

Parks, Jazel

From: Ziegler, Eloise
Sent: Wednesday, August 04, 2010 1:42 PM
To: Bayssie, Mekonen
Subject: RE: RG 1.54 R2

Mekonen,

If there were minor changes, the guide does not have to go to QTE. I will prepare a concurrence package. Please let me know who should receive the concurrence memo.

Eloise

From: Burke, John
Sent: Wednesday, August 04, 2010 1:37 PM
To: Bayssie, Mekonen
Cc: Lin, Bruce; Ziegler, Eloise
Subject: RE: RG 1.54 R2

Attached is the Reg Analysis.

As you may remember, ACRS has waived their final review. See memo dated 3/15/10

I do not understand why another QTE is needed. There were very minor changes as a result of public comments.

John Burke, PE
Senior Engineer
(301) 251-7628
john.burke@nrc.gov

From: Bayssie, Mekonen
Sent: Wednesday, August 04, 2010 11:26 AM
To: Burke, John
Cc: Lin, Bruce; Ziegler, Eloise
Subject: RE: RG 1.54 R2

Hi John,

I just checked the status of the guide. I do not have Regulatory analysis section sent to me as the current template requires that the RG analysis section be put separate. See the attached example.

Once I got those files, it will have to go to QTE (1-3 weeks because of backlog), then to inter-office concurrence (3 weeks), then OGC (2 weeks) & ACRS.

Then we can publish it.

Mekonen

From: Burke, John
Sent: Wednesday, August 04, 2010 8:30 AM

BAE

To: Bayssie, Mekonen; Valentin, Andrea

Subject: RG 1.54 R2

Mekonen, what is the next step for getting this RG published?

John Burke, PE

Senior Engineer

(301) 251-7628

john.burke@nrc.gov