PDR

DESIGNATED ORIGINAL

Standard Form 83
(Rev. September 1983)

Request for OMB Review

Important

Read instructions before completing form. Do not use the same SF 83 to request both an Executive Order 12291 review and approval under the Paperwork Reduction Act.

Answer all questions in Part I. If this request is for review under E.O. 12291, complete Part II and sign the regulatory certification. If this request is for approval under the Paperwork Reduction Act and 5 CFR 1320, skip Part II, complete Part III and sign the paperwork certification.

Send three copies of this form, the material to be reviewed, and for paperwork—three copies of the supporting statement, to:

Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs
Office of Management and Budget
Attention: Docket Library, Room 3201
Washington, DC 20503

PART I.—Complete This Part for All Requests.

1. Department/agency and Bureau/office originating request

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

2. Agency code

3 1 5 0

3. Name of person who can best answer questions regarding this request

Regis Boyle

Telephone number

(301) 492-0559

4. Title of information collection or rulemaking

10 CFR Part 2, Appendix B - Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings

5. Legal authority for information collection or rule *(cite United States Code, Public Law, or Executive Order)*

42 USC 2201(c), (o) or

6. Affected public *(check all that apply)*

1 ☐ Individuals or households
2 ☐ State or local governments
3 ☐ Farms
4 ☒ Businesses or other for-profit
5 ☒ Federal agencies or employees
6 ☒ Non-profit institutions
7 ☒ Small businesses or organizations

PART II.—Complete This Part Only if the Request is for OMB Review Under Executive Order 12291

7. Regulation Identifier Number (RIN)

___ ___ ___ ___ — ___ ___ ___ ___, or, None assigned ☐

8. Type of submission *(check one in each category)*

Classification
1 ☐ Major
2 ☐ Nonmajor

Stage of development
1 ☐ Proposed or draft
2 ☐ Final or interim final, with prior proposal
3 ☐ Final or interim final, without prior proposal

Type of review requested
1 ☐ Standard
2 ☐ Pending
3 ☐ Emergency
4 ☐ Statutory or judicial deadline

9. CFR section affected

_____ CFR _____

10. Does this regulation contain reporting or recordkeeping requirements that require OMB approval under the Paperwork Reduction Act and 5 CFR 1320? ☐ Yes ☐ No

11. If a major rule, is there a regulatory impact analysis attached? 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

If "No," did OMB waive the analysis? 3 ☐ Yes 4 ☐ No

Certification for Regulatory Submissions

In submitting this request for OMB review the authorized regulatory contact and the program official certify that the requirements of E.O. 12291 and any applicable policy directives have been complied with.

Signature of program official	Date
Signature of authorized regulatory contact	Date

12. *(OMB use only)*

OF02

1/1

PART III.—Complete This Part Only if the Request is for Approval of a Collection of Information Under the Paperwork Reduction Act and 5 CFR 1320.

12. Abstract—Describe needs, uses and affected public in 50 words or less

"Radioactive Materials, Nuclear Waste Management"

Appendix B to 10 CFR Part 2 provides regulatory guidance for obtaining expeditious action on rulemaking petitions to exempt specific radioactive waste streams from NRC regulation because the radionuclides present are in such low concentrations or quantities as to be below regulatory concern.

13. Type of information collection *(check only one)*

Information collections not contained in rules

1 ☐ Regular submission
2 ☐ Emergency submission *(certification attached)*

Information collections contained in rules

3 ☒ Existing regulation *(no change proposed)*
4 ☐ Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM)
5 ☐ Final NPRM was previously published
6 Final or interim final without prior NPRM
A ☐ Regular submission
B ☐ Emergency submission *(certification attached)*

7. Enter date of expected or actual Federal Register publication at this stage of rulemaking *(month, day, year)*: _____

15. Type of review requested *(check only one)*

1 ☐ New collection
2 ☐ Revision of a currently approved collection
3 ☒ Extension of the expiration date of a currently approved collection without any change in the substance or in the method of collection
4 ☐ Reinstatement of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired
5 ☐ Existing collection in use without an OMB control number

16. Agency report form number(s) *(include standard/optional form number(s))*

17. Annual reporting or disclosure burden

1 Number of respondents	6
2 Number of responses per respondent	1
3 Total annual responses *(line 1 times line 2)*	6
4 Hours per response	3,000
5 Total hours *(line 3 times line 4)*	18,000

18. Annual recordkeeping burden

1 Number of recordkeepers	
2 Annual hours per recordkeeper	
3 Total recordkeeping hours *(line 1 times line 2)*	
4 Recordkeeping retention period	years

19. Total annual burden

1 Requested *(line 17-5 plus line 18-3)*	18,000
2 In current OMB inventory	18,000
3 Difference *(line 1 less line 2)*	0
Explanation of difference	
4 Program change	
5 Adjustment	

22. Purpose of information collection *(check as many as apply)*

1 ☐ Application for benefits
2 ☐ Program evaluation
3 ☐ General purpose statistics
4 ☒ Regulatory or compliance
5 ☐ Program planning or management
6 ☐ Research
7 ☐ Audit

23. Frequency of recordkeeping or reporting *(check all that apply)*

1 ☐ Recordkeeping

Reporting

2 ☐ On occasion
3 ☐ Weekly
4 ☐ Monthly
5 ☐ Quarterly
6 ☐ Semi-annually
7 ☐ Annually
8 ☐ Biennially
9 ☒ Other *(describe)*: One-time submission

20. Current *(most recent)* OMB control number or comment number

3150-0136

21. Requested expiration date

3 years from approval date

24. Respondents' obligation to comply *(check the strongest obligation that applies)*

1 ☐ Voluntary
2 ☒ Required to obtain or retain a benefit
3 ☐ Mandatory

25. Are the respondents primarily educational agencies or institutions or is the primary purpose of the collection related to Federal education programs? ☐ Yes ☒ No

26. Does the agency use sampling to select respondents or does the agency recommend or prescribe the use of sampling or statistical analysis by respondents? ☐ Yes ☒ No

27. Regulatory authority for the information collection

10 CFR Part 2 ; or _____ FR _____ ; or, Other *(specify)*: _____

Paperwork Certification

In submitting this request for OMB approval, the agency head, the senior official or an authorized representative, certifies that the requirements of 5 CFR 1320, the Privacy Act, statistical standards or directives, and any other applicable information policy directives have been complied with.

Signature of program official — Date

Signature of agency head, the senior official or an authorized representative — Date

Joyce A. Amenta, Designated Senior Official for Information Resources Management — 10-4-89

☆ GPO : 1984 O - 453-776

SUPPORTING STATEMENT FOR POLICY STATEMENT
AND STAFF IMPLEMENTATION PLAN REGARDING
RADIOACTIVE WASTE BELOW REGULATORY CONCERN
10 CFR PART 2, APPENDIX B
RULES OF PRACTICE FOR DOMESTIC LICENSING PROCEEDINGS

Description of the Information Collection

Section 10 of the Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1985 (Public Law 99-240), requires that NRC "establish standards and procedures, pursuant to existing authority, and develop the technical capability for considering and acting upon petitions to exempt specific radioactive waste streams from regulation by the Commission due to the presence of radionuclides in such waste streams in sufficiently low concentrations or quantities as to be below regulatory concern." The Act also directs NRC to act in an expeditious manner on the petitions. Section 10 also requires that the standards and procedures established include the information that should be submitted in support of such rulemaking petitions. See the enclosed copy of Section 10 (enclosure 1).

The Commission has met this mandate by issuing a policy statement that sets forth guidance for obtaining expeditious action on rulemaking petitions for below regulatory concern wastes. An accompanying staff implementation plan has also been developed and is being published as an attachment to the statement. Section II of the staff implementation plan, "Information to Support Petitions," describes the nature and purpose of information petitions should contain. The petition and supporting information should include:

- Information and analysis to demonstrate that the radiological impacts are so low as to be below regulatory concern so that the Commission may exempt the disposal.

- Information on the environmental impacts that would likely result from the exempt disposal sufficient to permit the Commission to make a finding of no significant impact on the quality of the human environment.

- A regulatory analysis including a cost/benefit analysis that demonstrates a significant societal cost reduction.

- An assessment of the burdens on small entities sufficient to permit the Commission to conclude that the petitioned action will not have a significant economic impact or a substantial number of small entities.

- Information to permit the Commission to evaluate the radiological impacts using the computer code IMPACTS-BRC.

- Information characterizing the waste stream sufficient to enable the Commission to find that the waste stream is compatible with proposed treatment and disposal, that the waste has negligible potential for recycle, and that the expected variation in characteristics is acceptable.

