude that while Congress has substantial power under the Constitution to encourage the States to provide for the disposal of the radioactive waste generated within their borders, the Constitution does not confer upon Congress the ability simply to compel the States to do so. I We live in a world full of low level radioactive waste. Radioactive material is present in luminous watch dials, smoke alarms, measurement devices, medical fluids, research materials, and the protective gear and construction materials used by workers at nuclear power plants. Low level radioactive waste is generated by the Government, by hospitals, by research institutions, and by various industries. Bernstein, and David K. Michael Leffler, and John C. Millions of cubic feet of low level radioactive waste must be disposed of each year. Five more sites opened in the following decade: Between and , the Illinois site closed because it was full, and water management problems caused the closure of the sites in Kentucky and New York. As a result, since only three disposal sitesthose in Nevada, Washington, and South Carolina-have been in operation. Waste generated in the rest of the country must be shipped to one of these three sites for disposal. In , both the Washington and Nevada sites were forced to shut down temporarily, leaving South Carolina to shoulder the responsibility of storing low level radioactive waste produced in every part of the country. The Governors of Washington and Nevada announced plans to shut their sites permanently. Faced with the possibility that the Nation would be left with no disposal sites for low level radioactive waste, Congress responded by enacting the Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Act, Pub. The Act authorized States to enter into regional compacts that, once ratified by Congress, would have the authority beginning in to restrict the use of their disposal facilities to waste generated within member States. The Act included no penalties for States that failed to participate in this plan. By , only three approved regional compacts had operational disposal facilities; not surprisingly, these were the compacts formed around South Carolina,

Nevada, and Washington, the three sited States. The following year, the Act would have given these three compacts the ability to exclude waste from nonmembers, and the remaining 31 States would have had no assured outlet for their low level radioactive waste. With this prospect looming, Congress once again took up the issue of waste disposal. In broad outline, the Act embodies a compromise among the sited and unsited States. The sited States agreed to extend for seven years the period in which they would accept low level radioactive waste from other States. In exchange, the unsited States agreed to end their reliance on the sited States by The mechanics of this compromise are intricate. The Act authorizes States to "enter into such [interstate] compacts as may be necessary to provide for the establishment and operation of regional disposal facilities for low-level radioactive waste. For an additional seven years beyond the period contemplated by the Act, from the beginning of through the end of , the three existing disposal sites "shall make disposal capacity available for low-level radioactive waste generated by any source," with certain exceptions not relevant here. After the 7-year transition period expires, approved regional compacts may exclude radioactive waste generated outside the region. The Act provides three types of incentives to encourage the States to comply with their statutory obligation to provide for the disposal of waste generated within their borders. One quarter of the surcharges collected by the sited States must be transferred to an escrow account held by the Secretary of Energy. The Secretary then makes payments from this account to each State that has complied with a series of deadlines. By July 1, , each State was to have ratified legislation either joining a regional compact or indicating an intent to develop a disposal facility within the State. By January 1, , each unsited compact was to have identified the State in which its facility would be located, and each compact or stand-alone State was to have developed a siting plan and taken other identified steps. By January 1, , each State or compact was to have filed a complete application for a license to operate a disposal facility, or the Governor of any State that had not filed an application was to have certified that the State would be capable of disposing of all waste generated in the State after The rest of the account is to be paid out to those States or compacts able to dispose of all low level radioactive waste generated within their borders by January 1, Each State that has not met the deadline must either take title to the waste generated within its borders or forfeit to the waste generators the incentive payments it has received. The second type of incentive involves the denial of access to disposal sites. States that fail to meet the July deadline may be charged twice the ordinary surcharge for the remainder of and may be denied access to disposal facilities thereafter. States that fail to meet the deadline may be charged double surcharges for the first half of and quadruple surcharges for the second half of , and may be denied access thereafter. States that fail to meet the deadline may be denied access. Finally, States that have not filed complete applications by January 1, , for a license to operate a disposal facility, or States belonging to compacts that have not filed such applications, may be charged triple surcharges. The take title provision. The third type of incentive is the most severe. In the seven years since the Act took effect, Congress has approved nine regional compacts, encompassing 42 of the States. All six unsited compacts and four of the unaffiliated States have met the first three statutory milestones. Brief for United States 10, n. Petitioners-the State of New York and the two counties-filed this suit against the United States in The District Court dismissed the complaint. The Court of Appeals affirmed. Petitioners have abandoned their due process and Eleventh Amendment claims on their way up the appellate ladder; as the cases stand before us, petitioners claim only that the Act is inconsistent with the Tenth Amendment and the Guarantee Clause. While no one disputes the proposition that "[t]he Constitution created a Federal Government of limited powers," Gregory v. At least as far back as Martin v. These questions can be viewed in either of two ways. In some cases the Court has inquired whether an Act of Congress is authorized by one of the powers delegated to Congress in Article I of the Constitution. United States, U. In other cases the Court has sought to determine whether an Act of Congress invades the province of state sovereignty reserved by the Tenth Amendment. In a case like these, involving the division of authority between federal and state governments, the two inquiries are mirror images of each other. If a power is delegated to Congress in the Constitution, the Tenth Amendment expressly disclaims any reservation of that power to the States; if a power is an attribute of state sovereignty reserved by

