Tappert, Karen

From: Tappert, Karen
Sent: Wednesday, September 01, 2010 4:24 PM
To: 'Larry Danese'
Cc: Soo-hoo, Lang; Augustine, John; Dunlap, Ann
Subject: RE: Telecon Record

Importance: High

Mr. Danese,

Here's what I understood from our discourse:

1. You were advised that there is no current funding for this unsolicited proposal.

2. You were advised that the unsolicited proposal submitted was rejected based on the technical review by Mr. Bechtel.

3. You were advised that the FOIA submitted needs to be submitted to DOE's main FOIA office not me. http://management.energy.gov/foia_pa.htm

4. You were asked if you were requesting withdrawal of the FOIA and you agreed to confirm by email whether you were proceeding with this course of action after consulting with your colleagues.

Thank you for giving me a chance to respond.

Respectfully,

Karen Tappert

Business Management Specialist

Office of Nuclear Energy, NE-42

US Department of Energy

Phone (301) 903-5905 Fax (301) 903-9480

-----Original Message-----
From: Larry Danese [mailto:danese@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, September 01, 2010 3:21 PM
To: Tappert, Karen
Subject: Telecon Record

Ms. Tappert -

For the purpose of having a Corporate record, this email documents the essential elements of the telephone conversation at 2:00 PM between us.

Please let me know if I have anything incorrectly stated.

1. I was advised that there is no current funding for unsolicited proposals.

2. I was advised that the unsolicited proposal submitted was rejected based on the technical review by Mr. Bechtel.

3. I was advised that the FOIA submitted was not considered formal or accepted in that it was addressed to the wrong person and did not follow the specified format.

4. I was asked if I was requesting withdrawal of the FOIA, and I replied that I was not.

Larry Danese

Tracking:	**Recipient**	**Read**
	'Larry Danese'	
	Soo-hoo, Lang	Read: 9/1/2010 4:48 PM
	Augustine, John	
	Dunlap, Ann	

Tappert, Karen

From: Tappert, Karen
Sent: Wednesday, September 01, 2010 2:42 PM
To: Augustine, John; Dunlap, Ann
Cc: Soo-hoo, Lang
Subject: FW: FW: FOIA Request - NeuCon

All,

I spoke with Mr. Danese and let him know that there was no funding available for his proposal. I also stated that any documents available consisted of emails between NETL, Mr. Bechtel and me.

He expressed disappointment and felt that the technical review of his proposal was "grossly incomplete." (NE's Mr. Bechtel has had extensive experience with the subject of the proposal and NeuCon had actually consulted his thesis.)

Mr. Danese was offended by the timeliness of our response which I sent to Angela one day after receiving the initial proposal. Angela contacted me on June 10 and I responded with Mr. Bechtel's response on June 11.

As to the FOIA, Mr. Danese has said he will "speak to the others" and let me know by email as to whether he wants to go ahead with the request for information.

I will contact you when I hear from NeuCon and Mr. Danese.

Thanks for all your support,

Karen Tappert
Business Management Specialist
Office of Nuclear Energy, NE-42
US Department of Energy
Phone (301) 903-5905 Fax (301) 903-9480

-----Original Message-----
From: Tappert, Karen
Sent: Wednesday, September 01, 2010 10:53 AM
To: Augustine, John
Subject: RE: FW: FOIA Request - NeuCon

Certainly, I'll let you know how it all goes.

Karen Tappert
Business Management Specialist
Office of Nuclear Energy, NE-42
US Department of Energy
Phone (301) 903-5905 Fax (301) 903-9480

-----Original Message-----
From: John Augustine [mailto:John.Augustine@NETL.DOE.GOV]
Sent: Wednesday, September 01, 2010 10:49 AM

To: Tappert, Karen
Subject: RE: FW: FOIA Request - NeuCon

Hi Karen, thanks...there is really no reason for me to be on call but I would suggest having Ryan on it since he was the reviewer. thanks for doing this. John

>>> "Tappert, Karen" <Karen.Tappert@Nuclear.Energy.gov> 9/1/2010 10:39
>>> AM >>>
Hello John,

Yes, I'd be happy to arrange a conference call. Would you be in on the call and would you want Ryan Bechtel to be there if he's available?

Karen Tappert
Business Management Specialist
Office of Nuclear Energy, NE-42
US Department of Energy
Phone (301) 903-5905 Fax (301) 903-9480

-----Original Message-----
From: John Augustine [mailto:John.Augustine@NETL.DOE.GOV]
Sent: Wednesday, September 01, 2010 10:28 AM
To: Dunlap, Ann; Tappert, Karen
Cc: Lanauze, Angela
Subject: Re: FW: FOIA Request - NeuCon

Hi Karen,

I received an email from Mr. Danese yesterday and believe he would be agreeable to a phone conference to clarify the subject. Would you mind contacting him to set up a good time.

thanks,

John

>>> "Tappert, Karen" <Karen.Tappert@Nuclear.Energy.gov> 8/31/2010 11:32
>>> AM >>>
Hello All,

Please let me know what further action needs to be taken. I am open to having a phone conference if that would help clarify matters.

