



VEOLIA NORTH AMERICA - INDUSTRIAL BUSINESS REGULATORY UPDATE - March 2015

ENVIRONMENTAL UPDATES

- A. [EPA National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Off-Site Waste and Recovery Operations; Final Rule](#)
- B. [Improving EPA Regulations; Notice and Request for Comment](#)

TRANSPORTATION UPDATES

- C. [FMCSA Updates the Safety Measurement System to Better Align with Serious Violations in its Regulations and IT Systems](#)
- D. [DOT/FMCSA Driver Qualifications; Regulatory Guidance Concerning the Use of Computerized Employer Notification Systems for the Annual Inquiry and Review of Driving Records; Notice of Regulatory Guidance](#)
- E. [DOT/FRA Railworthiness Directive for Railroad Tank Cars Equipped with Certain McKenzie Valve and Machining, LLC Valves](#)

HEALTH & SAFETY UPDATES

- F. [OSHA Updating OSHA Standards Based on National Consensus Standards; Eye and Face Protection; Notice of Proposed Rulemaking](#)

MISCELLANEOUS UPDATES

- G. [Office of Science and Technology Policy; Impact of the Select Agent Regulations; Request for Public Comment](#)
- H. [NRC Low-Level Radioactive Waste Regulatory Program; Draft Programmatic Assessment Results; Request for Comment](#)
- I. [NRC Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal; Proposed Rule](#)
- J. [NRC Guidance for Conducting Technical Analyses for Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal; Draft NUREG and Request for Comment](#)

A. EPA National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Off-Site Waste and Recovery Operations; Final Rule

On March 18, 2015, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) published a final rule (80 FR 14247-14283) finalizing revisions to the Off-Site Waste and Recovery Operations (OSWRO) national emission standards for hazardous air pollutants (NESHAP) in response to a residual risk and technology review.

Background

The Clean Air Act (CAA) has established a two-stage regulatory process to address the emission of hazardous air pollutants (HAPs) from stationary sources. The first stage requires EPA to promulgate technology-based NESHAPs for sources that emit one or more listed HAPs. The second stage focuses on reducing any residual risks that were not addressed in the establishment of the NESHAP standard.

The NESHAP for OSWRO was promulgated on July 1, 1996 (61 FR 34140) and amended on July 20, 1999 (64 FR 38950). The OSWRO NESHAP applies to waste management units and recovery operations that are: (1) located at major sources of HAP emissions; and (2) used to manage, convey, or handle used oil, used solvent, or waste received from other facilities that contain at least one of 97 organic HAPS specified in the rule. Regulated waste management units and recovery operations include: hazardous waste treatment, storage, and disposal facilities (TSDFs); resource conservation and recovery act (RCRA) exempt hazardous wastewater treatment facilities; non-hazardous wastewater treatment facilities other than publicly-owned treatment works; used solvent recovery plants; RCRA exempt hazardous waste recycling operations; and used oil re-refineries. The HAP emission sources at facilities subject to the OSWRO NESHAP are tanks, containers, surface impoundments, oil-water separators, organic-water separators, process vents and transfer systems used to manage off-site material and equipment leaks.

On July 2, 2014, EPA published a proposed rule (79 FR 37849) that included amendments to the OSWRO NESHAP based on a residual risk and technology review conducted by EPA. This rule finalizes amendments included in the July 2014 proposed rule along with revisions identified following the public comment on the proposed rule.

Summary

Following are the amendments included in this final rule:

1. Increases control of emissions for tanks based on specific size ranges that contain material above a specified vapor pressure. The emission control levels are included in Tables 3, 4, and 5 of 40 CFR 63, Subpart DD.
2. Revises the control of emissions from equipment leaks to require compliance with 40 CFR 63, Subpart H. Facilities are no longer allowed to utilize 40 CFR 61, Subpart V for compliance.
3. Eliminates the Startup, Shutdown, and Malfunction (SSM) exemption. Clarifies that emission limits apply at all times except when the source is not operating.
4. Prohibits bypassing control devices and emissions released directly to the atmosphere from pressure release devices (PRDs) and closure devices on pressure tanks.
5. Requires PRDs to be monitored with a device or monitoring system capable of:
 - a. Identifying the pressure release;
 - b. Recording the time and duration of each pressure release; and
 - c. Notifying operators immediately that a pressure release is occurring.
6. Finalizes recordkeeping and reporting requirements associated with releases to the atmosphere from bypasses and PRDs.
7. Requires regulated facilities to submit electronic copies of required performance test reports through an electronic performance test report tool called the ERT.
8. Revises the routine maintenance provisions to limit their applicability to tanks routing emissions to a control device rather than any equipment or process routing emissions to a control device.

