

From: Daniel Huang
To: Bernard White; Charles Interrante; Christopher Bajwa; Elaine Keegan; Mahendra Shah; Robert Shewmaker; Ron Parkhill; Stephanie Bush-Goddard
Date: 8/29/02 3:53PM
Subject: Re: Fwd: Outline of 093002 report

} nmss

I agree with both Mahendra and Ron on the issue of small plane. My other comments are as follows:

1. It is not clear to me as to what will be included in the small plane survey results. What is the difference between small plane survey tables (listed under the Appendices/Report) and small plane survey results? If the "small plane survey results" is really about the basis for small plane selection as recommended by Mahendra, then the title should be changed to reflect it.
2. Do we need SNL to address the effects of rail car on the NAC-UMS cask during a Boeing 767 impact? Assuming the NAC-UMS cask is mounted on a rail car, would the rail car absorb some of the impact loading from a low flying Boeing 767 jet and thus cause less damage to the cask?
3. CNS should be changed to CNS 1-13C II.

Daniel

>>> Bernard White 08/29/02 11:33AM >>>

Attached is an outline that I just received from SNL on the report that we will be getting on the plane evaluations and the work to date on the blast and shaped charge evaluations. If you have any comments on the outline please respond to me as soon as you can so that we can get back to SNL in a timely manner since they will have to start writing the report shortly.

Thanks
 Bernie

CC: E. William Brach; Earl Easton; Jack Guttman; M. Wayne Hodges

A134