

From: ^{EDD} Chester Poslusny ^{NMSS}
To: Mindy Landau; Scott Flanders ^{-NMSS}
Date: Fri, Nov 30, 2001 3:43 PM
Subject: Action Items from Meeting with Dep. EDOs

I am attaching the guidance we are using on the PFS info screening effort. You will need to make a few changes to make it read more generic in nature so that it can be provided to the Commission next week.

We were also asked to talk about the impacts of redaction. Specifically, for the PFS FEIS publishing effort, the redaction effort is expected to take an additional 30 effective staff days of review effort for redaction, it is unclear what additional resources will be needed for printing of additional redacted volumes. We estimate that the current due date of December 21 could slip by as much as a month due to the additional effort required for redaction and printing two versions of the document. **[Note this schedule delay information should not be discussed in a public meeting since we have not informed the ASLB or the applicant of any potential slips in schedule]**

Regarding new documents that should not be placed in ADAMS, we consider for SFPO, that the following would be the set of documents: SARs, amendments to SARs, correspondence to the NRC regarding SARs, supporting an application (eg. environmental reports, calculations, etc).

If SFPO had to do the screening of incoming documents, than about an additional two months would need to be added to the schedule for such effort for large submittals like one for an ISFSI. However, a more desirable process would be for the NRC to provide screening criteria and guidance to applicants and have them provide full and redacted versions of applications and supporting documents on a routine basis.

Note: I have passed this on for Scott Flanders to look at from an NMSS point of view regarding screening of incoming documents, so expect a revision on Monday.

CC: E. William Brach; Patricia Rathbun; Susan Frant; William Reckley

TT-16

B-62