

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS
Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future Disposal Subcommittee
Presentation by Mike L. Baughman, Ph.D., CEcD
Representing Lincoln County, Nevada
July 7, 2010

Lincoln County has sponsored over 85 Yucca Mountain related impact and mitigation planning studies covering a diverse range of topics including economic and fiscal impacts; demographic impacts; transportation safety; risk management and risk perception; community development; impacts to tourism; and impacts to local institutions; and opportunities for mitigating impacts and maximizing repository system economic benefits. All of the documents have been available for use by DOE. The County and City have been deeply disappointed that despite exhaustive efforts to respond to DOE requests for information and to provide comprehensive comments on the scope and content of DOE studies, little, if any, of the information has found its way into DOE's plans and assessments of impact. As a consequence, DOE's Yucca Mountain documents have been largely non-responsive to the issues of most concern to the County and City.

Lincoln County recommends that any Blue Ribbon Commission proposed process for siting nuclear waste disposal facilities include independent local oversight, impact assessment and mitigation planning; de-politization of the nuclear waste disposal program; impact avoidance and mitigation; and compensation to state and local jurisdictions hosting disposal and related transportation systems. Specific recommendations include:

1. *Consider mechanisms for ensuring that locally derived information is considered in disposal facility development, operation and closure and in design of measures to avoid or minimize impacts.*
2. *Require that affected units of local government be adequately funded to enable independent oversight, impact assessment and mitigation planning. In recommending the provision of funding to enable local oversight, impact assessment and mitigation planning seek to ensure that the entity vested with disposal responsibility is not also given authority to oversee the manner in which local governments expend funding provided for independent local oversight.*
3. *Include funding for a host state and affected units of local government participation in any local, state or federal project-related licensing or permitting proceeding.*
4. *Seek avenues for de-politicizing the disposal of nuclear waste in the United States.*
5. *Provide for stable program management i.e. some form of quasi-governmental organization that doesn't change management frequently and isn't tied to any one administration.*
6. *Design a program not driven by prescriptive dates, but one that encourages progress at a quicker pace than seen with Yucca Mountain -- thus minimizing the adverse impact of going through multiple political eras during the pre-construction, construction, operations and closure stages.*
7. *Recommend a structure for management of nuclear waste disposal which is not dependent upon annual appropriations by the Congress.*
8. *Recognize the potential for siting of nuclear waste disposal facilities to induce political divisiveness and identify mechanisms to ensure that such impacts are both anticipated and mitigated.*
9. *A process must be employed which enables timely mitigation of unanticipated impacts.*
10. *Achieve an equitable distribution of project related beneficial and adverse economic and demographic impacts.*
11. *Include payment to affected local governments by the project responsible entity of payments equal to taxes.*
12. *Consider mechanisms for ensuring that siting of disposal facilities does not result in unanticipated and/or unmitigated impacts to range livestock ranching operations.*
13. *Recommend that any disposal process require that full mitigation of direct and indirect impacts to private land parcels a portion of which have been acquired by the responsible project entity or across which an easement for project facilities has been acquired.*
14. *Consider the need for mitigation planning and implementation to be an integral part of early disposal option development and budgeting.*
15. *Encourage the consideration of nuclear waste transportation systems and options concurrent with identification of disposal options that consider impacts of said systems in host areas.*
16. *Insist that any program for disposal of nuclear waste include Section 180 (c) like provisions enhanced by direct funding to local governments and the availability of funding for appropriate emergency first response equipment and training.*

17. *Recommend that escrow or similar dedicated accounts be utilized as a means to set aside and guarantee the availability of funding to be used to rapidly implement plans for mitigating various potential impacts of a nuclear disposal system.*
18. *Consider embracing a process for ensuring that significant benefit sharing and compensation is paid to a state and any affected unit of local government hosting a disposal facility and/or through spent nuclear fuel or high-level radioactive waste is transported.*