

FINAL SUPPORTING STATEMENT
FOR
10 CFR PART 62
CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR EMERGENCY ACCESS TO
NON-FEDERAL AND REGIONAL LOW-LEVEL WASTE DISPOSAL FACILITIES
(3150-0143)

EXTENSION

Description of the Information Collection

Part 62 of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (CFR) sets out the information that will have to be provided to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) by any Low-Level Radioactive Waste (LLRW) generator or State seeking emergency access to an operating LLW disposal facility pursuant to Section 6 of the LLW Policy Amendments Act of 1985 (PL 99-240, January 15, 1986) (The Act).

A. Justification

1. Need for and Practical Utility of the Collection of Information

Section 6 of the Act provides that the NRC can override denial of access decisions and grant generators "emergency access" to the operating non-Federal disposal facilities. To receive emergency access, a State or generator must request it and successfully demonstrate to the NRC that access to LLW disposal is necessary in order to eliminate a serious and immediate threat to the public health and safety or the common defense and security, and that the threat cannot be mitigated by any alternative consistent with the public health and safety, including ceasing the activities that generate the waste. From the information provided by the requester, NRC must be able to make both determinations prior to granting emergency access. The NRC is also directed to grant extensions of emergency access and temporary emergency access under specified circumstances.

The Act also provides that as part of the overall decision to grant emergency access, NRC is to designate the operating LLW disposal facility/facilities which will receive the waste requiring emergency access. The requester must submit the information necessary for NRC to make sure that the LLW approved for emergency access disposal is compatible in form, composition, waste package, radioactivity, etc., with the criteria established by the license or the licensing agreement of the facility designated to receive the waste. The Act provides that any requests for emergency access should contain all information and certifications that the NRC may require to make its determinations.

The Commission has promulgated a rule (10 CFR Part 62) establishing the criteria and procedures to be used for granting emergency access to non-Federal and regional LLW disposal facilities. The rule sets out the information and certifications to be provided in a request for emergency access in order for the NRC to determine whether emergency access should be granted and which disposal facilities should receive the wastes.

Section 62.5 specifies the Commission may, upon application of any interested person or upon its own initiative, grant an exemption from the requirements of the regulations in this part that it determines is authorized by law and will not endanger life or property or the common defense and security and is otherwise in the public interest.

Section 62.11 specifies the filing and distribution requirements for a request for a Commission determination. This section also provides for publication in the *Federal Register* of a notice acknowledging the receipt of a request for a determination and asking for public comment on the request to be submitted to the NRC within 10 days of the date of notice. Section 62.11 also provides that a copy of the notice be transmitted to specific potentially affected parties.

Section 62.12 specifies the information that must be provided to the NRC in a request for emergency access. For each generator for which the request applies, general information to include the name and address of the requester and persons or companies requiring emergency access must be provided. In addition, a statement indicating if the request is based on public health and safety or common defense and security, a certification that the waste is low-level, the activity responsible for generating the waste, the name of disposal facility receiving waste prior to generator being denied access, a description of the waste including characteristics and composition, volume, time duration, and packaging, and a description of volume reduction and waste minimization techniques must be provided. The NRC also requires that information concerning the circumstances that led to the denial of access, a description of the situation responsible for creating the threat to the public health and safety or the common defense and security, a description of actions taken by the requester to prevent the need for making the request, and the impacts on public health and safety and common defense and security if emergency access is not granted, or if generator services, including research activities were to be curtailed for a limited time or indefinitely.

Section 62.13 specifies the information that must be included in a request for emergency access on alternatives to emergency access. Information detailing the process used by the requester to identify, consider, and reject alternatives to emergency access is required, as well as information concerning the actual alternatives.

Section 62.14 specifies the information that must be provided in a request for an extension of emergency access, including documentation that the generator of the LLW and the State in which the waste was generated has diligently acted to eliminate the need for emergency access (as is required by the Act).

