

OMB SUPPORTING STATEMENT FOR PROPOSED RULE
10 CFR PART 52,
CONSIDERATION OF AIRCRAFT IMPACTS FOR
NEW NUCLEAR POWER DESIGNS
(3150-0151)
REVISION

Description of the Information Collection

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission is proposing to amend its regulations in 10 CFR part 52, "Licenses, Certifications, and Approvals for Nuclear Power Plants," to add 10 CFR 52.500, "Aircraft Impact Assessment," to require applicants for new standard design certifications that do not reference a standard design approval; new standard design approvals; combined licenses that do not reference a standard design certification, standard design approval, or manufactured reactor; and new manufacturing licenses that do not reference a standard design certification or standard design approval to assess the effects of the impact of a large, commercial aircraft on the nuclear power plant. Based on the insights gained from this assessment, the applicant would need to include in the application a description and evaluation of the design features, functional capabilities, and strategies to avoid or mitigate the effects of an aircraft impact, addressing core cooling capability, containment integrity and spent fuel pool integrity. The applicant would be required to describe how such design and other features avoid or mitigate, to the extent practicable, the aircraft impact effects with reduced reliance on operator actions. In this manner, this rule would result in newly designed power reactor facilities being more inherently robust with regard to a potential aircraft impact than if they were designed in the absence of this rule. This rule thus provides an enhanced level of protection beyond that which is provided by the existing adequate protection requirements, which all operating power reactors are required to meet, and which would be provided by the proposed adequate protection requirements that the facilities will be required to meet when finalized (see the proposed 10 CFR part 73, "Physical Protection of Plants and Materials," power reactor security requirements (71 FR 62663; October 26, 2006)).

The benefits of the proposed rule can only be evaluated on a qualitative basis. The proposed rule would result in qualitative benefits with respect to the following attributes.¹

Public Health (Accident). The proposed rule would reduce the risk that public health will be affected by the release of radioactive materials to the environment from the impact of a large, commercial aircraft on a nuclear power plant.

Occupational Health (Accident). The proposed rule would reduce the risk that occupational health will be affected by the release of radioactive materials to the environment from the impact of a large, commercial aircraft on a nuclear power plant.

¹ The list of potential attributes that the proposed rule could affect were identified by using the potential attributes provided in Chapter 5 of NUREG/BR-0184, "Regulatory Analysis Technical Evaluation Handbook" (January 1997).

Offsite Property. The proposed rule would reduce the risk that offsite property will be affected by the release of radioactive materials to the environment from the impact of a large, commercial aircraft on a nuclear power plant.

Onsite Property. The proposed rule would reduce the risk that onsite property will be affected by the release of radioactive materials to the environment from the impact of a large commercial aircraft on a nuclear power plant.

Industry Implementation. The proposed rule would require applicants for new standard design certifications that do not reference a standard design approval; new standard design approvals; combined licenses that do not reference a standard design certification, standard design approval, or manufactured reactor; and new manufacturing licenses that do not reference a standard design certification or standard design approval to assess the effects of the impact of a large, commercial aircraft on the nuclear power plant. Based on the insights gained from this assessment, the applicant would need to include in its application a description and evaluation of design features, functional capabilities, and strategies to avoid or mitigate, to the extent practicable, the effects of an aircraft impact, with reduced reliance on operator actions.

Improvements in Knowledge. The proposed rule would improve knowledge by ensuring that applicants for newly designed nuclear power facilities perform a rigorous assessment of the effects of the impact of a large, commercial aircraft on the designed facility. Based on the insights gained from this assessment, the applicant would need to include in its application a description and evaluation of the design features, functional capabilities, and strategies to avoid or mitigate the effects of the aircraft impact, addressing core cooling capability, containment integrity, and spent fuel pool integrity. The applicant would need to describe how such design and other features avoid or mitigate, to the extent practicable, the aircraft impact effects with reduced reliance on operator actions.

Safeguards and Security Considerations. This proposed rule to address the capability of newly designed power reactors relative to a potential aircraft impact is based both on enhanced public health and enhanced safety and common defense and security but is not necessary for adequate protection. Rather, it would be to enhance the facility's inherent robustness.