the Tenth Amendment, it is necessarily a power the Constitution has not conferred on Congress. See United States v. It is in this sense that the Tenth Amendment "states but a truism that all is retained which has not been surrendered. As Justice Story put it, "[t]his amendment is a mere affirmation of what, upon any just reasoning, is a necessary rule of interpreting the constitution. Being an instrument of limited and enumerated powers, it follows irresistibly, that what is not conferred, is withheld, and belongs to the state authorities. Story, Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States San Antonio Metropolitan Transit Authority, supra, at internal quotation marks omitted. Congress exercises its conferred powers subject to the limitations contained in the Constitution. Thus, for example, under the Commerce Clause Congress may regulate publishers engaged in interstate commerce, but Congress is constrained in the exercise of that power by the First Amendment. The Tenth Amendment likewise restrains the power of Congress, but this limit is not derived from the text of the Tenth Amendment itself, which, as we have discussed, is essentially a tautology. Instead, the Tenth Amendment confirms that the power of the Federal Government is subject to limits that may, in a given instance, reserve power to the States. The Tenth Amendment thus directs us to determine, as in this case, whether an incident of state sovereignty is protected by a limitation on an Article I power. The benefits of this federal structure have been extensively cataloged elsewhere, see, e. Federalism for a Third Century, 88 Colum. Our task would be the same even if one could prove that federalism secured no advantages to anyone. It consists not of devising our preferred system of government, but of understanding and applying the framework set forth in the Constitution. This framework has been sufficiently flexible over the past two centuries to allow for enormous changes in the nature of government. The Federal Government undertakes activities today that would have been unimaginable to the Framers in two senses; first, because the Framers would not have conceived that any government would conduct such activities; and second, because the Framers would not have believed that the Federal Government, rather than the States, would assume such responsibilities. Among the provisions of the Constitution that have been particularly important in this regard, three concern us here. First, the Constitution allocates to Congress the power "[t]o regulate Commerce Interstate commerce was an established feature of life in the late 18th century. The volume of interstate commerce and the range of commonly accepted objects of government regulation have, however, expanded considerably in the last years, and the regulatory authority of Congress has expanded along with them.

DOWNLOAD PDF LOW-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE POLICY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1985

Chapter 2 : New York v. United States :: U.S. () :: Justia US Supreme Court Center

Title I: Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Amendments Act of - Amends the Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Act to confer responsibility for the disposal of specified low-level radioactive wastes upon each State (either by itself or in cooperation with other States).