- Information on methods of determining compliance with the proposed exemption sufficient to enable the Commission to find that licensees can reasonably demonstrate compliance.

- Information on the reporting and recordkeeping which will be needed to document disposals sufficient to enable the Commission to prepare an OMB clearance package for the proposed rule.

- Proposed text for the petitioned rule change sufficient to enable the Commission to conclude that the proposed exemption can be codified.

- Information on the proposed treatment and disposal methods to permit the Commission to conclude that the methods are practical and will not be impacted by the exempted activity.

Separate OMB approvals will be requested for recordkeeping and reporting contained in proposed rules that would grant a petitioned rule. Notice of the policy statement and plan was published August 29, 1986 (51 FR 30839) (Enclosure 2). The statement was also published as an informational Appendix B to 10 CFR Part 2. No changes have been made to the statement or plan.

Justification

Need for the Collection of Information

The codified information requirements for petitions for rulemaking are outlined in the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 2.802(c) (See enclosure 3). These regulations require the petitioner to identify the problem and propose solutions, to state the petitioner's grounds for and interest in the action, and to provide supporting information and rationale. As a practical matter, the information demonstrating that the radiological health and safety impacts are so low as to be below regulatory concern must be provided by the petitioner if the Commission is to act in an expedited manner. Petitions for rulemaking should therefore be submitted following the staff's supplemental guidance and procedures to assure expedited action.

Agency Use of Information

Section 10 of the Act did not relieve NRC of all the legal and procedural requirements normally associated with rulemaking. Thus, NRC must meet the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Paperwork Reduction Act, and the Regulatory Flexibility Act, as well as the Administrative Procedure Act. The supporting information requested of the petitioner should be complete enough so that Commission action is primarily limited to independent evaluation and administrative processing. Minimizing the NRC resources needed is necessary for expeditious action because of limited NRC resources. If the information is not provided, NRC cannot act in an expedited manner on petitions as required by law.

Reduction of Burden through Information Technology

There are no legal obstacles to reducing the burden associated with this information collection. Improved technology has been used to offer petitioners easy access to the analytical computer program the Commission will use to evaluate impacts. The computer code has been modified for use on personal

computers and a user guide has been prepared. Petitioners may use the same program. Petitioners may also provide the commission with the program input on a floppy disk for easier transfer.

Effort to Identify Duplication
The Information Requirements Control Automated System (IRCAS) was searched to determine duplication. None was found.

Effort to Use Similar Information
Maximum use of the published methodology and information in NUREG/CR-3585, "De Minimis Waste Impacts Analysis Methodology," was made. The unique nature of each waste stream and need to address the management of that specific waste on a national basis requires more specific information than exists in NUREG/CR-3585 and other NRC documents. The guidance does encourage the petitioner to draw on data generated in the course of complying with 10 CFR Part 61. Any source of information may be used by petitioners.

Effort to Reduce Small Business Burden
The petitioner is being asked to consider alternatives that could accomplish the objective of the petitioner's proposed rule while minimizing the economic impact on small entities. The petitioner's supporting information should include an assessment of the incremental recordkeeping and reporting costs that would be associated with the petitioned rule change. (See the staff plan at 51 FR 30844 in Enclosure 2). Further, the type of petitioners likely to respond are trade groups and licensee organizations. Individual small entities may be asked by their representatives to provide input but the burden on each small entity should be small, particularly when compared to the potential benefits to each individual small entity.

Consequences of Less Frequent Collection
This action involves one-time-only submissions.

Circumstances Which Justify Variation from OMB Guidelines
There is no varation from OMB guidelines.

Consultations Outside NRC
A working draft of the Federal Register notice was informally provided to the Edison Electric Institute. The Edison Electric Institute and Utility Nuclear Waste Management Group have jointly petitioned for exemption of waste oil disposal by nuclear power plants (Docket No. PRM-20-15). The Institute indicated verbally that it had no objections to the information collection aspects. (Contact: Brian Ferrell 202/828-7669). A draft was also circulated to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). (Contact: Floyd Galpin, Office of Radiation Programs 202/475-9633). The EPA response supported the need for the information and encouraged NRC to include reports from licensees in any rules granting petitions. The notice also solicited comments which can be used to address concerns in this regard in future revisions.

Confidentiality of Information
Any information collected is part of the legal record for each rulemaking, which is available to the public. The Commission has rules in place in

10 CFR 2.790 for processing and protecting confidentiality of information. One advantage to having the petitioner supply information on market parameters is that summary data can be provided to minimize the information which might require protection. Having trade groups collect the information should also result in more complete data since the responders will be aware that only summary information will be provided to NRC and that the requested information is in their best interest.

Sensitive Questions
None.

Estimated Annual Cost to the Federal Government
Current budget estimates are that the entire process of reviewing the submitted information through proposed and final rules granting each petition will require about one staff year. If multiple waste streams are combined into a single petition, more than one staff year per petition would be required. Contractual support is in place for Sandia National Laboratory to perform computer calculations. Up to $150,000 is available through FY 90 for Sandia support. Plans for the following years are uncertain.

The annual cost to the Government is estimated as follows:

Number of Annual Responses	Hours per Response	Total Annual Burden (Hours)	Total Annual Cost
6	2,000	12,000	$720,000

These estimates could vary depending on the specific wastes involved.

It should be noted that persons already have the right to file petitions for rulemaking under 10 CFR Part 2. If the information requested in the policy statement and staff implementation plan is not provided and the same number of petitions were filed, the annual cost to the government would likely be a factor of 3 higher plus contractual support. Contractual support could be at least $250,000 per petition for an additional cost of $1,500,000 (6 x $250,000).

Estimate of Burden
The estimated annual burden on the public will be affected by the specific wastes involved, the number of persons generating the wastes, market information already available, and the alternate methods of disposal requested. We estimate the burden to fully support a petition for rulemaking to be 2-4,000 hours and $250,000 in contractual or consultant support. This effort would be expended over a period of about a year (prior to filing the petition and providing supplemental information in response to questions and public comment during processing).

The annual petitioner burden is estimated as follows:

Number of Annual Responses	Hours per Response	Total Annual Burden (Hours)	Total Annual Cost
6	3,000	18,000	$1,080,000

Reason for Change in Burden
There is no change in burden.

Publication for Statistical Use
None.

Enclosures:
1. Section 10 of Pub.L. 99-240
2. Policy Statement (51 FR 30839)
3. 10 CFR §2.802

sion shall specify and publish such requirements in a manner and form deemed appropriate by the Commission.

"SEC. 9. LICENSING REVIEW AND APPROVAL.

42 USC 2021i.

"In order to ensure the timely development of new low-level radioactive waste disposal facilities, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission or, as appropriate, agreement States, shall consider an application for a disposal facility license in accordance with the laws applicable to such application, except that the Commission and the agreement state shall—

"(1) not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of the Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1985, establish procedures and develop the technical capability for processing applications for such licenses;

Ante, p. 1842.

"(2) to the extent practicable, complete all activities associated with the review and processing of any application for such a license (except for public hearings) no later than 15 months after the date of receipt of such application; and

"(3) to the extent practicable, consolidate all required technical and environmental reviews and public hearings.

"SEC. 10. RADIOACTIVE WASTE BELOW REGULATORY CONCERN.

"(a) Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of the Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1985, the Commission shall establish standards and procedures, pursuant to existing authority, and develop the technical capability for considering and acting upon petitions to exempt specific radioactive waste streams from regulation by the Commission due to the presence of radionuclides in such waste streams in sufficiently low concentrations or quantities as to be below regulatory concern.

"(b) The standards and procedures established by the Commission pursuant to subsection (a) shall set forth all information required to be submitted to the Commission by licensees in support of such petitions, including, but not limited to—

"(1) a detailed description of the waste materials, including their origin, chemical composition, physical state, volume, and [illegible] and

"(2) the concentration or contamination levels, half-lives, and identities of the radionuclides present.

Health. Safety. Regulation.

Such standards and procedures shall provide that, upon receipt of a petition to exempt a specific radioactive waste stream from regulation by the Commission, the Commission shall determine in an expeditious manner whether the concentration or quantity of radionuclides present in such waste stream requires regulation by the Commission in order to protect the public health and safety. Where the Commission determines that regulation of a radioactive waste stream is not necessary to protect the public health and safety, the Commission shall take such steps as may be necessary, in an expeditious manner, to exempt the disposal of such radioactive waste from regulation by the Commission.".

TITLE II—OMNIBUS LOW-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE INTERSTATE COMPACT CONSENT ACT

Omnibus Low-Level Radioactive Waste Interstate Compact Consent Act. 42 USC 2021d note.

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This Title may be cited as the "Omnibus Low-Level Radioactive Waste Interstate Compact Consent Act".

