PROPOSED ISSUANCE DATE: PRESS RELEASE CONCURRENCE mender Licensing, Ingection HEADLINE: Jamial File K VIEWER NAME OFFICE INITIALS RE Funcles OCFO 2 EDO OPA CHRMN

OPA Contact: Bol Jasuchi Sue Jague Kleyler (Call for pickup)

SIGNIFY ANY SPECIAL ACTION OR ISSUANCE THAT IS REQUIRED BEFORE PRESS RELEASE GOES OUT:

Final Rule Jusuande

G:\pressconcur.wpd

G:\annualfees3.wpd

### OPA

#### DRAFT

(Source: Final Rule)

#### NRC AMENDS LICENSING, INSPECTION AND ANNUAL FEES RULE

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission is amending its regulations for the licensing, inspection and annual fees it charges applicants and licensees for fiscal year (FY) 2003.

The agency is required to collect nearly all of its annual appropriated budget through two types of fees. One is for specific NRC services, such as licensing and inspection activities, that apply to a specific license. The other is an annual fee paid by all licensees, which recovers generic regulatory expenses and other costs not recovered through fees for specific services. These fees are contained in Commission regulations 10 CFR Part 170 (fees for licensing and inspection services) and 10 CFR Part 171 (annual fees).

By law, the NRC must recover \$526.3 million or 94 percent of its budget for FY 2003 (October 1, 2002 - September 30, 2003) less the \$24.7 million appropriated from the Nuclear Waste Fund for high-level waste activities. The amount to be recovered in FY 2003 includes \$29.3 million appropriated for NRC's activities related to homeland security. Homeland security costs were not

RJJ

included in the agency's fee base for FY 2002, and were appropriated from the Treasury's General Fund. The total amount to be recovered is about \$47 million more than last year.

The hourly rates are \$156 for reactor program activities and \$158 for nuclear material program activities. There is a \$6 increase over FY 2002 in the hourly labor rate for NRC services performed in the nuclear materials program. A major reason for this increase is the higher salary and benefits resulting from the Government-wide pay raise. While salary and benefits also increase for the reactor program, the increase is offset by a reduction in the average overhead.

The annual fees have been determined under the "re-baselining" method. The Commission decided to re-baseline annual fees this year based on the changes in the magnitude of the budget to be recovered through fees. Re-baselined annual fees for this year have resulted in increases compared to FY 2002 fees for four classes of licensees (operating power reactors, spent fuel storage/reactor decommissioning, fuel facilities, and rare earth facilities), and decreased annual fees for two classes (non-power reactors and uranium recovery).

Finally, in two classes, material users and transportation, some categories (or sub-classes) of licensees have increased annual fees while others have decreased annual fees. A proposed regulation on this subject was published in *The Federal Register* for public comment on April 3. The comments were considered and addressed in the final rule.

The FY 2003 annual fees include the following for representative classes/categories of licensees:

Class/Category of Licensees	FY 2003 Annual Fee
Operating Power Reactors	\$3,251,000
Spent Fuel Storage/Reactor	
Decommissioning	\$319,000
Non-Power Reactors	\$63,300
High-enriched Uranium Fuel Facility	\$5,836,000
Low-enriched Uranium Fuel Facility	\$1,957,000
Uranium Recovery (Conventional Mills)	\$63,700
Transportation:	
Users/Fabricators	\$76,200
Users Only	\$7,100
Material Users:	
Radiographers	\$12,200
Broad Scope Medical	\$24,700
Distribution of Radiopharmaceuticals	\$4,700
Gauge Users	\$1,900
	· · · · ·

A copy of the final rule will be published in The Federal Register in the near future.

###





## Submission of Federal Rules Under the Congressional Review Act

President of the Senate Speaker of the House of Representatives GAO

Please fill the circles electronically or with black pen or #2 pencil.

1. Name of Department or Agency	2. Subdivision or Office
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission	Office of the Chief Financial Officer
3. Rule Title	

Revision of Fee Schedules; Fee Recovery for FY 2003

	Identification Number (RIN) or Other Uniqu	e Identifier (if applic	able) RIN: 315(	)-AH14		
5.	Major Rule  Non-major Rule O					
6.	Final Rule  Other O					
7. With (	respect to this rule, did your agency solicit	public comments?	Yes ●	No O	N/A O	
B. Prioril	ty of Regulation (fill in one)	······································	••••••			
	<ul> <li>Economically Significant; Significant; or Substantive, Nonsignifica</li> </ul>	·	Informational/Ad (Do not comple	Iministrative/O	de	
9. Effect	tive Date (if applicable) 60 days from pu	blication in the Fe	deral Register			
10. Is a (	concise Summary of the Rule provided?	Yes 🌒	No O			
		: . •				
	Submitted by:					
	Name:		· .			
	Title: Director, Office of Congression			·		
	For Congressional Use Only:					·
	Date Received:	. *			•	



	41217		·		
			 Yes	No	N/A
A. With respect to this rule, did your agency prepare an analysis of costs and benefits?		 0	0	•	
B.	With respect to this rule, at the fin	al rulemaking stage, did your agency			

ΰВ.	With respect to this rule, at the final rulemaking stage, did your agency				
	1. certify that the rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under 5 U.S.C. § 605(b)?	0	•	0	
	2. prepare a final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis under 5 U.S.C. § 604(a)?	•	0	0	
C.	With respect to this rule, did your agency prepare a written statement under § 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995?	0	0	٠	ţ
	With respect to this rule, did your agency prepare an Environmental Assessment or an Environmental Impact Statement under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)?	0	0	٠	
E.	Does this rule contain a collection of information requiring OMB approval under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995?	0	•	0	
F.	Did you discuss any of the following in the preamble to the rule?				
•	• E.O. 13132, Federalism	0	0	•	
	<ul> <li>E.O. 12630, Government Actions and Interference with Constitutionally Protected Property Rights</li> </ul>	0	0	٠	
	<ul> <li>E.O. 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review</li> </ul>	0	0	•	
	• E.O. 12988, Civil Justice Reform	0	0	۲	
	<ul> <li>E.O. 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks</li> </ul>	0	0	۲	

• Other statutes or executive orders discussed in the preamble concerning the rulemaking process (please specify)

.



