

## HLWYM PEmails

---

**From:** Patrick LaPlante [plaplante@swri.edu]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 31, 2001 4:38 PM  
**To:** masmith@gargol.cnwra.swri.edu; smayer@gargol.cnwra.swri.edu  
**Cc:** 'Patrick Laplante (plaplante)'  
**Subject:** RE: some more tables

I agree that the DOE response (at least as Mike has paraphrased it) is inadequate. At our pre-meeting DOE appeared to understand the concern and said they would check on it. There is nothing in the original data sources (say for transfer coefficients) that comes close to an analysis of whether the values are applicable to YM. All the data sources for transfer coefficients are either generic or for another site. Merely selecting the values that are referenced the most does not demonstrate the values are applicable to YM. (All we are asking for is for DOE to have a rationale for selecting data that makes some sense).

Pat

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

**From:** Michael Smith [mailto:masmith@gargol.cnwra.swri.edu]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 31, 2001 4:16 PM  
**To:** smayer@gargol.cnwra.swri.edu  
**Cc:** Patrick Laplante (plaplante)  
**Subject:** RE: some more tables

Stefan,

I just looked over the DOE responses to MA comments that had my name on them. The only DOE response that appears to still be lacking is that for DOSE3.2.1. This may require further clarification by the DOE at the technical exchange. The DOE did not respond to the point that their data sources (various reports and articles) may have shared primary data sources.

Even though the DOE has cited several data sources, in a sense many are the same source. The DOE did not completely respond to question of whether or not the data are appropriate for YM, but state that the basis for that determination is included in the cited references, assuming that the technical evaluation was performed by the data compilers.

Pat may have some input on this.

Also, the response to DOSE3.5.1 (model validation) is only sufficient in that the DOE promises to complete validation exercises in response to previous requests, but does not provide any detail. I think we're o.k. here, since I believe that this will already be covered under separate discussion for model validation.

-Mike

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

**From:** Stefan Mayer [mailto:smayer@gargol.cnwra.swri.edu]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 31, 2001 2:44 PM  
**To:** 'Gordon'; 'James'; 'Mike'; 'Osvaldo'; 'Pat'; 'Roland'; 'Ron'; 'Sitakanta'; 'Stefan'; 'Bobby Pabalan'; 'Britt Hill'; 'Chuck O'Connor'; 'Darrell Dunn'; 'David Farrell'; 'David Pickett'; 'David Turner'; 'Doug Gute'; 'Jim Winterle'; 'Lauren Browning'; 'Randy Fedors'  
**Subject:** some more tables

Hello all,

There is an almost done Rev08 (waiting for a few NRC and ISI feedbacks) of the model abstraction TSPA blueprint available. Since the last version (Rev06 about 2 months ago, the basis for all the telecon discussions), there has been an incremental change. A number of comments were added, mainly in UZ. A number of suggested agreements were edited/added and the core of the telecon discussions with DOE were also added.

If you want this now for a specific ISI, or the whole thing, let me know, be glad to email to you.

Cheers  
Stefan

PS: Many received the DOE delta-table this morning. If you have not, and you would like/need to look at what type of responses they offer to our comments, would also be glad to forward you a copy.

**Hearing Identifier:** HLW\_YM\_Public\_EX  
**Email Number:** 33

**Mail Envelope Properties** (plaplante@swri.edu20060208142242)

**Subject:** RE: some more tables  
**Sent Date:** 7/31/2001 4:38:00 PM  
**Received Date:** 2/8/2006 2:22:42 PM  
**From:** Patrick LaPlante

**Created By:** plaplante@swri.edu

**Recipients:**

"Patrick Laplante (plaplante)" <plaplante@gargol.cnwra.swri.edu>  
Tracking Status: None  
"masmith@gargol.cnwra.swri.edu" <masmith@gargol.cnwra.swri.edu>  
Tracking Status: None  
"smayer@gargol.cnwra.swri.edu" <smayer@gargol.cnwra.swri.edu>  
Tracking Status: None

**Post Office:**

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3139	2/8/2006 2:22:42 PM

**Options**

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