# Supporting Statement for

# Waste Management Plans, Refuse Discharge Logs, Letters of Instruction for Certain Persons-in-Charge (PIC) and Great Lakes Dry Cargo Residue Recordkeeping [w/ proposed changes by USCG-2004-19621; RIN 1625-AA89]

#### A. Justification.

1) <u>Circumstances that make the collection of information necessary</u>.

This collection is a combination of the following four approved information requests.

- (a) Waste Management Plans.
- (b) Refuse Discharge Logs.
- **(c)** Letter of Instruction for Persons-in-Charge (PIC) on Uninspected Vessels.
- (d) Dry Cargo Residue (DCR) Recordkeeping
- (a) and (b) The International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, 1973, as modified by the Protocol of 1978 (MARPOL 73/78) and codified in 33 USC §§ 1901-1909 requires that the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating to prescribe regulations for refuse record books and waste management plans. These statutory provisions are addressed in 33 CFR Part 151.55 and 151.57 respectively.
- **(c)** The letter of instruction's contents should verify the PIC's credentials, stating that the holder has received sufficient formal instruction from the owner, operator, or agent of the vessel, as required by 33 CFR 155.710(e) (2) and 155.715.
- (d) DCR Recordkeeping and Management Plan apply to Great Lakes vessels that discharge bulk dry cargo residue, per 33 CFR 151.66.

This information collection supports the following strategic goals:

**Department of Homeland Security** 

- Prevention
- Protection

# U.S. Coast Guard

- Safety
- Protection of the Natural Resources

# Prevention and Response Directorates (CG-5P & CG-5R)

- Safety: Eliminate deaths, injuries, and property damage associated with commercial maritime operations.
- Human and Natural Environment: Eliminate environmental damage associated with maritime transportation and operations

#### on and around the nation's waterways.

- 2) By whom, how, and for what purpose the information is to be used.
  - (a) Vessel operators of U.S. oceangoing ships, 40 feet or more in length, engaged in commerce or equipped with galleys and berths are required to develop waste management plans. The purpose of a waste management plan is to prevent the discharge of waste, including plastics, into water. These plans are used to determine whether a ship is in compliance with MARPOL 73/78 Annex V.
  - **(b)** Vessel operators of U.S. oceangoing ships of 400 gross tons or more, and U.S. ships involved on international voyages carrying 15 passengers or more, are required to maintain refuse record books. Refuse record books (discharge logs) are used to document waste discharges from the ships. These are also used to determine whether a ship is in compliance with MARPOL 73/78 Annex V. If noncompliance is indicated, these records may serve as evidence that a ship has violated discharge restrictions.
  - **(c)** To ensure that fuel transfer competency standards are met, all persons in charge (PICs) on un-inspected vessels must carry a Letter of Instruction if they do not hold a Coast Guard issued license or properly endorsed Merchant Mariner's Document.
  - **(d) (1)**DCR recordkeeping requires foreign carriers conducting bulk dry cargo operations on the U.S. waters of the Great Lakes, and U.S. carriers conducting those operations anywhere on the Great Lakes, to record data about:
    - Cargo handled;
    - Shoreside facilities involved in loading and unloading;
    - Control measures used by the facility or vessel to reduce the accumulation of DCR (and hence the volume of DCR needing discharge);
    - Time needed to implement control measures;
    - Estimated volume of DCR resulting from each loading or unloading; and
    - Date, time, vessel location, and speed during each discharge.

Carriers would enter and maintain this data on any format that is easily available to the vessel master. The information would be kept aboard the vessel for a minimum of two years.

This data gives the Coast Guard a more comprehensive picture of what causes DCR accumulation, the conditions under which DCR is swept overboard, the volume of DCR being discharged into the Great Lakes, and the efficacy of control measures in minimizing DCR accumulation. This data is essential if the Coast Guard is to monitor and respond to future trends in Great Lakes DCR discharges. The proposed information collection would provide important data on the efficacy of any control measures that carriers use to comply with the management plan discussed below.