1000

# Submission of Federal Rules Under the Congressional Review Act President of the Senate Speaker of the House of Representatives

GAO

Please fill the circles electronically or with black pen or #2 pencil.

1. Name of Department or Agency		2. Subdivision or Office	
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission		Office of the Chief Financial Officer	
3. Rule Title Revision of Fee Schedules; Fee Recovery fo	or FY 2003	····	
4. Rule Identification Number (RIN) or Other L			

5. Major Rule  Non-major Rule O	
6. Final Rule Other O	
7. With respect to this rule, did your agency solicit public comme	nts? Yes 🌒 No O N/A O
8. Priority of Regulation (fill in one)	
<ul> <li>Economically Significant; or Significant; or Substantive, Nonsignificant</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Routine and Frequent or Informational/Administrative/Other (Do not complete the other side of this form if filled in above.)</li> </ul>
9. Effective Date (if applicable) 60 days from publication in t	he Federal Register
10. Is a concise Summary of the Rule provided? Yes	No O
Submitted by: (sign Name: Dennis K. Rathbun	ature)
Title: Director, Office of Congressional Affairs	
For Congressional Use Only:	
Date Received:	
Committee of Jurisdiction:	
	11/09/99



.

		Yes	No	N/A
A.	With respect to this rule, did your agency prepare an analysis of costs and benefits?	0	0	•
B.	With respect to this rule, at the final rulemaking stage, did your agency			a.
	1. certify that the rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under 5 U.S.C. § 605(b)?	0	•	0
	2. prepare a final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis under 5 U.S.C. § 604(a)?	•	0	0
C.	With respect to this rule, did your agency prepare a written statement under § 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995?	0	0	٠
	With respect to this rule, did your agency prepare an Environmental Assessment or an Environmental Impact Statement under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)?	0	0	•
E.	Does this rule contain a collection of information requiring OMB approval under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995?	• 0	•	0
F.	Did you discuss any of the following in the preamble to the rule?			
•	• E.O. 13132, Federalism	0	0	
	<ul> <li>E.O. 12630, Government Actions and Interference with Constitutionally Protected Property Rights</li> </ul>	0	0	٠
	<ul> <li>E.O. 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review</li> </ul>	0	0	•
	E.O. 12988, Civil Justice Reform	0	0	۲
	<ul> <li>E.O. 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks</li> </ul>	0	0	۲
	Other statutes or executive orders discussed in the preamble			

concerning the rulemaking process (please specify)

Please fill the circles ele	ectronically or with black	k pen or #2 per	ncil.			
1. Name of Department	or Agency		2. Subo	livision or Office		
U.S. Nuclear Regulator	ry Commission		Office	of the Chief Fir	ancial Off	ficer
Revision of Fee Schedu	lles; Fee Recovery fo	r FY 2003				
4. Rule Identification Nu	umber (RIN) or Other U	nique Identifier	(if applicat	le) RIN: 3150	-AH14	
5. Major Rule	Non-major Rule O					
6. Final Rule	Other ()					
7. With respect to this r	ule, did your agency sol	icit public com	ments?	Yes 🌒	No O	N/A O
8. Priority of Regulation	(fill in one) Economically Significa Significant; or Substantive, Nonsigni			Routine and Freq nformational/Adr {Do not complet of this form if t	ninistrative/ le the other	side
9. Effective Date (if app	licable) 60 days from	publication i	n the Fede	ral Register		·····
	ry of the Rule provided?	N	'es 🌒	No O	·····	

For Congressional Use Only:

Date Received: \_\_\_\_\_

Committee of Jurisdiction: \_



e

		Yes	No	N/A	
Α.	With respect to this rule, did your agency prepare an analysis of costs and benefits?	0	0	•	
В.	With respect to this rule, at the final rulemaking stage, did your agency				
	1. certify that the rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under 5 U.S.C. § 605(b)?	0	٠	0	
	2. prepare a final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis under 5 U.S.C. § 604(a)?	•	0	0	
C.	With respect to this rule, did your agency prepare a written statement under § 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995?	0	0	٠	
	With respect to this rule, did your agency prepare an Environmental Assessment or an Environmental Impact Statement under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)?	0	0	•	
E.	Does this rule contain a collection of information requiring OMB approval under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995?	0	•	0	
F.	Did you discuss any of the following in the preamble to the rule?				
•	• E.O. 13132, Federalism	0	0	۲	
	<ul> <li>E.O. 12630, Government Actions and Interference with Constitutionally Protected Property Rights</li> </ul>	0	0	•	
	<ul> <li>E.O. 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review</li> </ul>	0	0	٠	
	E.O. 12988, Civil Justice Reform	0	0	۲	
	<ul> <li>E.O. 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks</li> </ul>	0	0	۲	
	<ul> <li>Other statutes or executive orders discussed in the preamble</li> <li>concerning the rulemaking process (please specify)</li> </ul>				

'n,

| |