Section 62.15 specifies that the Commission may require additional information from the requester on any portion of the request for emergency access. This section also specifies that the Commission shall deny a request for emergency access if the additional information is not provided by the requester within 10 days from the date of the request for additional information.

2. Agency Use of Information

The information required by the NRC will be reviewed by the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, Division of Decommissioning Uranium Recovery and Waste Programs, and other NRC offices. The information will enable the NRC to make the required statutory findings that:

- a serious and immediate threat exists to the public health and safety or the common defense and security,
- no mitigating alternatives are available,
- a grant of emergency access to an operating non-Federal or regional LLW disposal facility is necessary, and
- the facility/facilities should receive the low-level waste.

In case of requests for an extension of emergency access, the information required will also enable the Commission to determine whether the person making the request has diligently pursued alternatives to emergency access.

The Act directs the Commission to decide on requests for emergency access within 45 days of their receipt. It is important if NRC is to be able to respond within this timeframe that all information necessary for making the required determinations be submitted as part of the initial request.

3. Reduction of Burden Through Information Technology

There are no legal obstacles to reducing the burden associated with this information collection. The NRC encourages respondents to use new automated information technology when it would be beneficial to them. The NRC issued a regulation October 10, 2003 (68 FR 58791), consistent with the Government Paperwork Elimination Act, which allows its licensees, vendors, applicants, and members of the public the option to make submissions electronically via CD-ROM, e-mail, special Web-based interface, or other means. Because of the infrequency of submission, there currently are no electronic submissions for this clearance.

4. Effort to Identify Duplication and Use Similar Information

No sources of similar information are available. There is no duplication of requirements. The NRC has in place an ongoing program to examine all information collections with the goal of eliminating all duplication and/or unnecessary information collections.

5. Effort to Reduce Small Business Burden

Since access to LLW disposal may be denied to any generator of LLW¹, the rule could potentially affect both large and small generators. The generators of LLW are nuclear power plants, medical and academic facilities, radiopharmaceutical manufacturers, fuel fabrication facilities, and government licensees. Of these categories, all but the power plants, fuel fabrication facilities, and government licensees could potentially include small entities. However, since the generator itself triggers imposition of the requirements of the rule by requesting emergency access from the NRC, information requirements are the same for both large and small entities, and total number of requests for emergency access is expected to be small, the NRC does not believe it is possible to reduce the burden for small businesses either by less frequent or less complete information submittals.

6. Consequences to Federal Program or Policy Activities if the Collection is Not Conducted or is Conducted Less Frequently

If the collection is not conducted, the NRC will be unable to determine whether a serious and immediate threat to public health and safety or the common defense and security exists that warrants the granting of emergency access to the low-level waste disposal facility. The NRC is not using Part 62 to impose a schedule for a periodic collection of information. The information collection requirements set out in the rule will only apply when an LLW generator requests emergency access from the NRC. Thus, the frequency of collection will not be controlled by the NRC, but will be dictated by the needs of the generators.

7. Circumstances Which Justify Variations from Office of Management and Budget Guidelines

The rule contains one variation from OMB guidelines. Section 62.15 allows a person requesting emergency access only 10 days to provide the NRC with any additional information identified by the NRC as necessary for its review. This period of time is significantly shorter than the 30 days normally required for such information collection under the OMB guidelines. However, given that the request will be for an emergency situation, that NRC will have less than 45 days total to review requests for emergency access and arrive at its decisions, and given the complexity of the review and decision-making process, it would be impossible to accommodate a 30-day response time. The 10-day response time for additional information is both necessary and reasonable.

8. Consultations Outside the NRC

¹ In 2008, access to the Barnwell, SC, Low-level Waste Disposal Facility was denied to generators in all but three states. This has led to no emergency access requests. In 2012, the Waste Control Specialists site near Andrews, TX, was made available to generators that otherwise have no disposal access. This makes any request for emergency access even less likely.