Thank you,

Karen Tappert
Business Management Specialist
Office of Nuclear Energy, NE-42
US Department of Energy
Phone (301) 903-5905 Fax (301) 903-9480

-----Original Message-----
From: Tappert, Karen
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2010 3:26 PM
To: Lanauze, Angela; Dunlap, Ann; Augustine, John
Subject: RE: FOIA Request - NeuCon

Hi All,

Please let me know what the next steps are. This is my first FOIA and I'm not precisely sure just what Mr. Danese requires and who should be providing it.

I've left a phone message for Ann Dunlap and will wait to hear from your office as to what action is needed.

Thanks very much.

Regards,

Karen Tappert
Business Management Specialist
Office of Nuclear Energy, NE-42
US Department of Energy
Phone (301) 903-5905 Fax (301) 903-9480

-----Original Message-----
From: Larry Danese [mailto:danese@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2010 11:50 AM
To: Tappert, Karen
Cc: Lanauze, Angela; Dunlap, Ann; Augustine, John
Subject: Re: FOIA Request - NeuCon

Ms. Tappert -

Please accept my apology for the unavoidable delay in responding. Thank you for your email. We appreciate your assistance in providing information that assists us in understanding the reason(s) for the rejection of our USP.

NeuCon reviewed a copy of Mr. Bechtel's thesis more than a year ago while researching information on optimizing target/emitter ratios and other technical issues. The thesis presents the analysis of a neutron source using an uncommon material (somewhat impure 235U). However, in function and construct, it is little different than neutron sources that the DOE has been designing and fabricating since the 1940's. We consider the design and manufacturing of neutron sources to be a mature technology, there being some 2,600 documents on the subject in DOE's Information Bridge.

While the neutrons that a source generates are important, the particular material generating the neutrons is not. The USP considers the construct of a neutron source using a mix of actinide materials as they may be presented for use from waste processes, but proposes to capture many of the generated neutrons, and use them to accelerate the decay of

those actinides that are part of the source material. It is this use that sets the USP apart from consideration of the sources themselves, and which we had hoped would be considered.

Based on the information in your email, I would agree with Mr. Bechtel's statement that "DOE would likely come back with no responsive documents," and I would acknowledge that it is not necessary to provide a copy of the thesis.

However, I wish to expand the FOIA request to include a copy of any written (including email) review, report, evaluation, and/or comparison to criteria, that Mr. Bechtel may have been created as part of the process to document the consideration of the USP. If there are none, please advise accordingly. I apologize for not including this in the original request. If it there is a formal process that must be followed to expand the FOIA, please let me know.

NeuCon Technology greatly appreciates the timely way in which you and your office have addressed this issue. Thank you so much for your assistance.

Larry Danese

CFO

NeuCon Technology

770-458-0534

----- Original Message -----
From: Tappert, Karen <mailto:Karen.Tappert@Nuclear.Energy.gov>
To: Dunlap, Ann <mailto:ann.dunlap@netl.doe.gov> ; Augustine, John <mailto:john.augustine@netl.doe.gov> ; 'Danese@comcast.net'
Cc: Lanauze, Angela <mailto:angela.lanauze@pr.netl.doe.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, August 18, 2010 1:06 PM
Subject: FW: FOIA Request - NeuCon

All,

Ryan Bechtel, the engineer reviewing this abstract, wrote in an email to me:

DOE would likely come back with no responsive documents, because the basis for my rejection of the USP was based on my master's thesis. My thesis is in the public domain, and was not funded by DOE and is not under DOE's control. Should it become necessary (if all he really wants is a paper showing that a very similar study was completed), a copy of my thesis can be found at:

http://etd.gatech.edu/theses/available/etd-08312006-144610/

NE's review was based on Mr. Bechtel's thesis, not on any initiative here at DOE. The underlined passage on the second page of the attached document is in error - the research in question was not accomplished here at DOE. The thesis was done at Georgia Tech and is in the public domain.

I hope this clears up any misunderstandings. Please confirm by return email if you need further information or wish to proceed with the FOIA request.

Thank you,

Karen Tappert

Business Management Specialist

Office of Nuclear Energy, NE-42

US Department of Energy

Phone (301) 903-5905 Fax (301) 903-9480

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

From: Ann Dunlap [mailto:Ann.Dunlap@NETL.DOE.GOV]

Sent: Wednesday, August 18, 2010 11:19 AM

To: Tappert, Karen

Cc: Augustine, John

Subject: FOIA Request - NeuCon

Dear Ms. Tappert:

I am attaching a FOIA request that was sent to me for processing which I believe should have been sent to your office for response.

After you get a chance to review it, would you please let me know if this should be answered by your office.

Thanks.

Ann C. Dunlap

Paralegal Specialist

FOIA Officer

National Energy Technology Laboratory

U. S. Department of Energy

626 Cochrans Mill Road

P. O. Box 10940

M/S 922/M210

Pittsburgh, PA 15236

(412) 386-6167

(412) 386-5949 - fax

email: ann.dunlap@netl.doe.gov

Tracking:

Recipient	Read
Augustine, John	
Dunlap, Ann	
Soo-hoo, Lang	Read: 9/1/2010 2:59 PM

Tappert, Karen

From: Tappert, Karen
Sent: Wednesday, September 01, 2010 12:25 PM
To: Augustine, John; Dunlap, Ann
Subject: FW: NeuCon Submittal/FOIA Request

FYI

Karen Tappert
Business Management Specialist
Office of Nuclear Energy, NE-42
US Department of Energy
Phone (301) 903-5905 Fax (301) 903-9480

-----Original Message-----
From: Larry Danese [mailto:danese@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, September 01, 2010 12:21 PM
To: Tappert, Karen
Subject: Re: NeuCon Submittal/FOIA Request

Ms. Tappert -

I am generally available those days except between about 11:30 and 2:00 at 770-458-0534 (land line).