The definitions in this section have been alphabetized pursuant to RCW 1. Effective dateâ€" c The department of ecology is designated as the executive branch agency for participation in the federal nuclear waste policy act of and the federal low-level radioactive waste policy act of , however the legislature retains an autonomous role with respect to participation in all aspects of the federal nuclear waste policy act of The department may receive federal financial assistance for carrying out radioactive waste management activities, including assistance for expenses, salaries, travel, and monitoring and evaluating the program of repository exploration and siting undertaken by the federal government. All departments, agencies, and officers of this state and its subdivisions shall cooperate with the department of ecology in the furtherance of any of its activities pursuant to this chapter. The department of ecology shall adopt such rules as are necessary to carry out responsibilities under this chapter. The department of ecology is authorized to adopt such rules as are necessary to carry out its responsibilities under chapter The director of ecology shall, in addition to the powers and duties otherwise imposed by law, have the following special powers and duties: The department of ecology may sublease to private or public entities all or a portion of the land for specific purposes or activities which are determined, after public hearing, to be in agreement with the terms of the lease and in the best interests of the citizens of the state consistent with any criteria that may be developed as a requirement by the legislature; 2 To assume the responsibilities of the state under the perpetual care agreement between the state of Washington and the federal government executed July 29, , and the sublease between the state of Washington and the site operator of the commercial low-level radioactive waste disposal facility. In order to finance perpetual surveillance and maintenance under the agreement and ensure site closure under the sublease, the department of ecology shall impose and collect fees from parties holding radioactive materials for waste management purposes. The fees shall be established by rule adopted under chapter Such fees shall reflect equity between the disposal facilities of this and other states. A site closure account and a perpetual surveillance and maintenance account are hereby created in the state treasury. Site use permit fees collected by the department of health under RCW Funds in the site closure account other than site use permit fee funds shall be exclusively available to reimburse, to the extent that moneys are available in the account, the site operator for its costs plus a reasonable profit as agreed by the operator and the state, or to reimburse the state licensing agency and any agencies under contract to the state licensing agency for their costs in final closure and decommissioning of the commercial low-level radioactive waste disposal facility. If a balance remains in the account after satisfactory performance of closure and decommissioning, this balance shall be transferred to the perpetual surveillance and maintenance account. The perpetual surveillance and maintenance account shall be used exclusively by the state to meet post-closure surveillance and maintenance costs, or for otherwise satisfying surveillance and maintenance obligations. Appropriations are required to permit expenditures and payment of obligations from the site closure account and the perpetual surveillance and maintenance account. Receipts shall be directed to the site closure account and the perpetual surveillance and maintenance account as specified by the department. Additional moneys specifically appropriated by the legislature or received from any public or private source may be placed in the site closure account and the perpetual surveillance and maintenance account. During the fiscal biennium, the legislature may transfer up to thirteen million eight hundred thousand dollars from the site closure account to the general fund; 3 a Subject to the conditions in b of this subsection, on July 1, , and each July 1st thereafter, the treasurer shall transfer from the perpetual surveillance and maintenance account to the site closure account the sum of nine hundred sixty-six thousand dollars. The nine hundred sixty-six thousand dollars transferred on July 1, , and thereafter shall be adjusted to

a level equal to the percentage increase in the United States implicit price deflator for personal consumption. The last transfer under this section shall occur on July 1, If agreement cannot be reached between the state department of ecology and the United States department of energy by June 1, , the treasurer shall transfer the funds from the general fund to the site closure account according to the schedule in a of this subsection. The treasurer shall transfer to the site closure account in full the amount remaining to be repaid upon written notice from the secretary of health that the department of health has authorized closure or that disposal operations have ceased. The treasurer shall complete the transfer within sixty days of written notice from the secretary of health. These plans shall include an analysis of expected revenue to the state in various taxes and funds related to low-level radioactive waste disposal and the resulting implications that any increase or decrease in revenue may have on state agency duties or responsibilities. The plans shall be updated annually.

