HLWYM HEmails

From: David Pickett
Sent: Monday, January 23, 2006 6:32 PM
To: Richard Codell; Bret Leslie
Subject: RE: FYI & ACTIONS: Please provide any input on impacted agreements to me by COB 1/23

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dick makes some good points here. There are some conflicts with what I have on the table I sent Dick, but I can't argue against what he says here.

David

> -----Original Message-----
> From: Richard Codell [mailto:RBC@nrc.gov]
> Sent: Monday, January 23, 2006 2:55 PM
> To: aghosh@cnwra.swri.edu; bsagar@cnwra.swri.edu;
> dpickett@cnwra.swri.edu; gwitt@cnwra.swri.edu; jstam@cnwra.swri.edu;
> ofoegbu@cnwra.swri.edu; oosidele@cnwra.swri.edu;
> opensado@cnwra.swri.edu; opovetko@cnwra.swri.edu;
> plaplante@cnwra.swri.edu; rbenke@cnwra.swri.edu;
> rpabalan@cnwra.swri.edu; shgonzalez@cnwra.swri.edu; Abou-Bakr Ibrahim;
> Brittain Hill; Bret Leslie; Christopher Grossman; David Brooks; Dennis
> Galvin; John Trapp; Jin-Ping Gwo; James Rubenstone; Philip Justus;
> Tina Ghosh; Timothy McCartin
> Cc: jwinterle@cnwra.swri.edu; Andy Campbell
> Subject: Re: FYI & ACTIONS: Please provide any input on impacted
> agreements to me by COB 1/23
>
>
> Bret:
> I looked at your list, and have questions about several of the
> agreements you highlight:
>
> tspai.3.03 - I didn't think this should be highlighted because the TAD
> would be an additional layer of protection only. Adding this
> protection could only help the performance.
>
> tspai 3.12 - Same comment as 3.03. Corrosion of the primary corrosion
> barriers of the WP should not be affected by the TAD.
>
> In my review of all the agreements, I highlight the following ones to
> possible reopen:
>
> CLST 3.05 - Rule and design - In-package chemistry could be affected
> by materials used in TAD. Also, lack of carbon steel in TAD will
> change, and probably reduce the severity of effects of corrosion on
> in-package chemistry and generation of iron colloids.
>
> CLST 5.05, 5.05, 5.06, 5.07 - Rule - Long time frames make the issue
> of in-package and external criticality more troublesome.
>

> ENFE 4.05 - Rule - Screening for radionuclides would be affected in
> some cases by million year time frame; e.g.,
> Pu-242 might become more of a threat.
>
> RDTME - Rule - Any agreements that tend to screen out drift collapse
> based on low risk would have to be changed for million year time
> frame.
>
> RT4.01, 4.03 - External criticality, while still remote, would be more
> of a threat for one million years.
>
> TSPAI 3.34 - Same as ENFE 4.05
>
> Dick
>
> >>> Bret Leslie 01/22/06 8:39 AM >>>
> Folks,
> FYI:
> 1. You are receiving this note because you are identified in Yucca
> Mountain LA-Postclosure Technical Review Teams Draft Rev 2.6
> (attached) as members of TSPAI1 (Mulitple Barriers),
> TSPAI2 (Scenario Analysis [FEPs]), or TSPAI2 (Identification of Events
> with Probabilities > 10-8 per year) teams.
>
> 2. I intend to have a meeting of these teams in the first part of
> February (tentatively AM of February 7, 9-noon EST).
> Please let me know of any major meetings that day which could affect
> large numbers of team members that day. I intend to only hold two
> meetings: one for mutiple barriers and one for the two tspai2 teams.
> I will provide an agenda within the next week if the logistics look
> positive for the 7th.
>
> 3. Note that I have taken on lead authorship for the Scenario Analysis
> (FEPs) team, and that although Tina Ghosh is still identified as lead
> author for Probability team, while she is on a three month rotation to
> NRR (thru april 06) I will also take on the lead author role for that
> team as well.
>
> 4. The forwarded email has a short fuse (input due to Rubenstone COB
> tuesday). I have taken a first crack at a response. Please read the
> attached file (TSPAI associated KTI agreements status and
> prognosis.doc) which I will forward to Jim on Tuesday once I obtain
> any feedback. To assist you I have also attached a file (all
> agreements related to TSPAI in App A of IIRSR.doc) that lists the text
> of all the agreements that were identified as related to TSPAI review
> teams in Appendix A of the IIRSR. For TSPAI3 (Model Abstraction)
> agreements on the first line you will find the review teams which will
> should be adressing the agreement (e.g., TSPAI3.01 TSPAI/ENG1). For
> several of the agreements only TSPAI is identified, and it will be
> incumbent upon the MOSP programmatic element to address them so that
> all the model abstraction teams (ISIs) will implement them in their
> reviews (this is the subject of another effort that starts this
> upcoming thursday morning. contact Femi and I for more information on
> that effort).
>
> If you have time or are so inclined to provide comments on my cut at

> impacted ageements
>
> ACTIONS:
> All: Provide me your input, including justification for any proposed
> changes to the file (TSPAI associated KTI agreements status and
> prognosis.doc) by COB 1/23. Thanks!
>
> Osidele: arrange for room on 2/7 for meetings.
>
> Osidele, Stamatakos, and Pensado - contact me this week to discuss
> strategies, activities, and agenda for 2/7 meeting.
>
> thanks,
> Bret Leslie, Technical Lead TSPAI1 & TSPAI2, and Project Officer MOSP
>
>
>
>

Hearing Identifier: HLW_YuccaMountain_Hold_EX
Email Number: 620

Mail Envelope Properties (dpickett@cnwra.swri.edu20060123183200)

Subject: RE: FYI & ACTIONS: Please provide any input on impacted agreements to me by COB 1/23
Sent Date: 1/23/2006 6:32:14 PM
Received Date: 1/23/2006 6:32:00 PM
From: David Pickett

Created By: dpickett@cnwra.swri.edu

Recipients:
"Richard Codell" <Richard.Codell@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Bret Leslie" <Bret.Leslie@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office:

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	5212	1/23/2006 6:32:00 PM

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