While I don't know what the subject of the conference call might be, I think it might be helpful to you for me to briefly give our position.

1. Our submittal was unsolicited. Consequently, it is likely not subject to the same standard of review as a solicited proposal and could be rejected for most any reason. The fact that we happened to draw the reviewer that we did is part of the reason that I have never won the lottery.

2. Based on the stated cause of rejection, we requested the document(s) the reviewer used to establish their position. The reason for this was that we reviewed almost 3,000 documents before we invested $12,000 in preliminary evaluation of the potential of the process. One of the documents we had reviewed was Mr. Bechtel's thesis - which was provided to us by his Professor, Dr. Nolan Hertel. Dr. Hertel thought that it addressed actinide/beryllium ratio issues. It did not address those in any helpful way.

3. Upon seeing the document reference, we felt that it was not reasonable for Mr. Bechtel to take 6 weeks to reject our submittal based on his own work. Since we had already reviewed his thesis, we knew that it was not relevant to the proposal. Internally, this raised questions about the nature of Mr. Bechtel's review of the submittal and prompted us to extend the scope of the FOIA.

4. In truth, the FOIA for the source document was very important to us because of the current work we are trying to fund out of our own pocket. We were very concerned that in spite of our best effort, we had overlooked some analysis that, in deed, dealt with the accelerated disintegration of actinides. Mr. Bechtel's source document does not deal with that issue, it merely deals with the generation of neutrons - a very mature technology.

5. The followon request for information about the review itself is, unfortunately, likely to be more punitive than it is informational. We are certain that no objective review could have been done and wanted to verify that. In truth, it

makes little difference except as it may apply to your own internal process controls to assure reasonable reviews.

6. Our preference is that the submittal be reviewed by someone else and that we (NeuCon) use that as a reason to withdraw our FOIA. I realize that causing a new review may not be within your purview, but the substance of the proposal is really a good idea.

If you think that not much more can come from a continuing FOIA, let me know and I try will talk the others into withdrawing it. If any of this helps to obviate the need for a telephone call, I am also ok with that.

In the end, we were only trying to get some funding for what is an idea worth exploring - even if we would end up using Dr. Hertel at Georgia Tech to help us - and he wants to because it makes a good thesis project.

Larry
Cell 404-281-6956

----- Original Message -----
From: Tappert, Karen <mailto:Karen.Tappert@Nuclear.Energy.gov>
To: 'Larry Danese' <mailto:danese@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, September 01, 2010 10:43 AM
Subject: RE: NeuCon Submittal/FOIA Request

Hello Mr. Danese,

If you could provide me with your availability for this afternoon, 9/1, and Friday, 9/3, I will try to coordinate a phone conference for all of us.

Thank you,

Karen Tappert
Business Management Specialist
Office of Nuclear Energy, NE-42
US Department of Energy
Phone (301) 903-5905 Fax (301) 903-9480

-----Original Message-----
From: Larry Danese [mailto:danese@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, August 31, 2010 9:42 PM
To: Augustine, John
Cc: Tappert, Karen; Lanauze, Angela
Subject: NeuCon Submittal/FOIA Request

Mr. Augustine -

I was wondering if there might be a process or procedure under which NeuCon could request a reconsideration of our unsolicited proposal.

There are two reasons for the request.

The first is that the submittal itself was incompletely reviewed. The review was incomplete because the focus of the completed review was on the construct and analysis of a neutron source. While the proposal considers a neutron source, the review does not address the use of moderation and reflection of those neutrons to accelerate the decay of

the source material that generates the neutrons. This is the remarkable feature of the system.

The second is that the neutron source portion of the submittal may have been misunderstood. Mr. Bechtel's thesis provides an analysis of a specific construct of a neutron source consisting primarily of a single isotope. Such analysis is appropriate to a project that is intended to provide some new information and to demonstrate proficiency with the analytical tools common to the analysis. The thesis does that. The difference arises in that the general group of actinide materials do not lend themselves to such isotopic separation. Consequently, the source material must be considered as it is when it is separated from fuel fission products - a mix of materials consisting primarily of Americium, Curium and Neptunium. (Isotopes of Uranium and Plutonium are considered to have value and they would likely not be submitted to a deliberate accelerated decay process.) Our analysis would seek to optimize the ratio of actinides to beryllium to maximize neutron generation. This does, in fact, require similar calculations as was performed in the thesis, but it must consider the actinide mixture.

If such a reconsideration is possible, and could be allowed, it would be greatly appreciated; and, we recognize that the proposal could be rejected for other reasons.

Thank you for your consideration.

Larry Danese

----- Original Message -----
From: Larry Danese <mailto:danese@comcast.net>
To: Tappert, Karen <mailto:Karen.Tappert@Nuclear.Energy.gov>
Cc: Lanauze, Angela <mailto:angela.lanauze@pr.netl.doe.gov> ; Dunlap, Ann <mailto:ann.dunlap@netl.doe.gov> ; Augustine, John <mailto:john.augustine@netl.doe.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2010 11:50 AM
Subject: Re: FOIA Request - NeuCon

Ms. Tappert -

Please accept my apology for the unavoidable delay in responding. Thank you for your email. We appreciate your assistance in providing information that assists us in understanding the reason(s) for the rejection of our USP.

