

Request for OMB Review

PDR

Certified By *R. Attwood*

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 Leon Reiter	Telephone number (301) 492-0841
4. Title of information collection or rulemaking 10 CFR 100, Appendix A, Seismic and Geologic Siting Criteria for Nuclear Power Plants	

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

42 USC **2201(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	Stage of development	Type of review requested
1 <input type="checkbox"/> Major	1 <input type="checkbox"/> Proposed or draft	1 <input type="checkbox"/> Standard
2 <input type="checkbox"/> Nonmajor	2 <input type="checkbox"/> Final or interim final, with prior proposal	2 <input type="checkbox"/> Pending
	3 <input type="checkbox"/> Final or interim final, without prior proposal	3 <input type="checkbox"/> Emergency
		4 <input type="checkbox"/> 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? Yes No
If "No," did OMB waive the analysis? Yes 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
11

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.

13. Abstract—Describe needs, uses and affected public in 50 words or less "Nuclear Facility Safety, Geologic Hazard"
 Nuclear power plants must be designed, constructed, and maintained to withstand geologic hazards such as faulting, seismic hazards, and the maximum credible earthquake.

14. 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)

6 Final or interim final without prior NPRM

4 Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM)

A Regular submission

5 Final, NPRM was previously published

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

4 Reinstatement of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired

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

5 Existing collection in use without an OMB control number

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

NA

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

17. Annual reporting or disclosure burden

1 Number of respondents

3

2 Number of responses per respondent

1

3 Total annual responses (line 1 times line 2)

3

4 Hours per response

16,666

5 Total hours (line 3 times line 4)

50,000

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

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): _____

19. Total annual burden

1 Requested (line 17-5 plus line 18-3)

50,000

2 In current OMB inventory

50,000

3 Difference (line 1 less line 2)

0

Explanation of difference

4 Program change

5 Adjustment

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

3150-0093

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

1 Voluntary

2 Required to obtain or retain a benefit

3 Mandatory

21. Requested expiration date

12/31/92

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 100

FR

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, DSO for Information Resources Management

SUPPORTING STATEMENT
FOR
10 CFR 100, APPENDIX A

SEISMIC AND GEOLOGIC SITING CRITERIA FOR NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS

DESCRIPTION OF THE INFORMATION COLLECTION

The Commission's regulations, 10 CFR Part 100, "Reactor Site Criteria," Appendix A "Seismic and Geologic Siting Criteria for Nuclear Power Plants" [Criterion II, Paragraph 3; Criterion IV; and Criterion VI (B) (1)] require applicants to provide the types of information which show evidence or indications as to the size and frequency of occurrence of prehistoric earthquakes, and evidence of the last time there was movement along faults at the site or in the site region to determine whether or not there is a potential for fault offset during the life of a nuclear power plant.

The information required by 10 CFR Part 100, Appendix A, must be submitted with the application for a construction permit (CP) or operating license (OL). Although no new applications are anticipated for the next three years this clearance is necessary in the event the NRC has a need to reassess some previous seismic positions. The NRC review process for a construction permit or an operating license application ranges from one to several years. The NRC staff reviews the Safety Analysis Report for one to two months and, if necessary, generates a request for additional information. The applicant usually responds within 1 to 6 months, depending on the complexity of the issues. The average time is usually about 3 months. The responses are reviewed and a draft Safety Evaluation Report is written by the NRC staff. This document summarizes conclusions and highlights any outstanding issues. The staff arranges for a meeting and site visit to resolve any open issues. When the open issues have been resolved, the staff writes the final Safety Evaluation Report which is published and used as a basis for the remainder of the NRC licensing process, i.e., the meeting with the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards (ACRS) and hearing before the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, which usually takes about 1½ years.

During the next 3 years, Appendix A will be used as an aid for evaluating significant new geologic and seismic data as to whether or not it will have an effect on the earthquake design bases for several operating nuclear power plants. Appendix A will continue to serve as a basis for NRC-sponsored research.

A. JUSTIFICATION

1. Need for the Collection of Information

The information required by these criteria may be needed by the NRC to assess the adequacy of proposed seismic design bases and the design bases for other geological hazards for nuclear power plants. It is submitted to the NRC as part of the application and supporting documentation for a construction permit and operating license for a nuclear power plant.

Moreover, Appendix A, supplemented by the Standard Format and the Standard Review Plan, is used by applicants as general guidance in planning investigations of nuclear power plant sites.

2. Agency Use of Information

The NRC reviews the geological and seismological information to determine the suitability of the proposed site for a nuclear power plant and the suitability of the plant design bases established in consideration of the seismic and geologic characteristics of the proposed site. A construction permit or operating license cannot be issued until this data has been reviewed and approved by the NRC.

New geological and seismological information that becomes known during the operating life of the plant is also evaluated on the basis of these criteria. These criteria also serve as the basis for ongoing NRC research in the earth sciences.

