

Clark, Michael

From: John Hayes *FSME*
Sent: Thursday, February 19, 2009 6:49 AM
To: Jenny Goodman
Subject: FW: SMC

Jenny,

Let me try to give you my thoughts and the yardstick I have tried to use. I don't know if I have always followed it or if I have been successful in managing this situation.

I believe that if the topic deals with the subject of the conference call then it is fair to discuss. So for yesterday's call if your item was one or more reasons why the presentation of the information in the "Characterization of the Slag " Report did not allow the reader to follow and understand SMC's conclusions and the approach for future testing, then I believe it would be acceptable to raise the item for discussion. On the other hand, if your item was missing information, e. g., Figure 1 or other items dealing more with the content of the report, not its completeness, I would save it for the discussion of the report. That said, if there was such a glaring weakness or an omission from the report, I might mention it as an item for consideration by SMC when considering the revision to the report. As I mentioned yesterday, the staff has some issues with the information presented in the report. However, before discussing the information in the report the staff felt that the report needed to be revised so that an adequate assessment of the date could be performed. Once the report is revised, the staff will be discussing the information presented in the report.

Now, regarding your specific comment on the pH. Whether to have raised the issue yesterday might depend upon the focus of your point. If it was pH was not measured and an explanation should be provided as to why not, then that would have seemed appropriate to me. On the other hand, if the point was that future leach rate tests should include measurement of pH, then that point might be a subject for discussion during the conference call involving the next round of tests.

Anyway, don't know if this has been helpful but these are my thoughts.

Jack

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

From: Jenny Goodman [mailto:Jenny.Goodman@dep.state.nj.us] *misstate*

Sent: Wednesday, February 18, 2009 3:24 PM

To: John Hayes

Cc: Steve Spayd

Subject: SMC

Jack,

I wasn't sure if I was allowed to comment on things that were not in the NRC talking points. Anyway, as a followup, I searched the document and it appears that they did not take the pH of the liquid after the tests were completed. I think this would be a good idea, along with testing for uranium and thorium when equilibrium is reached (if ever).

Jenny

I/11