9. Clarifies that open-ended valves or lines (OELs) are verified to be “sealed” by a cap, blind flange, plug, or second valve when monitoring of the OEL conducted in accordance with 40 CFR 60, Appendix A, Method 21 shows no readings of 500 parts per million (ppm) or greater.
10. This rule also requires that OELs that are exempt from the requirements be equipped with a cap, blind flange, plug or second valve and a flow indicator seal, or locking device.

Alternate Compliance

Facilities complying with 40 CFR 61, Subpart FF, National Emission Standard for Benzene Waste Operations, are NOT required to comply with the OSWRO NESHAP.

Compliance Dates

The revisions to the OSWRO NESHAP become effective on March 18, 2015.

The compliance date for the revised SSM requirements, electronic reporting, revised routine maintenance provisions, the operating and pressure release management requirements for PRDs, and the revised requirements regarding bypasses and closure devices on pressure tanks for existing OSWRO facilities is the effective date of the standard, March 18, 2015.

The compliance date for the equipment leaks provisions for existing sources is one year from the effective date, March 18, 2016.

The compliance date for the revised tank requirements is two years from the effective date, March 20, 2017.

The compliance date for existing OSWRO facilities to comply with the PRD monitoring requirements is three years from the effective date, March 20, 2018.

Link

The link below will allow you to view /print this final rule.

<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2015-03-18/pdf/2015-05463.pdf>

B. Improving EPA Regulations; Notice and Request for Comment

On March 9, 2015, EPA published a notice (80 FR 12372-12373) requesting public input on their periodic review of EPA regulations. Executive Orders, 13563 “Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review and 13610 “Identifying and Reducing Regulatory Burdens” require all federal agencies to conduct an analysis of their regulations to determine if they are outmoded, ineffective, or overly burdensome and to modify, streamline, expand, or repeal them as necessary.

Summary

In this notice EPA is requesting comment on efforts that can be made to promote regulatory modernization through business-process streamlining using improved technology. Specifically, EPA is seeking comment on the following questions:

1. Which regulations, including economically significant rules, could be transitioned from paper to electronic reporting?
2. How can EPA reduce duplicative reporting requirements in existing regulations that may overlap other federal requirements?
3. How can EPA streamline or consolidate reporting requirements to reduce burden?

4. Which regulations could benefit from the use of existing shared services (such as the Substance Registry System) or new shared services?
5. Should EPA create a joint registry of regulated facilities with states and tribes to streamline electronic reporting to multiple programs and maximize burden reduction?
6. Which regulations could be improved through the use of advance monitoring techniques or the development of mobile applications to facilitate environmental protection?
7. Which regulations could be amended to reduce the frequency of reporting while maintaining effective programs?
8. Is the same information being collected in multiple places, either across different regulations, or across different levels of government (Federal, State, Tribal, and local)?

Comments Due

Comments must be received by EPA on or before April 8, 2015.

Link

The link below will allow you to view/print this notice and request for comment.

<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2015-03-09/pdf/2015-05303.pdf>

C. FMCSA Updates the Safety Measurement System to Better Align with Serious Violations in its Regulations and IT Systems

On March 6, 2015, the Department of Transportation, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA) published a notice that they had updated the Safety Measurement System (SMS) to include 5 new violations as “Serious Violations.”

Summary

Serious Violations are violations where non-compliance is so severe that they require immediate action by a motor carrier regardless of its overall safety posture – or violations that are indicative of breakdowns in a carrier’s safety management controls.

FMCSA uses the SMS to assess a carrier’s safety performance and compliance. When a carrier’s most recent investigation results in the discovery of a Serious Violation, the SMS displays a violation in the carrier’s Investigation Results for the Behavior Analysis and Safety Improvement Category (BASIC) for 12 months. Motor carriers who are issued Serious Violations may be prioritized for an intervention action and increased roadside inspections.