- (2) US vessels conducting bulk dry cargo operations anywhere in the Great Lakes will be required to develop a management plan that describes vessels' procedures for minimizing DCR. Foreign carriers of bulk dry cargo operating in US waters of the Great Lakes will be required to affix language that would modify their current wastes management plan to accommodate the requirements of the proposed management plan in our SNPRM. Requirements of the management plan are listed below:
  - Equipment onboard the vessel that is designed to minimize bulk dry cargo spillage during loading and unloading;
  - Equipment onboard the vessel that is available to recover spilled cargo from the decks and transfer tunnels and return it to the holds or to unloading conveyances;
  - Operational procedures employed by the vessel's crew during the loading or unloading of bulk dry cargoes to minimize cargo spillage onto the decks and into the transfer tunnels and to achieve and maintain the broom clean deck condition required by paragraph (b)(4) of the regulation section in SNPRM;
  - Operational procedures employed by the vessel's crew during or after loading or unloading operations to return spilled bulk dry cargo residue to the vessel's holds or to shore via an unloading conveyance;
  - How the vessel's owner or operator ensures that the vessel's crew is familiar with any operational procedures described by the plan;
  - The position title of the person onboard who is in charge of ensuring compliance with procedures described in the plan;
  - Any arrangements between the vessel and specific ports or terminals for the unloading and disposal of the vessel's bulk dry cargo residues ashore; and
  - The procedures used and the vessel's operating conditions to be maintained during any unavoidable discharge of bulk dry cargo residue into the Great Lakes.

Foreign vessel carriers would not have to comply with all requirements in the management plan, since they can prolong most of their DCR management until they reach international waters, at which time they would not be affected by US regulations.

The management plan provides a prescriptive mean by which the industry would be afforded the capabilities of policing themselves to achieve the best possible and economically feasible practice that will minimize the amount of DCR discharge that can potentially find its way into the waters of the Great lakes. The management also provides the Coast Guard with the means to monitor vessel's DCR minimization practices by comparing management plan to observable DCR minimization done on the vessels.

- 3) Consideration of the use of improved information technology.
  - (a) We believe that most waste management plans and related materials can be recorded electronically.
  - **(b) and (c)** Not applicable. To meet international treaty obligations and national compliance and enforcement requirements, the logs and Letter of Instruction must be maintain and available in written (i.e., non-electronic) format.
  - **(d)** We believe that most DCR recordkeeping can be recorded and maintained electronically onboard the vessel.

We estimate that 60% of the recordkeeping requirements can be done electronically. At this time, we estimate that 25% are done electronically.

4) Efforts to identify duplication. Why similar information cannot be used.

There are no State or local regulations relating to this issue. No similar information collection is conducted by other Federal agencies. Similar information does not exist.

5) Methods to minimize the burden to small businesses if involved.

This information collection does not have an impact on small businesses or other small entities.

- 6) Consequences to the Federal program if collection were conducted less frequently.
  - (a) Written waste management plans ensure personnel responsible for the handling of ship generated refuse are aware of the garbage pollution regulations and that waste is handled aboard the ship in a consistent manner. If this information were not recorded, vessel personnel would be unfamiliar with waste handling procedures, which might result in the unintentional disposal of garbage in violation of the regulations. This information is a one-time requirement and revised whenever waste handling procedures are modified.
  - **(b)** This information is collected whenever applicable ships discharge garbage. If recordkeeping were required less frequently, the Coast Guard would not be able to use these records as an enforcement tool. Less frequent recordings of disposal/discharge operations would also hinder the Coast Guard's ability to accurately evaluate the level of compliance among ships with MARPOL 73/78 Annex V discharge restrictions. Lastly, if the crew is not held accountable for documenting every disposal/discharge operation, the recordkeeping process will no longer be an effective tool to promote knowledge of discharge regulations and awareness of waste handling practices on the ship.

- **(c)** If information was submitted or recorded less frequently, no assurance could be given that vessels are operating within the applicable requirements that ensure marine safety.
- (d) If the DCR loading, unloading, or discharge operation data were recorded less frequently, the Coast Guard would expect the data to be less accurate, and this would reduce our ability to enforce compliance with the conditions under which DCR discharges are permitted in the Great Lakes, as well as our ability to monitor and respond to long term developments in DCR discharge practices.

Also, under the proposed amendment to 1625-0072, the regulation will require businesses to develop a management plan and distribute the management plan to their vessels. The management plan is vital to the Coast Guard in measuring how DCR is being managed and minimized onboard vessels. Although changes in this particular industry happen slowly, changes still occur over time. Therefore, as vessels modernize their equipment and practices, they will be required to update their vessel management plan. Updating the management plan is a requirement of the proposed rule, without this requirement, the Coast Guard would be unable to monitor changes in industry practices.

