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James E. Brunner, Esquitre
Consumers Power Co.
212 Hest Michigan Avenue
Jackson, Michigan 49201
Dear Mr. Brunner:
We have reviawed your letter of July 22, 1980, which again questioned the correctness of the detempination that Consumers Powar Company owes a fee for a construction permit amendment application in connection with Amendment No. 72. Your letter presents no new material that would lead us to depart from our previously stated position. The quotation from the ainutes of the October 16, 1979 meting appears to us to be irrelevant to the fee question. Rather it expresses quite clearly the licensing review staff's dissatisfaction with the manner in which Consumers was proceading with the remedial action.

We feel constrained at this point to bring to your attention 10 CFR 170.12(a) which calls for payment of application fees with the application, and states that no application will be processed without payment. In the case of Amendment 72, procassing has not been held up due to non-payment, but it is an established working rule in NRC that, to comply with the regulation, no license or amendment will be issued untll fees are pald. We understand that the amendment is an issue before the hearing Panel. If at some future date it is determined that the amendment is not necessary, then any amendment fe?s paid for the application wlll befunded. In the meantime, amendment fees totalling $\$ 12,700$ should be promptly forwarded to this office. Our legal counsel concurs in this letter.

Sincerely,

Originat Signet by
Wwi. 0 . 2 ziller
Willian O. Miller, Chief License Fee Management Branch Office of Administration


