Boys' Club Members Win National Prizes



LIFE'S HALLWAY

Mark Watkins, II, Connersville, Ind., won the second prize of a \$75 Kodak gift certifi-cate in the 13-and-under category of transformer Club/Kodak Photo Contest for this picture. He will also receive a Kodak Centennial Medallion for excellence in amateur photography as part of the company's 100th birthday celebration.



"I DARE YOU"

Stacy Roberts, 15, Waterloo, Iowa, won the 14-through-18 category prize of a \$50 Kodak gift certificate in the "What My Camera Sees at the Boys' Club' division of the Boys' Club/Kodak Photo Contest for this picture. He will also receive a Kodak Centennial Medallion for excellence in amateur photography as part of the company's 100th birthday celebration.

Thirty-seven Boy's Club members have received prizes in the form of Kodak gift certificates in the 1980 Boys' Club/Kodak Photo Contest, conducted by Boys' Clubs of America and sponsored by Eastman Kodak Company.

Each will receive a Kodak Centennial Medallion for excellence in amateur photography as part of the company's 100th birthday celebration.

Steve Boyd, 13, Martinsburg, W. Va., won the \$100 first prize gift certificate in the 13-and-under category for an architectural-type shot homes, in color, entitled "Green Yellow.

and Yellow." First prize winner of \$100 in the 14-through-18 age category is Sinan Atooli, 15, Youngstown, Ohio. His winning black-and-white entry, "Do Butterflies go to Heaven?" is a result of fast shooting when he saw a butterfly land on a little girl's finger. The Boys' Clubs to which the two top minners boleage will receive \$100 awards from

winners belong will receive \$100 awards from Kodak.

Second and third prize winners in the 13-and-under category, who received \$75 and \$50 gift certificates, respectively, are: Mark Watkins, 11, Conersville, Ind., for a black-and-white picture entitled "Life's Hall-way"

wav

Russell Davis, II. Parkersburg, W. Va., for a solarized black-and-white picture of a guitarist entitled "Surreal Song."

In the 14-through-18 category, second and third prize winners of \$75 and \$50 are: John Popowich, 16, Garfield, N. J., for a picture of two horses of contrasting color sharing food, which he named "Brotherhood."

Bruce Siskawicz, 16, Carnegie, Pa., for a picture of a musical group aptly titled, "Rock 'N' Roll."

A special subject matter division of the contest, "What My Cameras Sees at the Boys' Club" awarded a \$50 Kodak gift certificate Club" awarded a \$50 Kodak gift certificate in each age group. These prizes went to Robbie Carter, 12, Kingsport, Tenn., for "Koncentration," showing young spectators watching a pool player, and Stacy Roberts, 15, Waterloo, Iowa, for "I Dare You," a posed confrontation in a gym between a tall, thin boy and a challenging much shorter one. The prize awarded to the 29 runners-up is a \$25 Kodak gift certificate.

is a \$25 Kodak gift certificate. Judges in the National Boys' Club/Kodak Photo Contest were Arthur Rothstein, photo-graphy editor, Parade Magazine; Lucy Evank, a photo editor for Scholastic Magazines, Inc., Joseph S. Lada, director of photography, The Image Bank, and Frank Pallo, Eastman Kodak Company.

FREE! FREE! JOB TRAINING SIERRA NEVADA **JOB CORPS CENTER** YOUNG MEN & WOMEN AGES 16-21

TRAINING FOR A CAREER IN:

IN 1 15 VFG 15 4kl .1 Womer dl 082-1217 Mer 2 385 3211 Vo La 15

644

1.2

CAN WE SAFELY DISPOSE OF NUCLEAR WASTES?

ENERGY UPDAT

By Floyd Culler Floyd Culler, president of the Electric Power Re-search Institute, spent 30 years with Oak Ridge Na-tional Laboratory. He has been elected to the Nation-el Acedemy of Engineering al Academy of Engineering, and is a fellow of the Amer-ican Institute of Chemists. There are ways to dispose of radioactive wastes safely which have been technically demonstrated at small scale

demonstrated at small scale. The science and technology is available to permanently sequester the wastes. But the controlling factor is public perception and ac-ceptance of the possible technical solutions. Public technical solutions. Public knowledge and understand-ing of the issues are, in part, confused by many wrong impressions about the na-ture of and the potential hazards of radioactive hazards of radioactive wastes, when fixed as insol-

wastes, when fixed as insol-uble glass and stored in small zones of geologically stable parts of the earth. I think that the best solution for disposal of high-level waste starts with making insoluble glass or ceramics from the residues produced, following repro-cessing of fuel from nuclear plants. These glasses, pro-tected in corrosion-resistant containers, can be placed in carefully selected geological formations, such as salt beds formations, such as salt beds or dry enclosures in granite rocks. The reprocessing step removes valuable plutonium and uranium from the wastes and returns these fuels to a reactor where they undergo fission to gen-

erate power. If wastes are stored in deep salt beds, there is no problem of contaminating normal water supplies, be-cause all of the normally used water occurs in the first few hundred feet below the surface of the earth, particularly in regions where disposal is considered. These deeply buried, stable, and geologically protected beds are most useful where they are most useful where they are from 1,000 to 3,000 feet deep and are sand-wiched between hundreds of feet of very tight layers of shale. Many such natural deposits exist which extend for thousands of square miles. The layers of shale, salt, and again, shale were put down by the great in-land seas 300 million years ago. Obviously, the salt beds would not exist if water flowed there, because salt is flowed there, because salt is soluble. The salt is pro-tected from water intrusion, glaciers of the ice ages, and surface floods by thick layers of shale. The salt layer itself is very slightly



Floyd Culle plastic (somewhat like can-dle wax); if dug or cracked, it will reseal itself.

Actual subsurface area re-quired for nuclear power waste disposal is very, very small. If the United States were to build 1,000 reactors in the next 20 years, which is now extremely unlikely, the accumulated wastes from all of these plants could be stored in about 1,200 acres of salt under the ground. Compared to this requirement, one single de-posit of bedded salt covers about 10,000 square miles,

about 10,000 square miles, or 6,400,000 acres. In these 1,200 acres, the nuclear wastes would be contained in six-inch cylin-ders, ten feet long, placed on 25-foot centers, so that most of the area would be occupied by salt between the canisters. So, there cer-tainly is no problem insofar as availability of a safe disas availability of a safe dis-posal site is concerned. There are other forma-

tions, such as granites, tuffs, limestone caverns and, for low-level wastes, the tight shales which will protect

shales which will protect radioactive wastes. Unreprocessed fuel ele-ments from the reactors now operating can be stored very safely in heavily pro-tected water-cooled, or air-cooled, basins at or near the earth's surface. The current practice of storing unrepro-cessed power fuel is the necessary first step in an acceptable nuclear waste

disposal scheme. But I think the safest course of all is to reprocess the fuel elements after they have been removed from the nuclear reactor. The residual plutonium and uranium can then be used to produce more nuclear fission power. This would remove those long-lived radioactive elements, leaving only those shorter-lived fission products which decay to innocuous levels in 1,000 years or less. Such innocuous levels would be about equal to a natural source, such as the uranium ores on our Colorado Plateau.