7) Explain any special circumstances that would cause the information collection to be conducted in a manner inconsistent with guidelines.

This information collection is conducted in manner consistent with the guidelines in 5 CFR 1320.5(d)(2).

# 8) Consultation.

The Coast Guard published on September 29, 2008, an Interim Rule (IR) entitled "Dry Cargo Residue Discharges in the Great Lakes" (DCR) [USCG-2004-19621; RIN 1625-AA89; 73 FR 56492]. The rulemaking amended Coast Guard regulations—

• to allow the discharge of bulk dry cargo residue (DCR) in limited areas of the Great Lakes by self-propelled vessels and by any barge that is part of an integrated tug and barge unit. DCR is the residue of non-toxic and nonhazardous bulk dry cargo like limestone, iron ore, and coal. These regulations also add new recordkeeping and reporting requirements and encourage carriers to adopt voluntary control measures for reducing discharges. Discharges are now prohibited in certain protected and sensitive areas where, previously, they were allowed.

The Coast Guard received no collection of information-related comments.

On July 30, 2012, the DCR Supplemental Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (SNPRM) was published (77 FR 44528). The SNPRM 90-day comment period closed on October 29, 2012. The Coast Guard has finalized its review of SNPRM comments and determined that there are no changes needed to the DCR SNPRM

COI estimate.

9) Explain any decision to provide any payment or gift to respondents.

There is no offer of monetary or material value for this information collection.

10) Describe any assurance of confidentiality provided to respondents.

There are no assurances of confidentiality provided to the respondents for this information collection.

11) Additional justification for any questions of a sensitive nature.

There are no questions of sensitive language.

12) Estimates of reporting and recordkeeping hour and cost burdens of the collection of information.

The burden for each of the three aspects of this collection is contained in the following paragraphs and in Tables 12.1, 12.2, 12.3, 12.4. Table 12.5 provides a summation of the burden for all aspects of this collection. It should be noted that the applicability of each regulation is different, as described in paragraph 2. All hour burdens are for recordkeeping.

The burden associated with the Waste Management Plan portion of this collection is collection is reported in 12.1.

Table 12.1 - Waste Management Plans

Universe of Potential Respondents	14,374
# New Plans Developed Annually	217
# Plans Modified Periodically	2,831
Annual # of Respondents	3,048
Annual # of Responses	3,048
Clerical Effort/Response, New Plans (hrs)	1.25
Clerical Hourly Rate	\$33
Management Effort/Response, New Plans (hrs)	1.25
Management Hourly Rate	\$84
New Plan Hour Burden/Plan	2.5
New Plan Cost Burden/Plan	\$146
Total New Plan Hour Burden	543
Total New Plan Cost Burden	\$31,736
Clerical Effort/Response, Plan Modification (hrs)	0.5
Clerical Hourly Rate	\$33
Management Effort/Response, Plan Modification (hrs)	0.5
Management Hourly Rate	\$84
Plan Modification Hour Burden/Plan	1
Plan Modification Cost Burden/Plan	\$59
Total Plan Modification Hour Burden	2,831
Total Plan Modification Cost Burden	\$165,614
	+100,01 i
TOTAL BURDEN HOURS	3,374
TOTAL BURDEN COST	\$197,350

#### Notes on Table 12.1:

- a. The Coast Guard estimates that these plans will be modified, on average, once every five years. The estimated number of responses is therefore 20 percent of the universe of potential respondents (number of vessels required to maintain a waste management plan.)
- b. We estimate that, on average, five percent of the population consists of new vessels, requiring the creation of a new waste management plan.
- c. The positions of management and clerical staff are analogous to a Lieutenant (O-3) and a GS-5, respectively. The rates shown are in accordance with the current edition of COMDTINST 7310.1 (series).

The burden associated with the Refuse Discharge Log portion of this collection is collection is reported in 12.2.

