HLWYM HEmails

From: Chandrika Manepally
Sent: Thursday, June 28, 2007 1:01 PM
To: David Pickett; Osvaldo Pensado
Cc: Hakan Basagaoglu
Subject: RE: Chap 10 responses

David
I had one response to Randy's responses to your responses :>

10-7: You ask "Why is a probability factor mentioned...?" I don't follow you. These are all flow factors. No changes.
[RWF] This section is discussing flow factors that adjust flow (section 10.3.1). Then out of the blue, an inventory-adjusting factor is thrown into the list. Fwet adjusts the amount of inventory available for release (section 10.3.3 on release upscaling). It is not the only one. Thus, Fwet's sudden appearance here, without any introduction (e.g., two types of flow factors) or definition, seemed out of place

.
[CM] I had the same question about Subarea Wet Fraction as it does not adjust flow but adjusts the inventory. Jim Winterle stated that it needs to be included in EBSREL (as Randy states it is not the only one!)… I guess we can add a sentence or two about Fwet to respond to Randy's comment; however, the real comment about having inventory adjustment factors included with flow factors may need to be addressed…

-----Original Message-----
From: Randall Fedors [mailto:RWF@nrc.gov]
Sent: Thursday, June 28, 2007 7:02 AM
To: David Pickett
Cc: chandrika.manepally@swri.org
Subject: Re: Chap 10 responses

Here the rest of my responses in blue italics (beyond the response already given for redundancy of symbol definitions).
--Randy

>>> David Pickett <dpickett@cnwra.swri.edu> 06/25/2007 12:05 PM >>>
Randy,

Here are responses to some of your review comments on TAP guide Chapter 10. I mainly mention here instances in which I did not completely follow your suggestion.

David

Intro page: Symbol definitions were done according to guidance; no changes.

Intro page: Ci confusion. I don't see an easy solution. C with the subscript i is a long-established symbol for concentration. I did change the lower case instance in Eq 10-15 to upper case.
[RWF] Okay.

Intro page: Comments 4 and 5: These are outside my area of responsibility. No changes. I did ensure that my parameter table was consistent with tpa.inp.
[RWF] This was a generic comment, no specific item in this chapter drove this comment. Thanks for checking.

10-9, last para, "For the reference case....": Osvaldo says there is drift degradation in the reference case, so I didn't change this.
[RWF] I didn't convey the intent of the comment properly; and yes, it is true that the reference case now is for drift degradation. There was some guidance that we should avoid putting in reference case descriptions and values into the text describing the codes capabilities. The reference case was suppose to be brought out in the table, with the basis in the last column. Grossman envisioned simple table modifications whenever the reference case in tpa.inp changed. That is why I deleted other instances where parameters values were given in the text (they also show up in the table). Obviously, complete avoidance of mentioning something about the reference case was hard to avoid in other chapters. Here, you didn't have to mention that the reference case was that drift degradation occurred. Again, the goal for section 10.3 was to describe the code's capabilities, not the how we are setting up our reference case.
My comment would have been an easy change in this instance. Just start the paragraph with "For the drift degradation scenario ..."

10-13, bottom: I don't understand this comment about rock types.
[RWF] It was a link to item 5 in the general comments placed on the title page. You can ignore this comment.
I was on travel, and this served the purpose of causing me to check what the MechFail people set their rock types to (they ignored that we now have subareas with only 1 rock type).

Fig 10-8: I prefer to keep figures A and B separate. The figures are for different waste package classes.
[RWF] I realized that the curves are relevant to different ways a waste package is perturbed, thus two groupings of release terms for these two groups of waste packages. My point was that the figures are identically except for one part of the x-axis label. My suggestion was to avoid looking redundant (save space) by modifying the caption and putting "t_e or t_GC " on the x-axis.

10-58: You highlighted but didn't write a comment.

[RWF] If we were really working as a seemless team (NRC and CNWRA), then you should know what I intended to put there!

I think the statement is false. The invert transport leg is always bypassed, not just when the flux is greater than the invert permeability. Osvaldo should know the proper wording for how we make sure no invert transport leg is computed.

Hearing Identifier: HLW_YuccaMountain_Hold_EX
Email Number: 386

Mail Envelope Properties (cmanepally@cnwra.swri.edu20070628130000)

Subject: RE: Chap 10 responses
Sent Date: 6/28/2007 1:00:58 PM
Received Date: 6/28/2007 1:00:00 PM
From: Chandrika Manepally

Created By: cmanepally@cnwra.swri.edu

Recipients:
"Hakan Basagaoglu" <hbasagaoglu@cnwra.swri.edu>
Tracking Status: None
"David Pickett" <dpickett@cnwra.swri.edu>
Tracking Status: None
"Osvaldo Pensado" <opensado@cnwra.swri.edu>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office:

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	4757	6/28/2007 1:00:00 PM

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