A. JUSTIFICATION

The Commission has determined that the impact of a large, commercial aircraft is a beyond-design-basis event. For this reason, the Commission-approved final design basis threat (DBT) does not include an aircraft attack. The NRC published its final DBT rule, 10 CFR 73.1, "Purpose and Scope," in the *Federal Register* on March 19, 2007 (72 FR 12705). Two well-established bases support the exclusion of aircraft attacks from the DBT. First, it is not reasonable to expect a private licensee with a private security force using weapons legally available to it to be able to defend against such an attack. Second, such an act is in the nature of an attack by an enemy of the United States. Power reactor licensees are not required to design their facilities or otherwise provide measures to defend against such an attack, as provided by 10 CFR 50.13, "Attacks and Destructive Acts by Enemies of the United States; and Defense Activities."

Requiring applicants for new reactor designs to perform a rigorous aircraft impact assessment and describe design features to address the effects of a beyond-design-basis aircraft impact is consistent with the NRC's historic approach to beyond-design-basis events and is consistent with the NRC's position in its "Policy Statement on Severe Reactor Accidents Regarding Future Designs and Existing Plants" (50 FR 32138; August 8, 1985) (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession No. ML003711521). The policy statement notes, "The Commission expects that vendors engaged in designing new standard [or custom] plants will achieve a higher standard of severe accident safety performance than their prior designs." The Commission reiterated that regulatory approach in its "Policy Statement on the Regulation of Advanced Nuclear Power Plants," dated July 8, 1986 (ADAMS Accession No. ML051660651), "The Commission expects that advanced reactors would provide more margin prior to exceeding safety limits and/or utilize simplified, inherent, passive, or other innovative means to reliably accomplish their safety functions." This regulatory approach has demonstrated its success, as all designs subsequently submitted to and certified by the Commission represent substantial improvement in safety from operational events and accidents. Therefore, the NRC is proposing to require applicants for newly designed facilities to assess the effects of an aircraft impact on the designed facility.

The NRC is seeking clearance with respect to the proposed changes to 10 CFR part 52 regarding the requirements proposed under the new 10 CFR 52.500 to perform a design-specific assessment of the effects on the designed facility of the impact of a large, commercial aircraft (impact assessment).

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

10 CFR 52.47(a)(28). Section 52.47, "Contents of Applications; Technical Information," identifies the required technical information to be included in an application for a standard design certification. The proposed rule would revise this section by adding a new paragraph (a)(28) requiring that the final safety analysis report (FSAR) contain the information required by proposed 10 CFR 52.500. The burden for submitting this information is covered under the proposed 10 CFR 52.500.

10 CFR 52.79(a)(47). Section 52.79, "Contents of Applications; Technical Information in Final Safety Analysis Report," identifies the required technical information to be included in an FSAR submitted in a combined license application under 10 CFR part 52, subpart C, "Combined Licenses." The proposed rule would revise this section by adding a new paragraph (a)(47) requiring that the FSAR contain the information required by proposed 10 CFR 52.500. The burden for submitting this information is covered under the proposed 10 CFR 52.500.

10 CFR 52.137(a)(26). Section 52.137, "Contents of Applications; Technical Information," identifies the required technical information to be included in an application for a standard design approval. The proposed rule would revise this

section by adding a new paragraph (a)(26) requiring that the FSAR contain the information required by proposed 10 CFR 52.500. The burden for submitting this information is covered under the proposed 10 CFR 52.500.

10 CFR 52.157(f)(37). Section 52.157, "Contents of Applications; Technical Information in Final Safety Analysis Report," identifies the required technical information to be included in an application for a manufacturing license. The proposed rule would revise this section by adding a new paragraph (f)(32) requiring that the FSAR contain the information required by proposed 10 CFR 52.500. The burden for submitting this information is covered under the proposed 10 CFR 52.500.

10 CFR 52.500 Aircraft Impact Assessment. Section 52.500 would be a new requirement for assessing a large, commercial aircraft impact at nuclear power plants and incorporating design features, functional capabilities, and strategies to avoid or mitigate, to the extent practicable, the effects of such aircraft impacts.

