

From: Myron Fliegel
To: Joel Berwick
Date: 07/24/2006 10:42:09 AM
Subject: Re: Comment Responses to April 4 and 5 meeting Moab RAP

Joel:

See attached emails from my reviewers. We await the details in the draft RAP.

Mike

>>> "Joel Berwick" <joel.berwick@gjo.doe.gov> 07/18/2006 2:07 PM >>>

Mike,

As we discussed, Attached are proposed Comment Responses from the April 4 and 5 meetings. The August 31 Draft RAP submittal will be revised according to the Attachment. Please have you reviewers take a look and let me know if there are any areas of concern.

Thanks,

Joel <<RNRCCommResp.doc>>

CC: Abou-Bakr Ibrahim; Philip Justus

Mail Envelope Properties (44C4DC41.15D : 1 : 10392)

Subject: Re: Comment Responses to April 4 and 5 meeting Moab RAP
Creation Date 07/24/2006 10:42:09 AM
From: Myron Fliegel

Created By: MHF1@nrc.gov

Recipients

gjo.doe.gov
joel.berwick (Joel Berwick)

nrc.gov
OWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
AKI CC (Abou-Bakr Ibrahim)

nrc.gov
OWGWPO04.HQGWDO01
PSJ CC (Philip Justus)

Post Office

OWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
OWGWPO04.HQGWDO01

Route

gjo.doe.gov
nrc.gov
nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1062	07/24/2006 10:42:09 AM
TEXT.htm	883	
Mail		
Mail		

Options

Expiration Date: None
Priority: Standard
ReplyRequested: No
Return Notification: None

Concealed Subject: No
Security: Standard

From: Abou-Bakr Ibrahim
To: Myron Fliegel; Philip Justus
Date: 07/20/2006 9:18:25 AM
Subject: Re: Fwd: Comment Responses to April 4 and 5 meeting Moab RAP

Mike:

Please remind them not to depend mainly on results from literature search, some of these literatures may be very old. They may need to support there additional information by recent observations and investigations.

Hope there response will be complete, the devil in the details.

Bakr

>>> Myron Fliegel 07/19/2006 9:50 AM >>>

Buck:
Phil:

Responses from DOE. Any areas of concern?

Mike

CC: jxg

From: Philip Justus
To: Myron Fliegel
Date: 07/19/2006 3:55:43 PM
Subject: RESPONSE TO DOE's RESPONSES ON MOAB UMTRA PROJECT

Mike. As requested, I reviewed DOE's written response to NRC comments made at the April 4 and 5, 2006 meeting on the Moab project (received from you by email today). In particular, DOE commented on 12 requests for information on 'Geology' that I made regarding the discussions on the Draft Remedial Action Plan.

In every instance, DOE responded by acknowledging the request and committing to do work to address the point, or by confirming that certain items that I requested had been transmitted. DOE's commitments appear to reflect a reasonable understanding of the information I had requested. In general, I agree with the DOE's approaches to addressing the requested information. Its approaches include: *conducting limited field work, as appropriate, relevant to potential design or waste isolation considerations (if the geologic or geomorphic feature or condition was or is present); *aerial photo and topographic analyses; *lithologic log and Mancos Shale characteristics analyses; *historical records and literature reviews; *analyses of data and calculations of rates and quantities.

In any case, I will be available to discuss these matters with DOE and its consultants any time throughout its period of investigations, by phone or in the field, if necessary. Similarly, I would be available to discuss the geological items that DOE is investigating in related areas, such as the identification of potential capable faults, potential for structural connectivity of the Granite and Ryan Creek faults, and applicability of salt tectonic models to the Thompson and Tenmile structures.

Phil

CC: Abou-Bakr Ibrahim; Dan Rom; Jack Guttmann