- *Mined cavities (new and existing)*
- *Augered holes (lined and unlined).*

After extensive evaluation it was concluded that four technologies ranked highly:

- *Above-ground vaults*
- *Below-ground vaults*
- *Modular concrete canister disposal (below grade)*
- *Modular concrete canister disposal (above grade)*

The Commission decided to recommend all four technologies for consideration by the host state.

Disposal costs for these technologies are estimated to range from $38-42 per cubic foot in 1985 dollars. This compares with about $15 per cubic foot for shallow land burial costs in mid-1986. Also these costs do not include any costs not related to operation of the facility. For example, surcharges or taxes that may be levied to finance the Commission's incentives and compensation package are not included.

Selecting a Facility Location

The question of how to select the state to host (i.e., in which to locate) the first regional facility is a major and critical decision facing the Commission. In fact, the entire Regional Management Plan is, in one sense, designed to provide the information and guidelines for making a fair and cost-effective decision.

- **Attracting A Volunteer Host State**

Recognizing that substantial financial and non-financial benefits would have to be made available to the host state and host community, considerable effort was invested to develop a comprehensive incentives and compensation package. In financial terms alone, this package as presently configured will provide the host community with about $40 million and the host state with about $20 million over approximately 20 years. These funds will be sufficient to pay community and state expenses incurred in monitoring, development and operation of the facility and will provide resources for other uses as well. In addition the host state and host community will have a say in the techology selection, design, and operation of the facility. These arrangements will apply whether a state volunteers to be the host state or whether the host state is designated by the Commission.

With regard to a volunteer host state, the Commission will carry out in late 1986 and early 1987 an extensive public information program to present a balanced picture of the risks and benefits of hosting the facility. Based on experience in other areas, there is reason to be optimistic that a volunteer host state can be found by May 1987, the Commission's target date for host state designation.

who & how?

iv

- **Designating A Host State**

Should a volunteer host state not be found, the Regional Management Plan contains information determined by the Commission to be the basis for host state designation. These include data on waste quantities and waste transportation. For purposes of analysis of transportation considerations, 28 hypothetical disposal site locations (four in each state) were employed.

With regard to important public health, safety, and environmental matters, the Commission concluded that ample land could be found in all states that would satisfy required standards. Therefore, these matters were not considered as a useful basis for distinguishing between the relative merit of one state versus another as a host state.

While the waste quantity and transportation considerations do not clearly point to a single state as the appropriate host state, the results are useful in grouping the states with respect to the various criteria which will, in turn, help focus the Commission's deliberation on host state designation.

v & vi

Jan 1988
2 years ago last March Kansas designated potential sites. awareness using public and involvement. sites with 3 Michigan sites June 1, 1988 our Commission decision, insist there will not be a site.

STATE

Radioactive waste dump site possible in I-94 corridor

By Jeff Alexander
South News Service

A site for the dump must be named by Sept. 1, 1989, and the dump accepting waste by 1993.

A coalition of environmentalists is predicting the state's first low-level radioactive waste dump will be located along the I-94 corridor.

Federal law requires that the Michigan site be selected by Sept. 1, 1989.

That same federal law requires that the site begin accepting radioactive waste from seven Midwestern states by Jan. 1, 1993.

The Coalition for a Responsible Radioactive Waste Policy's prediction of a site in southern Michigan is partially supported by independent research performed by two Western Michigan University geology professors.

Richard Passero and Tom Straw have identified areas in southern Michigan that offer the best natural protection against ground water pollution from hazardous or radioactive wastes are along the I-94 corridor in parts of Berrien, Jackson, Calhoun, Hillsdale and Branch counties, and an area that extends south along the Detroit River and Lake Erie from Macomb County to the Ohio border.

State officials insist there is no favored location for the radioactive garbage dump, which will accept through the year 2010 all waste generated in a seven-state region. An estimated 3.4 million cubic feet of waste will be sent to the facility during that time.

David Hales, commissioner of Michigan's Low Level Radioactive Waste Authority, said the dump could go anywhere in the state.

"There are no favored sites and there is no list of potential sites, there never has been," Hales said. "This is a process that will be driven only by statistics and one that has one purpose: to find a safe site."

Hales will select a site for the facility but his decision must be approved by the state Legislature.