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

September 5, 1986

ATTENTION: Commission Licensees

SUBJECT: POLICY STATEMENT ON RADIOACTIVE WASTE BELOW REGULATORY CONCERN

A Commission policy statement concerning petitions for rulemaking to exempt specific radioactive waste streams from regulation was published in the Federal Register on August 29, 1986. A copy of the published policy statement and accompanying staff implementation plan is enclosed for your information. As a licensee, you may wish to encourage your trade or professional organizations to submit petitions following the guidance provided. You also may be contacted by such groups to help collect data or information to support petitions.

Any comments or suggestions you may have concerning the policy statement or implementation plan would be welcome.

Malcolm R. Knapp, Chief
Low-Level Waste and Uranium Recovery
Projects Branch
Division of Waste Management

Enclosure:
FR Notice dtd 8/29/86

Enclosure 2

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

10 CFR Part 2

Radioactive Waste Below Regulatory Concern; Policy Statement

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Final rule: policy statement.

SUMMARY: This notice contains a policy statement and staff implementation plan regarding expeditious handling of petitions for rulemaking to exempt specific radioactive waste streams from disposal in a licensed low-level waste disposal facility. For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) to grant these rulemaking petitions, the waste streams must be sufficiently low in concentration or quantities of radionuclides for the Commission to find that they may be disposed of by alternative means without posing an undue risk to public health and safety. The policy statement and plan are in the nature of regulatory guidance for implementing existing requirements for rulemaking petitions in 10 CFR 2.802. The documents describe the kind of information petitioners should file to allow timely Commission review of the petition. They also describe decision criteria the Commission will use and the administrative procedures to be followed in order to permit the Commission to act upon the petition in an expedited manner. These documents respond to a mandate in the Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1985 and are being published as Appendix B to 10 CFR Part 2.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 27, 1986.

ADDRESSES: Send any written comments or suggestions to the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555; Attention: Docketing and Service Branch. Comments received within 60 days would be most helpful. Copies of comments received by the Commission may be examined or copied for a fee at the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) Public Document Room, 1717 H Street NW, Washington, DC 20555.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kitty S. Dragonette, Division of Waste Management, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, telephone: (301) 427-4300.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

List of Subjects in 10 CFR Part 2

Administrative practice and procedure, Classified business information, Freedom of information, Hazardous waste, Nuclear material, Nuclear power plants and reactors, Penalties, Sex discrimination.

For the reasons set forth below and under the authority of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 as amended, the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974, as amended, and 5 U.S.C. 553, the NRC is adopting the following amendments to 10 CFR Part 2.

PART 2—RULES OF PRACTICE FOR DOMESTIC LICENSING PROCEDURES

1. The authority citation for Part 2 is revised to read as follows:

Authority: Secs. 161, 181, 68 Stat. 948, 953, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2201, 2231); sec. 191, as amended, Pub. L. 87-615, 76 Stat. 409 (42 U.S.C. 2241); sec. 201, 88 Stat. 1242, as amended (42 U.S.C. 5841); 5 U.S.C. 552.

Section 2.101 also issued under secs. 53, 62, 63, 81, 103, 104, 105, 68 Stat. 930, 932, 933, 935, 936, 937, 938, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2073, 2092, 2093, 2111, 2133, 2134, 2135); sec. 102, Pub. L. 91-190, 83 Stat. 853, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4332); sec. 301, 88 Stat. 1248 (42 U.S.C. 5871). Sections 2.102, 2.103, 2.104, 2.105, 2.721 also issued under secs. 102, 103, 104, 105, 183, 189, 68 Stat. 936, 937, 938, 954, 955, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2132, 2133, 2134, 2135, 2233, 2239). Section 2.105 also issued under Pub. L. 97-415, 96 Stat. 2073 (42 U.S.C. 2239). Sections 2.200-2.206 also issued under secs. 186, 234, 68 Stat. 955, 83 Stat. 444, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2236, 2282); sec. 206, 88 Stat. 1246 (42 U.S.C. 5846). Sections 2.600-2.606 also issued under sec. 102, Pub. L. 91-190, 83 Stat. 853, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4332). Sections 2.700a, 2.719 also issued under 5 U.S.C. 554. Sections 2.754, 2.760, 2770 also issued under 5 U.S.C. 557. Section 2.790 also issued under sec. 103, 68 Stat. 936, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2133) and 5 U.S.C. 552. Sections 2.800 and 2.808 also issued under 5 U.S.C. 553. Section 2.809 also issued under 5 U.S.C. 553 and sec. 29, Pub. L. 85-256, 71 Stat. 579, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2039). Subpart K also issued under sec. 189, 68 Stat. 955 (42 U.S.C. 2239); sec. 134, Pub. L. 97-425, 96 Stat. 2230 (42 U.S.C. 10154). Appendix A also issued under sec. 6, Pub. L. 91-560, 84 Stat. 1437 (42 U.S.C. 2135). Appendix B is also issued under sec. 10, Pub. L. 99-240, 99 Stat. 1842 (42 U.S.C. 2021b et seq.).

2. Add the following policy statement as Appendix B to Part 2:

Appendix B to Part 2—General Statement of Policy and Procedures Concerning Petitions Pursuant to § 2.802 for Disposal of Radioactive Waste Streams Below Regulatory Concern:

I. Introduction and Purpose
II. Standards and Procedures
III. Agreement States
IV. Future Action

I. Introduction and Purpose

The Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1985 (the Act) (42 U.S.C. 2021b et seq.) was enacted January 15, 1986. Section 10 of the Act addresses disposal of wastes termed "below regulatory concern" that would not need to be subject to regulatory control to assure adequate protection of the public health and safety because of their radioactive content. The goal of this section of the Act is for the Commission to make practical and timely decisions to determine when wastes need not go to a licensed low-level waste disposal site. These decisions will be expressed through rulemaking. Alternative disposal would conserve space in the existing sites while new sites are established and reduce the costs of disposal. Rulemaking petitions may play a role in the national low-level waste strategy outlined by the Act. The Act provides that the Commission establish procedures for acting expeditiously on petitions to exempt specific radioactive waste streams from the Commission's regulations.

The purpose of this statement and accompanying implementation plan is to establish the standards and procedures that will permit the Commission to act upon rulemaking petitions in an expeditious manner as called for in the Act. This policy statement does not require petitioners to present all the information outlined or demonstrate that the decision criteria for expedited handling can be met, if such expedited handling is not wanted. For example, petitions requesting exemption of concentrations of radionuclides that might

S-074999 0005(00)28-AUG-86-10:51:43)

result in individual exposures higher than those recommended in the decision criteria may be submitted, but expedited handling cannot be assured.

Finally, this policy statement and accompanying implementation plan are intended to facilities handling of rulemaking petitions for streams from multiple producers and do not apply to individual licensing actions on single producer waste. Individual licensees who seek approval for disposal of their uniques wastes may continue to submit their disposal plans under 10 CFR 20.302(a).

II. Standards and Procedures

The standards and procedures needed to handle petitions expeditiously fall into the following three categories: (1) Information petitioners should file in support of the petitions, (2) standards for assessing the adequacy of the proposals and providing petitioners insight on the decision criteria the Commission intends to use so that all relevant informational issues will be addressed in the petition, and (3) the internal NRC administrative procedures for handling the petitions. These three categories are addressed in the attached staff implementation plan. The staff plan was developed in response to Commission direction to provide detailed guidance on implementing the general approach outlined in this policy statement. Although staff may revise it from time to time as experience is gained in processing petitions, the plan outlines a reasonable basis for accomplishing the approach. Staff is to publish revisions as NUREG documents and notice the availability of the revisions in the **Federal Register**.

As a practical matter, the primary information for justifying and supporting petitions must be supplied by the petitioner if the Commission is to act in an expedited manner. If the petitioner wishes to assure expedited action, the supporting information should be complete enough so that Commission action is primarily limited to independent evaluation and administrative processing.

Decision criteria for judging whether to grant a petition involve the overall impacts of the proposed action, waste properties, and implementation of the proposed exemption. The following criteria address these areas. Petitions which demonstrate that these criteria are met should be suitable for expedited action.

1. Disposal and treatment of the wastes as specified in the petition will result in no significant impact on the quality of the human environment.

2. The maximum expected effective dose equivalent to an individual member of the public does not exceed a few millirem per year for normal operations and anticipated events.

3. The collective doses to the critical population and general population are small.

4. The potential radiological consequences of accidents or equipment malfunction involving the wastes and intrusion into disposal sites after loss of normal institutional controls are not significant.

