

**Craver, Patti**

**From:** Krieg, Rebekah <rebekah.krieg@pnl.gov>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 27, 2011 2:31 PM  
**To:** Doyle, Daniel  
**Cc:** Logan, Dennis; Mcdowell, Bruce K  
**Subject:** RE: Columbia BA/EFH - tech editor mark up

OK. That looks fine.

Becky

**From:** Doyle, Daniel [mailto:Daniel.Doyle@nrc.gov]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 27, 2011 8:57 AM  
**To:** Krieg, Rebekah  
**Cc:** Logan, Dennis  
**Subject:** RE: Columbia BA/EFH - tech editor mark up

Thanks, Becky. See my inline responses below to see how I resolved your comments.

Dan Doyle

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

**From:** Krieg, Rebekah [mailto:rebekah.krieg@pnl.gov]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 19, 2011 11:37 AM  
**To:** Logan, Dennis; Doyle, Daniel  
**Cc:** Mcdowell, Bruce K  
**Subject:** RE: Columbia BA/EFH - tech editor mark up

I agree with the Dennis comments. Especially the BiOp and the "X to Y". And the Fahrenheit/Celsius abbreviations.

I also have the following comments

1. Page D-1-1, Line 38 – this is a call for you to make since you are the NRC, but I had always understood that the "Commission" and "NRC" are not interchangeable. **[Doyle, Daniel]** I will go with NRC.  
 This definition of purpose and need reflects the **NRC's** recognition that—unless there are findings in the safety review r
2. Also, this sentence (38-42) currently states that "...unless there are findings in the safety review required by the Atomic Energy Act or findings in the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), as amended—the NRC does not have a role in the energy-planning decisions of State regulators and utility officials as to whether a particular nuclear power plant should continue to operate."  
 But I think that what it needs to say is  
 ...unless there are findings in the safety review required by the Atomic Energy Act or findings in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) **environmental analysis** that would lead the NRC to reject a license renewal application, the NRC does not have a role in the energy-planning decisions of State regulators and utility officials as to whether a particular nuclear power plant should continue to operate.**[Doyle, Daniel]** added 'environmental analysis'

B/17

This is boiler plate language that is out of the Introduction of the SEIS. We don't anticipate any findings from NEPA.

