

## **SUPPORTING STATEMENT**

**U.S. Department of Commerce**

**National Institute of Standards and Technology**

**Ecosystem Questionnaire for States and Territories to Inform CHIPS R&D Facility Site Selection Process**

**OMB Control No. 0693-XXXX**

### **SUPPORTING STATEMENT PART A**

#### **Abstract**

The CHIPS Research and Development (R&D) Office is seeking to collect information needed for implementation of the CHIPS Act of 2022 (Division A of P.L. 117-167) (the Act). The Act tasks the Secretary of Commerce with carrying out section 9906 of the William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021 (15 U.S.C. 4656). This statute aims to catalyze long-term growth in the domestic semiconductor industry in support of U.S. economic resilience and national security. Both the National Semiconductor Technology Center (NSTC) and the National Advanced Packaging Manufacturing Program (NAPMP) have an urgent need to identify facilities in order to accomplish their statutory missions, which are fundamentally economic and national security missions.

This information collection is needed in conjunction with a phased site selection process that will be used to identify a flagship research and development prototyping and packaging facility that is anticipated to become the linchpin of both the NSTC and NAPMP. The information is important for the Department of Commerce and Natcast—the purpose-built nonprofit entity which serves as the operator of the NSTC, and which is anticipated to serve as the operator of this facility—in order to establish at the outset of the site selection process which states and/or territories have existing semiconductor ecosystems that could support this facility.

Congress appropriated \$11 billion to fund CHIPS research and development programs. It is anticipated that the single biggest investment of that \$11 billion will be allocated to NSTC and NAPMP facilities, which are critically important to the success of both of programs. Given the scale of the investment, the funding needed to acquire and operate this research and development prototyping and packaging facility will have implications on the entirety of the CHIPS research and development budget, further underscoring the importance of the collection to inform this process launching in the very near future.

#### **Justification**

**1. Explain the circumstances that make the collection of information necessary. Identify any legal or administrative requirements that necessitate the collection. Attach a copy of the appropriate section of each statute and regulation mandating or authorizing the collection of information.**

The Department of Commerce is requesting emergency approval of a new information collection that is essential to the mission of the Department—namely, swift and robust implementation of the CHIPS Act of 2022 (Division A of P.L. 117-167) (the Act). The Department has determined that collecting this information promptly, prior to expiration of the ordinary time periods established in the Paperwork Reduction Act, is necessary to prevent public harm that would be reasonably likely to result if those time periods were followed. *See* 44 U.S.C. 3507(j); 5 C.F.R. 1320.13(a).

The Act tasks the Secretary of Commerce with carrying out section 9906 of the William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021 (15 U.S.C. 4652-4656). This statute aims to catalyze long-term growth in the domestic semiconductor industry in support of U.S. economic resilience and national security. An expeditious collection of this information is needed in conjunction with a phased site selection process that will be used to identify a flagship research and development prototyping and packaging facility that is anticipated to become the linchpin of both the NSTC and NAPMP, the two largest CHIPS research and development programs established by Congress. The information is important for the Department of Commerce and Natcast—the purpose-built nonprofit entity which serves as the operator of the NSTC, and which is anticipated to serve as the operator of this facility—in order to establish at the outset of the site selection process which states and/or territories have existing semiconductor ecosystems that could support this facility.

Both the NSTC and NAPMP have an urgent need to identify facilities in order to accomplish their statutory missions, which are fundamentally economic and national security missions. The NSTC is required “to conduct advanced semiconductor manufacturing, design and packaging research, and prototyping that strengthens the entire domestic ecosystem.” 15 U.S.C. 4656(c)(2) (A). The NSTC is expected to “significantly reduce the time and cost of moving from design idea to commercialization through access to shared facilities, digital assets and technical expertise for advancing design, prototyping, manufacturing, packaging, and scaling of semiconductors and semiconductor-related products.”<sup>1</sup> The NAPMP is expected to “include an Advanced Packaging Piloting Facility (APPF) where successful development efforts will be transitioned and validated for scaled transition to U.S. manufacturing. This is a key facility for technology transfer to high-volume manufacturing.”<sup>2</sup> The Department of Commerce and Natcast have determined that co-locating many NSTC- and NAPMP-related capabilities in a single facility would be a significant added value to both programs. Having state-of-the-art semiconductor research and development capabilities in the same location as advanced packaging capabilities would be transformative for the semiconductor ecosystem in the United States, because the boundaries between semiconductor wafer/chip processing and next generation advanced packaging are blurring. Today, technology and researchers in these different domains are separated, and no independent research facilities for such innovations in

