

**TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT
FOR
[U.S. Air Force, Navy, or Army], [Site Name],
[City], [State]**

Docket No.:

DATE:

FACILITY:

TECHNICAL REVIEWERS:

PROJECT MANAGER:

1.0 SUMMARY

1.1 Conclusion

2.0 BACKGROUND

2.1 Site History

2.2 Proposed or Current Onsite Remedial Activities

3.0 TECHNICAL EVALUATION

3.1 Geotechnical Engineering [if engineered barriers/controls will be used]

3.1.1 Engineered Barriers

Introduction

[State Action to Be/Being Performed]

Review

[Describe relevant NRC Guidance used for review, focusing on how this action will help the site meet NRC's 25 mrem/yr dose criteria for either unrestricted release or restricted release with controls in place]

Conclusions

[Conclude how this action will help the site meet NRC's 25 mrem/yr dose criteria for either unrestricted release or restricted release with controls in place]

3.1.1 Erosion Protection

Introduction

[State Action to Be/Being Performed]

Review

[Describe relevant NRC Guidance used for review, focusing on how this action will help the site meet NRC's 25 mrem/yr dose criteria for either unrestricted release or restricted release with controls in place]

Conclusions

[Conclude how this action will help the site meet NRC's 25 mrem/yr dose criteria for either unrestricted release or restricted release with controls in place]

3.2 Hydrology [If action involved groundwater; minimally staff should note why groundwater is not a concern]

Introduction

[State Action to Be/Being Performed]

Review

[Describe relevant NRC Guidance used for review, focusing on how this action will help the site meet NRC's 25 mrem/yr dose criteria for either unrestricted release or restricted release with controls in place]

Conclusions

[Conclude how this action will help the site meet NRC's 25 mrem/yr dose criteria for either unrestricted release or restricted release with controls in place]

3.3 Health Physics /Dose Assessment

Introduction

[State Action to Be/Being Performed]

Review

[Describe relevant NRC Guidance used for review, focusing on how this action will help the site meet NRC's 25 mrem/yr dose criteria for either unrestricted release or restricted release with controls in place]

Conclusions

[Conclude how this action will help the site meet NRC's 25 mrem/yr dose criteria for either unrestricted release or restricted release with controls in place]

3.4 Site Inspection

[Describe any NRC site inspection work that was completed in support of this action]

4.0 Conclusions

NRC staff believes that the **[geotechnical engineering, health physics, and/or hydrology]** aspects of the **[list site areas reviewed]** will assist the site in meeting NRC's 25 millirem per year dose criteria for either unrestricted release or restricted release with controls in place. This has been confirmed by an NRC dose assessment of **[list site area]**.

It is important to note that as part of NRC's graded approach to Site Monitoring, which was approved by the Commission in SRM-SECY-14-0082, NRC selectively reviews prioritized aspects of a site (unless major technical issues are identified) to add confidence that the DoD's CERCLA remedial activities will be protective. However, NRC staffs' review does not look at all aspects of a particular site. Ultimately, the release of a site is the responsibility of the U.S. DoD in their role as the Lead Federal Agency under CERCLA.

4.0 RECOMMENDED FOLLOWUP

NRC staff should review **[list other aspects of the site to follow-up with]** in the future, as resources and schedules permit.

5.0 REFERENCES