5. The exemption will result in a significant reduction in societal costs.

6. The waste is compatible with the proposed treatment and disposal options.

7. The exemption is useful on a national scale, i.e., it is likely to be used by a category of licensees or at least a significant portion of a category.

8. The radiological properties of the waste stream have been characterized on a national basis, the variability has been projected, and the range of variation will not invalidate supporting analyses.

9. The waste characterization is based on data on real wastes.

10. The disposed form of the waste has negligible potential for recycle.

11. Licensees can establish effective, licensable, and inspectable programs for the waste prior to transfer to demonstrate compliance.

12. The offsite treatment or disposal medium (e.g., sanitary landfill) does not need to be controlled or monitored for radiation protection purposes.

13. The methods and procedures used to manage the wastes and to assess the impacts are no different from those that would be applied to the corresponding uncontaminated materials.

14. There are no regulatory or legal obstacles to use of the proposed treatment or disposal methods.

III. Agreement States

The Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1985 establishes a national system for dealing with low-level waste disposal. The system assigns to the States responsiblity for disposal capacity for low-level wastes not exceeding Class C wastes as defined in 10 CFR 61.55. Section 10 of the Act encourages a reduction in volume of such wastes subject to State responsibilitiy for disposal through the option of determining that certain wastes need not go to existing licensed disposal facilities or new sites licensed under 10 CFR Part 61 or equivalent State regulations. If radiological safety can be assured, such disposal would conserve space in the existing sites while new sites are developed, and would serve as an important adjunct to volume reduction efforts in meeting the waste volume allocation limits set forth in the Act. Thus, these rulemakings should aid the States in fulfilling their responsibilities under the Act. Equity also suggests that all waste generators be able to take advantage of below regulatory concern options as part of their waste management strategies. Generators in both Agreement and non-Agreement States will be competing for space in the existing sites and the concept should be applicable nationwide.

Agreement States will play an important role in ensuring that the system works on a national basis and that it remains equitable. States have been encouraging findings that certain wastes are below regulatory concern and do not have to go to low-level waste sites. The States have been voicing this view for a number of years through forums such as the Conference of Radiation Control Program Directors. Rulemakings granting petitons will be made a matter of compatibility for Agreement States. Consequently, rulemaking will be coordinated with the States.

IV. Future Action

The Commission will conduct a generic rulemaking on waste streams below regulatory concern based on a number of factors. The factors include public comments received on the statement, the number and types of petitons for rulemaking received, and how effective the statement is in enabling timely processing of petitions. A generic rulemaking is warranted to provide a more efficient and effective means of accomplishing the goals reflected in Section 10 of the Act. An advance notice of proposed rulemaking will be published within 90 days. Furthermore, the Commission may periodically review all rulemakings in order to ensure that the relevant parameters have not changed significantly and may ask the petitioner to submit updated information to assist in the review. The Commission would also have to confirm that approved exemptions are consistent with any general standards issued by EPA.

Dated at Washington, DC this 25th day of August, 1986.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Samuel J. Chilk,

Secretary to the Commission.

Editorial Note: The staff implementation plan will not appear in the Code of Federal Regulation.

Nuclear Regulatory Commission Staff Implementation of Nuclear Regulatory Commission Policy on Radioactive Waste Below Regulatory Concern

I. Introduction

Section 10 of the Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1985 requires the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) to develop standards and procedures for expeditious handling of petitions for rulemaking to exempt disposal of radioactive waste determined to be

below regulatory concern. The Act also requires NRC to identify information petitioners should file. The Commission Policy Statement provides general guidance on how to meet the requirements of section 10 of the Act, outlines the overall approach to be followed, and lists decision criteria to be used. Implementation of the general approach and decision criteria of the Commission Policy Statement involves developing more detailed guidance and procedures. In accordance with Commission direction, the NRC staff has developed more detailed guidance and procedures for implementation of the Commission Policy Statement. This staff guidance and procedures cover: (1) Information petitioners should file in support of petitions to enable expedited processing, (2) discussion of the decision criteria, and (3) administrative procedures to be followed.

II. Information to Support Petitions

A. General

1. *10 CFR Part 2 requirements.* The codified information requirements for petitions for rulemaking are outlined in the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 2.802(c). These regulations require the petitioner to identify the problem and propose solutions, to state the petitioner's grounds for and interest in the action, and to provide supporting information and rationale. As a practical matter, the information demonstrating that the radiological health and safety impacts are so low as to be below regulatory concern must be provided by the petitioner if the Commission is to act in an expedited manner. Petitions for rulemaking should therefore be submitted following the staff's supplemental guidance and procedures to assure expedited action.

2. *Environmental impacts.* Petitions must enable the Commission to make a finding of no significant impact on the quality of the human environment. Such Commission findings must be based on an Environmental Assessment that complies with 10 CFR 51.30 and must meet the requirements of 10 CFR 51.32. These requirements include addressing the need for the proposed action, identifying alternatives, and assessing the potential environmental impacts of the proposed action and alternatives. Consistent with 10 CFR 51.41, the petitioner should submit the information needed to meet these requirements and do so in a manner that permits independent evaluation by the Commission of the data and methodology used and the conclusions reached.

3. *Economic impact on small entities.* When a rulemaking action is likely to have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities, the Regulatory Flexibility Act requires that the impacts on these small entities must be specifically addressed. (The Commission's size standard for identifying a small entity is $3.5 million or less in annual receipts except for private practice physicians and educational institutions where the standard is $1 million or less in annual receipts for private practice physicians and 500 employees for educational institutions. See 50 FR 50214, December 9, 1985.) For any rulemaking, the Commission must either certify that the rule will not economically impact or will have no significant economic impacts on small entities, or present an analysis of alternatives to minimize the impacts. Because rulemakings on below regulatory concern should provide relief from requirements for all affected entities, satisfaction of this requirement should be straightforward but it must be addressed in any rulemaking. To facilitate expeditious preparation of the proposed rule responding to the petition, the petitioner should submit an evaluation of the estimated economic impacts on small entities. The evaluation should include estimates of the costs for small entities in terms of staff time and dollar costs. Any alternatives that could accomplish the objective of the petitioner's proposed rule while minimizing the economic impact on small entities should be presented. The evaluation should include an assessment of the incremental recordkeeping and reporting costs that would be associated with the petitioned rule change.

4. *Computer program.* The computer program (IMPACT-BRC) the Commission intends to use to independently evaluate petitioners' assessments of impacts is based on "De Minimis Waste Impacts Analysis Methodology" (NUREG/CR-3585) published February 1984.[1] Petitioners are encouraged to consult NUREG/CR-3585 in order to better understand the Commission's information needs. The IMPACTS-BRC program will be distributed by the National Energy Software Center on floppy diskettes for use on IBM-PC and compatible computers. The Center's address is 9700 South Cass Avenue, Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, Illinois 60439. The users guide for IMPACTS-BRC will be published as a draft Volume II of NUREG/CR-3585. Petitioners may evaluate the impacts of the proposed activity using NRC's code, if desired. When alternate calculational methodologies are used, the petitioner should provide all the specific input needed to analyze the waste stream in the petition using IMPACTS-BRC and provide a rationale for all parameter selections. The Commission may clarify or modify the computer code from time to time. Petitioners choosing to use NRC's code should be sure to use the current revision. The National Energy Software Center will provide changes to persons obtaining the program from the Center. Users are encouraged to comment on the code so that their experience can be factored into future revisions.

5. *Scope.* The petitioner should define the geographic area to which the proposed rule should apply and the reasons supporting any area less than national in scope. It might be possible to justify limiting the scope to a low-level waste regional compact or a state but implementation issues such as import or export of wastes outside the compact or state should be addressed in the rationale.

B. Waste Characterization

1. *Radiological properties.* The minimum radiological properties that should be described are the concentration or contamination levels and the half-lives, total quantity, and identities of the radionuclides present. The chemical and physical form of the radionuclides should be addressed. All radionuclides present or potentially present should be specified, including radionuclides identified as trace constituents. The distribution of the radionuclides within the wastes should be noted (e.g., surface or volume distribution). Mass and volume average concentrations should also be presented. For incineration, the radioactive content of the ash and noncombustible fraction should be described. The variability as a function of process variation and variation among licensees should be addressed and bounded.

2. *Other considerations.* An understanding of nonradiological properties of the waste stream is needed to assure that they are consistent with the proposed disposal method and to evaluate the adequacy of the analysis of the radiological impacts. (NRC's deregulation of the radioactive content would not relieve licensees from the applicable rules of other agencies which cover the nonradiological properties.) The petitioner should provide a detailed description of the waste materials, including their origin, chemical

[1] Footnotes at end of article

composition, physical state, volume, and mass.

