

**Craver, Patti**

---

**From:** Krieg, Rebekah <rebekah.krieg@pnl.gov>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 18, 2011 11:11 AM  
**To:** Doyle, Daniel; Logan, Dennis  
**Cc:** Mcdowell, Bruce K  
**Subject:** RE: Columbia BA/EFH - tech editor mark up

I will start looking at it this afternoon. I understand your guidance.

BiOp is short for Biological Opinion. It is commonly used, but could probably be considered more jargon than acronym. I am fine if you'd like to replace BiOp with the spelled out words.

Becky

**From:** Doyle, Daniel [<mailto:Daniel.Doyle@nrc.gov>]  
**Sent:** Friday, April 15, 2011 3:00 PM  
**To:** Krieg, Rebekah; Logan, Dennis  
**Subject:** Columbia BA/EFH - tech editor mark up

Becky and Dennis,

Please look over the tech editor's mark up for the Columbia BA/EFH assessment and let me know if you have any comments.

Please try to focus on revisions that you believe alter the intended meaning of what you wrote and not "cosmetic" issues ...unless something really bothers you and you insist that I reject something the tech editor has done. I am willing to do that but I am trying to follow a process so the tech editors have clear guidance from DLR about what we want in our SEISs. For example, if we want them to change how they format references, we need to agree internally how we want it and document that and give it to them so they are clear on what we want them to do. They are just following the guidance they have now (the NRC style guide). Following this process will save us all time and our documents will be more consistent. I realize that there are some differences between this tech editor (IEA) and the old tech editor (Thomas).

I don't know about "BiOp"...is that something you've seen before?

Thanks,

Dan Doyle

Project Manager  
Division of License Renewal  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
[daniel.doyle@nrc.gov](mailto:daniel.doyle@nrc.gov)  
(301) 415-3748