"The Coalition for a Responsible Radioactive Waste Policy is opposed to the construction of a radioactive waste dump anywhere in the Great Lakes region. Yet, since Michigan is virtually locked into the project by federal law, coalition members said it would be logical for the state to build the dump somewhere near I-94, between Detroit and Bridgman.

"Logic dictates that the smartest thing to do if (the dump) has to be in this state is to put it near the Indiana border," said Ellen Beal, an Ingham County Commissioner and a spokeswoman for the waste policy coalition.

"It's just logical that they would put it closest to to the other states and a fairly good distance from the Great Lakes," Beal said. "It's all conjecture at this point, but logic dictates that they are not going to put it up in Traverse City."

Gov. James J. Blanchard last October told a group of high school students in Cadillac that the dump should be built along the Indiana border. His aides later said the governor was talking off the top of his head and thinking out loud.

The WMU geology professors stressed that it would be difficult to find a site for a radioactive waste dump that isn't near ground water, or water-bearing soil formations.

Beal stressed that operation of the dump will impact all Michigan residents especially those residing near the chosen area and along the I-94 corridor, which will serve as a primary artery for transporting radioactive waste from other states.

"Regardless of wh ty gets it, it is going Michigan taxpayers an to affect the agriculture, ism industries in that area," she said.

The coalition's prediction on the fact that the facilit store radioactive waste shi from three nuclear power plant southern Michigan and 11 other s actors in Ohio, Iowa, Missour Minnesota and Wisconsin.

Those six states and Indiana are members of the Midwest Low Level Radioactive Waste Compact, which voted in 1986 to build the region's first dump for low-level radioactive garbage in Michigan. The coalition resulted from a 1980 federal law that ordered all states to develop either individual or regional disposal facilities for such waste.

Environmentalists and state officials are trying to persuade Congress to re-write the 1980 law that will require the construction of 13-15 low-level radioactive waste dumps nationwide.

State officials, however, admit privately that the odds are Michigan will go ahead build a radioactive waste dump.

All low level radioactive waste generated in the U.S. is currently shipped to disposal facilities in Washington state, South Carolina and Nevada.

Kalamazoo County Commissioner Mary Powers, an environmental activist, said she is frightened by the possibility that a radioactive waste dump may be built in southwestern Michigan. She said her concerns center on the state's ability to overrule local municipalities when selecting a dump site.

"We really won't have any voice as to whether it goes into our county or not," Powers said. "That is scary."

Meeting in G.R. DNR waste MICHIGAN Sat. Feb 6 1988 2-5 p.m.



as state offices

By Jacqueline Teare
Press Bureau

1/21/88

WASHINGTON — Michigan is making its campaign to land the government's $4.4-billion super collider into high gear in the wake of the federal acceptance Tuesday of experts' recommendations to make Stockbridge a finalist for the high-tech plum.

Gov. James J. Blanchard made tentative plans to meet with the state's congressional delegation in Washington next week to discuss the project, which would bring thousands of jobs and great prestige to its designated location.

And officials began planning for a visit to Stockbridge Feb. 18 by Department of Energy officials, who want to hear from local residents about the scope of issues to be covered in a required environmental impact statement.

Energy Secretary John S. Herrington officially designated Stockbridge Tuesday as one of the seven finalists in competition for the super collider, an atom smasher to be used to research energy and matter.

The other finalists are located in Texas, Illinois, North Carolina, Tennessee, Arizona and Colorado. Announcement of a "preferred" site will be made in July, and final site selection is slated for January 1988.

Herrington's announcement, which confirmed earlier recommendations by an expert panel of scientists, is "a great credit to our community and our state," said Rep. Bob Carr, D-East Lansing, whose congressional district encompasses the proposed site.

"Now the [illegible] starts. We can't rest on our laurels. We have to redouble our efforts."

Carr noted that New York Gov. Mario Cuomo withdrew a site in his state from the competition in response to strong opposition from local residents.

"What happened in New York is key," Carr said. "It's clear they didn't have community support. I think right now what we have to do is show community support . . . put the best foot forward."

The Reagan administration is expected to seek more than $350 million for the collider in the fiscal year when construction is to begin. Congress approved $25 million for preparation in the current fiscal year.