Paragraph (a) would state that the requirements of this section would be applicable to all standard design certifications issued after the effective date of the final rule that do not reference a standard design approval; standard design approvals issued after the effective date of the final rule; combined licenses issued after the effective date of the final rule that do not reference a standard design certification, standard design approval, or manufactured reactor; and manufacturing licenses issued after the effective date of the final rule that do not reference a standard design certification or standard design approval. A design certification rule issued after the effective date of the final 10 CFR 52.500 rule that does not reference a design approval is subject to the requirements of the rule even if its application was filed before the effective date of the final 10 CFR 52.500 rule. Similarly, a design approval issued after the effective date of the final rule is subject to the requirements of the rule even if its application was filed before the effective date of the final rule. A combined license issued after the effective date of the final 10 CFR 52.500 rule that does not reference a design certification, design approval, or manufactured reactor would be subject to the requirements of the rule, even if its application was filed before the effective date of the final 10 CFR 52.500 rule. Furthermore, a combined license issued after the effective date of the final 10 CFR 52.500 rule referencing one of the four current standard design certifications, would *not* be subject to the requirements of proposed 10 CFR 52.500.

Paragraph (b) would require those applicants subject to proposed 10 CFR 52.500 to perform a design-specific assessment of the effects on the designed facility of the impact of a large, commercial aircraft (impact assessment). By "design-specific," the NRC means that the impact assessment must address the specific design which is either the subject of the standard design certification, standard design approval, combined license, or manufacturing license application. The proposed rule would require that the design-specific impact assessment be based on Commission-specified general aircraft characteristics

used to define the beyond-design-basis impact of a large, commercial aircraft used for long distance flights in the United States, with aviation fuel loading typically used in such flights, and an impact speed and angle of impact considering the ability of both experienced and inexperienced pilots to control large, commercial aircraft at the low altitude representative of a nuclear power plant's low profile. Beyond these general characteristics, the Commission will specify for plant designers in a Safeguards Information (SGI) guidance document more detailed characteristics of the large, commercial aircraft to be used in the required assessment.

Paragraph (c) would require the relevant applications to include a description and evaluation of the design features, functional capabilities, and strategies (features, capabilities, and strategies) to avoid or mitigate the effects of the aircraft impact that applicants must assess under paragraph (b). Design features, functional capabilities, and strategies could include such things as reinforced concrete walls (in the original design, modified, or added); redundancy and spatial separation of key systems, structures and components; diversity of power supplies; and compartmentalization of interior structures. The NRC expects the required assessment to include an evaluation of such features, capabilities, and strategies and of possible improvements in them. The evaluation of such design features, functional capabilities, and strategies must include core cooling capability, containment integrity, and spent fuel pool integrity.

The information submitted under this section would be used by the NRC to confirm that the required evaluation was performed and that the application includes the necessary description and evaluation of the design and other features adopted to avoid or mitigate, to the extent practicable, the potential effects of the applicable, beyond-design-basis aircraft impact. The NRC will review the evaluation contained in the application and reach a conclusion as to whether the applicant has conducted an evaluation reasonably formulated to identify practicable design and other features to avoid or mitigate the potential effects of the aircraft impact. However, NRC's review of the adequacy of the evaluation, and the effectiveness and practicability of the applicant-selected features, capabilities, and strategies, are separate and distinct from the NRC's determination whether to issue a final standard design certification rule, a final design approval, a combined license, or a manufacturing license.

The impact assessment is subject to audit and review by the NRC and, therefore, must be maintained by the applicant along with the rest of the information that forms the basis for the relevant application, consistent with paragraph (b) of 10 CFR 52.0, "Scope; Applicability of 10 CFR Chapter I Provisions," 10 CFR 50.70, "Inspections," and 10 CFR 50.71, "Maintenance of Records, Making of Reports." The applicant does not need to submit the impact assessment—as opposed to the "description and evaluation of the design features, functional capabilities, and strategies" required by proposed 10 CFR 52.500(c)—to the NRC in its application.

