



Sharing capitol ideas.

The Council of State Governments

Midwestern Office

September 21, 2010

Secretary

Attn: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Re: Docket # NRC-2008-0120

To Whom it May Concern:

On behalf of the members of The Council of State Governments' Midwestern Radioactive Materials Transportation Committee, we are writing to submit comments on the NRC's Proposed Rule on Physical Protection of Byproduct Material, published on June 15, 2010 (*Federal Register* vol. 75, No. 114, pp. 33902-33947). The 12 states in the Midwestern region participate on the committee: Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin. The committee's comments are limited to the transportation-related aspects of the proposed rules.

The Midwestern states agree with the NRC's decision to promulgate the existing orders in regulations for the purpose of giving stakeholders an opportunity to provide comments and to make them generally applicable to all licensees. We note that, as part of the rulemaking process, the NRC is planning to hold "at least one public workshop" on any forthcoming guidance documents on the new security requirements. To make this information accessible to the greatest number of stakeholders, we encourage the NRC to hold more than one workshop and to locate the workshops in a central location within each NRC region.

In the answer to Transportation Security question #4 (p. 33918), the NRC states that "verification of the transferee's license" is "necessary." The Midwestern states agree. In terms of the timing and frequency of the verification process, for the states, the verification should take place as close to the shipping date as possible. We recognize, however, that there is a need to balance the states' needs with the burden placed on the shipper. We believe the NRC must decide on the most appropriate frequency of checks based on the capabilities of the new web-based system it is developing for this purpose. If the new system will be user friendly, fast, and updated often, then frequent checks should not be a burden. An annual check would not be acceptable.

**DOCKETED  
USNRC**

September 22, 2010 (8:31a.m.)

OFFICE OF SECRETARY  
RULEMAKINGS AND  
ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

701 East 22<sup>nd</sup> Street  
Suite 110  
Lombard, Illinois 60148  
Tel: 630/925-1922  
Fax: 630/925-1930  
E-mail: csgm@csg.org  
www.csgmidwest.org

**Michael H. McCabe**  
Regional Director

Lexington  
P.O. Box 11910  
Lexington, Kentucky 40578  
Tel: 859/244-8000

Atlanta  
P.O. Box 98129  
Atlanta, Georgia 30359  
Tel: 404/633-1866

New York  
100 Wall Street  
20th Floor  
New York, New York 10005  
Tel: 212/482-2320

Sacramento  
1107 9th Street  
Suite 730  
Sacramento, California 95814  
Tel: 916/553-4423

Washington  
444 North Capitol Street, NW  
Suite 401  
Washington, DC 20001  
Tel: 202/624-5460

Regarding question #5 (p. 33918), the Midwestern states agree with the NRC that "24 hours is too long before starting an investigation" into the possible theft or diversion of material. The proposed two-hour timeframe for Category 1 material and four-hour timeframe for Category 2 material seem reasonable.


Regarding question #8 (p. 33919), the proposal is for the receiving licensee to notify the shipping licensee "no later than four hours after the package arrives." However, the shipping licensee for shipments containing Category 1 material is required to begin an investigation if the shipment does not arrive within *two* hours of the estimated arrival time. The Midwestern states suggest that the NRC consider modifying these timeframes to provide more consistency between the timing of notifications and the initiation of investigations.

Regarding question #9, the Midwestern states note that the NRC is considering a rule that would require shippers to provide advance notification to tribes for shipments of irradiated reactor fuel. The final rule on byproduct material should be consistent with whatever rule the NRC promulgates for tribal notifications.

Finally, with regard to question #26, the Midwestern states believe it is imperative that the requirements for the transshipment of material be identical to those for domestic shipments. We understand that DOT and DHS regulate transshipments, but it is both ineffective and inefficient to have different sets of rules for shipments based on their final destination. We urge the NRC to work with the other federal agencies to harmonize the regulations so that licensees and their regulators at the federal and state level follow consistent rules for all shipments. In a letter dated January 18, 2008, the state of Illinois suggested general licensing of carriers as one way to resolve this issue. We urge the NRC to consider this approach and others in order to ensure that *all* shipments of Category 1 and 2 material that travel within the U.S. are "subject to enhanced security requirements and safeguarded during transport," not just domestic shipments or those involving imports or exports.

We appreciate the opportunity to weigh in on the proposed rules. If you have any questions about our comments, please contact Lisa Janairo with CSG Midwest at 920/458-5910.

Sincerely,



Melanie Rasmusson  
Co-Chair, CSG Midwestern Radioactive  
Materials Transportation Committee



Paul Schmidt  
Co-Chair, CSG Midwestern Radioactive  
Materials Transportation Committee

# PUBLIC SUBMISSION

<b>As of:</b> September 22, 2010
<b>Received:</b> September 21, 2010
<b>Status:</b> Pending_Post
<b>Tracking No.</b> 80b547f5
<b>Comments Due:</b> October 13, 2010
<b>Submission Type:</b> Web

**Docket:** NRC-2008-0120  
Physical Protection of Byproduct Material

**Comment On:** NRC-2008-0120-0038  
Physical Protection of Byproduct Material

**Document:** NRC-2008-0120-DRAFT-0049  
Comment on FR Doc # 2010-13319

---

## Submitter Information

**Name:** Lisa Janairo

**Address:**

PO Box 981

Sheboygan, WI, 53082-0981

**Organization:** The Council of State Governments

**Government Agency Type:** Regional

---

## General Comment

I am submitting the attached letter on behalf of The Council of State Governments' Midwestern Radioactive Materials Transportation Committee.

---

## Attachments

**NRC-2008-0120-DRAFT-0049.1:** Comment on FR Doc # 2010-13319

Received: from HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov ([148.184.44.76]) by OWMS01.nrc.gov  
([148.184.100.43]) with mapi; Wed, 22 Sep 2010 08:31:18 -0400  
Content-Type: application/ms-tnef; name="winmail.dat"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: binary  
From: "Gallagher, Carol" <Carol.Gallagher@nrc.gov>  
To: Rulemaking Comments <Rulemaking.Comments@nrc.gov>  
Date: Wed, 22 Sep 2010 08:30:34 -0400  
Subject: Comment on Physical Protection of Byproduct Material  
Thread-Topic: Comment on Physical Protection of Byproduct Material  
Thread-Index: ActaUfPOTlfMmyGZRqSJMuhlgfHkBQ==  
Message-ID:  
<6F9E3C9DCAB9E448AAA49B8772A448C52258F8377C@HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov>  
Accept-Language: en-US  
Content-Language: en-US  
X-MS-Has-Attach: yes  
X-MS-Exchange-Organization-SCL: -1  
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:  
<6F9E3C9DCAB9E448AAA49B8772A448C52258F8377C@HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov>  
MIME-Version: 1.0