---

<sup>1</sup> CHIPS Research and Development Office, National Institute of Standards and Technology, U.S. Department of Commerce, *A Vision and Strategy for the National Semiconductor Technology Center*, available at <https://www.nist.gov/system/files/documents/2023/04/26/NSTC-Vision-Strategy-Fact-Sheet.pdf-Vision-Strategy-Fact-Sheet.pdf> (published Apr. 25, 2023).

<sup>2</sup> CHIPS Research and Development Office, National Institute of Standards and Technology, U.S. Department of Commerce, *The Vision for the CHIPS for America National Advanced Packaging Manufacturing Program*, p. 3, available at <https://www.nist.gov/system/files/documents/2023/11/19/NAPMP-Vision-Paper-20231120.pdf> (published Nov. 19, 2023).

packaging exist in the United States. A flagship facility with co-located chip/package solutions would accelerate co-optimized solutions at a pace that is not currently possible and set the United States on a path for continued leadership—at a time when public and private investment in semiconductor research and development by foreign adversaries is substantially increasing.

Today, many elements of the semiconductor ecosystem are geographically concentrated and produced outside of the United States, which is especially true of many advanced packaging capabilities. This endangers the global economy and U.S. national security. For example, many U.S. defense capabilities—including hypersonic weapons, drones, and satellites—are unduly vulnerable to supply chain disruptions and competing advances in research and development. To strengthen U.S. economic and national security, the CHIPS research and development programs must have these facilities online in an expeditious manner.

Congress appropriated \$11 billion to fund CHIPS research and development programs. It is anticipated that the single biggest investment of that \$11 billion will be allocated to NSTC and NAPMP facilities, which are critically important to the success of both of programs. Given the scale of the investment, the funding needed to acquire and operate this research and development prototyping and packaging facility will have implications on the entirety of the CHIPS research and development budget, further underscoring the importance of the collection to inform this process launching in the very near future.

The Department is requesting emergency approval of the Ecosystem Questionnaire for States and Territories to Inform CHIPS R&D Facility Site Selection Process by July 15, 2024. Prompt collection of the information sought in the Questionnaire is necessary to avert public harm. In particular, because both Congress and the Administration have identified American leadership in semiconductor research and development as a matter of national security and defense, the Department is implementing the search for this facility on an expedited timeline to meet economic and national security needs that Congress has identified. The Department needs to obtain the requested information from EDOs as expeditiously as possible in order to meet its statutory obligations under the CHIPS Act to provide an appropriate facility for both the NSTC and NAPMP programs, while the appropriated funds continue to be available for this purpose.

Additionally, adherence to the ordinary timelines of the Paperwork Reduction Act could jeopardize NSTC and its economic and national security mission more broadly. Congress required the Departments of Commerce and Defense to establish the NSTC as a public-private consortium with participation from the private sector, the Department of Energy, and the National Science Foundation. See 15 U.S.C. 4656(c)(1). Private participation is voluntary, yet critical to ensure NSTC's ability to meet its statutory missions, including strengthening the domestic semiconductor ecosystem. See 15 U.S.C. 4656(c)(2)(A). And, as noted, a state-of-the-art prototyping and packaging facility is expected to be vital to NSTC's success and a marquee benefit for private participants. Natcast is required to ensure that potential members of the NSTC are eligible to join the public-private sector consortium in fall 2024; thus, it is especially important to the Department and Natcast to be able to make significant progress on the site selection for this facility in order to demonstrate the expected value of the NSTC to potential members. The three- or four-month delay that would result if an emergency clearance was not granted would undermine NSTC's national and economic security missions and would cause broader harm to the Department's ability to meet Congress's expectations under the CHIPS Act.