NeuCon reviewed a copy of Mr. Bechtel's thesis more than a year ago while researching information on optimizing target/emitter ratios and other technical issues. The thesis presents the analysis of a neutron source using an uncommon material (somewhat impure 235U). However, in function and construct, it is little different than neutron sources that the DOE has been designing and fabricating since the 1940's. We consider the design and manufacturing of neutron sources to be a mature technology, there being some 2,600 documents on the subject in DOE's Information Bridge.

While the neutrons that a source generates are important, the particular material generating the neutrons is not. The USP considers the construct of a neutron source using a mix of actinide materials as they may be presented for use from waste processes, but proposes to capture many of the generated neutrons, and use them to accelerate the decay of those actinides that are part of the source material. It is this use that sets the USP apart from consideration of

the sources themselves, and which we had hoped would be considered.

Based on the information in your email, I would agree with Mr. Bechtel's statement that "DOE would likely come back with no responsive documents," and I would acknowledge that it is not necessary to provide a copy of the thesis.

However, I wish to expand the FOIA request to include a copy of any written (including email) review, report, evaluation, and/or comparison to criteria, that Mr. Bechtel may have been created as part of the process to document the consideration of the USP. If there are none, please advise accordingly. I apologize for not including this in the original request. If it there is a formal process that must be followed to expand the FOIA, please let me know.

NeuCon Technology greatly appreciates the timely way in which you and your office have addressed this issue. Thank you so much for your assistance.

Larry Danese

CFO

NeuCon Technology

770-458-0534

----- Original Message -----
From: Tappert, Karen <mailto:Karen.Tappert@Nuclear.Energy.gov>
To: Dunlap, Ann <mailto:ann.dunlap@netl.doe.gov> ; Augustine, John <mailto:john.augustine@netl.doe.gov> ; 'Danese@comcast.net'
Cc: Lanauze, Angela <mailto:angela.lanauze@pr.netl.doe.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, August 18, 2010 1:06 PM
Subject: FW: FOIA Request - NeuCon

All,

Ryan Bechtel, the engineer reviewing this abstract, wrote in an email to me:

DOE would likely come back with no responsive documents, because the basis for my rejection of the USP was based on my master's thesis. My thesis is in the public domain, and was not funded by DOE and is not under DOE's control. Should it become necessary (if all he really wants is a paper showing that a very similar study was completed), a copy of my thesis can be found at:

http://etd.gatech.edu/theses/available/etd-08312006-144610/

NE's review was based on Mr. Bechtel's thesis, not on any initiative here at DOE. The underlined passage on the second page of the attached document is in error - the research in question was not accomplished here at DOE. The thesis was done at Georgia Tech and is in the public domain.

I hope this clears up any misunderstandings. Please confirm by return email if you need further information or wish to proceed with the FOIA request.

Thank you,

Karen Tappert

Business Management Specialist

Office of Nuclear Energy, NE-42

US Department of Energy

Phone (301) 903-5905 Fax (301) 903-9480

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

From: Ann Dunlap [mailto:Ann.Dunlap@NETL.DOE.GOV]

Sent: Wednesday, August 18, 2010 11:19 AM

To: Tappert, Karen

Cc: Augustine, John

Subject: FOIA Request - NeuCon

Dear Ms. Tappert:

I am attaching a FOIA request that was sent to me for processing which I believe should have been sent to your office for response.

After you get a chance to review it, would you please let me know if this should be answered by your office.

Thanks.

Ann C. Dunlap

Paralegal Specialist

FOIA Officer

National Energy Technology Laboratory

U. S. Department of Energy

626 Cochrans Mill Road

P. O. Box 10940

M/S 922/M210

Pittsburgh, PA 15236

(412) 386-6167

(412) 386-5949 - fax

email: ann.dunlap@netl.doe.gov

Tappert, Karen

From: Tappert, Karen
Sent: Wednesday, September 01, 2010 10:56 AM
To: Bechtel, Ryan
Subject: FW: NeuCon Submittal/FOIA Request

Hi Ryan,

I received the email below yesterday evening. John Augustine from NETL has requested just requested that you and I speak with Danese on a conference call and try to resolve this matter.

Are you available at all today?

Karen Tappert
Business Management Specialist
Office of Nuclear Energy, NE-42
US Department of Energy
Phone (301) 903-5905 Fax (301) 903-9480

-----Original Message-----
From: Larry Danese [mailto:danese@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, August 31, 2010 9:42 PM
To: Augustine, John
Cc: Tappert, Karen; Lanauze, Angela
Subject: NeuCon Submittal/FOIA Request

Mr. Augustine -

I was wondering if there might be a process or procedure under which NeuCon could request a reconsideration of our unsolicited proposal.

There are two reasons for the request.

The first is that the submittal itself was incompletely reviewed. The review was incomplete because the focus of the completed review was on the construct and analysis of a neutron source. While the proposal considers a neutron source, the review does not address the use of moderation and reflection of those neutrons to accelerate the decay of the source material that generates the neutrons. This is the remarkable feature of the system.