Standard Design Certification Applications that Do Not Reference a Standard Design Approval

Although the proposed rule would increase the recordkeeping burden for applicants for new standard design certifications that do not reference a standard design approval, overall it would be negligible (3 hours/year) and would be captured by the recordkeeping provisions in the applicable design certification rule (OMB clearance number 3150-0151). The NRC expects to take 4 years to adopt each application as a final standard design certification rule, after which the records are retained by the applicant for for the term of the certification rule (15 years), and any period of renewal. The NRC expects three applications during the next 3 years.

Standard Design Approval Applications

The NRC has no recordkeeping requirements in its regulations for a standard design approval. However, a standard design certification applicant or licensee (who had submitted a combined license application) that referenced the standard design approval would be required to retain the necessary records. No standard design approval applications are expected to be submitted to the NRC during the next 3 years. Thus, the relevant burden is zero.

Manufacturing License Applications that Do Not Reference a Standard Design Certification or Standard Design Approval

Although the proposed rule would increase the recordkeeping burden for applicants for new manufacturing licenses that do not reference a standard design certification or standard design approval, overall it would be negligible (3 hours/year) and would be captured by the current recordkeeping burden estimate for the entire manufacturing license under 10 CFR 50.71(c) (OMB clearance number 3150-0011) when the manufacturing license is issued. The NRC expects to take 4 years to approve the application, after which the records are retained by the manufacturing licensee for the term of the license (15 years), and any period of renewal. No new manufacturing licenses that do not reference a standard design certification or standard design approval are expected to be submitted to the NRC during the next 3 years. Thus, the relevant burden is zero.

Combined License Applications that Do Not Reference a Standard Design Certification, Standard Design Approval, or Manufactured Reactor

Although the proposed rule would increase the recordkeeping burden for applicants for new combined license applications that do not reference a standard design certification, standard design approval, or manufactured reactor, overall it would be negligible (3 hours/year) and would be captured by the current recordkeeping burden estimate for the entire combined license under 10 CFR 50.71(c) (OMB clearance number 3150-0011) when the combined license is issued. The NRC expects to take 4 years to approve the application, after which the records are retained by the licensee for the term of the license (40 years) and

any period of renewal. No new combined license applications that do not reference a standard design certification, standard design approval, or manufactured reactor are expected to be submitted to the NRC during the next 3 years. Thus, the relevant burden is zero.

No special forms are prescribed for submitting the results of the aircraft impact assessment with each application.

2. Agency Use of the Information

The aircraft impact assessment information to be submitted as part of the application would be used by the NRC to evaluate actions taken by the applicant in response to the requirements of the proposed rule. This would include any design features, functional capabilities, and strategies provided by the design to avoid or mitigate the effects of the aircraft impact. The NRC will review the evaluation contained in the application and reach a conclusion as to whether the applicant has conducted an evaluation reasonably formulated to identify practicable design and other features to avoid or mitigate the potential effects of the applicable, beyond-design-basis aircraft impact. This proposed rule is based both on enhanced public health and enhanced safety and common defense and security but is not necessary for adequate protection. Rather, it would be to enhance the facility's inherent robustness.

3. Reduction of Burden Through Information Technology

There are no legal obstacles to reducing the burden associated with this information collection. The NRC encourages respondents to use new automated information technology when it could be beneficial to them. NRC issued a regulation on October 10, 2003 (68 FR 58792), consistent with the Government Paperwork Elimination Act, which allows its licensees, vendors, applicants, and members of the public the option to make submissions electronically via CD-ROM, email, special Web-based interface, or other means. It is estimated that 100 percent of the applications will be submitted electronically.

4. Effort to Identify Duplication and Use Similar Information

There is no duplication of requirements and this information is not available from any source other than the applicants involved. The information required by the NRC in applications, reports, or records concerning the licensing of nuclear power plants does not duplicate other Federal information collection requirements. For example, to avoid duplication, a combined license application that references a design already certified by the Commission would need only to incorporate by reference the results of the aircraft impact assessment performed for the design certification. The NRC has in place an ongoing program to examine all information collections with the goal of eliminating all duplication and/or unnecessary information collections.

5. Effort to Reduce Small Business Burden

The information collection required by this regulation will not be a burden on small business because only large companies have the technical and financial resources to support the large capital investment required to design and construct these nuclear power plants. Therefore, small business will not be seeking the design certification or combined operating licenses made available by 10 CFR part 52. No small entities are expected to be impacted by the proposed rule.