The term "stream" only means wastes produced from a common set of circumstances and possessing common characteristics. It does not mean "liquid" although the stream may be in a liquid form (e.g., waste oil). The wastes may be resin beads, laboratory glassware, or any other form. Waste form includes packages or containers used to manage (i.e., store, handle, ship, or dispose) the wastes. The variability and potential changes in the waste form as a function of process variation should be addressed. The variation among licensees should be described and bounded.

Compatibility with requirements associated with the proposed management options should be carefully presented. For example, if the petitioner proposes that the wastes be incinerated, the waste form should be shown to be compatible with the temperatures, flow rates, feed rates, and other operating parameters of typical incinerators that may be used. The petitioner should identify the minimum requirements an incinerator must meet to assure adequate combustion. The form and volume of the ash and other residue from incineration should be described. Similar consideration for disposal at sanitary landfills or hazardous waste sites should be addressed. For example, wastes that include components or properties that would qualify the waste as a "hazardous waste" under EPA rules in 40 CFR Parts 260 through 265 should not be proposed for disposal at a municipal landfill.

The potential for recycle should be presented. Feasible treatment, such as shredding, one would reduce the recycle potential should be described. Both the resource value (e.g., salvageable metals) and the functional usefulness (e.g., usable tools) should be addressed. Both short- and long-term potentials for recycle are of significant concern to the Commission.

3. *Totals.* A subsequent rulemaking based upon an accepted petition is generic, and the exemption will likely be used nationwide. Therefore, to the extent possible, the petitioner should estimate the number of NRC and Agreement State licensees that produce the waste, the annual volumes and mass, and the total annual quantities of each radionuclide that would be disposed of. The estimates should include the current situation and the likely variability over the reasonably foreseeable future. If the petition is for a proposed rule that will be limited to less than national scope (e.g., a state or compact region), the totals should be estimated for the petitioned scope. A concentration distribution would be a helpful tool in characterizing the waste stream. For example, the petitioner could indicate that 10% of the wastes fall in the range of 1–10 picocuries per gram, 60% fall in the 10–100 range, and 30% in the 100–1,000 range. Such distribution would permit more realistic assessment of impacts in addition to conservative bounding estimates using maximum values. In any case, the typical quantities produced per generator and an estimate of the geographic distribution of the generators should be described.

4. *Basis.* The basis for the waste stream characterization should be provided. The basis for characterization of the wastes and the total quantities produced should be described. Monitoring, analytical data, and calculations should be specified. Actual measurements or values that can be related to measurements to confirm calculations are important. The description of the bases should include quality assurance aspects. For example, the petitioner should describe the number of samples measured, the representativeness of the samples, and the appropriateness of the instruments used. The statistical confidence in the estimates should be evaluated. If the petitioner conducted any surveys of licensees or relied on surveys by others to help quantify the amount and content of wastes, they should be described. Market information might be useful in characterizing waste generation on a national basis. Designation as a "trace concentration" should be related to specified detection limits, but detection limits themselves are not sufficient reason to dismiss trace concentrations when methods exist to infer concentrations.

For estimates of the radionuclide content of the waste stream, the petitioner may take advantage of licensee experience in classifying wastes for disposal at low-level waste sites. For example, the transuranic radionuclide content of the wastes would likely be below detection limits, but licensees have already established scaling factors for estimating the transuranic content of wastes as part of complying with 10 CFR Part 61 waste classification requirements. Waste generators use generic scaling factors and factors established for their specific wastes through sophisticated analyses. The scaling factors are used to infer the presence and concentrations of many radionuclides based on measurement of only a few nuclides. The classification scheme in 10 CFR Part 61 has been in effect since December 1983. Considerable data and experience should be available to allow characterizing the radiological content and composition of the waste stream being addressed in the petition. The same principles outlined in 10 CFR 61.55(a)(8) may be applied, i.e., values based on direct measurements, indirect methods related to measurements, or material accountability.

5. *As low as is reasonably achievable (ALARA).* The Commission's ALARA requirement in 10 CFR 20.1(c) applies to efforts by licensees to maintain radiation exposures and releases of radioactive materials in effluents to unrestricted areas as low is reasonably achievable. 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix I, describes ALARA for radioactive materials in light water reactor effluents. Licensee compliance with 10 CFR 20.1(c) is a precondition to acceptance by NRC of any waste stream as exempt. Therefore, a description should be provided of reasonable procedures that waste generators would be expected to use to minimize radiation exposures resulting from the disposal of the exempt waste, e.g., removal of surface contamination. These procedures are assumed to apply prior to characterizing the waste to be exempted.

C. Waste Management Options

The management options that the Commission can deal with expeditiously are those described in NUREG/CR-3585. Onsite options include incineration and burial. Offsite options are municipal waste disposal facilities (sanitary landfills), municipal waste incinerators, hazardous disposal facilities and hazardous waste incinerators. Pretreatment, e.g., shredding of otherwise potentially recyclable materials, is a potential adjunct to either onsite or offsite options. Combinations of these options can also be evaluated. For example, wastes may be incinerated on site and the ash shipped to a sanitary landfill. The favored disposal options should be identified and fully described. The petitioner should evaluate a full range of options. The practicality of the proposed option(s) should be presented. Waste compatibility discussed earlier is one aspect. The national availability and distribution of the option is another. Updates on national regulations and laws pertaining to the proposed option should be described and might have to be considered in selecting acceptable options.

D. Analyses

To support and justify the submittal, each petitioner should include analyses of the radiological impacts associated

with handling, transport, and disposal of the specific wastes. Any incremental nonradiological impacts should be assessed. Also the petitioner should use the analyses to prepare and submit a detailed regulatory analysis with the petition.

1. *Radiological impacts.* The evaluation of radiological impacts should distinguish between expected and potential exposures and events. Impacts should be assessed for the expected concentrations and quantities of radionuclides. The petitioner should quantitatively evaluate the impacts from the proposed waste for each option requested. The petitioner should clearly relate the analytical findings to specific provisions in the recommended rule changes. For example, the basis for each recommended radionuclide limit should be clearly explained.

The radiological impacts included in NUREG/CR-3586 and in NRC's computer program (IMPACTS-BRC) cover exposures to workers and individual members of the public and cumulative population exposures. The program calculates both external direct gamma exposures and exposures from ingested or inhaled radionuclides. NRC's computer program can be used to calculate the expected radiological impacts from generator activities, transportation, treatment, disposal operations, and post-disposal inputs. The program can analyze a wide range of management options including onsite treatment and disposal by the generator, shipment to municipal waste management facilities, and shipment to hazardous waste management facilities. The program covers impacts beginning with initial handling and treatment by the generator through final disposal of all the radionuclides contained in the waste stream. Sequential treatment, sorting, and incineration onsite and at municipal and hazardous facilities can be assessed. Disposal of resulting ash and residue is included. Post-disposal impacts that can be calculated include releases due to intrusion, ground-water migration, erosion, and leachate accumulation. The program thus addresses both expected and potential post-disposal impacts.

The petitioner's analysis of transport impacts should be based on a reasonably expected spacial distribution of licensees and waste treatment and disposal facilities which will accept the wastes. The petitioner should address parameters such as average and extreme transport distances. The petitioner's analysis should address the basis for parameter selection and characterize the expected patterns (e.g., indicate how likely the extreme case may be). In addition, the petitioner's analysis should also address potential exposures from handling and transport accidents. The petitioner's analysis of accidents should include all assumptions, data, and results to facilitate review. The potential for shipment of the entire waste stream to one or a few facilities should be assessed. This scenario currently exists for 10 CFR 20.306 exempted liquid scintillation wastes and might result from very limited numbers of treatment facilities or decontamination services. The analysis of impacts for transport, handling, and disposal should include evaluation of this potential circumstance unless it can be clearly ruled out.

As suggested in Paragraph 89 on page 20 of ICRP Publication 46 [2]:

> Exception from regulation and requirements on these bases should not be used to make it possible to dispose of large quantities of radioactive material in diluted form, or in divided portions, causing widespread pollution which would eventually build up high dose levels by the addition of many small doses to individuals. Nor should they be used to exempt activities that, by isolation or treatment, have been made temporarily harmless but that imply large potential for release and could give rise to high individual doses or high collective doses.

The analysis of expected radiological impacts should clearly address:

—The maximum individual exposures.
—The critical group exposures
—The cumulative population exposures.