3. Reduction of Burden Through Information Technology

There are no legal obstacles to reducing the burden associated with this collection through information technology. Moreover, NRC encourages the use of such technology.

4. Effort to Identify Duplication

This information does not duplicate other information being provided to NRC.

5. Effort to Use Similar Information

All pertinent geological and seismological information concerning the nuclear site and region around the site are utilized in the analysis of that site whether it is a product of the criteria requirements or not.

6. Effort to Reduce Small Business Burden

This information collection does not affect small businesses.

7. Consequences of Less Frequent Collection

Less frequent collection of information will result in serious delays in the licensing processes of nuclear power plants.

8. Circumstances Which Justify Variation From OMB Guidelines

There is no variation from the guidelines.

9. Consultations Outside the NRC

None since the last OMB review.

10. Confidentiality of Information

Proprietary information is protected in accordance with the provisions specified in 10 CFR 2 of the NRC's regulations.

11. Justification for Sensitive Questions

This regulation does not require sensitive information.

12. Estimated Annual Cost to the Federal Government

Over the next three years there will not be any burden to the staff regarding CP Applications. Seismic issues are presently under review for Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station. Estimated average annual effort for this OL review is approximately 400 hours or \$24,000 per year ($\$60 \times 400 \text{ hrs} = \$24,000$).

NRC staff anticipates the need to collect information for effort with respect to confirming the adequacy of seismic design bases for two operating reactors, Diablo Canyon and Vogtle. The NRC staff's reevaluation of earthquake design bases for Diablo Canyon is estimated to require an average of 1800 hours/year at an estimated cost of \$108,000 per year ($\$60 \times 1800 \text{ hrs} = \$108,000$). The Vogtle fault assessment will require an estimated 400 hours per year at a cost of \$24,000 per year ($\$60 \times 400 \text{ hrs} = 24,000$).

Consultants employed by the NRC to provide advice in these activities as related to staff reviews completed under the requirements of Appendix A, Part 100, include the U.S. Geological Survey and the University of Nevada-Reno, Brookhaven National Laboratory and the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. The estimated annual average effort for these consultants is approximately 5,000 hours or \$300,000 ($\$60 \times 5,000 \text{ hrs} = \$300,000$).

Total annual cost to the Federal Government for Appendix A-related activities is estimated to be \$456,000 ($\$60 \times 7,600 \text{ hrs}$). Note that these hours are based on that which is projected for two operating reactors, one OL review and associated consultant expenses.

13. Estimate of Industry Burden

- a. The estimated annual burden for one (1) applicant and two (2) licensees (Comanche Peak, Diablo Canyon, and Vogtle) is based on the involvement of from 2 to 3 of the licensees' technical staff members for the monitoring of post-operating licenses seismic activities for Vogtle; up to as many as 15 to 20 persons for the Comanche Peak OL review and the monitoring of post-operating license seismic activities for Diablo Canyon. Thus, the estimated annual burden for industry is 50,000 hours.
- b. The biggest portion of this estimate is based on the requirement for gathering, analyzing, and synthesizing data. In order for applicants/licensees to provide the types of information which show evidence or clues as to the size and frequency of occurrence of earthquakes, and evidence of the last time there was displacement along faults at the site or in the region, to determine whether or not there is a potential

for fault offset during the life of a nuclear power plant, extensive research and analysis must be conducted. This effort involves the analysis of voluminous amounts of drawings, logs, maps, seismic and other geophysical records, and reports.

14. Reasons for Change in Burden

The estimated burden on industry remains the same. However, note that in 1986 the burden decreased from 67K to 50K. The reason for that decrease remains applicable for this update because NRC's efforts continue to focus on reevaluating the seismic design bases for operating plants, particularly Diablo Canyon, because of the presentation of new data and hypothesis.

15. Publication for Statistical Use

This information is not collected for statistical purposes.

B. COLLECTION OF INFORMATION EMPLOYING STATISTICAL METHODS

Appendix A of 10 CFR Part 100 allows for the acquisition of statistical data and the use of statistical methods, but does not require them.

Enclosure: Summary of Supporting Statement
(Table 1)

TABLE 1

OMB SUPPORTING STATEMENT FOR APPENDIX A, 10 CFR 100

1.	ANNUAL BURDEN HOURS PER RESPONDENT	16,666
2.	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS ANNUALLY	3
3.	ESTIMATED TOTAL ANNUAL BURDEN HOURS	50,000
4.	ESTIMATED TOTAL ANNUAL COST TO INDUSTRY	\$3,000,000
5.	ESTIMATED TOTAL ANNUAL STAFF HOURS	2,600
6.	ESTIMATED NRC CONSULTANT HOURS	5,000
7.	ESTIMATED ANNUAL COST TO FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	\$ 456,000 (staff hours + consultant hours x \$60)