

HLWYM HEmails

From: Patrick LaPlante [plaplante@swri.edu]
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2000 5:57 PM
To: masmith@swri.edu; jweldy@swri.edu; 'Roland Benke (rbenke)'
Subject: RE: Opinions on DOE Approach

Mike,

I'm trying to find out whether DOE is doing any studies...so far only heard rumours. While their justification for the values is sparsely worded, I think from a practical position (since we were in the same boat) the argument that there are not sufficient data available and therefore generic values must be used is reasonable on one level. However, consistent w/ a prior comment we made to DOE at a tech exchange, it is also reasonable to expect that some extra work be conducted to justify the values selected for the important radionuclides (even if that is only 3). This extra work could range from actual studies to perhaps doing some literature work to find values for similar soils etc as noted by Roland. I temper this idea with the understanding that most transfer factor work that I am aware of does not occur in arid zones. Nonetheless, there was some work conducted by EPA at the test site some years back...and we have made this fact known to DOE and perhaps should make it again. At least, they should show they where they have looked and what they have found. At present, the report just states that site-specific info is not available (in typical sparse DOE fashion).

Perhaps "We need more meat" should be the comment. :-)

Pat

-----Original Message-----

From: Michael Smith [mailto:masmith@swri.edu]
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2000 5:39 PM
To: plaplante@swri.edu; jweldy@swri.edu; 'Roland Benke (rbenke)'
Subject: RE: Opinions on DOE Approach

I concur with points made thus far. I am always discouraged when a democratic process is used to solve scientific problems. It may be appropriate for DOE to select transfer factors from a group of scientific reports, however, the final selections must have a scientific basis. The available data should first be screened or weighted to ensure that they are appropriate for the YM biosphere (soil type, organic content, precipitation rates, etc.). The selection process should maintain a scientific basis, so simply selecting the most "popular" result must be justified. I think I know the answer, but has DOE conducted or have plans to conduct on-site studies for transfer factors?

-Mike

-----Original Message-----

From: Patrick LaPlante [mailto:plaplante@swri.edu]
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2000 4:11 PM
To: jweldy@swri.edu; 'Michael Smith'; 'Roland Benke (rbenke)'
Subject: RE: Opinions on DOE Approach

Thanks for the input. I agree w/ your points. On the latter one regarding the scale factors it is an issue, but short of having them modify the GENII code, I'm not sure how to resolve it. In our 'great wisdom', we decided not to implement full sampling of transfer factors (bang for the buck issue)...although I recognize that DOE has a greater regulatory burden and perhaps they should go the extra mile. Surely something to ponder over the next few days.

Pat

-----Original Message-----

From: James Weldy [mailto:jweldy@swri.edu]
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2000 5:00 PM
To: plaplante@swri.edu; 'Michael Smith'; 'Roland Benke (rbenke)'
Subject: RE: Opinions on DOE Approach

I tend to agree with you that this is an issue. They should list all of the original sources of data (probably only a few) and use these original sources as the basis for their parameters. They could then demonstrate that it is a reasonable selection by comparing the values to those that other people doing similar analyses have used.

A secondary issue associated with these parameters is that the GENII-S input parameters that are located in data files (such as the soil/plant and feed/animal transfer factors) cannot be sampled directly. Only a single scaling factor can be sampled, which may or may not actually represent the uncertainty associated with all of these parameters (may be too large for some and too small for others). I'm not sure if DOE talks about how well these scaling factor ranges actually represent the uncertainty in these data values.

James

-----Original Message-----

From: Patrick LaPlante [mailto:plaplante@swri.edu]
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2000 3:34 PM
To: James Weldy (jweldy); Michael Smith; Roland Benke (rbenke)
Subject: Opinions on DOE Approach

DOE's approach for selecting soil/plant and feed/animal transfer factors is sort of strange and I'm on the fence as to whether or not to raise a comment. Thus, I thought I would run it by you folks to see what you think.

In a nutshell, DOE has reviewed a number (say 8-10) technical reports that use or document such factors and tries to reach a consensus on what generic values are most favored by the technical community by doing their review.

They provide clear selection criteria that favor selection of those factors that appear most commonly in all the reports reviewed, those that appear common in most recent reports, or if those criteria don't apply they rank all and select a median value or if very little data they go with the default value in GENII code. One problem is that some of the reports reviewed are not the original data sources so there is some 'double counting' of sources that are popular (for example they cite our parameter report and IAEA, 1994 and our report uses the IAEA values). Thus, the selection becomes more of a popularity contest/expert elicitation style of selection rather than a more technically bases approach (e.g., a more technical approach might list all unique original data sources and choose the median or perhaps select the most recent summary by the most technically proficient resource with the idea that they represent the most current data and also apply a consistent approach to lit review and value selection).

Certainly there is some value in showing that the technical community favors some set of factors, but it seems to ignore the details of why they were selected by each author (reasons may not be appropriate for YM) and leads to sort of a mixed bag (factor for vegetables selected from one report...factor for fruit selected from another report which may have used different selection criteria).

I would be interested in your opinion as to whether you think the DOE approach as explained above appears to present a problem worth commenting on or not. The transfer factors for some of the important radionuclides are important to the dose calculation and some of DOE values vary by a factor of 10 from our values so it appears this is an area where some emphasis in the review is appropriate. If you have no opinions...that's ok too.

Thanks

Pat

Hearing Identifier: HLW_YuccaMountain_Hold_EX
Email Number: 1881

Mail Envelope Properties (plaplante@swri.edu20060208142239)

Subject: RE: Opinions on DOE Approach
Sent Date: 12/15/2000 5:56:56 PM
Received Date: 2/8/2006 2:22:39 PM
From: Patrick LaPlante

Created By: plaplante@swri.edu

Recipients:

"masmith@swri.edu" <masmith@swri.edu>
Tracking Status: None
"jweldy@swri.edu" <jweldy@swri.edu>
Tracking Status: None
"Roland Benke (rbenke)" <rbenke@gargol.cnwra.swri.edu>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office:

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	6525	2/8/2006 2:22:39 PM

Options

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