Opportunity for public comment on the information collection requirements for this clearance package was published in the Federal Register on December 1, 2014 (79 FR 71133). We received the following two comments.

Rich Janati, PA Dept. of Environmental Protection, Bureau of Radiation Protection

Question 1 – Is the proposed collection of information necessary for the NRC to properly perform its functions? Does the information have practical utility?

Yes, the information is necessary for the NRC to determine if denial of disposal constitutes an immediate threat to public health and safety and national security. It would enable NRC to determine whether there are alternatives available (i.e., storage, processing, etc.). The information would also enable NRC to decide on an appropriate facility for disposal of LLRW if emergency access or an extension of emergency access is warranted. As such, the information has practical utility.

NRC Response: Thank you for your feedback.

Question 2 – Is the burden estimate accurate?

Due to lack of prior experience with 10 CFR Part 62 and emergency access request, it would be difficult to predict the number of requests and the cost associated with each request. It should be mentioned that due to the availability of the commercial LLRW disposal facilities in Texas, Utah, South Carolina and Washington and the federally funded programs such as the Source Reduction and Collection (SCATR) program and Off-Site Source Recovery Project (OSRP), it is unlikely that there would be a request for emergency access during the next three years or so.

NRC Response: Thank you for your insight.

Question 3 – Is there a way to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected?

The information request contained in Subpart B of 10 CFR 62 is comprehensive and necessary for a Commission determination. As it relates to the LLRW under consideration, the contents of request for emergency access should be consistent with the information provided on the NRC Form 540, "Uniform LLRW Manifest - Shipping paper" and Form 541, "Uniform LLRW manifest- Container and Waste Description".

NRC Response: Thank you for your suggestion for improvement. NRC will consider it in any future efforts to refine Part 62 data collection.

Question 4 – How can the burden of the information collection be minimized, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology?

The NRC should consider constructing a database using Forms 540 and 541. This database, using a standard format, would be suitable for collecting information [on line] regarding LLRW for which emergency access is requested. Using an electric database format for the waste and other information requests contained in Subpart B would improve efficiency and should alleviate duplication of efforts.

NRC Response: Thank you for your suggestion for improvement. NRC will consider it in any future efforts to refine Part 62 data collection.

Mike Garner, Executive Director, Northwest Interstate Compact

Is the proposed collection of information necessary for the NRC to properly perform its functions? Does the information have practical utility?

Yes. The collection of the information required by Subpart B of 10 CFR Part 62 provides the NRC with information necessary to determine if a specific low-level radioactive waste stream truly represents a verifiable threat to public health and safety and/or national security. This includes: 1) a technical description of the low-level radioactive waste stream; 2) a description of the alternatives considered prior to seeking emergency access and; 3) why the low-level radioactive waste stream poses a significant threat to public health and safety and/or national security to warrant such a request. This information is necessary for the NRC to properly evaluate whether the threat from a particular low-level radioactive waste stream rises to a level requiring Emergency Access. Emergency Access should only be imposed after all other options have been evaluated and rejected.

Also, the sited state/compact that is identified as a disposal option for low-level radioactive waste for which Emergency Access is being requested is going to require this information be provided to them as detailed in the emergency access rules.

NRC Response: Thank you for your insight on this data collection issue from a state/compact perspective.

Is the burden estimate accurate?

Uncertain. However, with the Texas Compact Commission providing for the import of out-of-region low-level radioactive waste for disposal at the Waste Control Specialists' compact facility, this should not be an issue in the near future.

NRC Response: Thank you for your response.

Is there a way to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected?

The information required by Subpart B of 10 CFR Part 62 does a good job of identifying information needed by NRC to properly evaluate any request it receives for Emergency Access. This includes: 1) a technical description of the low-level radioactive waste stream; 2) a description of the alternatives considered prior to seeking Emergency Access and; 3) why the low-level radioactive waste stream

poses a significant threat to public health and safety and/or national security to warrant such a request.

NRC Response: Thank you for your response.