The second is that the neutron source portion of the submittal may have been misunderstood. Mr. Bechtel's thesis provides an analysis of a specific construct of a neutron source consisting primarily of a single isotope. Such analysis is appropriate to a project that is intended to provide some new information and to demonstrate proficiency with the analytical tools common to the analysis. The thesis does that. The difference arises in that the general group of actinide materials do not lend themselves to such isotopic separation. Consequently, the source material must be considered as it is when it is separated from fuel fission products - a mix of materials consisting primarily of Americium, Curium and Neptunium. (Isotopes of Uranium and Plutonium are considered to have value and they would likely not be submitted to a deliberate accelerated decay process.) Our analysis would seek to optimize the ratio of actinides to beryllium to maximize neutron generation. This does, in fact, require similar calculations as was performed in the thesis, but it must consider the actinide mixture.

If such a reconsideration is possible, and could be allowed, it would be greatly appreciated; and, we recognize that the proposal could be rejected for other reasons.

Thank you for your consideration.

Larry Danese

----- Original Message -----
From: Larry Danese <mailto:danese@comcast.net>
To: Tappert, Karen <mailto:Karen.Tappert@Nuclear.Energy.gov>
Cc: Lanauze, Angela <mailto:angela.lanauze@pr.netl.doe.gov> ; Dunlap, Ann <mailto:ann.dunlap@netl.doe.gov> ; Augustine, John <mailto:john.augustine@netl.doe.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2010 11:50 AM
Subject: Re: FOIA Request - NeuCon

Ms. Tappert –

Please accept my apology for the unavoidable delay in responding. Thank you for your email. We appreciate your assistance in providing information that assists us in understanding the reason(s) for the rejection of our USP.

NeuCon reviewed a copy of Mr. Bechtel's thesis more than a year ago while researching information on optimizing target/emitter ratios and other technical issues. The thesis presents the analysis of a neutron source using an uncommon material (somewhat impure 235U). However, in function and construct, it is little different than neutron sources that the DOE has been designing and fabricating since the 1940's. We consider the design and manufacturing of neutron sources to be a mature technology, there being some 2,600 documents on the subject in DOE's Information Bridge.

While the neutrons that a source generates are important, the particular material generating the neutrons is not. The USP considers the construct of a neutron source using a mix of actinide materials as they may be presented for use from waste processes, but proposes to capture many of the generated neutrons, and use them to accelerate the decay of those actinides that are part of the source material. It is this use that sets the USP apart from consideration of the sources themselves, and which we had hoped would be considered.

Based on the information in your email, I would agree with Mr. Bechtel's statement that "DOE would likely come back with no responsive documents," and I would acknowledge that it is not necessary to provide a copy of the thesis.

However, I wish to expand the FOIA request to include a copy of any written (including email) review, report, evaluation, and/or comparison to criteria, that Mr. Bechtel may have been created as part of the process to document the consideration of the USP. If there are none, please advise accordingly. I apologize for not including this in the

original request. If it there is a formal process that must be followed to expand the FOIA, please let me know.

NeuCon Technology greatly appreciates the timely way in which you and your office have addressed this issue. Thank you so much for your assistance.

Larry Danese

CFO

NeuCon Technology

770-458-0534

----- Original Message -----
From: Tappert, Karen <mailto:Karen.Tappert@Nuclear.Energy.gov>
To: Dunlap, Ann <mailto:ann.dunlap@netl.doe.gov> ; Augustine, John <mailto:john.augustine@netl.doe.gov> ; 'Danese@comcast.net'
Cc: Lanauze, Angela <mailto:angela.lanauze@pr.netl.doe.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, August 18, 2010 1:06 PM
Subject: FW: FOIA Request - NeuCon

All,

Ryan Bechtel, the engineer reviewing this abstract, wrote in an email to me:

DOE would likely come back with no responsive documents, because the basis for my rejection of the USP was based on my master's thesis. My thesis is in the public domain, and was not funded by DOE and is not under DOE's control. Should it become necessary (if all he really wants is a paper showing that a very similar study was completed), a copy of my thesis can be found at:

http://etd.gatech.edu/theses/available/etd-08312006-144610/

NE's review was based on Mr. Bechtel's thesis, not on any initiative here at DOE. The underlined

passage on the second page of the attached document is in error – the research in question was not accomplished here at DOE. The thesis was done at Georgia Tech and is in the public domain.

I hope this clears up any misunderstandings. Please confirm by return email if you need further information or wish to proceed with the FOIA request.

Thank you,

Karen Tappert

Business Management Specialist

Office of Nuclear Energy, NE-42

US Department of Energy

Phone (301) 903-5905 Fax (301) 903-9480

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

From: Ann Dunlap [mailto:Ann.Dunlap@NETL.DOE.GOV]

Sent: Wednesday, August 18, 2010 11:19 AM

To: Tappert, Karen

Cc: Augustine, John

Subject: FOIA Request - NeuCon

Dear Ms. Tappert:

I am attaching a FOIA request that was sent to me for processing which I believe should have been sent to your office for response.

After you get a chance to review it, would you please let me know if this should be answered by your office.

Thanks.

