

**From:** Claudia Seelig  
**To:** Glenda Jackson  
**Date:** 5/17/01 12:33PM  
**Subject:** Fwd: FEE RULE COMMENTS

Glenda per our discussion yesterday, attached are NMSS' comments on your proposed responses to public comments on the fee rule (attached Deegan email). Pierson said that he answered your questions on the matrix yesterday and they don't have any other comments on your proposed responses - other to say that #9 is consistent with the PM policy as it stands, however, as you know we're still discussing that (e.g., the 3:00 meeting today). SFPO, DWM, and Ann also reviewed and had no comments.

**From:** George Deegan  
**To:** Claudia Seelig  
**Date:** 5/15/01 5:39PM  
**Subject:** FEE RULE COMMENTS

Claudia: I have only one comment. It concerns Glenda's proposed response to comment 11. This appears on page 6, as item 5. Apparently, the commenter suggested ways we might reduce our budget and have a more efficient use of resources, and stated the fee rule does not account for budget reductions. Commenter also made specific suggestions for efficiencies.

I don't understand Glenda's proposed response, especially the phrase that states that the budget and the manner in which we carry out our activities are not within the scope of this rulemaking. I do see how that can be true, but even if it is, I wouldn't say it in this way. Perhaps a better response might be to replace the first two sentences with the following:

"NRC is sensitive to the impact of its resource expenditures on the fee structure, and will continue to budget only for those activities that are critical to the success of the NRC mission and its Strategic Goals. Within each budget cycle, NRC looks for process efficiencies that will allow us to conduct our business in the most resource efficient manner".

I will also pass this along to Don and Susan to see if they want to comment on the proposed responses.

**CC:** Donald Cool; Susan Frant