

**Dennig, Robert**

---

**From:** Basu, Sudhamay *MS*  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 23, 2012 10:35 PM  
**To:** Dennig, Robert  
**Cc:** Lee, Richard  
**Subject:** FW: [EXTERNAL] FW: Filtered vs.docx

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Bob - here is the answer you are looking for.

---

**From:** Osborn, Douglas [dosborn@sandia.gov] *Sand 9*  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 23, 2012 6:10 PM  
**To:** Basu, Sudhamay; Ghosh, Tina  
**Cc:** Bixler, Nathan E  
**Subject:** RE: [EXTERNAL] FW: Filtered vs.docx

Yes, MACCS2 does provide a groundshine dose.

The current runs I've done for you have the long-term groundshine dose in the output files. This is the total long-term population dose received by resident population from groundshine and is reported in person-rem. I have it for the 10 and 50 mile radius.

Doug

**From:** Basu, Sudhamay [mailto:Sudhamay.Basu@nrc.gov]  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 23, 2012 3:49 PM  
**To:** Osborn, Douglas; Ghosh, Suchandra Tina (External Contacts)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] FW: Filtered vs.docx

Does MACCS output ground shine dose? I am not aware of. Please respond.

**From:** Dennig, Robert  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 23, 2012 5:27 PM  
**To:** Basu, Sudhamay  
**Cc:** Lee, Richard  
**Subject:** RE: Filtered vs.docx

Don't know about RASCAL. But I thought you might have some cases that would do the same thing – look at the ground shine dose to see how it comes out with a filter on the drywell vent?

**From:** Basu, Sudhamay  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 23, 2012 5:20 PM  
**To:** Dennig, Robert  
**Cc:** Lee, Richard  
**Subject:** RE: Filtered vs.docx

Bob – I like the argument. This is the first time the land contamination issue has been brought to the forefront with regard to the potential benefit of filter. The question is can we hang our hat on RASCAL calculations.

**From:** Dennig, Robert *in R*

Sent: Thursday, August 23, 2012 3:10 PM  
To: Basu, Sudhamay  
Subject: Filtered vs.docx

What do you think of the argument? Worth pursuing?