Ann C. Dunlap

Paralegal Specialist

FOIA Officer

National Energy Technology Laboratory

U. S. Department of Energy

626 Cochrans Mill Road

P. O. Box 10940

M/S 922/M210

Pittsburgh, PA 15236

(412) 386-6167

(412) 386-5949 - fax

email: ann.dunlap@netl.doe.gov

Tracking:

Recipient	Read
Bechtel, Ryan	Read: 9/1/2010 10:57 AM

Tappert, Karen

From: Tappert, Karen
Sent: Wednesday, September 08, 2010 11:10 AM
To: Dunlap, Ann
Subject: RE: Fwd: NeuCon FOIA Issues

Ann,

Thanks for your help and advice - I want to comply with all the necessary requirements to the fullest extent possible.

Karen Tappert
Business Management Specialist
Office of Nuclear Energy, NE-42
US Department of Energy
Phone (301) 903-5905 Fax (301) 903-9480

-----Original Message-----
From: Ann Dunlap [mailto:Ann.Dunlap@NETL.DOE.GOV]
Sent: Wednesday, September 08, 2010 11:03 AM
To: Augustine, John; Tappert, Karen
Subject: Re: Fwd: NeuCon FOIA Issues

My next step will be to go back to Mr. Danese and request that he file a formal electronic FOIA request. But at the same time, it is a good idea to collect the information he is requesting. I am sure I will be assigned the request by our HQ FOIA office.

Thanks in advance for your help.

Ann

Ann C. Dunlap
Paralegal Specialist
FOIA Officer

National Energy Technology Laboratory
U. S. Department of Energy
626 Cochrans Mill Road
P. O. Box 10940
M/S 922/M210
Pittsburgh, PA 15236
(412) 386-6167
(412) 386-5949 - fax
email: ann.dunlap@netl.doe.gov

>>> John Augustine 9/8/2010 10:55 AM >>>
thanks Ann....what is next step....will you request these emails from Ms. Tappert?

>>> Ann Dunlap 9/7/2010 8:09 AM >>>

FYI - modified request.

Ann C. Dunlap
Paralegal Specialist
FOIA Officer

National Energy Technology Laboratory
U. S. Department of Energy
626 Cochrans Mill Road
P. O. Box 10940
M/S 922/M210
Pittsburgh, PA 15236
(412) 386-6167
(412) 386-5949 - fax
email: ann.dunlap@netl.doe.gov

>>> "Larry Danese" <danese@comcast.net> 9/6/2010 10:15 PM >>>

Ms. Dunlap -

As you may know, Ms. Tappert has advised me that the FOIA submitted by NeuCon is invalid in that it was submitted to her. While I don't agree with that, I do want to be sure that we have the appropriate, and administratively correct, request.

Based on the revisions to the original FOIA described below, please let me know the best way to proceed.

NeuCon seeks to revise the FOIA request as follows:

1. Withdraw the request for those documents upon which DOE relied in reaching its determination that the subject of our unsolicited proposal had already been evaluated.

2. Amend the request to obtain copies of those emails, related to the consideration of the unsolicited proposal, sent between Ms. Tappert and Mr. Ryan Bechtel; and those emails originated by Ms. Tappert and sent to Mr. Augustine and/or Ms. Lanauze.

Thank you for your help.

Larry Danese
CFO
NeuCon Technology

Tappert, Karen

From: Tappert, Karen
Sent: Wednesday, September 01, 2010 10:53 AM
To: Augustine, John
Subject: RE: FW: FOIA Request - NeuCon

Certainly, I'll let you know how it all goes.

Karen Tappert
Business Management Specialist
Office of Nuclear Energy, NE-42
US Department of Energy
Phone (301) 903-5905 Fax (301) 903-9480

-----Original Message-----
From: John Augustine [mailto:John.Augustine@NETL.DOE.GOV]
Sent: Wednesday, September 01, 2010 10:49 AM
To: Tappert, Karen
Subject: RE: FW: FOIA Request - NeuCon

Hi Karen, thanks...there is really no reason for me to be on call but I would suggest having Ryan on it since he was the reviewer. thanks for doing this. John

>>> "Tappert, Karen" <Karen.Tappert@Nuclear.Energy.gov> 9/1/2010 10:39
>>> AM >>>
Hello John,

Yes, I'd be happy to arrange a conference call. Would you be in on the call and would you want Ryan Bechtel to be there if he's available?

Karen Tappert
Business Management Specialist
Office of Nuclear Energy, NE-42
US Department of Energy
Phone (301) 903-5905 Fax (301) 903-9480

-----Original Message-----
From: John Augustine [mailto:John.Augustine@NETL.DOE.GOV]
Sent: Wednesday, September 01, 2010 10:28 AM
To: Dunlap, Ann; Tappert, Karen
Cc: Lanauze, Angela
Subject: Re: FW: FOIA Request - NeuCon

Hi Karen,

I received an email from Mr. Danese yesterday and believe he would be agreeable to a phone conference to clarify the subject. Would you mind contacting him to set up a good time.

thanks,

John

>>> "Tappert, Karen" <Karen.Tappert@Nuclear.Energy.gov> 8/31/2010 11:32
>>> AM >>>
Hello All,

Please let me know what further action needs to be taken. I am open to having a phone conference if that would help clarify matters.

Thank you,

Karen Tappert
Business Management Specialist
Office of Nuclear Energy, NE-42
US Department of Energy
Phone (301) 903-5905 Fax (301) 903-9480

-----Original Message-----
From: Tappert, Karen
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2010 3:26 PM
To: Lanauze, Angela; Dunlap, Ann; Augustine, John
Subject: RE: FOIA Request - NeuCon

Hi All,

Please let me know what the next steps are. This is my first FOIA and I'm not precisely sure just what Mr. Danese requires and who should be providing it.