The five new Serious Violations and the BASICS which they relate to are listed below:

1. 49 CFR 172.704(a)(4) – Failing to provide security awareness training – Hazardous Materials (HM) Compliance
2. 49 CFR 172.704(a)(5) – Failing to provide in-depth security awareness training – HM Compliance
3. 49 CFR 383.37(c) – Knowingly allowing, requiring, permitting, or authorizing an employee with more than one commercial driver’s license to operate a commercial motor vehicle – Driver Fitness
4. 49 CFR 395.3(a)(3)(i) – Requiring or permitting a property-carrying commercial motor vehicle driver to drive more than 11 hours – Hours-of-Service (HOS) Compliance
5. 49 CFR 395.3(a)(3)(ii) – Requiring or permitting a property-carrying commercial motor vehicle driver to drive if more than 8 hours have passed since the end of the driver’s last off-duty or sleeper-berth period of at least 30 minutes – HOS Compliance

Effective Date

These changes became effective on February 1, 2015 and will be reflected in the March SMS data release.

Link

The link below will allow you to view FMCSAs website announcing these changes.

http://csa.fmcsa.dot.gov/whats_new.aspx

D. **DOT/FMCSA Driver Qualifications; Regulatory Guidance Concerning the Use of Computerized Employer Notification Systems for the Annual Inquiry and Review of Driving Records; Notice of Regulatory Guidance**

On March 12, 2015, the Department of Transportation, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA) published a notice of regulatory guidance (80 FR 13069-13070) regarding the use of State-operated employer notification systems (ENS) for the annual inquiry and review of driving records required by 49 CFR 391.25.

Summary

On January 13, 2003, FMCSA issued a guidance letter to a company concerning the use of computerized employer notification systems for the annual inquiry and review of driving records required by 49 CFR 391.25. The guidance stated that the required information provided by a specific third-party computerized ENS satisfies the requirement for an annual review of each driver's record. This notice removes the previous guidance concerning use of a third-party computerized ENS provider and replaces it with a more general statement that a third-party computerized ENS satisfies the requirement for an annual review of each driver's record as long as it provides the required information.

The guidance was revised as follows:

Qualification of Drivers, Annual Inquiry and Review of Driving Record; Regulatory Guidance for 49 CFR 391.25

Question 4: Does the use of an employer notification system that provides motor carriers with a department of motor vehicle report for every State in which the driver held either an operator's license, a commercial driver's license (CDL), or permit when a driver is enrolled in the system and provides information about license status, crashes and convictions of laws or regulations governing the operation of motor vehicles on the driving record satisfy the requirement for an annual review of each driver's record?

Guidance: Yes. Since motor carriers would be provided with a department of motor vehicle report for every State in which the driver held a commercial motor vehicle operator's license or permit when a driver is enrolled in the system and the State licensing agency includes information about crashes and convictions of laws or regulations governing the operation of motor vehicles on the driving record, the requirements of § 391.25(a) would be satisfied. Generally, the requirements of § 391.25(b) and (c) would be satisfied if the employer notification system records the identity of the motor carrier's representative who conducted the review when the carrier's representative reviews the information on the driving record.

The use of an employer notification system would meet the requirements if either the motor carrier automatically receives updates from the State (push-system) or can regularly access the system to check for updates (pull-system), as long as the check occurs at least once per year. In addition, receipt

of these reports meets the requirement for the annual check even if it is provided to the motor carrier by a third-party.

Effective Date

This guidance became effective on March 12, 2015.

Link

The link below will allow you to view/print this notice of regulatory guidance.

<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2015-03-12/pdf/2015-05645.pdf>

E. DOT/FRA Railworthiness Directive for Railroad Tank Cars Equipped with Certain McKenzie Valve and Machining, LLC Valves

On March 18, 2015, the Department of Transportation, Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) published a notice of railworthiness directive (80 FR 14027-14029) regarding DOT Specification 111 railroad tank cars transporting hazardous materials leaking small quantities of product.

Background

Recent FRA investigations identified several railroad tank cars transporting hazardous materials leaking small quantities of product from the cars' liquid lines. FRA's investigation revealed that the liquid lines of the leaking tank cars were equipped with a 3" ball valve marketed and sold by McKenzie Valve and Machining (McKenzie). The investigation also revealed that closure plugs installed on the 3" valves cause mechanical damage to the valves which leads to the destruction of the valves' seal integrity and that the 3" valves, along with similarly-designed 1" and 2" valves provided by McKenzie are not approved for use on tank cars.

