

**From:** Claudia Seelig  
**To:** Constance Schum  
**Date:** 5/30/01 9:57AM  
**Subject:** Re: QUESTION ON FEE RULE

Recommend leaving response as is - the budget did go up in those areas. Glenda's historical data shows that even in areas such as licensing and inspection which sound like they ought to be 100% Part 170 fee recoverable, we don't get 100% back on these via part 170 - lots of the budget in these areas has to be recovered via Part 171. To find out more specifics, you'd have to look at the actual C-3 NMSS budget backup documents and look at actual RITS expenditures to find out why it is not all directly Part 170 billable - but trust me Glenda's experience of pulling all the prior Part 170 billings for each fee class for the last 5 quarters shows this - and some of our C-3 line items also indicate things that aren't Part 170 fee billable even though they fit under the "licensing" and "inspection" planned accomplishments.

>>> Constance Schum 05/30/01 09:48AM >>>  
Claudia:

I have two questions regarding the response to comments #5 on Annual Fees for Power Reactor in Decommissioning. The response references spent fuel storage licensing and inspection activities as an example. Although there may be some costs reflected in the annual fees wouldn't the majority of the cost be direct, Part 170 cost? Should this example be taken out to avoid confusion?

Connie

**CC:** Glenda Jackson