I've left a phone message for Ann Dunlap and will wait to hear from your office as to what action is needed.

Thanks very much.

Regards,

Karen Tappert
Business Management Specialist
Office of Nuclear Energy, NE-42
US Department of Energy
Phone (301) 903-5905 Fax (301) 903-9480

-----Original Message-----
From: Larry Danese [mailto:danese@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2010 11:50 AM
To: Tappert, Karen
Cc: Lanauze, Angela; Dunlap, Ann; Augustine, John
Subject: Re: FOIA Request - NeuCon

Ms. Tappert -

Please accept my apology for the unavoidable delay in responding. Thank you for your email. We appreciate your assistance in providing information that assists us in understanding the reason(s) for the rejection of our USP.

NeuCon reviewed a copy of Mr. Bechtel's thesis more than a year ago while researching information on optimizing target/emitter ratios and other technical issues. The thesis presents the analysis of a neutron source using an uncommon material (somewhat impure 235U). However, in function and construct, it is little different than neutron sources that the DOE has been designing and fabricating since the 1940's. We consider the design and manufacturing of neutron sources to be a mature technology, there being some 2,600 documents on the subject in DOE's Information Bridge.

While the neutrons that a source generates are important, the particular material generating the neutrons is not. The USP considers the construct of a neutron source using a mix of actinide materials as they may be presented for use from waste processes, but proposes to capture many of the generated neutrons, and use them to accelerate the decay of those actinides that are part of the source material. It is this use that sets the USP apart from consideration of the sources themselves, and which we had hoped would be considered.

Based on the information in your email, I would agree with Mr. Bechtel's statement that "DOE would likely come back with no responsive documents," and I would acknowledge that it is not necessary to provide a copy of the thesis.

However, I wish to expand the FOIA request to include a copy of any written (including email) review, report, evaluation, and/or comparison to criteria, that Mr. Bechtel may have been created as part of the process to document the consideration of the USP. If there are none, please advise accordingly. I apologize for not including this in the original request. If it there is a formal process that must be followed to expand the FOIA, please let me know.

NeuCon Technology greatly appreciates the timely way in which you and your office have addressed this issue. Thank you so much for your assistance.

Larry Danese

CFO

NeuCon Technology

770-458-0534

----- Original Message -----
From: Tappert, Karen <mailto:Karen.Tappert@Nuclear.Energy.gov>

To: Dunlap, Ann <mailto:ann.dunlap@netl.doe.gov> ; Augustine, John <mailto:john.augustine@netl.doe.gov> ; 'Danese@comcast.net'
Cc: Lanauze, Angela <mailto:angela.lanauze@pr.netl.doe.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, August 18, 2010 1:06 PM
Subject: FW: FOIA Request - NeuCon

All,

Ryan Bechtel, the engineer reviewing this abstract, wrote in an email to me:

DOE would likely come back with no responsive documents, because the basis for my rejection of the USP was based on my master's thesis. My thesis is in the public domain, and was not funded by DOE and is not under DOE's control. Should it become necessary (if all he really wants is a paper showing that a very similar study was completed), a copy of my thesis can be found at:

http://etd.gatech.edu/theses/available/etd-08312006-144610/

NE's review was based on Mr. Bechtel's thesis, not on any initiative here at DOE. The underlined passage on the second page of the attached document is in error - the research in question was not accomplished here at DOE. The thesis was done at Georgia Tech and is in the public domain.

I hope this clears up any misunderstandings. Please confirm by return email if you need further information or wish to proceed with the FOIA request.

Thank you,

Karen Tappert

Business Management Specialist

Office of Nuclear Energy, NE-42

US Department of Energy

Phone (301) 903-5905 Fax (301) 903-9480

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

From: Ann Dunlap [mailto:Ann.Dunlap@NETL.DOE.GOV]

Sent: Wednesday, August 18, 2010 11:19 AM

To: Tappert, Karen

Cc: Augustine, John

Subject: FOIA Request - NeuCon

Dear Ms. Tappert:

I am attaching a FOIA request that was sent to me for processing which I believe should have been sent to your office for response.

After you get a chance to review it, would you please let me know if this should be answered by your office.

Thanks.

Ann C. Dunlap

Paralegal Specialist

FOIA Officer

National Energy Technology Laboratory

U. S. Department of Energy

626 Cochrans Mill Road

P. O. Box 10940

M/S 922/M210

Pittsburgh, PA 15236

(412) 386-6167

(412) 386-5949 - fax

email: ann.dunlap@netl.doe.gov

Tappert, Karen

From: Tappert, Karen
Sent: Wednesday, September 01, 2010 10:39 AM
To: Augustine, John; Dunlap, Ann
Cc: Lanauze, Angela
Subject: RE: FW: FOIA Request - NeuCon

Hello John,

Yes, I'd be happy to arrange a conference call. Would you be in on the call and would you want Ryan Bechtel to be there if he's available?