3. Page D-1-13 – Line 19 and 25 table note. “Kurz (2010) working for the USFWS...” And Line 26 (as well as note on 25) – where the NMFS letter is cited as “Suzumoto 2010, rather than “NMFS 2010”. In the past we haven't named or referenced the Federal employees that write letters in a BA/EFH as we would do an author of a peer reviewed journal. I'm ok with this but I wanted to make sure you saw it and were also ok with it. I notice we did not do the same thing for the NRC staff requests in Line 15 of the same page. They are cited as “NRC 2010a” etc. **[Doyle, Daniel]** I am going to leave them as they are. I am aware that the tech editor changed some references to show the author's name rather than the organization and I realize that it has not been universally applied. I personally believe the reference should point to the organization but we are going to discuss this in the development of a SEIS style guide.
4. Page D-1-14 – Line 4, and 13 – same as comment 3. **[Doyle, Daniel]** no change
5. Page D-1-33, Line 4 – same comment as 3. **[Doyle, Daniel]** no change
6. Page D-1-15 – Line 21. I'd rather substitute the word “observation”, “study” or “finding” for “discovery”. Especially since it said “This discovery confirmed findings..” and usually I think of discovery as the first time someone noticed something. **[Doyle, Daniel]** Changed to ‘observation’
7. Page D-1-18 – Line 38 – I think we need a end paren on the end of this line - (University of Washington, 2011), (Wydoski and Whitney, 2003.**[Doyle, Daniel]** added ‘)
8. Page D-1-21, Line 5 – cladoceans should be cladocerans. My mistake. **[Doyle, Daniel]** changed to ‘cladocerans’
9. Page D-1-21 – line 11 – “...diet becomes primarily larval and juvenile fish to include Pacific herring, northern anchovy...” maybe we could change that to “...diet becomes primarily larval and juvenile fish such as Pacific hearing, northern anchovy...” - I wouldn't say they are “to include” rather, what I was trying to say is that the Pacific herring, northern anchovy , smelt, pilchard, etc are some of the larval and juvenile fish that are eaten by the salmon. **[Doyle, Daniel]** I'm going to leave this as is...‘to include’ makes sense to me. I think if we said “such as” then that would imply that all Pacific herring, northern anchovy, smelt, etc are larval or juveniles. Let me know if you disagree here and I'll change it but this is my take.
10. Page D-1-21 – Line 39 – Dworshak not Dworshack. My mistake**[Doyle, Daniel]** changed to ‘Dworshak’
11. Page D-1-21 – Line 44 – River peaked in the 1990s when the catch was more than 40 million pounds (not “that”) – my mistake **[Doyle, Daniel]** changed to ‘that’
12. Page D-1-22, Line 27 – we need a space after Figure D-1-9 and before “illustrates”. **[Doyle, Daniel]** added space **D-1-9illustrates** the locations of the fall Chinook spawning areas in the Hanford Reach of
13. Page D-1-29 – Line 37 – space between “Figure” and “D-1-10”. **[Doyle, Daniel]** added space steelhead have prepared redds are shown in **FigureD-1-10**. Aerial surveys identified two
14. Page D-1-30 – Line 2 – should be “mainstem” not “mainsteam”**[Doyle, Daniel]** changed to ‘mainstem’
15. Page D-1-21, Line 23 – needs a space between “D-1-7” and “shows”. **[Doyle, Daniel]** added space **Table D-1-7shows** the numbers of adult (not jack) coho that passed through the Hanford Reach
16. Table D-1-8 – that is correct, there are no Fahrenheit degrees in this table. I will send the conversions in a separate email.**[Doyle, Daniel]** ok
17. Page D-1-34, Line 20 – needs a space between “15” and “degrees”**[Doyle, Daniel]** added space “show that the temperature of the river is above 59 degrees Fahrenheit (**15degrees** Celsius) from”
18. Page D-1-37, Line 8 – needs a space between “Table D-1-10” and “lists”**[Doyle, Daniel]** added space **Table D-1-10lists** the aquatic resource issues identified in the GEIS.
19. Page D-1-37 - Table D-1-10 – Source – should be NRC 1996. Not NR 1996. **[Doyle, Daniel]** changed to ‘NRC’

Let me know if you have any questions.

Becky

**From:** Logan, Dennis [mailto:Dennis.Logan@nrc.gov]  
**Sent:** Monday, April 18, 2011 12:14 PM  
**To:** Krieg, Rebekah; Doyle, Daniel  
**Subject:** RE: Columbia BA/EFH - tech editor mark up

*mark*

Becky and Dan,

I see only a few obvious things:

As you (Becky) said, "BiOp" is just biologists' slang for "biological opinion", and we should just write it out. It's only two words.

I think the editor is wrong in replacing "X to Y" and "X through Y" with "X-Y". "X to Y" and "X through Y" mean different things, and we try to be careful which one we do mean. Replacing them globally with "X-Y" confuses them, and the reader has no way to know which one we mean.

Page D-1-19, end of the first (not full) paragraph now reads: "None of the populations is considered stable or clearly increasing in population." The last word should be "size", not "population".

Page D-1-33, Section D-1.4.2 now reads as "Coho are found from Monterey Bay, CA, north to Point Hope, AK." CA and AK are postal symbols that represent the states and as such are not normally used in writing as substitutes for the names of states or their abbreviations.

Page D-1-33, on Table D-1-7 and in the preceding paragraph, "2005-2010" should be "2005 through 2010".

Am I the only one who thinks it is nuts to write out "degrees Celsius" and "degrees Fahrenheit" at almost every occurrence when (1) the symbols are defined in "ABBREVIATIONS, ACRONYMS, AND SYMBOLS", (2) we do not do the same thing for other symbols for units, and (3) these are the among most common symbols for units and almost every reader will know them?

Dennis

---

**From:** Doyle, Daniel  
**Sent:** Friday, April 15, 2011 6:00 PM  
**To:** Rebekah Krieg (rebekah.krieg@pnl.gov); 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  
(301) 415-3748