- *Mined cavities (new and existing)*
- *Augered holes (lined and unlined).*

After extensive evaluation it was concluded that four technologies ranked highly:

- *Above-ground vaults*
- *Below-ground vaults*
- *Modular concrete canister disposal (below grade)*
- *Modular concrete canister disposal (above grade)*

The Commission decided to recommend all four technologies for consideration by the host state.

Disposal costs for these technologies are estimated to range from $38-42 per cubic foot in 1985 dollars. This compares with about $15 per cubic foot for shallow land burial costs in mid-1986. Also these costs do not include any costs not related to operation of the facility. For example, surcharges or taxes that may be levied to finance the Commission's incentives and compensation package are not included.

Selecting a Facility Location

The question of how to select the state to host (i.e., in which to locate) the first regional facility is a major and critical decision facing the Commission. In fact, the entire Regional Management Plan is, in one sense, designed to provide the information and guidelines for making a fair and cost-effective decision.

- **Attracting A Volunteer Host State**

Recognizing that substantial financial and non-financial benefits would have to be made available to the host state and host community, considerable effort was invested to develop a comprehensive incentives and compensation package. In financial terms alone, this package as presently configured will provide the host community with about $40 million and the host state with about $20 million over approximately 20 years. These funds will be sufficient to pay community and state expenses incurred in monitoring, development and operation of the facility and will provide resources for other uses as well. In addition the host state and host community will have a say in the technology selection, design, and operation of the facility. These arrangements will apply whether a state volunteers to be the host state or whether the host state is designated by the Commission.

With regard to a volunteer host state, the Commission will carry out in late 1986 and early 1987 an extensive public information program to present a balanced picture of the risks and benefits of hosting the facility. Based on experience in other areas, there is reason to be optimistic that a volunteer host state can be found by May 1987, the Commission's target date for host state designation.

- **Designating A Host State**

Should a volunteer host state not be found, the Regional Management Plan contains information determined by the Commission to be the basis for host state designation. These include data on waste quantities and waste transportation. For purposes of analysis of transportation considerations, 28 hypothetical disposal site locations (four in each state) were employed.

With regard to important public health, safety, and environmental matters, the Commission concluded that ample land could be found in all states that would satisfy required standards. Therefore, these matters were not considered as a useful basis for distinguishing between the relative merit of one state versus another as a host state.

While the waste quantity and transportation considerations do not clearly point to a single state as the appropriate host state, the results are useful in grouping the states with respect to the various criteria which will, in turn, help focus the Commission's deliberation on host state designation.

Jan. 1988
2 years ago
Kansas had 184
potential sites designated,
raising public awareness,
education and involvement.
Even with 3 Michigan sites
due by June 1, 1988
and Commissioners insist there
is not and will not be a
list of potential sites. ☺

G R Press
1/10/88
p. A 13

STATE

Radioactive waste dump site possible in I-94 corridor

By Jeff Alexander
Booth News Service

A site for the dump must be named by Sept. 1, 1989, and the dump accepting waste by 1993.

A coalition of environmentalists is predicting the state's first low-level radioactive waste dump will be located along the I-94 corridor.

Federal law requires that the Michigan site be selected by Sept. 1, 1989.

That same federal law requires that the site begin accepting radioactive waste from seven Midwestern states by Jan. 1, 1993.

The Coalition for a Responsible Radioactive Waste Policy's prediction of a site in southern Michigan is partially supported by independent research performed by two Western Michigan University geology professors.

Richard Passero and Tom Straw have identified areas in southern Michigan that offer the best natural protection against ground water pollution from hazardous or radioactive wastes are along the I-94 corridor in parts of Berrien, Jackson, Calhoun, Hillsdale and Branch counties, and an area that extends south along the Detroit River and Lake Erie from Macomb County to the Ohio border.

State officials insist there is no favored location for the radioactive garbage dump, which will accept through the year 2010 all waste generated in a seven-state region. An estimated 3.4 million cubic feet of waste will be sent to the facility during that time.

David Hales, commissioner of Michigan's Low Level Radioactive Waste Authority, said the dump could go anywhere in the state.

"There are no favored sites and there is no list of potential sites, there never has been," Hales said. "This is a process that will be driven only by statistics and one that has one purpose: to find a safe site."

Hales will select a site for the facility but his decision must be approved by the state Legislature.