The maximum individual exposure evaluation should include exposures to all members of the public who may be exposed beginning with the initial handling at the generator's facility through post-closure. Both internal uptake and external exposures should be included. The individual may be a member of the general population (e.g., consumer of contaminated ground water) or a person receiving the exposure from his or her occupation. Anyone who may be exposed and is not a radiation worker should be considered a member of the public. For example, a worker at a sanitary landfill or a commercial trash truck driver would not be a radiation worker. However, occupational exposures to radiation workers should be evaluated and considered in the cost/benefit analysis of the incremental impacts between disposal at a licensed facility and the requested disposal options.

The total population exposures can be estimated and summed in two parts. One part is the smaller critical group (usually the occupationally exposed population) where potential exposures may be higher on an individual basis but the exposures and the number of exposed individuals are more predictable and the exposures are short-term. The critical group should be the segment of the population most highly exposed exclusive of radiation workers. The other part is the general population where the expected exposures and size of the exposed population are less predictable, potential individual exposyres are probably much smaller, and exposures may extend over longer timeframes. Presentation of the population exposures in these two parts should contribute to a more meaningful cost/benefit analysis.

2. *Other impacts.* The NRC action to exempt the radiological content of the wastes would not relieve persons handling, processing, or disposing of the wastes from requirements applicable to the nonradiological properties. The petition should demonstrate that the nonradiological properties of the radioactive waste are the same as the nonradioactive materials normally handled and disposed of by the proposed methods. If the nonradiological properties are similar and the volumes of exempted waste would not impact the normal operations, there should be no incremental impacts. If the petitioner is aware of other impacts which should be considered for the specific wastes in the petition, the petitioner should also address the additional impacts.

3. *Regulatory analysis.* In order to expedite subsequent rulemaking if the petition is granted, the analysis should also address the topics NRC must address in a Regulatory Analysis (e.g., see NUREG/BR-0058, Revision 1, "Regulatory Analysis Guidelines of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission"). [1] Following the Regulatory Analysis format will structure the analytical findings, present the bases for decisions, and address the environmental assessment requirements. The topics are:

(1) *A statement of the problem.* This topic is the need for determining which wastes may be safely disposed of by means other than shipment to licensed low-level waste sites.

(2) *Alternatives.* All reasonable alternatives to the proposed action should be described. The no action or status quo alternative should always be included.

(3) *Consequences.* This topic calls for an analysis of the impacts of each alternative described. The factors the petitioner should address include costs and benefits and practical or legal constraints. Cost/benefit considerations

and constraints are discussed more fully after this listing of topics.

(4) *Decision rationale.* This topic is a conclusions statement that explains why the preferred alternative(s) should be adopted.

(5) *Implementation.* This topic covers the steps and schedules for actual implementation of the proposed rule. The petitioner should address the topic from the waste generator's perspective and include surveys discussed under Topic III.A.5. Recordkeeping and Reporting.

A cost/benefit discussion is an essential part of both environmental and regulatory impact considerations and is, therefore, essential to expedited handling. The discussion should focus on expected exposures and realistic concentrations or quantities of radionuclides. The cost/benefit discussion should include the differential exposure and economic costs between disposal at a licensed low-level waste disposal site and the proposed option(s). It may also include qualitative benefits. Reduced hazards from not storing hazardous or combustible materials might be a benefit. Elimination or reduction of the hazardous properties (e.g., by incineration) could be another. Detrimental costs might also be qualitative such as loss of space in municipal or hazardous waste sites. The economic impact on the licensed site operations (i.e., loss of income from diverted wastes) and its potential effect on the availability of economic and safe disposal should be addressed. Costs of surveys and verifying compliance discussed under Topic II.E. Recordkeeping and Reporting should also be covered. The cost/benefit should also reflect ALARA considerations. Radiation worker exposure, public exposure, and environmental releases might be appropriate in ALARA considerations. In weighing the exposure costs and economic costs for light-water-cooled nuclear reactor wastes, the petitioner could use, for perspective, the $1,000 per person-rem guideline in 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix I, for effluent releases from these facilities.

The petitioner should identify any legal or regulatory constraints that might impact implementation of the petitioned change. The compatibility of the waste with the proposed method of disposal was discussed under Topic II.B.2. Other constraints might stem from Department of Transportation (DOT) labeling, placarding, and manifesting requirements for radioactive materials. Since the receiving facility will not be licensed to receive radioactive materials, this could be an impediment to implementation. For most radioactive materials, the general DOT threshold limits of 0.002 microcuries per gram apply. However, the DOT issued a final rule on June 6, 1985 (50 FR 23811) that amended 49 CFR Part 173 to exempt low specific activity wastes as described in NRC's rules in 10 CFR 20.306. (Note that DOT emphasized that the wastes remain subject to the provisions related to other hazards; see 49 CFR 173.425(d).)

E. Recordkeeping and Reporting

1. *Surveys.* Existing regulations in § 10 CFR 20.201 establish general NRC requirements for performing surveys as necessary to comply with Part 20. Licensees would have to conduct surveys of the waste properties prior to release for exempt disposal to verify that the waste meets the prescribed limits. Such survey programs might consist of (1) fairly comprehensive initial sampling and analysis to confirm that the licensee's wastes will fall below the limits, (2) periodic analysis as part of a process or quality control program to confirm the initial findings, and (3) a routine survey program prior to release of wastes to monitor for gross irregularities. To show that licensees can be expected to conduct compliance surveys prior to waste transfer, the petitioner should describe a sample survey program. The three components just discussed should be included, if appropriate, for the waste stream. Records of the surveys would be maintained for inspection.

2. *Reports.* The petitioner should assume that annual reports on disposals will be required and that associated recordkeeping to generate the reports will be imposed. Minimum information in the annual reports initially might include the type of waste, its volume, its estimated curie content, and the place and manner of disposal. Increased recordkeeping and reporting requirements would address uncertainties in projecting future volumes or amounts of wastes and NRC's responsibility to consider the cumulative impacts of multiple exemptions. When these requirements are proposed, Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval is required. To facilitate NRC filing for OMB approval, the petitioner should include any duplicating or overlapping reporting requirements, the number and type of expected respondents, suggestions for minimizing the burden, estimates of the staff hours and costs to prepare the reports and keep the records, and a brief description of the basis for the estimates. The petitioner should also address whether changes in technical specifications or licenses may be needed.

F. Proposed Rule

The petition should include the text for the proposed rule (see 10 CFR 2.802(c)(1)). The proposed text should cover at least the following:

(1) The quantity and/or concentration limit for each radionuclide present (trace radionuclides could be lumped together with a total limit);

(2) A method to deal with radionuclide mixtures;

(3) The nonradiological specifications necessary to adequately define the waste; and

(4) The specific method(s) of exempt disposal.

If practicable, and if the supporting information indicates the need, the text should also address other features such as annual limits on each generator in terms of volume, mass, or total radioactivity, and administrative or procedural requirements including process controls, surveys, etc., that have been discussed. The text should not include the various dose limits used to justify the proposed radionuclide limits.

III. Decision Criteria

The Commission policy statement establishes that the following criteria should be used by staff as guidelines for acting on a petition. Each criterion is repeated and staff views on implementation are discussed.

1. Disposal and treatment of the wastes as specified in the petition will result in no significant impact on the quality of the human environment.

Discussion: Unless this finding can be made during information submitted by the petitioner, the Commission must prepare an Environmental Impact Statement to more fully examine the proposed action, alternatives to the proposed action, and associated potential impacts of alternatives. Preparation would likely involve contractual support and would likely take 2 years or more to complete. The Commission could not act in the petition in an expedited manner.

2. The maximum expected effective dose equivalent to an individual member of the public does not exceed a few millirem per year for normal operations and anticipated events.

Discussion: The effective dose equivalent means the ICRP Publication 26 and 30 [illegible] sum of the dose from

external exposure and the dose incurred from that year's intake of radionuclides. While a range of 1–10 millirem per year might be acceptable, a one millirem dose would facilitate expedited processing. Higher doses may require more extensive justification. Based on a mortality risk coefficient for induced cancer and hereditary effects of 2×10^{-4} per rem (ICRP Publication 26), radiation exposure at a level of millirem per year would result in an annual mortality risk of 2×10^{-7} (i.e., 2×10^{-4} effects/rem $\times 10^{-3}$ rem/year).

The EPA is developing criteria for identifying low-level radioactive waste that may be below regulatory concern as part of that agency's development of general environmental standards for low-level waste disposal. The EPA published an Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on August 31, 1983 (48 FR 39563) and currently hopes to publish proposed standards in early 1987. Other EPA standards that the doses can be compared to are the Clean Air Act radioactive release standard of 25 millirems per year in 40 CFR Part 61 and the uranium fuel cycle annual whole body limit of 25 millirems in 40 CFR 190.