How can the burden of the information collection be minimized, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology?

It seems the NRC could establish an electronic submission form containing the information requirements of Subpart B 10 CFR Part 61 that generators could then use to submit the information electronically.

NRC Response: Thank you for your suggestion for improvement.

9. Payment or Gift to Respondents

Not applicable.

10. Confidentiality of Information

Confidential and proprietary information is protected in accordance with NRC regulations at 10 CFR 9.17 (a) and 10 CFR 2.390 (b). However, no information normally considered confidential or proprietary is requested.

11. Justification for Sensitive Questions

None.

12. Estimated Burden and Burden Hour Cost

Only one exemption under 10 CFR 62.5 during the next three years is estimated. The total anticipated burden for one respondent is an estimated 6 hours at a minimal cost of \$1,210 (4 hours of professional staff time @ \$279/hour + 2 hours of administrative staff time @ \$47/hour).

Only one emergency access request is estimated. The total anticipated burden for one respondent is an estimated 227 hours at a cost of \$60,317 (214 hours of professional staff hours @ \$279/hour + 13 hours of administrative staff hours @ \$47/hour).

Therefore, the total burden for 10 CFR Part 62 is 233 hours (227 hours + 6 hours) at a cost of \$61,527 (218 hours of professional time @ \$279/hour + 15 hours of clerical time @ \$47/hour). These numbers will vary depending on which kind of generators requires emergency access and the circumstances involved.

13. Estimate of Other Additional Costs

There are no additional costs.

14. Estimated Annualized Cost to the Federal Government

- a) Only one exemption request is estimated. The following costs would be incurred by the NRC:

For a request for an exemption under Section 62.5, the NRC estimates that it would likely require 11 hours to make a determination that an exemption is appropriate and a total cost of \$1,793 (5.50 hours of professional staff time @ \$279/hour + 5.50 hours of administrative staff time @ \$47/hour).

- b) The NRC's cost to process a request for emergency access is dependent on the basis of the following threats:

If the threat is on the basis of public health and safety, the NRC estimates that it will take approximately 480 hours for staff to analyze the information submitted in a request for emergency access at a cost of \$133,920 (480 hours of professional staff time @ \$279/hour).

If the threat is on the basis of common defense and security, the NRC estimates that it will take approximately 320 hours for staff to analyze the information submitted in a request for emergency access at a cost of \$89,280 (320 hours of professional staff time @ \$279/hour).

For all the threats, the NRC intends to involve Department of Energy (DOE) and/or Department Defense (DOD) in the decision making process for requests for emergency access based on a threat to the common defense and security. The NRC estimates that approximately 70 hours would be required for each emergency access request processed by DOE or DOD at a cost of \$19,530 (70 hours of professional staff time @ \$279/hour).

The NRC assumes one request based on a threat to public health and safety, and no requests based on common defense and security. The total burden to the Federal government for emergency access is 480 hours.

The annual cost to the Federal government for this renewal is \$134,178.50 (480 hours of professional staff time @ \$279/hour + 5.50 hours of administrative time @ \$47/hour). The NRC's costs are fully recovered by fee assessments to NRC licensees pursuant to 10 CFR Parts 170 and 171.

15. Reasons for Change in Burden or Cost

The overall burden for this renewal remains unchanged. The professional staff time rate increased from \$273 to \$279 per hour. The burden cost for administrative staff hours remains \$47/ hour.

16. Publication for Statistical Use

None.

17. Reason for Not Displaying the Expiration Date

The recordkeeping and reporting requirements for this information collection are associated with regulations and are not submitted on instruments such as forms or surveys. For this reason, there are no data instruments on which to display an OMB expiration date. Further, amending the regulatory text of the CFR to display information that, in an annual publication, could become obsolete would be unduly burdensome and too difficult to keep current.

18. Exceptions to the Certification Statement

There are no exceptions.

B. Collection of Information Employing Statistical Methods

Statistical methods are not used in this collection of information.