

HLWYM HEmails

From: Randall Fedors
Sent: Friday, March 03, 2006 2:52 PM
To: Frederick Brown; Thomas Matula
Cc: Stuart Stothoff; Jack Guttman
Subject: terminology for USGS issue
Attachments: summaryTypesOfProblems.wpd

At the meeting on Wednesday, I was asked to provide comments on terminology. We were reticent to use the phrase "falsification of data" in our answers to questions, when we saw no indication that the USGS intentionally falsified data that might change model results. Stu Stothoff and I split the task of reading all the emails made available by the DOE and state; others may have also read the emails. Stu and I created the 4 categories of problems shown in the attached file, which also includes a short description as bullets for each category.

I still do not believe we should refer to it as "falsified data." There were certainly problems with the code, and certainly problems with falsified QA records. The use of "USGS information" is still recommended.

--Randy

Hearing Identifier: HLW_YuccaMountain_Hold_EX
Email Number: 125

Mail Envelope Properties (Randall.Fedors@nrc.gov20060303145229)

Subject: terminology for USGS issue
Sent Date: 3/3/2006 2:52:29 PM
Received Date: 3/3/2006 2:52:29 PM
From: Randall Fedors

Created By: Randall.Fedors@nrc.gov

Recipients:

"Stuart Stothoff" <sstothoff@cnwra.swri.edu>
Tracking Status: None
"Jack Guttman" <Jack.Guttman@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Frederick Brown" <Frederick.Brown@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Thomas Matula" <Thomas.Matula@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office:

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	782	3/3/2006 2:52:29 PM
summaryTypesOfProblems.wpd		13481

Options

Priority: Standard
Return Notification: No
Reply Requested: No
Sensitivity: Normal
Expiration Date:
Recipients Received:

Comments on net infiltration aspects of emails (Summer 2005)

- includes those emails made public by DOE
 - includes those posted on state of Nevada website
-
- Data quality issues
 - Traceability of data: blocking ridge data, and adjustment of mean annual precipitation to account for temperature (approximation was not documented)
 - Calibration problems or forging documentation of QA (neutron probe data, thermocouples, etc...)
 - Use one data set for simulations and another for QA (utilized data were not different)
 - Documentation of measured or simulated data
 - Providing data with known QA problems
 - Not using scientific notebook, or other means to document analyses
 - Desire to “truly document” how the model is “done”
 - Model conceptualization
 - Inconsistency of some site-specific measured data with conceptual model
 - Simulation of analog sites highlighted inconsistency, but those simulations have not been put into public documents
 - Code errors
 - Avoided fixing known code errors in code because of perceived small effect in results and large effort involved with following QA procedures (e.g., errors associated with vegetation, temperature, surface water routing, units conversion)
 - Not following QA procedures for the code