One millirem is very small when compared to naturally occurring background doses from cosmic and terrestrial sources. Background doses in the United States are typically in the 100–120 millirems per year range exclusive of the lung doses from radon. One millirem is also small when compared to the annual 500 millirem dose limit for individual members of the general public in Federal Radiation Council guidance.

An important feature is that doses of up to 1 millirem from the individual petition should minimize concerns over exposure to multiple exempted waste streams. ICRP Publication 46 addressed individual dose limits and other issues related to exemptions and stated, in paragraphs 83 and 84 on page 19:

> Many radiation exposures routinely encountered in radiation protection, particularly those received by members of the public, are very small by comparison with dose limits or natural background, and are well below dose levels at which the appearance of deleterious health effects has been demonstrated. In individual-related assessments, it is widely recognized that there are radiation doses that are so small that they involve risks that would be regarded as negligable by the exposed individuals. Studies of comparative risks experienced by the population in various activities appear to indicate that an annual probability of death of the order of 10^{-6} per year or less is not taken into account by individuals in their decisions as to actions that could influence their risks. Using rounded dose response factors for induced health effects, this level of risk corresponds to an annual dose of the order of 0.1 mSv (10 millirem).
>
> However, in most practical cases, the need for exemption rules arises in source-related assessment, to decide whether a source or waste stream should be subject to control. Consideration should be given to the need for any optimization of radiation protection and to the possibility that many practices and sources of the same kind could combine now or in the future so that their total effect may be significant, even though each source causes an annual individual dose equivalent below 0.1 mSv (10 millirem) to individuals in the critical group. This may involve assessments of dose commitments and of the collective dose per unit practice or source, in order to ensure that the individual dose requirement will not be exceeded now or in the future. It seems almost certain that the total annual dose to a single individual from exempted sources will be less than ten times the contribution from the exempted source giving the highest individual dose. This aspect could, therefore, be allowed for by reducing the annual individual dose exemption criterion from 0.1 to 0.01 mSv (10 to 1 millirem).

The NRC staff recognizes that at times, human reactions are not so strictly governed by quantative considerations as the ICRP excerpt suggests. Nevertheless, the 10^{-6} per year value seems about as low as practicable, seems too low to justify significant concern, and so seems acceptable.

The United Kingdom's National Radiological Protection Board has issued generic guidance on de minimis dose levels (ASP-7, January 1985) [4] that has status similar to Federal Radiation Guidance issued by the President in this country. The Board identified effective dose equivalents of 5 millirem per year as insignificant when members of the public make their decisions. The 5 millirem limit represents the total dose contribution from all exempted practices. For individual practices, the Board divided by 10 (i.e., 0.5 millirem per year) to account for exposures from multiple practices. These limits are applied generically. Less conservatism under the well defined circumstances associated with specific waste streams and disposal options envisaged in this NRC statement seems justified. In a proposed policy statement dated May 6, 1985,[5] the Canadian Atomic Energy Control Board specifically addressed disposal of specific wastes that are of no regulatory concern. An individual does limit of 5 millirems per year was proposd for this limited application.

A maximum individual exposure of 1 millirem per year is also consistent with Appendix I to 10 CFR Part 50. Appendix I specifies design objective doses for operational light-water-cooled nuclear power reactor effluents. These design objectives include annual total body doses of 3 millirems for liquid effluents and 5 millirems for gaseous effluents. If onsite incineration at reactors is petitioned for as a specified disposal option, the petitioner should address how the proposed activity, combined with all other effluents from the sites, would not exceed the design objective doses in Appendix I to 10 CFR Part 50.

3. The collective doses to the critical population and general population are small.

Discussion: An additional advantage when individual doses are no more than 1 millirem per year is that the collective doses are then summations over very small exposures. The collective dose evaluation is primarily for information purposes, cost/benefit considerations, and to confirm the finding of no significant impact on the quality of the human environment. This determination will be made based on information available during the review of each petition in concert with criterion 5. Staff notes that the United Kingdom policy on individual dose limits includes an associated collective dose criterion. (The collective dose criterion must be met in addition to the individual limits). In ICRP Publication 46, a similar criterion is stated.

4. The potential radiological consequences of accidents or equipment malfunction involving the wastes and intrusion into disposal sites after loss of normal institutional controls are not significant.

Discussion: Potential doses from accidents or intrusion should be well within public exposure limits and take into account the probability or possibility of such events. In a statement dated April 26, 1986,[6] the International Commission on Radiological Protection (ICRP) stated that the ICRP's present view is that the principal dose limit for members of the public is 100 millirems in a year. The ICRP further stated that the 500 millirem limit from ICRP Publication 26 could be used as a subsidiary limit provided the lifetime average does not exceed the principal limit. Consequently, potential exposures from accidents or unexpected events would be more easily justified if they are well below 100 millirem per year principal limit.

5. The exemption will result in a significant reduction in societal costs.

Discussion: When the economic and exposure costs associated with the exemption are compared to disposal at a licensed low-level waste site there should be a significant reduction in costs.

6. The waste is compatible with the proposed treatment and disposal options.

Discussion: This criterion relates to the nonradiological properties of the wastes. For example, disposal of radioactive wastes that also qualify as a nonradiological hazardous material should be proposed for disposal methods in accord with EPA regulations (e.g., incineration or disposal at a hazardous waste facility). Also, wastes proposed for incineration should be combustible and wastes proposed for landfills should be appropriate for disposal in typical landfills anywhere in the nation.

7. The exemption is useful on a national scale, i.e., it is likely to be used by a category of licensees or at least a significant portion of a category.

Discussion: Rulemaking is usually not warranted for wastes involving a single licensee, whether a continuing disposal activity or a one-time disposal. Such proposals by individual licensees are normally processed as licensing actions under 10 CFR 20.302(a).

8. The radiological properties of the waste stream have been characterized on a national basis, the variability has been projected, and the range of variation will not invalidate supporting analyses.

Discussion: One of the merits of dealing with specific waste streams is that the actual properties of the waste stream can be relied upon in estimating impacts rather than conservative bounding parameters. The specific pathways that must be considered can be limited to manageable numbers. The expected fate can be credibly limited based on the properties.

9. The waste characterization is based on data on real wastes.

Discussion: Actual data on real waste provide reasonable assurance that the waste characterization is accurate.

10. The disposed form of the waste has negligible potential for recycle.

Discussion: Eliminating the uncertainties associated with recycle is necessary to expeditious handling. Specifying specific wastes and specific methods of disposal narrows the pathways and timeframes to manageable numbers.

11. Licensees can establish effective, licensable, and inspectable programs for the waste prior to transfer to demonstrate compliance.

Discussion: Survey programs and quality control programs will be needed to provide reasonable assurance that actual wastes disposed of under an exemption rule meet the specified parameters. Since disposal would be exempted based on both established and projected waste characteristics, reporting on the wastes actually transferred for below regulatory concern disposal will be important and should be practical.

12. The offsite treatment or disposal medium (e.g., sanitary landfill) does not need to be controlled or monitored for radiation protection purposes.

Discussion: The evaluation of expected exposures should provide the basis for meeting this criterion. However, this is an area where NRC will have a continuing responsibility as multiple petitions are processed. Reporting on actual disposals will help NRC address this responsibility and monitor the adequacy of the limits included in the exempted disposals.

13. The methods and procedures used to manage the wastes and to assess the impacts are no different from those that would be applied to the corresponding uncontaminated materials.

Discussion: Since the receiving facility will not be licensed for radioactive materials, special handling or measures should not be required at the processing or disposal sites because of the radioactive content of the wastes. This criterion also means that realistic assumptions about the disposal methods have been made in estimating exposures.

14. There are no regulatory or legal obstacles to use of the proposed treatment or disposal methods.

Discussion: To have practical use, the disposal option must be available. For example, if all hazardous waste facilities that accept offsite wastes are closed or are not reasonably distributed, the practicality of an exemption to allow disposal at such sites is questionable. Since the receiving facility will not be licensed for radioactive materials, shipments to landfills or hazardous waste facilities should not require identification as radioactive materials.

IV. Administrative Handling

Agency procedures for expeditious handling of petitions for rulemaking were initially published in 1982 in NUREG/BR-0053, "Regulations Handbook."[1] The procedures are contained in Part 11 of the Handbook and were most recently revised in September 1985. Because of resource limitations and other factors, these procedures have not been fully implemented. Petitions for rulemaking submitted in accordance with the Commission's policy statement and this staff implementation plan will be processed in full compliance with these procedures. These procedures coupled with agency policy to complete all rulemaking within 2 years will provide expeditious action on the petitions. In addition, the Handbook notes general scheduling advice that proposed rules to grant petitions should be published in 6–12 months after acceptance and publication for comment. Proposed rules will be forwarded to the Commission on a 6-month schedule to the extent permitted by resource limits, the nature and extent of public comments, and internal Control of Rulemakings procedures. Rulemakings involving power reactors must be reviewed by the Committee on Review of Generic Requirements prior to publication. Proposed rules involving reactors will therefore be forwarded to the Commission on a 7-month schedule to the extent permitted by resources, comments, and approval procedures. In both cases, every effort will be made to publish proposed rules no later than 12 months after noticing for public comment.

