

HLWYM HEmails

From: Dennis Galvin
Sent: Friday, November 26, 2004 9:26 AM
To: David Pickett
Cc: Lane Howard; Oleg Povetko; Vijay Jain; Marissa Bailey; Tae Ahn
Subject: RE: Response to HLW criticality agreements

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

David,

In the paragraph in section 4.3 starting "DOE also identifies ..." The first sentence indicates that the geochemistry reports are not even discussed. The second sentence indicates that we don't really know what DOE is doing with these reports. The third sentence is a reminder that DOE committed to providing these reports in July 2003, in particular the film degradation model. I am open to proposals on the letter. Call me or email me with your suggestions. I will be in on 11/29/04 and then 12/13/04.

Though it is not transparent, I believe DOE is still planning on showing that criticality is excluded based on water not getting in the waste packages. If water does get in, DOE will have to evaluate degraded fuel and degraded baskets. DOE may be able to using bounding criticality configurations to eliminate modeling degradation processes. However, if DOE wants to use realistic configurations, it seems that degradation processes will need to be modeled. Based on what I saw in the configuration generator report, the topical report, and very briefly in the screening argument, DOE is ignoring degradation processes. One of the challenges for DOE is once you need to model something with a continuous distribution (such as degradation processes and potential configurations), the fault tree approach is not really useful. However it would take some time better understand what DOE is proposing and then to write this up and is probably beyond the scope of the letter.

Thanks,

Dennis

>>> David Pickett <dpickett@cnwra.swri.edu> 11/24/04 05:09PM >>>
Dennis,

I looked at your review, and have no problem with it. (Congrats for a yeoman's effort wading through various backs-and-forths between DOE and NRC!) I am curious about one thing - and maybe clarification is needed. In Section 4.3, are you saying that the two geochemistry model validation reports will be replaced by "Film and Vapor Degradation Model" and "Accumulation in the Invert Model"?

David

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Dennis Galvin [mailto:DJG3@nrc.gov]
> Sent: Tuesday, November 23, 2004 4:48 PM
> To: Dan Rom; Marissa Bailey; Tae Ahn
> Cc: DDUNN@cnwra.swri.edu; DPICKETT@cnwra.swri.edu;
> LHOWARD@cnwra.swri.edu; OPOVETKO@cnwra.swri.edu; Charles Interrante;
> Christopher Brown; David Brooks; Geoffrey Hornseth; John Bradbury;
> Richard Codell; Robert Einziger; Robert Johnson; Shana Helton; Timothy
> Kobetz; Yong Kim
> Subject: Response to HLW criticality agreements

>
>
> Tae,
>
> I have prepared the attachment for the response to the criticality
> related agreements. I have included the people who should take a look
> at this draft. Please check the list to see if anyone else needs to
> review it. I will also work on the cover letter.
>
> Note that I will be on leave from November 30 to December 10.
> Therefore, it would be helpful to get some feedback by Monday morning
> November 29. Otherwise, I will be available to work on it December
> 13.
>
> Note that several agreements will be closed and several agreements
> will remain open. I have also identified some concerns.
>
> SFPO Materials staff
> Paragraph numbered 1 on page 5 is the paragraph we discussed at the
> materials caucus today. I believe that I have captured all your
> comments. Let me know if there are still problems.
>
> Other addressees
> The criticality agreements cover 4 KTIs - CLST, ENFE, RT, and PRE. I
> have sent it the response letter to persons associated with each KTI.
> Feel free to forward it to other individuals.
>
> Thanks,
>
> Dennis Galvin
>
>

Hearing Identifier: HLW_YuccaMountain_Hold_EX
Email Number: 702

Mail Envelope Properties (s1a6f6b6.065)

Subject: RE: Response to HLW criticality agreements
Sent Date: 11/26/2004 9:26:06 AM
Received Date: 11/26/2004 9:23:29 AM
From: Dennis Galvin

Created By: Dennis.Galvin@nrc.gov

Recipients:

"Lane Howard" <LHOWARD.CNWRAIA.SWRIIA@cnwra.swri.edu>
Tracking Status: None
"Oleg Povetko" <OPOVETKO.CNWRAIA.SWRIIA@cnwra.swri.edu>
Tracking Status: None
"Vijay Jain" <VJAIN.CNWRAIA.SWRIIA@cnwra.swri.edu>
Tracking Status: None
"Marissa Bailey" <MGB.twf4_po.TWFN_DO@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Tae Ahn" <TMA.twf4_po.TWFN_DO@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"David Pickett" <dpickett@cnwra.swri.edu>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: nrcgwia.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	3654	11/26/2004 9:23:29 AM

Options

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