

From: Ken Dattilo
To: Glenda Jackson
Date: 3/19/01 6:56AM
Subject: Re: Fee comment

yes

>>> Glenda Jackson 03/16/01 03:23PM >>>
Ken,

Just checking--I assume that means we have NMSS concurrence (with the changes)?

>>> Ken Dattilo 03/16/01 02:38PM >>>
our only proposed change is on page 20. The changes to the paragraph are attached to the e-mail. They are in redline.

From: Ken Dattilo
To: Glenda Jackson
Date: 3/16/01 2:38PM
Subject: Fee comment

our only proposed change is on page 20. The changes to the paragraph are attached to the e-mail. They are in redline.

CC: Constance Schum

Page 20, first full paragraph should read:

The increase in annual fees for transportation quality assurance approvals authorizing use only, which would have the largest percentage increase, is due in part to the allocation of budgeted costs for the enhanced participatory Part 71 rulemaking, headquarters and regional allegation and enforcement follow-up activities, and the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards' risk activities. In addition, there has been a decrease in the amount of budgeted costs allocated for Part 71 vendor inspections while the allocation of budgeted costs for quality assurance reviews remained about the same. The ratio of the budgeted costs for these activities is currently used to allocate the total annual fee amount for the transportation class, less the amount allocated to DOE for its certificates of compliance, between the quality assurance approvals authorizing use only and those that authorize use and fabrication/design. As a result of the decrease in budgeted costs for the Part 71 vendor inspections, a larger percentage of the total annual fee amount for the transportation class would be allocated to quality assurance approvals authorizing use only than in the past.

P:\fee_paper - cmt, wpd