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

This information is collected once from a single applicant. Applications are required only when regulatory or licensing action (as applicable) is sought on a new standard design certification that does not reference a standard design approval; a new standard design approval; a combined license that does not reference a standard design certification, standard design approval, or manufactured reactor; and a new manufacturing license that does not reference a standard design certification or standard design approval. Without this one-time collection of information, the NRC would not have a sufficient technical basis for evaluating the results of large, commercial aircraft impacts on new nuclear power reactor designs. The NRC cannot collect the information any less frequently than provided in this rule or it would compromise its ability to (1) make appropriate regulatory or licensing decisions, and (2) determine whether nuclear power plant designers have performed a rigorous assessment of design features that could provide additional inherent protection to avoid or mitigate, to the extent practicable, the effects of an aircraft impact, with reduced reliance on operator actions.

7. Circumstances Which Justify Variation from OMB Guidelines

None.

8. Consultation Outside the NRC

Opportunity for additional public comment has been published in the *Federal Register* notice for the proposed rule.

Since September 11, 2001, the NRC has worked closely with the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Defense, and other agencies both to understand their information on terrorist threats and to communicate the NRC's study results. A number of foreign governments are considering the construction of new nuclear power plants. The NRC is communicating with the regulatory authorities in these countries to understand their requirements and to convey its own results and plans.

Also, the NRC staff is providing information based on the design basis aircraft characteristics specified by the Commission, to plant designers or other

stakeholders who have the need to know, and who meet NRC's requirements for disclosure of such information.

9. Payments or Gifts to Respondents

Not applicable.

10. Confidentiality of Information

Information identified as proprietary or confidential would be handled and protected in accordance with with NRC regulations at 10 CFR 9.17(a) and 10 CFR 2.390(b). Portions of the security assessment submitted by an applicant that contain sensitive information would only be available to those NRC staff who are authorized and have a need-to-know. Certain information designated as Safeguards Information is prohibited from public disclosure in accordance with the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, Chapter 12, Section 147, or designated as classified National Security Information, in accordance with Executive Order 12958.

11. Justification for Sensitive Questions

No sensitive questions are asked in the proposed revisions to 10 CFR part 52.

12. Estimate of Annualized Burden and Burden Hour Cost

The aircraft impact assessment would be collected once from each applicant for a new standard design certification that does not reference a standard design approval; new standard design approval; combined license that does not reference a standard design certification, standard design approval, or manufactured reactor; and new manufacturing license that does not reference a standard design certification or standard design approval. The proposed rule would increase the recordkeeping burden for each applicant and would entail the retention of the assessment, evaluation, and supporting documentation. Because an applicant would spend about 3 hours per year to store these records (about 50 to 100 pages), the recordkeeping burden is considered to be negligible for this OMB clearance package. However, this negligible increase in recordkeeping burden would be captured by other regulations as discussed above in Section 2.

The reporting burden for the proposed rule is calculated for each category of application that is expected to be submitted to the NRC during this 3-year OMB clearance period.

Section 52.500 Aircraft Impact Assessment

The proposed 10 CFR 52.500 is estimated to increase the reporting burden on applicants as follows.

Standard Design Certification Applications that Do Not Reference a Standard Design Approval

During the OMB clearance period, the staff expects that 3 applications for new design certifications that do not reference a standard design approval will be submitted to the NRC. In accordance with the proposed 10 CFR 52.500, each applicant shall perform an aircraft impact assessment of the effects of the impact of a large commercial aircraft on the nuclear power plant and include in its application a description and evaluation of the design features, functional capabilities, and strategies to avoid or mitigate the effects of the aircraft impact. Inclusion of any SGI in the evaluation submitted as part of the application must be in accordance with applicable requirements in 10 CFR part 73.

The NRC estimates that it would take each applicant 3,840 hours (24 staff-months x 4 weeks/month x 40 hours) to perform the assessment and to include the description and evaluation in the application. In addition, each applicant would incur a one-time burden to develop an SGI program to secure the assessment, evaluation, and related documents. The NRC estimates that each applicant would spend 120 hours to develop the SGI program. The total burden on the industry to collect this information is estimated to be 11,880 hours of industry resources.