**2. Indicate how, by whom, and for what purpose the information is to be used. Except for a new collection, indicate the actual use the agency has made of the information received from the current collection.**

The information is important for the Department of Commerce and Natcast in order to establish at the outset of the site selection process which states and/or territories have existing semiconductor ecosystems that could support this facility. The voluntary information collection will take the form of an Ecosystem Questionnaire for States and Territories to Inform CHIPS R&D Facility Site Selection Process. The Questionnaire will pose identical questions to Economic Development Organizations (EDOs) in all 56 states, territories, and the District of Columbia; this collection is therefore subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act. *See* 5 C.F.R. 1320.3(c)(4) and 1320.3(k)). The Ecosystem Questionnaire will request information regarding the extent to which a state or territory can demonstrate: the presence of entities from the semiconductor value chain; a semiconductor workforce and current workforce development programs; semiconductor-related advanced education and research programs; significant state, local, and private investment in the semiconductor ecosystem; and state incentives for semiconductor research and development. The Ecosystem Questionnaire is also structured to be as minimally burdensome as possible, both because responses are predominantly requested in the form of multiple-choice answers, and because the information the Questionnaire solicits should be easily available to EDOs. This will be a one-time collection of information to all 56 states and territories. Only states or territories that submit responses to the Ecosystem Questionnaire will be considered for selection of this facility.

**3. Describe whether, and to what extent, the collection of information involves the use of automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses, and the basis for the decision for adopting this means of collection. Also describe any consideration of using information technology to reduce burden.**

An electronic form, hosted on the platform Formsite, will be used to collect this information in order to expedite the analysis of the data by the Department and Natcast.

**4. Describe efforts to identify duplication. Show specifically why any similar information already available cannot be used or modified for use for the purposes described in Item 2 above.**

While some of this information may exist in public sources, there is no single place to find all data and information regarding the strength of a state or territory's semiconductor ecosystem. Additionally, several of the data sources available are specific to semiconductor membership organizations and do not provide comprehensive industry data. Likewise, many data sources do not provide information on territories, which would exclude their ability to participate in the site selection process described above. Thus, EDOs are the best single source for the Department to contact regarding this information on a semiconductor ecosystem and the relevant state policies to support it.

**5. If the collection of information impacts small businesses or other small entities, describe any methods used to minimize burden.**

This information collection will not impact small business or other small entities, as the data is exclusively obtained from state and United States territory governments.

**6. Describe the consequence to Federal program or policy activities if the collection is not conducted or is conducted less frequently, as well as any technical or legal obstacles to reducing burden.**

Because both Congress and the Administration have identified American leadership in semiconductor research and development as a matter of national security and defense, as well as economic resilience, the Department is implementing the search for this facility on an expedited timeline. The Department needs to obtain the requested information from EDOs as expeditiously as possible in order to meet its statutory obligations under the CHIPS Act to provide an appropriate facility for both the NSTC and NAPMP programs, while the appropriated funds continue to be available for this purpose. It is especially important to the Department and Natcast to be able to make significant progress on the site selection for this facility in order to demonstrate the expected value of the NSTC to potential members of the public-private sector consortium, who will be eligible to start joining the NSTC in Fall 2024. The three- or four-month delay that would result if an emergency clearance was not granted would cause harm to the Department's ability to meet Congress's expectations under the CHIPS Act.

