HLWYM HEmails

From: David Pickett
Sent: Monday, November 22, 2004 1:41 PM
To: vjain@cnwra.swri.edu; Jude Mcmurry
Subject: RE: Review Comments - Re: KTI items CLST 3.02, 3.05, ENFE 3.04

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

A new thought. Even if in-pkg chemistry is "not important" with respect to wasteform degradation rates, what about solubility?

David

> -----Original Message-----
> From: Vijay Jain [mailto:vjain@cnwra.swri.edu]
> Sent: Monday, November 22, 2004 10:10 AM
> To: jmcmurry@cnwra.swri.edu; dpickett@cnwra.swri.edu
> Subject: RE: Review Comments - Re: KTI items CLST 3.02, 3.05, ENFE
> 3.04
>
>
> I am wondering if the total amount of radionuclides (Tc, Cs,
> I) released from 2 (or 1) DOE SNF are greater than two (or
> five) HLW glass canisters. If that's the case we can argue that
> irrespective of dissolution chemistry, their calculations are
> conservative.
>
> I kind of see their point.
>
> Vijay
>
> Vijay Jain
> Center for Nuclear Waste Regulatory Analyses Southwest Research
> Institute 6220 Culebra Road San Antonio, TX 78228
> V: (210) 522 5439
> F: (210) 522 6081
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Jude McMurry [mailto:jmcmurry@cnwra.swri.edu]
> Sent: Monday, November 22, 2004 10:02 AM
> To: dpickett@cnwra.swri.edu; vjain@cnwra.swri.edu
> Subject: RE: Review Comments - Re: KTI items CLST 3.02, 3.05, ENFE
> 3.04
>
> David,
> My interpretation of Tae's remark was that he was talkinly
> >only< about the codisposal packages (where all this debate
> about the glass dissolution is relevant). In the codisposal packages,
> DOE assumes that the SNF dissolves immediately when the waste package
> is breached. So that's where the conservatism comes in.
>
> Jude
>

>
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: David Pickett [mailto:dpickett@cnwra.swri.edu]
> Sent: Monday, November 22, 2004 9:23 AM
> To: jmcmurry@cnwra.swri.edu; vjain@cnwra.swri.edu
> Subject: RE: Review Comments - Re: KTI items CLST 3.02, 3.05, ENFE
> 3.04
>
>
> Jude and Vijay,
>
> Do we know that the current SNF model is still as conservative as in
> the past? Has anyone looked at it lately?
> DOE has been reeling in their conservatisms a lot lately - and I'd
> expect that to continue when/if a new standard comes out. I'm
> uncomfortable saying one thing is OK just because a model that could
> be changed is highly conservative.
>
> And is his last statement about clading correct?
>
> David
>
> > -----Original Message-----
> > From: Tae Ahn [mailto:TMA@nrc.gov]
> > Sent: Monday, November 22, 2004 8:32 AM
> > To: jmcmurry@cnwra.swri.edu; vjain@cnwra.swri.edu; Richard Codell
> > Cc: david.pickett@swri.org; vijay.jain@swri.org
> > Subject: RE: Review Comments - Re: KTI items CLST 3.02, 3.05, ENFE
> > 3.04
> >
> >
> > My overall comment is that DOE's SNF dissolution models are already
> > extremely conservative whatever pH would be. Cladd failure would
> > occur only pH less than 2.
>

Hearing Identifier: HLW_YuccaMountain_Hold_EX
Email Number: 642

Mail Envelope Properties (dpickett@cnwra.swri.edu20041122134000)

Subject: RE: Review Comments - Re: KTI items CLST 3.02, 3.05, ENFE 3.04
Sent Date: 11/22/2004 1:40:39 PM
Received Date: 11/22/2004 1:40:00 PM
From: David Pickett

Created By: dpickett@cnwra.swri.edu

Recipients:
"vjain@cnwra.swri.edu" <vjain@cnwra.swri.edu>
Tracking Status: None
"Jude Mcmurry" <jmcmurry@cnwra.swri.edu>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office:

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	2800	11/22/2004 1:40:00 PM

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