Table 12.2 - Refuse Discharge Logs

			Avg Annual # of	Avg Daily	Total #	Annual Hour Burden
Vessel Type		# Vessels	Days in Operation	Entries	Entries	Per Vessel Type
Commerical fishing vsls		139	330	1	45,870	3,823
Freight Ship		170	330	2	112,200	9,350
Industrial vsls		109	330	1	35,970	2,998
MODUs		60	365	1	21,900	1,825
OSVs		266	365	1	97,090	8,091
Oil recovery vsls		44	330	1	14,520	1,210
Passenger vsls		96	330	2	63,360	5,280
Research vsls		5	200	1	1,000	83
School Ship		8	200	1	1,600	133
Tank Ship		68	330	2	44,880	3,740
Towing Vessel		21	262	1	5,502	459
Unclassified		21	200	1	4,200	350
Manned Platforms		770	365	1	281,050	23,421
	TOTAL	1,777			729,142	60,763

Cost/Hour \$84

TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS
TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONSES
TOTAL ANNUAL HOUR BURDEN
TOTAL ANNUAL COST BURDEN

1,777
729,142
60,763
\$5,104,092

Notes on Table 12.2:

- a. The Coast Guard estimates that each log entry will take no more than five minutes to complete.
- b. The responsibilities of the individual making the log entry is commensurate with that of a Lieutenant (O-3). The wage rate shown is in accordance with the current edition of COMDTINST 7310.1 (series).

The burden associated with the PIC Letter of Designation portion of this collection is collection is reported in 12.3.

Table 12.3 - PIC Letter of Designation

# Vessels Requiring PIC Designation	122
# PICs On Board Each Vessel	2
Total # PICs Holding Designation	244
Estimated Annual Attrition Rate	30%
Estimated # Replacement Letters Created	73
Hour Burden per Designation Letter	0.167
Total Hour Burden	12
Wage Rate of Individual Creating Letter	\$68
Total Cost Burden	\$830
TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	73
TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONSES	73
TOTAL ANNUAL HOUR BURDEN	12
TOTAL ANNUAL COST BURDEN	\$830

# Notes on Table 12.3:

- a. The Coast Guard estimates that each vessel will be required to maintain two designated PICs.
- b. Because this collection is performed only once during an individual's period of employment, the number of responses is assumed to match the rate of attrition (turnover), conservatively estimated at 30 percent.
- c. The responsibilities of the individual creating the Letter of Designation is commensurate with that of a Lieutenant, Junior Grade (O-2). The wage rate shown is in accordance with the current edition of COMDTINST 7310.1 (series).
- d. We estimate that each letter will take no more than 10 minutes to create.

The burden associated with the DCR recordkeeping portion of this collection is collection is reported in 12.4.

U.S. Recordkeeping burden:

U.S. Respondents	55
LLC Clavical Degrapes	0.075
U.S. Clerical Responses	9,075 0.08
Clerical Effort/ Response (HR)  Clerical Hourly Rate	\$61
Clerical Houry Rate  Clerical Total Hours	726
Total Clerical Cost	\$44,286
Total Hour Burden	726
Total Burden Cost	\$44,286
U.S. Management Plan:	Ψ+4,200
U.S. Respondent	14
U.S. Responses	55
Clerical Hourly Rate	\$28
Clerical Total Hours	2.75
Management Hourly Rate	\$69
Management Total Hours	350
Total Clerical Cost	\$77
Total Management Cost	\$24,150
Total Hour Burden	352.75
Total Burden Cost	\$24,227
Canadian Recordkeeping Burden:	
Canadian Respondents	70
Canadian Clerical Responses	2,426
Clerical Effort/ Response (HR)	0.08
Clerical Hourly Rate	\$61
Total Hour Burden	194.08
Total Burden Cost	\$11,839
Canadian Management Plan:	
Canadian Respondent	-
Canadian Responses	70
Management Hourly Rate	\$136
Management Hours	2
Total Hour Burden	105
Total Burden Cost	\$14,280
Non-Canadian Foreign Recordkeeping Burden:	4.5
Non-Canadian Foreign Respondents	18
Non-Canadian Foreign Clerical Responses	1,305
Clerical Effort/ Response (HR)	0.08
Clerical Hourly Rate	\$61
Total Hour Burden	104.4
Total Burden Cost	\$6,368
Non - Canadian Management Plan:	
Non - Canadian Respondent	-
Non - Canadian Responses	18
Management Hourly Rate	\$136
Management Hours	2
Total Hour Burden	27
Total Burden Cost	\$3,672

Total DCR Burden:	
Total Recordkeeping Respondents	143
Total Recordkeeping Responses	12,806
Total Recordkeeping Hours	1,024
Total Management Plan Respondents	14
Total Management Plan Responses	143
Total Management Plan Hours	485
TOTAL BURDEN HOURS	1,509
TOTAL BURDEN COST	\$104,672