FRA is issuing this Railworthiness Directive to all owners of tank cars used to transport hazardous materials within the United States to ensure that they identify, remove, and replace these valves with approved valves.

Railworthiness Directive Requirements

Any rail tank car equipped with an unapproved McKenzie threaded ball valve is prohibited from being loaded with any hazardous material described in 49 CFR 172.101 and/or offered into transportation until the requirements listed below are met. Owners of tank cars equipped with McKenzie valves must:

1. Identify the railroad tank cars in their fleet equipped with any McKenzie valve.
2. Provide to FRA: (a) the reporting mark and number of each car equipped with any McKenzie valve; and (b) the type of valve each car is equipped with.
3. Create and maintain for a minimum of 6 months from the applicability date of this directive a record of the inspection of each McKenzie valve. The record must include, at a minimum, the inspection date and location, as well as the results of the inspection (i.e., whether the valve was removed or not). The record must be made available to FRA for inspection upon request.
4. Immediately inspect the 3" McKenzie valves on each affected car. If any valve is configured with a 3" standalone plug, ensure that the car is not loaded and offered into transportation until that valve is replaced with an approved valve. In addition, any tank car equipped with an unapproved 3" McKenzie valve is prohibited from being offered into transportation (whether loaded or residue) after May 12, 2015.
5. Immediately inspect the 1" and 2" McKenzie valves on each affected car. If any valve shows evidence of mechanical damage, ensure that the car is not loaded and offered into transportation

- until the valve is replaced. Even if a valve is not damaged, a tank car equipped with an unapproved 1" or 2" McKenzie valve is prohibited from being offered into transportation after June 11, 2015.
6. Ensure that each unapproved McKenzie valve is removed and replaced by an entity permitted to perform the work in accordance with 49 CFR 179.
 7. Ensure the valve application is properly qualified as required by 49 CFR 180, Subpart F.

Effective Date

This Railworthiness Directive became effective on March 18, 2015.

Link

The link below will allow you to view/print the Railworthiness Directive.

<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2015-03-18/pdf/2015-06213.pdf>

F. OSHA Updating OSHA Standards Based on National Consensus Standards; Eye and Face Protection; Notice of Proposed Rulemaking

On March 13, 2015, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) published a notice of proposed rulemaking (80 FR 13295-13304) that would update the general industry, shipyard employment, marine terminal, longshoring, and construction eye and face protection standards by incorporating by reference the three most recent versions of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) Occupational and Educational Eye and Face Protection standards.

Summary

The original OSHA standards addressing eye and face protection were adopted in 1971 and have been amended on numerous occasions, most recently in 2009. The 2009 final rule amendments did not include a reference to the 2010 version of the ANSI Z87.1 standard because it had not yet been published.

In this proposed rule OSHA intends to update the references in 29 CFR 1910.133(b)(1), 29 CFR 1915.153(b)(1), 29 CFR 1917.91(a)(1)(i), and 29 CFR 1918.101(a)(1)(i) to include ANSI Z87.1, the most recent version of the standard and delete the reference to ANSI Z87.1-1989. The 2010 version of ANSI Z87.1 focuses on hazards such as droplet and splash, impact, optical radiation, dust, fine dust, and mist, and specifies the type of equipment needed to protect employees from these hazards. The 2010 standard also contains performance assessments that are unique to a specific protector configuration such as welding devices or prescription safety eyewear.

Comments Due

Comments on this notice of proposed rulemaking must be submitted to OSHA by April 13, 2015.

Link

The link below will allow you to view/print this notice of proposed rulemaking.

<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2015-03-13/pdf/2015-05521.pdf>

G. Office of Science and Technology Policy; Impact of the Select Agent Regulations; Request for Public Comment

On March 16, 2015, the Office of Science and Technology Policy, published a notice (80 FR 13639-13641) seeking public comment on the impact that the Select Agent Regulations have had on science, technology, and national security, and on the benefits, costs and limitations of the Select Agent Regulations.

Summary

The White House published a memo on August 18, 2014 titled *Enhancing Biosafety and Biosecurity in the United States* seeking stakeholder engagement on the impact of the Select Agent Regulations along with outlining immediate and longer-term steps the government will take to address the causes of a series of biosafety incidents at government laboratories.

