

that are billed on the anniversary date of the license are those covered by fee categories 1C, 1D, 2A(2) Other Facilities, 2A(3), 2A(4), 2B, 2C, 3A through 3P, 4B through 9D, 10A, and 10B.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this _____ day of _____, 2001.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Jesse L. Funches,
Chief Financial Officer.

Distribution:

OCFO R/F
OCFO S/F
EDO R/F
MLesar, ADM
OIG
OCFO/DAF SF (LF-1.25)

DOCUMENT NAME: g:daf\lfarb\2001final fee rule.wpd

To receive a copy of this document, indicate in the box: "C" = Copy without attachment/enclosure "E" = Copy with attachment/enclosure "N" = No copy

OFFICE	OCFO	OCFO:DAF	ADM	OGC	STP	NMSS
NAME	RCarlson/GJackson/ DDandois	TRossi	MSpringer	TBRothschild	PLohaus	MVirgilio <i>MJG</i>
DATE	/ /01	/ /01	/ /01	/ /01	/ /01	5/30/01

OFFICE	NRR	OIP	EDO	DCFO	CFO
NAME	SCollins	JLee	WTravers	PRabideau	JLFunches
DATE	/ /01	/ /01	/ /01	/ /01	/ /01

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

From: Claudia Seelig
To: Constance Schum; Glenda Jackson
Date: 5/30/01 9:47AM
Subject: NMSS CONCURRENCE IN FEE RULE

We concur (including the revised pp. 30-32), but want you to consider the following minor comment. I will hand carry to Glenda the actual concurrence page signed by Margaret (Acting NMSS Director).

The top of page 11 discusses 420 RITS codes - and we agree that the statement is factually correct. However, stating that 125 of 420 RITS codes are used for Part 170 billing adds nothing of substance in response. This could be read to mask any actual percentage of total hours billed across the 420 codes. For example, is the bulk of the time reported in the 125 codes or the remaining codes? Bottom line is it may cause more confusion - and this level of detail does not appear to add value to the response.