

HLWYM HEmails

From: Patrick LaPlante [plaplante@swri.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, July 03, 2001 8:34 PM
To: McCartin, Timothy
Cc: gwitt@gargol.cnwra.swri.edu; wpatrick@gargol.cnwra.swri.edu; Kotra, Janet; McKenney, Christopher; Budhi Sagar (bsagar)
Subject: RE2: Concurrence Version

Tim/Janet:

I read through the responses to comments from Page 1 to the end of critical group (pg 94) and it looked pretty good...only have a few comments (generally minor at this stage):

1. Page 8, REFERENCE BIOSPHERE, 2nd to last sentence uses "current knowledge" in referring to consideration of future biosphere changes. The draft final rule specifically uses "present knowledge" terminology in this context and reserves "current conditions" language for critical group characteristics. To avoid confusion, I recommend changing the noted text to "present knowledge". I did a search to check usage of both rule terms (present knowledge and current conditions) in the comment responses and all other uses are in proper context.
2. The use of RMEI as acronym and fully spelled is inconsistent (usage does not appear to conform to any rule).
3. Page 66, last paragraph ("In Support of Proposed Part...), 2nd to last sentence states that "it is difficult for the same individual to be a member of the critical group or to be the RMEI for multiple diverse sources". It may be more appropriate to say this is "unlikely" rather than "difficult".
4. Page 85, 2nd paragraph ("Man made developments...") still contains a reference to the economic base that "now includes" a fish hatchery. As was noted in an earlier comment the fish hatchery is no longer operating (according to C. McKenney) so the text has be made obsolete by events. If this was intentionally left in this draft then disregard the comment (I'm just letting you know it is still there).
5. Missing words (sorry if this is too much minutiae):

Page 7, first sentence "...period [?] the associated"

Page 7, RADIATION STANDARDS FOR HUMAN..., 3rd Sentence, "specified only [?] additional requirement..."

That's all.

Pat

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

From: Timothy McCartin [mailto:TJM3@nrc.gov]

Sent: Thursday, June 28, 2001 6:11 PM

To: bsagar@gargol.cnwra.swri.edu; gwitt@gargol.cnwra.swri.edu; plaplante@gargol.cnwra.swri.edu; wpatrick@gargol.cnwra.swri.edu

Cc: CBR@nrc.gov

Subject: Concurrence Version

Wes, Budhi, Gordon, & Pat:

Attached is the concurrence version of final Part 63, the Commission paper and attachment 1 that explains implementation of the standards. Many thanks and appreciation to all the hard work and quick reviews etc. Next week we will be addressing office level and OGC comments. Of course we this time to review the package again - comments still appreciated and welcomed!

Tim

Hearing Identifier: HLW_YuccaMountain_Hold_EX
Email Number: 1890

Mail Envelope Properties (plaplante@swri.edu20060208142242)

Subject: RE2: Concurrence Version
Sent Date: 7/3/2001 8:33:41 PM
Received Date: 2/8/2006 2:22:42 PM
From: Patrick LaPlante

Created By: plaplante@swri.edu

Recipients:

"gwitt@gargol.cnwra.swri.edu" <gwitt@gargol.cnwra.swri.edu>
Tracking Status: None
"wpatrick@gargol.cnwra.swri.edu" <wpatrick@gargol.cnwra.swri.edu>
Tracking Status: None
"Kotra, Janet" <Janet.Kotra@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"McKenney, Christopher" <Christopher.McKenney@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Budhi Sagar (bsagar)" <bsagar@gargol.cnwra.swri.edu>
Tracking Status: None
"McCartin, Timothy" <Timothy.McCartin@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office:

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2524	2/8/2006 2:22:42 PM

Options

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