Comments are encouraged on any aspect of the Select Agent Regulations, but the notice includes twelve specific questions for comments:

1. What are the specific benefits, challenges, and impacts in implementing the Select Agent Regulations with respect to: (a) scientific research (e.g., quality, breadth, international competitiveness, or other outcomes or consequences)?; (b) safety and security (e.g., biocontainment, biosafety, physical security, cybersecurity, and personnel suitability)?; (c) public or agricultural health and response (e.g., ability to respond rapidly and effectively to incidents and the development/availability of medical countermeasures)?
2. What gaps exist in the Select Agent Regulations (e.g., reporting, aggregated data collection, ability to transfer material across international borders) and what specific recommendations would fill those gaps?
3. Are facilities that possess, use, or transfer biological select agents and toxins in the U.S. safer than they were before the Select Agent Regulations went into effect in close to its current form in 2003? If so, to what extent are the Select Agent Regulations responsible?
4. The Select Agent Regulations strike a balance between avoiding harm (e.g., preventing safety or security lapses) and seeking benefits (e.g., conducting research and public or agricultural health activities). Do you think that balance has been struck appropriately? If not, what specific aspects of the Select Agent Regulations should be emphasized more, and what should be emphasized less?
5. Have the regulations unduly impaired research and other applications of select agents and toxins? If so how? Please provide examples as appropriate, with specific sections of the Select Agent Regulations if possible.
6. If the Select Agent Regulations have unduly impaired research, how can the research and other applications be further promoted, while still protecting against misuse and accidental release? Please provide examples as appropriate, with specific aspects of the Select Agent Regulations if possible.
7. Have the regulations sufficiently protected public and agricultural health and safety against the misuse and accidental release of these agents? If so, or if not, how? Please provide examples as appropriate, with specific sections of the Select Agent Regulations if possible.
8. If the Select Agent Regulations are not sufficient for health and safety protection, how can health and safety be better protected while still facilitating legitimate use of select agents and toxins? Please provide recommended changes to the specific sections of the Select Agent Regulations if appropriate.
9. Describe how the overall costs of the Select Agent Regulations are or are not appropriately balanced with their overall benefits.
10. The Select Agent Regulations regulate the use, transfer, or possession of a specific list of potentially dangerous pathogens and toxins. Is designing the regulations around a list of agents advantageous or disadvantageous? If disadvantageous, in what other way can the regulations be organized and implemented?

11. Research today is a thoroughly international activity, with scientists and research materials constantly crossing national borders. Security threats today likewise extend across national borders. Are the Select Agent Regulations appropriately configured to accommodate these international issues? If not, how could they be improved?
12. Are the Select Agent Regulations appropriately configured to accommodate changes in science and technology such as, but not limited to, advances in synthetic biology, genetic engineering, or viral systematics? If not, how can they be reconfigured to better do so? What scientific and technical advances might improve the function or lessen the costs and burdens of the Select Agent Regulations?

Comments Due

Comments on this notice must be submitted to the Office of Science and Technology Policy by March 30, 2015.

Link

The link below will allow you to view/print the notice and request for public comment.

<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2015-03-16/pdf/2015-05906.pdf>

H. NRC Low-Level Radioactive Waste Regulatory Program; Draft Programmatic Assessment Results; Request for Comment

On March 13, 2015, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) published draft programmatic assessment results (80 FR 13451-13456) requesting comment on a draft list of prioritized low-level radioactive waste (LLW) tasks based upon the assessment updates to the programmatic assessment conducted in 2007.

Background

In 2007, the NRC conducted a strategic assessment of the LLW regulatory program that identified and prioritized tasks to ensure that the LLW program: (1) ensures safe and secure LLW disposal; (2) improves the effectiveness, efficiency, and adaptability of the LLW program; and (3) ensures regulatory stability, and predictability while allowing flexibility in disposal options. The NRC has completed several of the high priority tasks and continues work on the revisions to 10 CFR 61 and the implementation of the updates to the concentration averaging and encapsulation branch technical paper.