**7. Explain any special circumstances that would cause an information collection to be conducted in a manner: requiring respondents to report information to the agency more often than quarterly; requiring respondents to prepare a written response to a collection of information in fewer than 30 days after receipt of it; requiring respondents to submit more than an original and two copies of any document; requiring respondents to retain records, other than health, medical, government contract; grant-in-aid, or tax records, for more than three years; in connection with a statistical survey, that is not designed to produce valid and reliable results that can be generalized to the universe of study; requiring the use of a statistical data classification that has not been reviewed and approved by OMB; that includes a pledge of confidentiality that is not supported by authority established in statute or regulation, that is not supported by disclosure and data security policies that are consistent with the pledge, or which unnecessarily impedes sharing of data with other agencies for compatible confidential use; or requiring respondents to submit proprietary trade secrets, or other confidential information unless the agency can demonstrate that it has instituted procedures to protect the information's confidentiality to the extent permitted by law.**

Respondents are only asked to submit one response to this questionnaire. Some respondents may choose to include confidential business information or other non-public information in their answers. The results from these data collection activities are not intended for general publication, however the results will/may be disseminated to CHIPS or DOC staff, key federal policy and management officials, and/or third parties retained by either Natcast or the Department. The Department will protect any confidential business information it receives in response to this questionnaire to the extent permitted by federal law, including the Trade Secrets Act (18 U.S.C. 1905) and the Department's Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) implementing regulations, including the regulation for confidential business information at 15 CFR 4.9.

The Department and Natcast are requesting that EDOs respond within 7 calendar days to this voluntary information collection because the information collection has been designed to be as

minimally burdensome as possible—it only contains 21 questions; most responses are requested in the form of multiple-choice answers; and the information the Questionnaire solicits should be readily available to EDOs. The requested response time is on par with response times requested of EDOs for similar information by commercial site selection firms. Commercial site selection firms often provide 5 or fewer business days to respond to these types of questionnaires. Finally, EDOs have been given advance notice to anticipate the arrival of this information collection via email, calls, and utilizing distribution channels of national networks. However, the Department has also determined that providing 30 or more days for responses would put the program mission at risk. It is especially important to the Department and Natcast to be able to make significant progress on the site selection for this facility in order to demonstrate the expected value of the NSTC to potential members of the public-private sector consortium, who will be eligible to begin joining the NSTC in Fall 2024.

Other items listed in this question are not applicable to this information collection.

**8. If applicable, provide a copy and identify the date and page number of publication in the Federal Register of the agency's notice, required by 5 CFR 1320.8(d), soliciting comments on the information collection prior to submission to OMB. Summarize public comments received in response to that notice and describe actions taken by the agency in response to these comments. Consultation with representatives of those from whom information is to be obtained or those who must compile records should occur at least once every 3 years - even if the collection of information activity is the same as in prior periods. There may be circumstances that may preclude consultation in a specific situation. These circumstances should be explained.**

Emergency Justification has been provided to OMB for this Information Collection.

A Federal Register Notice (FRN) with minimal comment period soliciting public comments was published on July 5, 2024 (Vol. 89, Number 129, page 55586). The due date for public comments was July 12, 2024 at 11:59pm ET.

**Comments received in the minimal comment period FRN and responses:** Comment(s) –

To read the full public comment(s) received during the Federal Register Notice comment period, please see attachments located within this Information Collection Request Package.

#### **Comment 1**

Below is a summary of a public comment received.

##### **Comment Summary**

With respect to the Ecosystem Questionnaire, the commenter suggested that the Ecosystem Questionnaire should be updated to: include a question on the volume of corporate R&D occurring in a state or territory in addition to university and government research; specify the use of the QCEW (Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages) data series for reporting current employment by NAICS; and invite the state or territory responding to describe relevant ecosystem components in bordering states.

Response –

The CHIPS R&D Office (CRDO) appreciates the comments submitted. The primary purpose of the Ecosystem Questionnaire is to inform CRDO and Natcast's determination as to which states and territories have a thriving and vibrant semiconductor ecosystem that could best support the NSTC Prototyping and NAPMP Advanced Packaging Piloting Facility.

