

August 24, 2011

Dr. Daniel Stram Comments on August 2011 Working Draft Uranium In-Situ ISL/ISR
Advisory

Hi Bernd and Jack,

I looked through the draft, and I think we are doing fine in terms of making on target general comments, but what about direct recommendations? For example, if seasonality or other variability in the individual monitoring wells is evident then at least one year of monthly data pre and post would seem to be the minimum needed so that clear obvious patterns are not missed. Other issues would be whether we recommend expanding the number of constituents that are measured, or expanding the role of kinetic modeling. Right now we are saying (basically) that these things need to be considered in developing the monitoring plan, but can we be stronger in our overall remarks? i.e. that a couple of quarterly measurements in the pre- and post-periods are just never going to be enough to characterize variability/seasonality, etc.

Dan Stram
Professor
Division of Biostatistics and Genetic Epidemiology
Department of Preventive Medicine,
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, CA