Industry:

Annualized over 3 years

| | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| (3,840 +120) hrs/appl. x 3 appl. = 11,880 hrs | 11,880 hrs/3 years = 3,960 hrs/year |
| 11,880 hrs x \$258/hr = \$3,065,040 | \$3,065,040/3 years = |
| | \$1,021,680 |

Standard Design Approval Applications

During the OMB clearance period, the staff expects that zero applications for new standard design approvals will be submitted to the NRC. If an application was submitted during a future OMB clearance period, the NRC estimates that the annualized reporting burden would be 3,960 hours and calculated as follows.

The NRC estimates that it would take each applicant 3,840 hours (24 staff-months x 4 weeks/month x 40 hours) to perform the assessment and to include the description and evaluation in the application. In addition, each applicant would incur a one-time burden to develop an SGI program to secure the assessment, evaluation, and related documents. The NRC estimates that each applicant would spend 120 hours to develop the SGI program. The total burden on the applicant to collect this information is estimated to be 3,960 hours.

Manufacturing License Applications that Do Not Reference a Standard Design Certification or Standard Design Approval

During the OMB clearance period, the staff expects that zero applications for new manufacturing licenses that do not reference a standard design certification or standard design approval will be submitted to the NRC. If an application was submitted during a future OMB clearance period, the NRC estimates that the annualized reporting burden would be 3,960 hours and calculated as follows.

The NRC estimates that it would take each applicant 3,840 hours (24 staff-months x 4 weeks/month x 40 hours) to perform the assessment and to include the description and evaluation in the application. In addition, each applicant would incur a one-time burden to develop an SGI program to secure the assessment, evaluation, and related documents. The NRC estimates that each applicant would spend 120 hours to develop the SGI program. The total burden on the applicant to collect this information is estimated to be 3,960 hours.

Combined License Applications that Do Not Reference a Standard Design Certification, Standard Design Approval, or Manufactured Reactor

During the OMB clearance period, the staff expects that zero applications for combined licenses that do not reference a standard design certification, standard design approval, or manufactured reactor will be submitted to NRC. If an application was submitted during a future OMB clearance period, the NRC estimates that the annualized reporting burden would be 3,960 hours and calculated as follows.

The NRC estimates that it would take each applicant 3,840 hours (24 staff-months x 4 weeks/month x 40 hours) to perform the assessment and to include the description and evaluation in the application. In addition, each applicant would incur a one-time burden to develop an SGI program to secure the assessment, evaluation, and related documents. The NRC estimates that each applicant would spend 120 hours to develop the SGI program. The total burden on the applicant to collect this information is estimated to be 3,960 hours.

Total Burden and Burden Hour Cost for All Applications

The costs associated with the information collections are given in Table 1 for the annualized one-time reporting burden. The estimated one-time cost for all affected applicants over the 3-year period covered by this analysis is \$3,065,040 (\$3,065,040 [design certification applicants] + \$0 [standard design approval applicants] + \$0 [combined license applicants] + \$0 [manufacturing license applicants] + \$0 [combined license applicants]). The total burden hour cost over the 3-year period covered by this analysis is 11,880 hours (11,880 hours [design certification applicants] + 0 hours [standard design approval applicants] + 0 hours [combined license applicants] + 0 hours [manufacturing license applicants] + 0 hours [combined license applicants]).

13. Estimate of Other Additional Cost

The NRC has determined that the records storage cost is roughly proportional to the recordkeeping burden cost. Based on a typical clearance, the records storage cost has been determined to be equal to 0.0004 percent of the recordkeeping burden cost. Because recordkeeping burden is estimated to be 3 hours, additional recordkeeping cost is negligible.

The NRC estimates that there is a one-time cost of \$2,500 to purchase an SGI storage container. The annualized cost over 3 years is \$833 ($\$2,500/3$ years).

14. Estimated Annualized Cost to the Federal Government

This section calculates the estimated annualized one-time cost to the government over the 3-year OMB clearance period covered by this analysis.