Chapter 3 : RCW Implementation of federal low-level radioactive waste policy amendments of

(C) low-level radioactive waste described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) that is generated outside of the State and accepted for disposal in accordance with sections 1 e or f of this title.

Laws acquire popular names as they make their way through Congress. History books, newspapers, and other sources use the popular name to refer to these laws. How the US Code is built. The United States Code is meant to be an organized, logical compilation of the laws passed by Congress. At its top level, it divides the world of legislation into fifty topically-organized Titles, and each Title is further subdivided into any number of logical subtopics. In theory, any law -- or individual provisions within any law -- passed by Congress should be classifiable into one or more slots in the framework of the Code. On the other hand, legislation often contains bundles of topically unrelated provisions that collectively respond to a particular public need or problem. A farm bill, for instance, might contain provisions that affect the tax status of farmers, their management of land or treatment of the environment, a system of price limits or supports, and so on. Each of these individual provisions would, logically, belong in a different place in the Code. The process of incorporating a newly-passed piece of legislation into the Code is known as "classification" -- essentially a process of deciding where in the logical organization of the Code the various parts of the particular law belong. Sometimes classification is easy; the law could be written with the Code in mind, and might specifically amend, extend, or repeal particular chunks of the existing Code, making it no great challenge to figure out how to classify its various parts. And as we said before, a particular law might be narrow in focus, making it both simple and sensible to move it wholesale into a particular slot in the Code. But this is not normally the case, and often different provisions of the law will logically belong in different, scattered locations in the Code. As a result, often the law will not be found in one place neatly identified by its popular name. Nor will a full-text search of the Code necessarily reveal where all the pieces have been scattered. Instead, those who classify laws into the Code typically leave a note explaining how a particular law has been classified into the Code. It is usually found in the Note section attached to a relevant section of the Code, usually under a paragraph identified as the "Short Title". Our Table of Popular Names is organized alphabetically by popular name. So-called "Short Title" links, and links to particular sections of the Code, will lead you to a textual roadmap the section notes describing how the particular law was incorporated into the Code. Finally, acts may be referred to by a different name, or may have been renamed, the links will take you to the appropriate listing in the table.

Chapter 4 : New York v. United States - Wikipedia

The United States Code is meant to be an organized, logical compilation of the laws passed by Congress. At its top level, it divides the world of legislation into fifty topically-organized Titles, and each Title is further subdivided into any number of logical subtopics.