Although the procedures in Part 11 of NUREG/BR-0053 include fast track processing, the nature of the anticipated petitions do not fully comply with the decision criteria to follow this alternative.

Some of the key features of the handling procedures include the following steps for complete and fully supported petitions.

1. Petitioners may confer on procedural matters with the staff before filing a petition for rulemaking. Requests to confer on procedural matters should be addressed to: The Director, Division of Rules and Records, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Attention: Chief, Rules and Procedures Branch.

2. Petitions should be addressed to: The Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Attention: Docketing and Service Branch. In keeping with 10 CFR 2.802(f), petitioners will be promptly informed if the petition meets the threshold requirements for a petition for rulemaking in 10 CFR 2.802(c) and can be processed in accordance with this implementation plan. Ordinarily this determination will be made within 30 days after receipt of the petition.

3. Following this determination, the petition will be noticed in the **Federal Register** for a public comment period of at least 60 days.

4. The petitioner will be provided copies of all comments received, scheduling information, and periodic status reports.

The procedures in NUREG/BR-0053 also include the process for denial and withdrawal of petitions.

Footnotes:

[1] Copies of NUREG/BR-0053, NUREG/BR-0058 and NUREG/CR-3585 may be purchased through the U.S. Government Printing Office by calling (202) 275-2060 or by writing to the U.S. Government Printing Office, P.O. Box 37082, Washington, DC 20013-7082. Copies may also be purchased from the National Technical Information Service, U.S. Department of Commerce, 5185 Port Royal Road, Springfield, VA 22161. Copies are available for inspection and/or copying for a fee in the NRC Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, NW, Washington, DC 20555.

[2] ICRP Publication 46, "Radiation Protection Principles for the Disposal of Solid Radioactive Waste," adopted July 1985.

[3] ICRP Publication 26, "Recommendations of the International Commission on Radiological Protection," adopted January 17, 1977. ICRP Publication 30, "Limits for Intake of Radionuclides by Workers," adopted July 1978.

[4] Copies of the United Kingdom's document are available for inspection as enclosures to SECY-85-147A (relating to 10 CFR Part 20) dated July 25, 1985 in the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street NW, Washington, DC 20555. The United Kingdom documents are available for sale from: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, P.O. Box 569, London SE1 9NH, United Kingdom, as Advice document ASP-7 and a related technical report, "The Significance of Small Doses of Radiation to Members of the Public," NRPB-R175.

[5] Copies of the Canadian document are available for inspection as an enclosure to SECY-85-147A (relating to 10 CFR Part 20) dated July 25, 1985 in the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street NW, Washington, DC 20555. The Canadian document was issued as Consultative Document C-85, "The Basis for Exempting the Disposal of Certain Radioactive Materials from Licensing" by the Atomic Energy Control Board, P.O. Box 1046, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, K1P 5S9.

[6] ICRP/85/G-03, "Statement from the 1985 Paris Meeting of the International Commission on Radiological Protect," 1985-04-26.

[FR Doc. 86-19550 Filed 8-28-86; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

That information submitted in a rule making proceeding which subsequently forms the basis for the final rule will not be withheld from public disclosure by the Commission and will not be returned to the applicant after denial of any application for licensing submitted in connection with that information. If a request for withholding pursuant to paragraph (b) of this section is granted, the Commission will notify the applicant of its determination to withhold the information from public disclosure. 41 FR 11800

(d) The following information shall be deemed to be commercial or financial information within the meaning of § 9.17(a)(4) of this chapter, and shall be subject to disclosure only in accordance with the provisions of § 9.19 of this chapter. 53 FR 17569

(1) Correspondence and reports to or from the NRC which contain information or records concerning a licensee's or applicant's physical protection or material control and accounting program for special nuclear material not otherwise designated as Safeguards Information or classified as National Security Information or Restricted Data.

(2) Information submitted in confidence to the Commission by a foreign source.

(e) The presiding officer, if any, or the Commission may, with reference to the NRC records and documents made available pursuant to this section, issue orders consistent with the provisions of this section and § 2.740(c). 41 FR 11806

Subpart H—Rule Making

§ 2.800 Scope of rule making.

This subpart governs the issuance, amendment and repeal of regulations in which participation by interested persons is prescribed under section 553 of title 5 of the United States Code. 35 FR 11459

§ 2.801 Initiation of rule making.

Rule making may be initiated by the Commission at its own instance, on the recommendation of another agency of the United States, or on the petition of any other interested person. 27 FR 377

§ 2.802 Petition for rule making.

(a) Any interested person may petition the Commission to issue, amend or rescind any regulation. The petition should be addressed to the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, Attention: Chief, Docketing and Service Branch. 44 FR 61320

(b) A prospective petitioner is encouraged to confer with the staff prior to the filing of a petition for rulemaking. Questions regarding applicable NRC regulations sought to be amended, the procedures for filing a petition for rulemaking, or requests for a meeting with the appropriate NRC staff to discuss a petition should be addressed to the Director, Division of Rules and Records, Office of Administration and Resources Management, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Attention: Chief, Rules and Procedures Branch. A prospective petitioner may also telephone the Division of Rules and Records on 301-492-7086 or Toll Free on 800-368-5642. 52 FR 31601

(c) Each petition filed under this section shall:

(1) Set forth a general solution to the problem or the substance or text of any proposed regulation or amendment, or specify the regulation which is to be revoked or amended;

(2) State clearly and concisely the petitioner's grounds for and interest in the action requested;

(3) Include a statement in support of the petition which shall set forth the specific issues involved, the petitioner's views or arguments with respect to those issues, relevant technical, scientific or other data involved which is reasonably available to the petitioner, and such other pertinent information as the petitioner deems necessary to support the action sought. In support of its petition, petitioner should note any specific cases of which petitioner is aware where the current rule is unrduly burdensome, deficient, or needs to be strengthened. 44 FR 61320

(d) The petitioner may request the Commission to suspend all or any part of any licensing proceeding to which the petitioner is a party pending disposition of the petition for rule making.

(e) If it is determined that the petition includes the information required by paragraph (c) of this section and is complete, the Director, Division of Rules and Records, or designee, will assign a docket number to the petition, will cause the petition to be formally docketed, and will deposit a copy of the docketed petition in the Commission's Public Document Room. Public comment may be requested by publication of a notice of the docketing of the petition in the Federal Register, or, in appropriate cases, may be invited for the first time upon publication in the Federal Register of a proposed rule developed in response to the petition. Publication will be limited by the requirements of section 181 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and may be limited by order of the Commission. 46 FR 35486

(f) If it is determined by the Executive Director for Operations that the petition does not include the information required by paragraph (c) of this section and is incomplete, the petitioner will be notified of that determination and the respects in which the petition is deficient and will be accorded an opportunity to submit additional data. Ordinarily this determination will be made within 30 days from the date of receipt of the petition by the Office of the Secretary of the Commission. If the petitioner does not submit additional data to correct the deficiency within 90 days from the date of notification to the petitioner that the petition is incomplete, the petition may be returned to the petitioner without prejudice to the right of the petitioner to file a new petition. 44 FR 61320

(g) The Director, Division of Rules and Records, Office of Administration and Resources Management, will prepare on a quarterly basis a summary of petitions for rulemaking before the Commission, including the status of each petition. A copy of the report will be available for public inspection and copying for a fee in the Commission's Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC. 53 FR 42419

§ 2.803 Determination of petition.

No hearing will be held on the petition unless the Commission deems it advisable. If the Commission determines that sufficient reason exists, it will publish a notice of proposed rule making. In any other case, it will deny the petition and will notify the petitioner with a simple statement of the grounds of denial. 27 FR 377

§ 2.804 Notice of proposed rule making.

(a) Except as provided by paragraph (d) of this section, when the Commission proposes to adopt, amend, or repeal a regulation, it will cause to be published in the **Federal Register** a notice of proposed rulemaking, unless all persons subject to the notice are named and either are personally served or otherwise have actual notice in accordance with law. 50 FR 13500

(b) The notice will include:

(1) Either the terms or substance of the proposed rule, or a specification of the subjects and issues involved;

(2) The manner and time within which interested members of the public may comment, and a statement that copies of comments may be examined in the Public Document Room; 27 FR 377