Standard Design Certification Applications that Do Not Reference a Standard Design Approval

The NRC expects to collect information from three applicants for a standard design certification that do not reference a standard design approval during this 3-year OMB clearance period. The estimated one-time cost to the government for the review of required reports is \$123,840 (480 hours, i.e., 160 hours x 3 design certification applications x \$258/hr). Averaging this over the 3-year period covered by the analysis, this burden amounts to \$41,280/year (160 hours/year).

Standard Design Approval Applications

Although the proposed requirements provide for collection of information from applicants for a standard design approval, the NRC does not expect to collect information from these entities during this 3-year OMB clearance period.

Manufacturing License Applications that Do Not Reference a Standard Design Certification or Standard Design Approval

Although the proposed requirements provide for collection of information from applicants for a manufacturing license that do not reference a standard design certification or standard design approval, the NRC does not expect to collect information from these entities during this 3-year OMB clearance period.

Combined License Applications that Do Not Reference a Standard Design Certification, Standard Design Approval, or Manufactured Reactor

Although the proposed requirements provide for collection of information from applicants for a combined license that do not reference a standard design certification, standard design approval, or manufactured reactor, the NRC does not expect to collect information from these entities during this 3-year OMB clearance period.

Total Annualized Cost

The one-time cost to the government for reviewing the design certification applications results in a total annualized cost of \$41,280. These costs are fully recovered by fee assessments to NRC applicants pursuant to 10 CFR parts 170 and/or 171.

15. Reasons for Change in Burden or Cost

All of the burden for this information collection would be new burden which would be added to 10 CFR part 52 and the total is 3,960 hours. This proposed rule would increase the burden for 10 CFR part 52 from 462,372 hours to 466,332 hours by requiring applicants for new standard design certifications that do not reference a standard design approval; new standard design approvals; combined licenses that do not reference a standard design certification, standard design approval, or manufactured reactor; and new manufacturing licenses that do not reference a standard design certification or standard design approval to assess the effects of the impact of a large, commercial aircraft on the nuclear power plant. Based on the insights gained from this assessment, the applicant would need to include in its application a description and evaluation of design features, functional capabilities, and strategies to avoid or mitigate, to the extent practicable, the effects of the aircraft impact with reduced reliance on operator actions.

16. Publication for Statistical Use

The collected information is not published for statistical use.

17. Reason for Not Displaying the Expiration Date

The requirement will be 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

None.

A. COLLECTION OF INFORMATION EMPLOYING STATISTICAL METHODS

Not applicable. Statistical methods are not used in this collection of information.

TABLE 1. 10 CFR PART 52 ESTIMATED ONE-TIME REPORTING BURDEN

| Section | Number of Respondents Annually | Responses per Respondent Annually | Total Responses Annually | Burden Per Response | Total Annual Burden Hours | Estimate Annual Cost @ \$258/Hr. |
|--|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 52.47(a)(28) Burden covered under § 52.500 | | | | | | |
| 52.79(a)(47) Burden covered under § 52.500 | | | | | | |
| 52.137(a)(26) Burden covered under § 52.500 | | | | | | |
| 52.157(f)(32) Burden covered under § 52.500 | | | | | | |
| 52.500 | | | | | | |
| Standard Design Certification Applications that Do No Reference a Standard Design Approval NRC expects 3 applications in the next 3 years (3/3 = 1 response/year) | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3,960 | 3,960 | \$1,021,680 |
| Standard Design Approval Applications NRC expects zero applications in the next 3 years | | | | | | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,960 | 0 | |
| Manufacturing License Applications that Do Not Reference a Standard Design Certification or Standard Design Approval NRC expects zero applications in the next 3 years | | | | | | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,960 | 0 | |
| Combined License Applications that Do Not Reference a Standard Design Certification, Standard Design Approval, or Manufactured Reactor NRC expects zero applications in the next 3 years | | | | | | |

| Section | Number of Respondents Annually | Responses per Respondent Annually | Total Responses Annually | Burden Per Response | Total Annual Burden Hours | Estimate Annual Cost @ \$258/Hr. |
|--|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,960 | 0 | |
| Total § 52.500 Reporting Burden | | | | | 3,960 | \$1,021,680 |