CRDO concurs that corporate semiconductor R&D is an important aspect of the overall domestic semiconductor ecosystem and represents a key segment of target users of the future NSTC Prototyping and NAPMP Advanced Packaging Piloting Facility. The questions ask about the presence of the semiconductor industry in a state or territory, which includes corporate R&D. Additionally, notable R&D operations can be included in the narrative portion of the response to question 2. Therefore, CRDO will not be adding another question.

In regard to using the QWEC data series as the employment data series, CRDO agrees that this is the preferred data set for question eight. However, the QWEC data series does not cover all 56 entities that have been invited to participate in the questionnaire (the QWEC data only includes the 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands). Therefore, CRDO will edit the text of the question to include the additional language shown in italics as follows: "Please provide the employment figures within the semiconductor NAICS codes: (1) 334413 Semiconductor and Related Device Manufacturing; and (2) 333242 Semiconductor Machinery Manufacturing, in your state/territory. *All 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands should use the most recent Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages data provided by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Those territories which are not included in the QWEC data set are encouraged to provide data sets that follow a similar methodology as the QWEC data series.*"

CRDO also agrees that some metro areas/regional ecosystems can cross state and territory borders. While CRDO seeks to collect state and territory-specific data at this time, CRDO will update Question 16 to allow respondents to provide additional information on bordering ecosystem components by including the additional language shown in italics as follows: "Please identify the metro areas/regions in your state/territory you believe are most suitable for investment in the semiconductor industry and provide a brief rationale for each. *Your answer may highlight relevant ecosystem components that border your state or territory. For purposes of this question, your response may include existing or planned investments in ecosystems or ecosystem components. Please note any confidential information and include relevant markings.*"

## **Comment 2**

Below is a summary of a public comment received.

### **Comment Summary**

The commenter recommends providing additional space for a narrative response that can add context to multiple choice and numeric responses; allowing for a limited number of attachments; adding a definition for the term "announced;" and ensuring responses (when appropriate) are protected as non-public, confidential information.

Response –

The CHIPS R&D Office (CRDO) appreciates the comment submitted, and the commenter's desire to provide narrative context to support the multiple choice and numeric responses to the Ecosystem Questionnaire.

As further described in the public document explaining the [selection processes](#) for CHIPS R&D facilities, in Phase 1, CRDO and Natcast seek to collect primarily quantitative information to assess all 56 states and territories' semiconductor ecosystems in an efficient manner. In Phase 1, CRDO and Natcast intentionally seek to limit the burden placed on states and territories who participate. The questions in the Ecosystem Questionnaire are designed to identify the best semiconductor ecosystems and already include space for narrative answers where appropriate. Providing space for additional context for every question and permitting attachments would undermine the design of the questionnaire to efficiently identify what CRDO and Natcast expect to be only a limited number of states and territories that possess a thriving and vibrant semiconductor ecosystem for this facility. Additionally, Phase 2 of the process is designed to allow invited states and territories to provide further detailed information.

For the purposes of this Ecosystem Questionnaire, the term "announced" used in questions 1-7 refers to new corporate investments that have been made public through verifiable sources such as websites, press releases, articles, or other data sources. This definition has been added as a footnote to the questionnaire, and Question 7 has been updated to include the term.

In regard to concerns about confidentiality, responses will be received by Natcast and shared with the Department of Commerce. The collected information may be shared with other key federal officials and/or third parties retained by either Natcast or the Department. To the extent an EDO's response includes non-public information, the Department will protect any confidential business information it receives in response to this questionnaire to the extent permitted by federal law, including the Trade Secrets Act (18 U.S.C. 1905) and the Department's FOIA implementing regulations, including the regulation for confidential business information at 15 CFR 4.9. The "Instructions for Submission" in the Ecosystem Questionnaire have been updated to reflect these points.

### **Comment 3**

Below is a summary of a public comment received.

