

FINAL SUPPORTING STATEMENT
FOR
10 CFR PART 60
DISPOSAL OF HIGH-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTES IN GEOLOGIC REPOSITORIES
(3150-0127)
REVISION REQUEST

Description of the Information Collection

NRC regulations pertaining to the disposal of high-level waste radioactive wastes in geologic repositories in 10 CFR Part 60 require States and affected Indian Tribes to submit certain information to the NRC if they: (1) request consultation with the NRC staff with respect to an area that has been approved by the President for site characterization, as provided in § 60.62, or (2) wish to participate in license reviews, as provided in § 60.63. Any person representing a State or affected Indian Tribe must also submit a statement of the basis of his or her authority to act in such representative capacity (§ 60.65).

All of the reported burden hours and cost for the information collection requirements under part 60 in the past three years pertained to the U.S. Department of Energy's proposed high-level waste site at Yucca Mountain, Nevada, and no other sites. In November 2001, the regulations changed by the issuance of a new 10 CFR Part 63 (66 FR 55792, November 2, 2001), which was promulgated specifically to regulate disposal of high-level radioactive wastes in a geologic repository at Yucca Mountain.

10 CFR Part 60 was also revised. As provided in §60.1, the regulations in 10 CFR Part 60 no longer apply to the licensing of a geologic repository at Yucca Mountain. All of the information collection requirements pertaining to Yucca Mountain were included in 10 CFR Part 63, and were approved by the Office of Management and Budget under control number 3150-0199.

It is expected that there will be no licensing actions pertaining to any high-level radioactive waste repository sites under 10 CFR Part 60 during the next three years. Therefore, no burden or hour cost for the information collection requirement is expected under Part 60 during the next three years.

A. Justification

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

The Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (NWSA) and 10 CFR Part 60 contain detailed provisions for the participation of States and affected Indian Tribes in the process of siting and developing a high-level radioactive waste geologic repository. The NRC must follow mandated formal procedures and schedules in meeting its responsibilities under the NWSA and Part 60. Part 60 does not require States and Indian Tribes to submit any proposals. This is strictly voluntary on their part, and only if they desire to do so would the information in question be required of them. The Director of the Office of Nuclear Materials Safety and Safeguards must have complete information on State and Indian Tribal plans for participation in order to

accommodate State and Tribal desires for participation while at the same time following mandated procedures and schedules. In addition, where State and Tribal proposals for participation involve requests for funding, the justification for such requests must be documented in order to assure productive uses of NRC funds.

Section 60.62 states that whenever an area has been approved by the President for site characterization, and upon request of a State or an affected Indian Tribe, the Director shall make NRC staff available to consult with representatives of such States and Tribes. Section 60.62 also states that requests for consultation shall be made in writing to the Director. Only if States and Tribes wish to obtain these services would they be required to submit any supporting information.

Making NRC staff available for consultation with representatives of States and affected Indian Tribes represents potentially a major commitment of NRC resources. The Director must have a firm basis for approving this commitment of resources. A written request for consultation is the minimum requirement which could provide a firm basis for the commitment of NRC resources.

Section 60.63 states that whenever an area has been approved by the President for site characterization, a State or an affected Indian Tribe may submit to the Director a proposal to facilitate its participation in the review of a site characterization plan and/or license application.

The proposal must contain a description and schedule of how the State or affected Indian Tribe wishes to participate in the review, or what services or activities the State or affected Indian Tribe wishes NRC to carry out, and how the services or activities proposed to be carried out by NRC would contribute to such participation.

Section 60.65 states that any person who acts under this subpart (Subpart C) as a representative for a State (or for the Governor or legislature thereof) or for an affected Indian Tribe shall include in his request or other submission, or at the request of the Commission, a statement of the basis of his authority to act in such representative capacity.

Such a statement is necessary to assure NRC of the status of representatives. NRC must provide States and Indian Tribes numerous opportunities for participation in the site review and licensing procedures. It is a common practice for States and Indian Tribes to be represented by legal counsel in dealing with Federal agencies. NRC must be assured of the authority of persons it deals with to represent States or Indian Tribes to avoid potential duplication and/or failure to transmit information to appropriate parties.

2. Agency Use of Information

The information requested will be reported to the Director of the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, who has programmatic responsibility for NRC's high-level radioactive waste program. It will be used by him to carry out requirements for States and Indian Tribes to participate in the siting and

development of high-level radioactive waste geologic repositories. The Director has established a mechanism in the Division of High-Level Waste Management within his office to deal with State and Indian Tribe participation. Staff resources are available to assure that reported information is used in a timely and useful fashion. NRC usually sets a time limit for review and action on funding requests of 60 days.

3. Reduction of Burden Through Information Technology

There is no legal obstacle to the use of information technology. Moreover, respondents are encouraged to use modern information technologies to collect, analyze, submit, and store the information required under these provisions. However, currently no responses are submitted electronically, and the non-recurrence of each individual collection makes it difficult to effect significant reductions of burden through the use of technology.

