

Allen, Pam, NMENV



From: Kliphuis, Trais, NMENV
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2012 12:47 PM
To: Allen, Pam, NMENV
Cc: Maestas, Ricardo, NMENV
Subject: FW: Oops

Another emial for the WIPP file (January)

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

From: Don Hancock [<mailto:sricdon@earthlink.net>]
Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2012 1:47 PM
To: Kliphuis, Trais, NMENV
Subject: Re: Oops

OK, I think I understand.

On 1/4/2012 1:31 PM, Kliphuis, Trais, NMENV wrote:

> OH, I wasn't clear in my last email.... I was referring to my intent to keep the phrase
> "when workers are present".

>
> Sorry...

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Don Hancock [<mailto:sricdon@earthlink.net>]
> Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2012 1:28 PM
> To: Kliphuis, Trais, NMENV
> Subject: Re: Oops

> Maybe I wasn't clear.

> Here's the suggested language for our comments:

> 1.5.19. Filled Room

> "Filled Room" means a room in an Underground Hazardous Waste Disposal Unit as specified in
Permit Part 4 that will no longer receive waste for emplacement.

> 1.5.20. Active Room

> "Active Room" means a room in an Underground Hazardous Waste Disposal Unit as specified in
Permit Part 4 that contains emplaced TRU waste and is not a filled room.

> In the Part 1 that you sent this morning:

> 1.5.19. Filled Room

> "Filled Room" means a room in an Underground Hazardous Waste Disposal Unit as described in
Permit Part 4 will no longer receive waste for emplacement.

> 1.5.20. Active Room

> "Active Room" means a room in an Underground Hazardous Waste Disposal
> Unit as described in Permit Part 4 that contains emplaced TRU mixed
> waste and is not a filled room

> That's what I'm referring to regarding "specified" (in the SRIC
> comments) and "described" in the proposed revisions.



>
>
>
> On 1/4/2012 1:07 PM, Kliphuis, Trais, NMENV wrote:
>> It was my intent to keep the phrase (your suggested language has it). Does this cause a
problem?
>>
>> -----Original Message-----
>> From: Don Hancock [<mailto:sricdon@earthlink.net>]
>> Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2012 1:01 PM
>> To: Kliphuis, Trais, NMENV
>> Subject: Re: Oops
>>
>> The "revised" ones still seem to have some of the "when workers are present" language
maintained. So they need to be reviewed again.
>>
>> There were a couple of typos that I saw in Attachment 0, which I've noted in the attached.
One ("documented") was corrected in the second version, the missing "to" was still in the
second version.
>>
>> Regarding the definitions, I can live with them. To me, the convention in the permit would
be "specified" rather than "described" though both terms are used.
>>
>> The 4.5.3.2 language also seems OK to me.
>>
>> On 1/4/2012 9:38 AM, Kliphuis, Trais, NMENV wrote:
>>> Hi Don,
>>>
>>> I mistakenly deleted the "when workers are present" in a few places
>>> (but not all). This would create a situation that requires continual
>>> ventilation in the active rooms-even when no one is working in them.
>>> Attached are corrected versions.
>>>
>