#### **Comment Summary**

The commenter requested separate ecosystem questionnaires for the NSTC and NAPMP programs, in part because they believe the questionnaire doesn't sufficiently identify viable advanced packaging ecosystems. They also recommended addressing in the questionnaire: the Industrial Advisory Committee recommendations; how inclusive opportunities will be created; scalability; and NSTC and NAPMP priorities. They requested more open-ended questions and expressed concerns about missing communities historically left out of economic growth.

Response –

The CHIPS R&D Office (CRDO) appreciates the comments submitted and takes them seriously.

As further described in the [CHIPS for America R&D Facilities Model](#), CRDO and Natcast envision co-located NSTC and NAPMP capabilities, and that a single facility site will provide the domestic semiconductor ecosystem with unique value to advance U.S. leadership. Therefore,



separate questionnaires are not appropriate at this time given this vision. Furthermore, as also discussed in the [NAPMP Vision Paper](#), new technologies are blurring the line between chip and package and as a result the ecosystems for fabs and advanced packaging facilities are converging with similar equipment, suppliers, and skills needed for the operation of these facilities. Thus, the questions in the Ecosystem Questionnaire are relevant for identifying an ecosystem that is required for co-located NSTC and NAPMP capabilities. Furthermore, the questions in the Ecosystem Questionnaire are designed to identify the best semiconductor ecosystems and already include space for narrative answers where appropriate. Including more open-ended questions would undermine the design of the questionnaire to efficiently identify what CRDO and Natcast expect to be only a limited number of states and territories that possess a thriving and vibrant semiconductor ecosystem for this facility. Additionally, Phase 2 of the process is designed to allow invited states and territories to provide further detailed information.

The Facilities Model is where the Department and Natcast describe the vision for this facility, building off the release of the NSTC and NAPMP vision papers, over a year of discussions with stakeholders, and other feedback, including consideration of the IAC's recommendations. The focus is three initial foundational facilities. As the model notes, however, other capabilities, potentially through additional technical centers, may be needed in the future.

Inclusion and participation are critical to the success of the NSTC and NAPMP visions. The model explains how the initial facilities will address critical gaps in the current ecosystem, offering unparalleled value to a diverse array of stakeholders across the semiconductor value chain, including universities, businesses of all sizes, and government agencies. Together, these facilities will allow innovators to collaborate and solve the most challenging problems in microelectronics.

#### **Comment 4**

Below is a summary of a public comment received.

##### **Comment Summary**

One commenter filled out the questionnaire but did not provide any comments on the questionnaire.

##### **Response –**

No changes have been made in response to this comment. In order to be considered, states and territories, through their EDOs, must respond to the questionnaire that will be released. Proposals received outside of this process (such as through the FRN comment process) will not be evaluated.

#### **9. Explain any decision to provide any payment or gift to respondents, other than remuneration of contractors or grantees.**

None, no payments or gifts will be provided to respondents.

#### **10. Describe any assurance of confidentiality provided to respondents and the basis for the assurance in statute, regulation, or agency policy. If the collection requires a system of**

**records notice (SORN) or privacy impact assessment (PIA), those should be cited and described here.**

The Department will protect any confidential business information it receives in response to this questionnaire to the extent permitted by federal law, including the Trade Secrets Act (18 U.S.C. 1905) and the Department’s FOIA implementing regulations, including the regulation for confidential business information at 15 CFR 4.9. Additionally, none of the information received in response to this questionnaire will directly identify an individual and it will not be used by the program office to identify an individual. The information used to contact individuals was previously supplied by a third-party contractor and is covered by the *CHIPS Program Office System* privacy impact assessment, which was last approved on December 19, 2023 and is available here: <https://www.commerce.gov/opog/privacy/PIA/NIST-PIA>. As the information received in response to this questionnaire is neither about an individual, nor does it directly identify any individual, it does not meet the definition of a “record” under the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552a) and is not subject to the notice requirements or any of the other administrative protections afforded by the Act.