4. Effort to Identify Duplication and Use Similar Information

The Information Requirements Control Automated System (IRCAS) was searched to determine duplication. None was found. No other sources of similar information are available.

5. Effort to Reduce Small Business Burden

No small businesses are affected by the information collection requirements, but some Indian Tribes might be considered small entities. The NRC staff's established program to provide information exchange with States and Tribes could provide such Tribes with assistance in preparation of the requested information.

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

If the collection is not conducted, the NRC will not have information that will enable the Director to carry out requirements for States and affected Indian Tribes to participate in the siting and development of high-level radioactive waste geologic repositories.

7. Circumstances Which Justify Variations from OMB Guidelines

There are no variations from OMB guidelines.

8. Consultations Outside NRC

The opportunity for public comment on the information collection requirements was published in the Federal Register on February 19, 2003 (68 FR 8051). No comments were received.

9. Payment or Gift to Respondents

Not applicable.

10. Confidentiality of Information

NRC provides no pledge of confidentiality for this collection of information.

11. Sensitive Questions

None.

12. Estimated Burden and Burden Hour Cost

As under Paragraph 14 below, it is expected that there will be no licensing actions pertaining to any high-level radioactive waste repository sites under 10 CFR Part 60 during the next three years. Therefore, no burden or hour cost for the information collection requirement are expected under Part 60 during the next three years. However, if requests were submitted, the total anticipated burden and costs to one respondent is an estimated 121 hours or \$18,392 (121 x \$152 per hour). Burden and costs are broken out as follows:

Section	No. of Respondents	Frequency of Response	Annual Responses	Burden Per Response	Annual Burden	Annual Cost
60.62	1	Once only	0	40	0	\$ 0
60.63	1	Once only	0	80	0	\$ 0
60.65	1	Once only	0	1	0	\$ 0
Total			0	121	0	\$ 0

13. Estimate of Other Additional Costs

None. For licensees subject to 10 CFR Part 60, it is most likely that purchases of equipment and services were made (1) prior to October 1, 1995, (2) to achieve regulatory compliance with requirements not associated with the information collection, (3) for reasons other than to provide information or keep records for the government, or (4) as part of customary and usual business or private practices.

14. Estimated Annualized Cost to the Federal Government

Currently, it is expected that there will be no licensing actions pertaining to any high-level radioactive waste repository sites under 10 CFR Part 60 during the next three years. Therefore, no burden or hour cost for the information collection requirement are expected under Part 60 during the next three years. However, if requests were submitted, the following costs are anticipated:

Section 60.62 involves NRC staff review of requests for consultation. This should require no more than 40 hours of staff time per response. At \$152 per hour for staff time, this would be \$6,080 per respondent. The total for one response is \$6,080.

Section 60.63 involves NRC staff review of proposals for participation in site review and licensing procedures. This should require no more than 80 hours of staff time per response. At \$152 per hour, this would be \$12,160 per respondent. The total for one response is \$12,160.

Section 60.65 involves NRC staff review of the statement of representation. This should require no more than one hour of staff time per response. At \$152 per hour, this would be \$152 per response. The total for one response is \$152.

Total cost to the government is \$18,392 (121 hours x \$152/hr). Costs are not anticipated to be recurrent and thus cannot reasonably be annualized. Rather, all costs are likely to be incurred within a year or two following selection of a repository site or submittal of a license application. These costs are fully recovered by NRC through appropriations from the Nuclear Waste Fund which was established by the Department of Energy pursuant to the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982.

15. Reasons for Change in Burden or Cost

All of the reported burden hours and cost for the information collection requirements under part 60 in the past three years pertained to the U.S. Department of Energy's proposed high-level waste site at Yucca Mountain, Nevada, and no other sites. In November 2001, the regulations changed by the issuance of 10 CFR Part 63 (66 FR 55792, November 2, 2001), which was promulgated specifically to regulate disposal of high-level radioactive wastes in a geologic repository at Yucca Mountain. 10 CFR Part 60 was also revised. As provided in §60.1, the regulations in 10 CFR Part 60 no longer apply to the licensing of a geologic repository at Yucca Mountain. All of the information collection requirements pertaining to Yucca Mountain were included in 10 CFR Part 63, and were approved by the Office of Management and Budget under control number 3150-0199.

It is expected that there will be no licensing actions pertaining to any high-level radioactive waste repository sites under 10 CFR Part 60 during the next three years. Therefore, no burden or hour cost for the information collection requirement is expected under Part 60 during the next three years.

16. Publication for Statistical Use

None.

17. Reason for Not Displaying the Expiration Date

The requirement is contained in a regulation. Amending the Code of Federal Regulations to display information that, in an annual publication, could become obsolete would be unduly burdensome and too difficult to keep current.

18. Exceptions to the Certification Statement

There are no exceptions.

B. Collection of Information Employing Statistical Methods

Statistical methods are not used in this collection of information.