A, B, and C. They must meet stricter disposal requirements than Class A waste. During the s and early s LLW was dumped in the oceans or buried into shallow unlined landfills. Throughout history, the U. In there were only three commercial disposal facilities remaining in operation, with only one of them, the site in South Carolina, located east of the Rocky Mountains. Due to the concentration of nuclear technology and waste products in the East, South Carolina was receiving percent of monthly volume of LLW generated commercially in the United States. The governors proposed that Congress establish a national policy governing the disposal of LLW based on two principles: In giving their endorsement, these groups expanded the initial proposal to incorporate three principles: The Act goes on to say that the states may enter into compacts with their neighbors under Congressional authorization. The law called for the ability of compacts to exclude wastes from other regions after January 1, Certain states, notably California and Texas, chose to remain independent at the time. Compacts are responsible for deciding what facilities are needed and which state will serve as host and or how long. Negotiations among states to form compacts and start developing disposal sites took longer than expected, making it impossible to meet the deadline. However, congressional approval was stalled by powerful states outside of the seven regions that were prepared to prevent congressional approval of the compact charters. Nevada, Washington, and South Carolina threatened to close their sites unless Congress acted to give them greater control. After that time the three sites could close or exclude waste from outside the compacts in which they were located. The Amendments Act also set up strong incentives to encourage states without sites for disposal facilities to site, license, and construct facilities. Compacts and states without sites when the Amendments Act was passed faced rising disposal charges for using existing disposal facilities. They also had to meet specific milestones in order to maintain access to the present facilities. Existing disposal sites are allowed to impose surcharges for disposal of wastes from regions without sites, with rebates to be used by states or compacts for site development. Department of Energy DOE keeps track of these arrangements, with authority to assign additional emergency disposal capacity to reactors, while the NRC can authorize emergency access to existing sites. Both agencies are active in providing information and guidance. Expeditious enforcement of federal rules, regulations and laws; Imposing sanctions against those found to be in violation of federal rules, regulations and laws; Timely inspection of their licensees to determine their capability to adhere to such rules, regulations and laws; Timely provision of technical assistance to this compact in carrying out their obligations under the LLRWPAA. The positive incentive was a provision that allowed compacts to restrict access to their regional LLW disposal facility to member states beginning in , thus limiting the amount of waste disposed of in any state hosting a regional disposal facility. In , in a lawsuit brought by New York State, the U. United States[edit] New York attempted to negotiate a regional compact with neighboring states in the northeast, but most of the states were alarmed by the volume of LLWs that New York produced. After 55 sites were examined in ten different geographic areas, public protests, demonstrations and civil disobedience from NIMBY members led the governor of New York to suspend further investigation for siting the LLW facility. The three states with the original LLW joined the defendants. Each involved the responsibility for LLW that is generated within each states borders. Chapter I is divided into different parts, while only parts 61 and 62 are the principal portions of low-level radioactive waste regulations. Part 61 describes the licensing requirements for land disposal of radioactive waste. This is in result of the date at which the content was written. When this part was initially developed, there were not facilities generating a large amount of depleted uranium waste streams. Part 62 involves the criteria and procedures for emergency access to non-federal and regional low-level waste disposal facilities.

Due to the constant variation in the fine line policy work of disposing nuclear waste, the NRC produces a semiannual agenda that provides descriptions of the rule making actions to the most recent date benchmark date. In September , Michigan drafted a bill that would regulate the amount of low-level radioactive material from often more fracking-intensive states. Each State involved has developed an oversight program that requires periodic inspections of the facilities. Agreement state program[edit] The NRC has entered into agreements with 37 states, called Agreement States, to allow these states to regulate the management, storage and disposal of certain nuclear waste. Section of the amended Atomic Energy Act of P. The Agreement States exercise their licensing and enforcement actions under direction of the governors in a manner that is compatible with the licensing and enforcement programs of the NRC. The membership of OAS consists of state radiation control directors and staff from the 37 Agreement States who are responsible for implementation of their respective Agreement State programs. Type A containers are usually either steel drums or steel boxes, while Type B are heavily engineered metal casks. Some of the testing procedures that are completed are a water spray to simulate a severe rainstorm and also dropping the container from different heights. Type B containers require more rigorous testing procedures because Type B containers carry materials with higher radioactivity levels; Type B containers must not only meet the requirements set by the USDOT, but also those set by the NRC. There are three kinds of labels: Labels are also placed on the outside of the truck carrying the materials depending on the type of package being carried. Safety procedures[edit] All parties involved in the transportation of LLW must maintain the following information: Those responsible of the actual transport of the material must also train employees on how to respond if a spill or accident were to occur. Any company that transports LLW is given a safety rating based on: A study completed by the USDOT showed there were only 53 accidents from to that involved LLW in the United States; it was only in four of these accidents that the container was breached and material was released. There are currently no radiological related injuries or deaths that have occurred from exposure to LLW transportation accidents. If an accident causes injury, hospitalization, or death the National Response Center must also be notified. There are three options for the disposal of such waste: Clive, Utah[edit] The third facility is located in Clive, Utah , and is licensed by the state of Utah. It accepts waste from all regions of the United States, but only accepts Class A waste. The operator of the facility, Waste Control Specialists LLC, was issued a license in September by the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality and construction was completed and the site became operational in November

Chapter 5 : NRC: Our Governing Legislation

Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Amendments Act of This Act gives States the responsibility to dispose of low-level radioactive waste generated within their borders and allows them to form compacts to locate facilities to serve a group of States.