**11. Provide additional justification for any questions of a sensitive nature, such as sexual behavior and attitudes, religious beliefs, and other matters that are commonly considered private. This justification should include the reasons why the agency considers the questions necessary, the specific uses to be made of the information, the explanation to be given to persons from whom the information is requested, and any steps to be taken to obtain their consent.**

Data obtained in this information collection includes a request for non-public information on planned factories or other investments in the semiconductor ecosystem that have not yet been made public in the state or territory. This non-public information will specifically help Natcast and the Department of Commerce understand the extent to which a state or territory can demonstrate the presence of entities from the semiconductor value chain and significant state, local, and private investment in the semiconductor ecosystem. This information is necessary for the Department and Natcast to best determine where to locate NSTC and NAPMP facilities as it will inform the assessment of the vibrancy of the semiconductor ecosystem in that state or territory.

Subsequent to the receipt of responses to the Questionnaire, Natcast or the Department of Commerce may contact states or territories to obtain clarifying information. By submitting this questionnaire, states and territories acknowledge and consent to the information contained within being reviewed by Natcast, the Department of Commerce, or third-party contractors retained by Natcast or the Department of Commerce for that purpose.

**12. Provide estimates of the hour burden of the collection of information.**

<u>Collection Activity</u>	<u>Number of Respondents</u>	<u>Number of responses (Once)</u>	<u>Estimated hours per response</u>	<u>Total Annual Burden Hours</u>
Questionnaire	56	1	10 hours	560

--	--	--	--	--

**13. Provide an estimate for the total annual cost burden to respondents or record keepers resulting from the collection of information. (Do not include the cost of any hour burden already reflected on the burden worksheet).**

There are no subscription costs to respondents or record keepers resulting from the collection of this information. Use of the online portal for submitting the information is free. Cost burden of the respondent is based on the 10 hours of time it is estimated to take for a state employee to complete this information collection.

Type of Respondent	Number of Respondents	Number of Responses per Respondent	Average Burden per Response	Hourly Wage Rate*	Total Burden Costs
State/ Territory Government	56	1	10 hours	\$ 65.85	\$ 36,876.00
<b>Total</b>	--	--	--	--	\$ 36,876.00

\* Hourly wage based on U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics for a 13-1082 Project Management Specialist, mean annual wage. <https://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes131082.htm>

**14. Provide estimates of annualized costs to the Federal government. Also, provide a description of the method used to estimate cost, which should include quantification of hours, operational expenses (such as equipment, overhead, printing, and support staff), and any other expense that would not have been incurred without this collection of information. Agencies may also aggregate cost estimates from Items 12, 13, and 14 in a single table.**

Staff	Grade/ Step	Annual Salary	Fringe (if applicable)	% of Effort	Total Annualized Cost to Gov't
<b>Federal Oversight</b>					
NIST Project Oversight Officer <i>for 2 months</i>	AD-00	260,000	59% (leave and benefits)	50%	\$76,553
NIST Project Oversight Officer <i>for 2 months</i>	ZP-III	129,757	59% (leave and benefits)	25%	\$38,205
<b>Contract Costs</b>					
Natcast	-	-	-	-	\$50,000

Site Selection Firm	-	-	-	-	\$275,000
<b>Total Cost to the Government</b>	-	-	-	-	<b>\$439,758</b>

**15. Explain the reasons for any program changes or adjustments reported on the burden worksheet.**

This is a new information collection.

**16. For collections of information whose results will be published, outline plans for tabulation and publication. Address any complex analytical techniques that will be used. Provide the time schedule for the entire project, including beginning and ending dates of the collection of information, completion of report, publication dates, and other actions.**

None of these activities will occur for this information collection.

**17. If seeking approval to not display the expiration date for OMB approval of the information collection, explain the reasons that display would be inappropriate.**

NIST will display the appropriate OMB Approved control number and expiration date on the information collection.

**18. Explain each exception to the topics of the certification statement identified in “Certification or Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions.”**

The agency certifies compliance with 5 CFR 1320.9 and the related provisions of 5 CFR 1320.8(b)(3).