In 2014, the NRC held public meetings, webinars, and requested public comments on suggestions to update the programmatic assessment. In response, the NRC is publishing the draft programmatic assessment results. A summary of tasks developed from the programmatic assessment are listed below:

1. Complete and implement Site-Specific Analysis Rulemaking – High
2. Update the Waste Classification Tables – High
3. Implement the Updated Concentration Averaging and Encapsulation Branch Technical Paper – High
4. Perform Scoping Study of the Need to Review/Expand Byproduct Material Financial Assurance to Account for Life-Cycle Cost – High
5. Clarify the Regulatory Authority of Greater-than-Class C (GTCC) Waste Disposal and Develop Licensing Criteria for a GTCC Disposal Facility – High
6. Finalize Internal Procedure/Standard Review Plan for 10 CFR 20.2002 Requests – High
7. Update NUREG/BR-0204, Rev. 2, "Instructions for Completing NRC's Uniform Low-Level Radioactive Waste Manifest" – High
8. Develop Guidance that Summarizes Disposition Options for Low-Activity Waste (LAW) – Medium

9. Update and Consolidate LLW Guidance into One NUREG – Medium
10. Coordinate with Other Agencies on Consistency in Regulating LAW and Determine the Impact of LAW Disposal from Radiological Dispersal Devices – Medium
11. Promulgate Rule for Disposal of Low-Activity Waste – Medium
12. Develop Procedures for Import/Export Review – Low
13. Examine the need for Guidance on Defining when Radioactive Material Becomes LLW – Low
14. Develop and Implement the National Waste Tracking System – Low

Comments Due

Comments on the summary of tasks from the programmatic assessment must be submitted to NRC by April 13, 2015.

Link

The link below will allow you to view/print the Draft Programmatic Assessment results.

<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2015-03-13/pdf/2015-05851.pdf>

I. NRC Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal; Proposed Rule

On March 26, 2015, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) published a proposed rule (80 FR 16081-16125) that would amend the regulations governing low-level radioactive waste disposal facilities.

Summary

The NRC is proposing to amend the regulations governing low-level radioactive waste (LLRW) disposal facilities to require new and revised site-specific technical analyses and to permit the development of criteria for LLRW acceptance based on the results of these analyses. The amendments would ensure that LLRW streams that are significantly different from those considered during the development of the current regulations can be disposed of safely and meet the performance objects for the land disposal of LLRW. The proposed rule would impact LLRW disposal licensees or license applicants regulated by NRC or Agreement States.

The major amendments included in the proposed rule are included below:

1. Revise the existing technical analysis for protection of the general population to include a 1,000-year compliance period;
2. Add a new site-specific technical analysis for the protection of inadvertent intruders that would include a 1,000-year compliance period and a dose limit;
3. Add new analyses that would include a 10,000-year protective assurance period and annual dose minimization target;
4. Add a new analysis for certain long-lived LLRW that would include a post-10,000-year performance period;
5. Add new analyses that would identify and describe the features of the design and site characteristics that provide defense-in-depth protections;
6. Add a new requirement to update the technical analyses at closure; and
7. Add a new requirement to develop site-specific criteria for the future acceptance of LLRW for disposal based on either the results of these technical analyses or the existing LLRW classification requirements.

Comments Due

Comments on this proposed rule must be submitted to NRC on or before July 24, 2015.

Link

The link below will allow you to view/print this proposed rule.

<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2015-03-26/pdf/2015-06429.pdf>

J. NRC Guidance for Conducting Technical Analyses for Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal; Draft NUREG and Request for Comment

On March 26, 2015, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) published a Draft NUREG (80 FR 15930-15931), NUREG-2175, “Guidance for Conducting Technical Analyses for 10 CFR 61.” This draft guidance has been developed to address the implementation of the proposed rule published by NRC on March 26, 2015.

Summary

The Draft NUREG-2175 was developed to provide guidance when conducting technical analyses (i.e., performance assessment, inadvertent intruder assessment, assessment of the stability of a LLRW disposal site, defense-in-depth analyses, protective assurance period analyses, and performance period analyses) to demonstrate compliance with the performance objectives in the proposed 10 CFR 61, “Licensing Requirements for Land Disposal of Radioactive Waste.” The NRCs goal in publishing this guidance is to assist licensees in the implementation of the proposed amendments as well as the regulatory authorities reviewing the technical analyses.

Comments Due

Comments on Draft NUREG-2175 must be submitted to NRC by July 24, 2015.

Links

The link below will allow you to view/print the request for comment on Draft NUREG-2175.

<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2015-03-26/pdf/2015-06536.pdf>

Draft NUREG-2175 is available on NRC’s Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) under Accession No. ML15056A516. The ADAMS website is:

<http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>