

HLWYM HEmails

From: David Brooks
Sent: Thursday, December 15, 2005 10:45 AM
To: Roberto Pabalan
Cc: English Percy; Aladar Csontos; Bret Leslie; Christopher Grossman; Eugene Peters; JMYERS.CNWRA.Internet@nrc.gov; Jack Guttman
Subject: Re: draft deliquescence example
Attachments: 06-1 ENG3 tim Questions.wpd

Bobby - This is a very good start, and certainly gets us off the dime.

As you and I discussed, we (you and Jim, Allen, Gene(?) and I) will meet (teleconference) on Tuesday (12/20) from 9 am to 11 am (your time) to discuss the questions and "mapping?"

In the meantime, I will be thinking more about this (which includes the "questions" Tim suggested/See attached), eliminating redundancy, etc.

I will distribute the AC1 questions to everyone along with the meeting announcement.

Talk to you on Tuesday.

>>> Bobby Pabalan <rpabalan@cnwra.swri.edu> 12/14/05 6:00 PM >>>
Dave,

Attached is a draft review strategy for deliquescence. I would be happy to explain how I came up with this example. Please call me when you get a chance either on Thursday or next week. Because of the limited time available for Jim Myers to review the DOE documents relevant to deliquescence, Jim and I decided he will work out another example using the DOE seepage water chemistry abstraction because he has been reviewing DOE documents on that issue. He'll provide you with his draft review strategy later.

--bobby

Hearing Identifier: HLW_YuccaMountain_Hold_EX
Email Number: 499

Mail Envelope Properties (s3a1494d.059)

Subject: Re: draft delinquescence example
Sent Date: 12/15/2005 10:45:06 AM
Received Date: 12/15/2005 10:47:16 AM
From: David Brooks

Created By: David.Brooks@nrc.gov

Recipients:

"English Percy" <epearcy@cnwra.swri.edu>
Tracking Status: None
"Aladar Csontos" <AAC.twf4_po.TWFN_DO@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Bret Leslie" <BWL.twf4_po.TWFN_DO@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Christopher Grossman" <CJG2.twf4_po.TWFN_DO@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Eugene Peters" <EMP2.TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"JMYERS.CNWRA.Internet@nrc.gov" <JMYERS.CNWRA.Internet@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Jack Guttman" <JXG.owf1_po.OWFN_DO@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Roberto Pabalan" <rpabalan@cnwra.swri.edu>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: NRNWMS05.NRC.GOV

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1118	12/15/2005 10:47:16 AM
06-1 ENG3 tim Questions.wpd	3782	

Options

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

Questions to be Considered in Development of ISI Review Strategies

- 1) What FEPs of this ISI are most important to estimating performance (no more than 3-5 is preferable)?
- 2) For the FEPs significant to performance what are the significant uncertainties? What is the staff doing to understand the impact of these uncertainties? Is further information expected from DOE?
- 3) Has DOE excluded FEPs from this ISI that might be expected to be controversial? What is the staff doing to understand the impact and basis for exclusion of these FEPs? Is further information expected from DOE?
- 4) What aspect of this ISI has the strongest technical basis?
- 5) What aspect of this ISI has the weakest technical basis?
- 6) What information (related to the significant FEPs) are you expecting from other ISIs?
- 7) What information (related to the significant FEPs) are you providing to other ISIs?