HLWYM HEmails

From: Budhi Sagar
Sent: Wednesday, May 04, 2005 5:31 PM
To: Goodluck Ofoegbu; Ronald Green; Osvaldo Pensado
Subject: RE: thermal conductivity

But "crushed tuff" is not the same as rubble; is it? I would assume that crushed tuff will have much smaller porosity (and smaller thermal conductivity) than rubble.

Budhi

-----Original Message-----
From: Goodluck Ofoegbu [mailto:ofoegbu@cnwra.swri.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, May 04, 2005 4:26 PM
To: 'Ron Green'; 'Budhi Sagar'; 'Osvaldo Pensado'
Subject: RE: thermal conductivity

The invert material is currently referred to as "crushed tuff", which suggests it will likely be tuff from repository excavations. Did they use a different tuff for their conductivity test?

gio

-----Original Message-----
From: Ron Green [mailto:rgreen@cnwra.swri.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, May 04, 2005 4:17 PM
To: Budhi Sagar; Osvaldo Pensado; Goodluck Ofoegbu
Subject: thermal conductivity

FYI from our lunchtime discussion. I spoke with Randy. The 0.12 W/m-K is for crushed invert material, not rock from the repository horizon (i.e., Tptpll).

Ronald T Green, PhD, PG
Staff Scientist
CNWRA
Southwest Research Institute
6220 Culebra
San Antonio, Texas 78238
(210) 522-5305
(210) 522-5184 fax
rgreen@swri.edu

Hearing Identifier: HLW_YuccaMountain_Hold_EX
Email Number: 1205

Mail Envelope Properties (04ab01c550f0$8a089ac0$a3c8a281)

Subject: RE: thermal conductivity
Sent Date: 5/4/2005 5:30:48 PM
Received Date: 5/4/2005 5:30:54 PM
From: Budhi Sagar

Created By: bsagar@cnwra.swri.edu

Recipients:
"Goodluck Ofoegbu" <ofoegbu@cnwra.swri.edu>
Tracking Status: None
"Ronald Green" <rgreen@cnwra.swri.edu>
Tracking Status: None
"Osvaldo Pensado" <opensado@cnwra.swri.edu>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: FRODO

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	1178	5/4/2005 5:30:54 PM

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