#### Notes on Table 12.4:

- a. The Coast Guard estimates that each Clerical Recordkeeping Entry will take .08 hours or 5 minutes to complete and each Master/Captain Certification will take .08 hours or 5 minutes to complete.
- b. The responsibilities of the individuals making the recordkeeping entry and certification are commensurate with that of GS-11 and GS-15 respectively. The wage rate shown is in accordance with the current edition of COMDTINST 7310.1 (series).
- c. The Coast Guard anticipates that each of the 14 U.S. companies that are operating dry cargo vessels on the Great Lakes will be developing a management plan for their fleet of vessels. We estimate that it will take each company 25 hours to develop the DCR Management Plan and an additional .08 hours or 5 minutes of copy time, of the management plan, for distribution to each of their vessels. The Coast Guard anticipates that foreign vessels will require 2 hours to amended their current waste management plans to meet the new requirements set forth in the SNPRM.
- d. For the U.S. population, we anticipate the individuals developing the Management Plan are commenrserate with that of a GS-12, and the individual making the copies with that of a GS-3. For the foreign population, the Coast Guard anticipates that the individual amending the waste management plan to meet the requirements of the DCR management plan will be commensurate with that of an O-6 (Captain). The wage rate shown is in accordance with the current edition of COMDTINST 7310.1 (series).

The summation of the four aspects of this collection is provided in the following table:

Table 12.4 - Summation of Collection Burden

Total # Respondents
Total # Responses
Total Burden Hours
Total Burden Cost

Waste Management	Refuse Discharge	PIC Designation	Dry Cargo Residue	GRAND
Plans	Logs	Letters	Recordkeeping	TOTALS
3,048	1,777	73	157	5,055
3,048	729,142	73	12,949	745,212
3,374	60,763	12	1,509	65,658
\$197,350	\$5,104,092	\$830	\$104,672	\$5,406,943

# 13) Estimates of annualized capital and start-up costs.

There are no capital, start-up or maintenance costs associated with this information collection.

# 14) Estimates of annualized Federal Government costs.

- (a), (b), (c): This collection is for recordkeeping purposes only, and the public need not submit the information for review to the Coast Guard. Instead, Coast Guard personnel review these documents during periodic inspections, random boardings, and post-casualty, in conjunction with other vessel documentation and equipment. The incremental burden to the Government is negligible, and therefore not herein calculated.
- **(d):** For the DCR recordkeeping collection data, the Coast Guard would review records during periodic vessel inspections, random boarding's, and post-casualty, in conjunction with other vessel documentation and equipment. In addition, we would analyze reported data as part of the data collection and analysis work to be performed in conjunction with the proposed new rulemaking to consider requiring the use of DCR control measures on the Great Lakes. The incremental burden to the Government is negligible, and therefore not herein calculated.

# 15) Explain the reasons for the change in burden.

First, the change (i.e., increase) in hour burden is a PROGRAM CHANGE due to the DCR rulemaking [USCG-2004-19621; RIN 1625-AA89]. The rulemaking proposes changes to the reporting and recordkeeping requirements of this collection by—

- Requiring the development of a DCR Management Plan
- Eliminating the use of form CG-33 and the quarterly reporting of that info to the Coast Guard. Info must still be maintained on board the vessel for inspection by the Coast Guard.
- Allowing DCR recordkeeping in any format (i.e., hard copy or electronic). Second, listed below are additional revisions to the collection—

- Changed title to reflect previously approved program change (ICR Ref. No. 200806-1625-002).
  - o Old title was—Waste Management Plans, Refuse Discharge Logs, and Letters of Intruction for Certain Persons-in-Charge (PIC).
  - o New title is— Waste Management Plans, Refuse Discharge Logs, Letters of Instruction for Certain Persons-in-Charge (PIC) and Great Lakes Dry Cargo Residue Recordkeeping.
- Coast Guard has revised the Instruction sheet for this collection to include the proposed DRC Management Plan requirement.

Third, the methodology for calculating burden remain unchanged.

16) For collections of information whose results are planned to be published for statistical use, outline plans for tabulation, statistical analysis and publication.

This information collection will not be published for statistical purposes.

17) Explain the reasons for seeking not to display the expiration date for OMB approval of the information of collection.

The Coast Guard will display the expiration date for OMB approval of this information collection.

18) Explain each exception to the certification statement.

The Coast Guard does not request an exception to the certification of this information collection.

**B.** Collection of Information Employing Statistical Methods.

This information collection does not employ statistical methods.