

WM-10, 11, 16

Attachment A

MEMORANDUM FOR: WM Staff

FROM: FEA Review Coordinator *John Janson 8/15/86*

SUBJECT: DISTRIBUTION OF REVISION NO. 7 TO THE FEA REVIEW PLAN

Attached is revision no. 7 to the FEA Review Plan. Pertinent information on this revision is listed below. Please update your original FEA review plan with this revision and also arrange for this revision to be given in a timely manner to any contractors supporting your review.

Revision No.	FEA Review Plan Section No./Title/ Page No. Revised	Description	Date of Issuance
6	Section II, Review Procedures, Section 7 Schedule	Procedure 7: Revised Schedule for <u>all</u> FEAs.	August 13, 1986
7	Section II, Review Procedures	Procedure no. 9: Transmittal of Draft Comments Resulting from Step 2 the Section/ Technical Quality Review and the Project Reviews	August 15, 1986

8611260245 860815
PDR WASTE PDR
WM-10

Final EA Review Procedure No. 9: Transmittal of Draft Comments Resulting from Step 2, the Section/technical Quality Review and the Project Reviews

This procedure gives a standard transmittal note format for use by all lead technical reviewers in transmitting their comments on August 15, 1986 for Branch Chief review.

The transmittal note indicates the current status as of August 15, 1986 of the comments relative to the Section/technical Quality Review and the Project Review. This is provided as a convince for the Branch Chief review and is not related to any quality assurance/concurrence requirements. The Lead Technical Reviewer should provide the status based on verbal feedback from both the Section Leader and Project Manager. The comment package should be given to the respective Project Manager who will combine all packages into one package for each final EA and give to the Branch Chiefs.

The transmittal note and any attached comments are considered to be predecisional material. As such this material will not be sent to the Public Document Room until after completion of the final EA review and after the Commission has decided on the appropriate followup action.

PREDECISIONAL

NOTE TO: John Linehan, Acting Chief
Repository Projects Branch, DWM

Philip Justus, Acting Chief
Geotechnical Branch, DWM

John Greeves, Chief
Engineering Branch, DWM

FROM: _____, Lead Technical Reviewer

SUBJECT: DRAFT _____ COMMENTS RESULTING FROM STEP 2, THE
SECTION/TECHNICAL QUALITY REVIEW AND THE PROJECT REVIEW, OF THE FINAL
EA FOR THE _____ SITE.

The status of the attached comment(s) is indicated below by a check in the appropriate box.

For the attached comment(s) the eight defined product requirements listed below have been reviewed under step 2 (section/technical quality review and project review) and comments revised to the mutual satisfaction of the Lead Technical Reviewer, Section Leader, and Project Manager.

Additional work is needed for those defined product requirements checked below.

PM SL

- 1. Technically defensible
 - 2. Accurately represents FEA information (i.e., FEA has been correctly quoted/represented including recognizing what is said on a given topic in all chapters and appendices of the FEA)
 - 3. Consistent with FEA review plan objectives (see section 3.0) and responsibilities (see section 8.2)
 - 4. Technically consistent within a discipline and across projects
 - 5. Technically consistent across different disciplines within one project
 - 6. Consistent with NRC-HLW policies and technical positions
 - 7. Written in a clear, concise, complete, and specific manner consistent with procedures 1 and 2 on comment and product content (see section 11.0)
 - 8. Written in an objective and factual tone consistent with procedures 1 and 2 on comment and product content (see section 11.0)
- Items that are unresolved due to differing points of view among reviewers or other reasons and which need branch chief resolution, or attention are noted on the attached comment(s).