

DEC 31 1984

Dear Mr. Lautenschlager:

Thank you for your letter dated December 21, 1984, in which you ask me a number of questions regarding the disposal of low-level radioactive waste (LLW).

A summary of the present status of alternative methods for disposal of LLW is presented in the enclosed document, "Proceedings of the State Workshop on Shallow Land Burial and Alternative Disposal Concepts," NUREG/CP-0055, October 1984, pp. 2-12 to 2-38. More of the details are described in "Alternative Methods for Disposal of Low-Level Radioactive Wastes," NUREG-CR-3774, Vol. 1, April 1984 (copy enclosed). We will be glad to provide more definitive information when it becomes available in the spring of 1985.

The criteria for complete evaluation of these alternatives have not been finalized. However, minimal submittal requirements for license applicants and license application review procedures have been developed and are codified in 10 CFR Part 61, "Licensing Requirements for Land Disposal of Radioactive Waste." I forwarded to you a copy of this regulation in my letter to you dated March 28, 1984. The regulation, 10 CFR Part 61, is the framework document for the licensing of the land disposal of all LLW. NRC staff is ready to review today any application for licensing one of these alternative methods.

The present schedule of fees for a LLW disposal license under category 4.A of 10 CFR Part 170.31 is \$150 for an application with billing at 6-month intervals to a ceiling of \$803,700. (See enclosure). The actual cost is recovered so that under some circumstances the licensing fee may not reach the ceiling. However, because the licensing process is the same for a large or small site, it is unlikely the licensing fees would be proportional to the size of the facility. The applicant pays no fee to NRC if the licensing takes place by an Agreement State. Normally, the Agreement State would have its own fee structure.

B506120076 B50207
PDR FOIA
PAYB5-54 PDR

[illegible]

In your letter, you make reference to private studies that indicate that a small site (using aboveground vaults which are concrete lined with steel and lead and of sufficient thickness to guarantee total site integrity in all possible events) would be well within the range of feasibility that takes into account technical and cost considerations. We are unaware of such studies and would be interested in having you provide them if possible.

We hope that we have been some assistance to you and thank you for your interest in this matter.

Sincerely,

Original signed by
Jerome Saltzman

for G. Wayne Kerr, Director
Office of State Programs

Enclosures:
As stated