A summary and a text of this law, as well as other key laws that govern our operations, are provided below. On the civilian side, it provides for both the development and the regulation of the uses of nuclear materials and facilities in the United States, declaring the policy that "the development, use, and control of atomic energy shall be directed so as to promote world peace, improve the general welfare, increase the standard of living, and strengthen free competition in private enterprise. The NRC retains authority over, among other things, nuclear power plants within the State and exports from the State. A major amendment to the Act established compensation for, and limits on licensee liability for injury to off-site persons or damage to property caused by nuclear accidents. Under the Atomic Energy Act of , a single agency, the Atomic Energy Commission, had responsibility for the development and production of nuclear weapons and for both the development and the safety regulation of the civilian uses of nuclear materials. The Act of split these functions, assigning to one agency, now the Department of Energy, the responsibility for the development and production of nuclear weapons, promotion of nuclear power, and other energy-related work, and assigning to the NRC the regulatory work, which does not include regulation of defense nuclear facilities. The Act of gave the Commission its collegial structure and established its major offices. The later amendment to the Act also provided protections for employees who raise nuclear safety concerns. Environmental Protection Agency EPA and gave it a role in establishing "generally applicable environmental standards for the protection of the general environment from radioactive material. If the Department and the President recommend to the Congress that a permanent repository be built there, and if the recommendation survives the special procedures that the Act establishes for Congressional review of the recommendation, the Department will apply to the NRC for authorization to construct the repository. The Act provides for extensive State, Tribal, and public participation in the planning and development of permanent repositories. The Act also requires the NRC to establish standards for determining when radionuclides are present in waste streams in sufficiently low concentrations or quantities as to be "below regulatory concern. Its original focus was on rulemaking and adjudication. It requires, for example, that affected persons be given adequate notice of proposed rules, and an opportunity to comment on the proposed rules, and that, in cases in which another statute requires that the agency provide a hearing "on the record", the parties are given adequate opportunity to present facts and argument and the hearing officer is impartial. The Act gives interested persons the right to petition an agency for the issuance, amendment, or repeal of a rule. It also provides standards for judicial review of agency actions. The Act has been amended often and now incorporates several other acts that cover a great range of processes. Three of these incorporated acts deal with access to information. The Government in the Sunshine Act requires that collegial bodies such as the Commission hold their meetings in public, with certain exceptions for meetings on matters such as, again, national security. The Privacy Act limits release of certain information about individuals. Two of the acts incorporated into the Administrative Procedure Act provide for alternative mechanisms for resolving differences. The Negotiated Rulemaking Act allows agencies to develop rules in certain situations by negotiations among a limited number of parties, negotiations aimed at reaching a consensus on the proposed rule and avoiding litigation over the final rule. The Administrative Dispute Resolution Act urges agencies to use negotiation, mediation, arbitration, and related techniques in place of adjudication, enforcement, rulemaking, or court litigation. Two other incorporated acts are noteworthy. The Regulatory Flexibility Act requires that agencies consider the special needs and concerns of small entities in conducting rulemaking. The Congressional Review Act requires that every agency rule be submitted to Congress before being made effective, and that every "major" rule sit before Congress for 60 days before

being made effective, during which time the rule can be subjected to an accelerated process that can lead to a statutory modification or disapproval of the rule. The statement is to accompany the proposal through the agency review process. The Act also established in the Executive Office of the President a Council on Environmental Quality, which has issued regulations on the preparation of environmental impact statements, and on public participation in the preparation of the statements.

Chapter 6 : Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Amendments Act of â€“ MCC

A bill to amend the Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Act to improve procedures for the implementation of compacts providing for the establishment and operation of regional disposal facilities for low-level radioactive waste, and for other purposes.

Chapter 7 : Low-level radioactive waste policy of the United States - Wikipedia

Amendments to H.R - 99th Congress (): Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Amendments Act of