The Coalition for a Responsible Radioactive Waste Policy is opposed to the construction of a radioactive waste dump anywhere in the Great Lakes region. Yet, since Michigan is virtually locked into the project by federal law, coalition members said it would be logical for the state to build the dump somewhere near I-94, between Detroit and Bridgman.

"Logic dictates that the smartest thing to do if (the dump) has to be in this state is to put it near the Indiana border," said Ellen Beal, an Ingham County Commissioner and a spokeswoman for the waste policy coalition.

"It's just logical that they would put it closest to to the other states and a fairly good distance from the Great Lakes," Beal said. "It's all conjecture at this point, but logic dictates that they are not going to put it up in Traverse City."

Gov. James J. Blanchard last October told a group of high school students in Cadillac that the dump should be built along the Indiana border. His aides later said the governor was talking off the top of his head and thinking out loud.

The WMU geology professors stressed that it would be difficult to find a site for a radioactive waste dump that isn't near ground water, or water-bearing soil formations.

Beal stressed that operation of the dump will impact all Michigan residents: especially those residing near the chosen area and along the I-94 corridor, which will serve as a primary artery for transporting radioactive waste from other states.

"Regardless of which community gets it, it is going to affect all Michigan taxpayers and it is going to affect the agricultural and tourism industries in that (chosen) area," she said.

The coalition's prediction hinges on the fact that the facility will store radioactive waste shipped from three nuclear power plants in southern Michigan and 11 other reactors in Ohio, Iowa, Missouri, Minnesota and Wisconsin.

Those six states and Indiana are members of the Midwest Low Level Radioactive Waste Compact, which voted in 1986 to build the region's first dump for low-level radioactive garbage in Michigan. The coalition resulted from a 1980 federal law that ordered all states to develop either individual or regional disposal facilities for such waste.

Environmentalists and state officials are trying to persuade Congress to re-write the 1980 law that will require the construction of 13-15 low-level radioactive waste dumps nationwide.

State officials, however, admit privately that the odds are Michigan will go ahead and build a radioactive waste dump.

All low level radioactive waste generated in the U.S. is currently shipped to disposal facilities in Washington state, South Carolina and Nevada.

Kalamazoo County Commissioner Mary Powers, an environmental activist, said she is frightened by the possibility that a radioactive waste dump may be built in southwestern Michigan. She said her concerns center on the state's ability to overrule local municipalities when selecting a dump site.

"We really won't have any voice as to whether it goes into our county or not," Powers said. "That is scary."

Meeting in G.R.
DON'T WASTE MICHIGAN
Sat. Feb. 6 1988
2-5 p.m.

Super collider effort in high gear as state officially made a finalist

By Jacqueline Teare
Press Bureau

1/21/88

WASHINGTON — Michigan is moving its campaign to land the government's $4.4-billion super collider into high gear in the wake of the federal acceptance Tuesday of experts' recommendations to make Stockbridge a finalist for the high-tech plum.

Gov. James J. Blanchard made tentative plans to meet with the state's congressional delegation in Washington next week to discuss the project, which would bring thousands of jobs and great prestige to its designated location.

And officials began planning for a visit to Stockbridge Feb. 16 by Department of Energy officials, who want to hear from local residents about the scope of issues to be covered in a required environmental impact statement.

Energy Secretary John S. Herrington officially designated Stockbridge Tuesday as one of the seven finalists in competition for the super collider, an atom smasher to be used to research energy and matter.

The other finalists are located in Texas, Illinois, North Carolina, Tennessee, Arizona and Colorado. Announcement of a "preferred" site will be made in July, and final site selection is slated for January 1988.

Herrington's announcement, which confirmed earlier recommendations by an expert panel of scientists, is "a great credit to our community and our state," said Rep. Bob Carr, D-East Lansing, whose congressional district encompasses the proposed collider site.

"Now the competition really starts. We can't rest on our laurels. We have to redouble our efforts."

Carr noted that New York Gov. Mario Cuomo withdrew a site in his state from the competition in response to strong opposition from local residents.

"What happened in New York is key," Carr said. "It's clear they didn't have community support. I think right now what we have to do is show community support . . ., put the best foot forward."

The Reagan administration is expected to seek more than $350 million for the collider in the fiscal year when construction is to begin. Congress approved $25 million for preparation in the current fiscal year.