Karen Tappert
Business Management Specialist
Office of Nuclear Energy, NE-42
US Department of Energy
Phone (301) 903-5905 Fax (301) 903-9480

-----Original Message-----
From: John Augustine [mailto:John.Augustine@NETL.DOE.GOV]
Sent: Wednesday, September 01, 2010 10:28 AM
To: Dunlap, Ann; Tappert, Karen
Cc: Lanauze, Angela
Subject: Re: FW: FOIA Request - NeuCon

Hi Karen,

I received an email from Mr. Danese yesterday and believe he would be agreeable to a phone conference to clarify the subject. Would you mind contacting him to set up a good time.

thanks,

John

>>> "Tappert, Karen" <Karen.Tappert@Nuclear.Energy.gov> 8/31/2010 11:32
>>> AM >>>
Hello All,

Please let me know what further action needs to be taken. I am open to having a phone conference if that would help clarify matters.

Thank you,

Karen Tappert
Business Management Specialist
Office of Nuclear Energy, NE-42
US Department of Energy
Phone (301) 903-5905 Fax (301) 903-9480

-----Original Message-----
From: Tappert, Karen
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2010 3:26 PM
To: Lanauze, Angela; Dunlap, Ann; Augustine, John
Subject: RE: FOIA Request - NeuCon

Hi All,

Please let me know what the next steps are. This is my first FOIA and I'm not precisely sure just what Mr. Danese requires and who should be providing it.

I've left a phone message for Ann Dunlap and will wait to hear from your office as to what action is needed.

Thanks very much.

Regards,

Karen Tappert
Business Management Specialist
Office of Nuclear Energy, NE-42
US Department of Energy
Phone (301) 903-5905 Fax (301) 903-9480

-----Original Message-----
From: Larry Danese [mailto:danese@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2010 11:50 AM
To: Tappert, Karen
Cc: Lanauze, Angela; Dunlap, Ann; Augustine, John
Subject: Re: FOIA Request - NeuCon

Ms. Tappert -

Please accept my apology for the unavoidable delay in responding. Thank you for your email. We appreciate your assistance in providing information that assists us in understanding the reason(s) for the rejection of our USP.

NeuCon reviewed a copy of Mr. Bechtel's thesis more than a year ago while researching information on optimizing target/emitter ratios and other technical issues. The thesis presents the analysis of a neutron source using an uncommon material (somewhat impure 235U). However, in function and construct, it is little different than neutron sources that the DOE has been designing and fabricating since the 1940's. We consider the design and manufacturing of neutron sources to be a mature technology, there being some 2,600 documents on the subject in DOE's Information Bridge.

While the neutrons that a source generates are important, the particular material generating the neutrons is not. The USP considers the construct of a neutron source using a mix of actinide materials as they may be presented for use from

waste processes, but proposes to capture many of the generated neutrons, and use them to accelerate the decay of those actinides that are part of the source material. It is this use that sets the USP apart from consideration of the sources themselves, and which we had hoped would be considered.

Based on the information in your email, I would agree with Mr. Bechtel's statement that "DOE would likely come back with no responsive documents," and I would acknowledge that it is not necessary to provide a copy of the thesis.

However, I wish to expand the FOIA request to include a copy of any written (including email) review, report, evaluation, and/or comparison to criteria, that Mr. Bechtel may have been created as part of the process to document the consideration of the USP. If there are none, please advise accordingly. I apologize for not including this in the original request. If it there is a formal process that must be followed to expand the FOIA, please let me know.

NeuCon Technology greatly appreciates the timely way in which you and your office have addressed this issue. Thank you so much for your assistance.

Larry Danese

CFO

NeuCon Technology

770-458-0534

----- Original Message -----
From: Tappert, Karen <mailto:Karen.Tappert@Nuclear.Energy.gov>
To: Dunlap, Ann <mailto:ann.dunlap@netl.doe.gov> ; Augustine, John <mailto:john.augustine@netl.doe.gov> ; 'Danese@comcast.net'
Cc: Lanauze, Angela <mailto:angela.lanauze@pr.netl.doe.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, August 18, 2010 1:06 PM
Subject: FW: FOIA Request - NeuCon

All,

Ryan Bechtel, the engineer reviewing this abstract, wrote in an email to me:

DOE would likely come back with no responsive documents, because the basis for my rejection of the USP was based on my master's thesis. My thesis is in the public domain, and was not funded by DOE and is not under DOE's control. Should it become necessary (if all he really wants is a paper showing that a very similar study was completed), a copy of my thesis can be found at:

http://etd.gatech.edu/theses/available/etd-08312006-144610/

NE's review was based on Mr. Bechtel's thesis, not on any initiative here at DOE. The underlined passage on the second page of the attached document is in error - the research in question was not accomplished here at DOE. The thesis was done at Georgia Tech and is in the public domain.

I hope this clears up any misunderstandings. Please confirm by return email if you need further information or wish to proceed with the FOIA request.

Thank you,

Karen Tappert

Business Management Specialist

Office of Nuclear Energy, NE-42

US Department of Energy

Phone (301) 903-5905 Fax (301) 903-9480

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

From: Ann Dunlap [mailto:Ann.Dunlap@NETL.DOE.GOV]

Sent: Wednesday, August 18, 2010 11:19 AM

To: Tappert, Karen

Cc: Augustine, John

Subject: FOIA Request - NeuCon

Dear Ms. Tappert:

I am attaching a FOIA request that was sent to me for processing which I believe should have been sent to your office for response.

After you get a chance to review it, would you please let me know if this should be answered by your office.

Thanks.

Ann C. Dunlap

Paralegal Specialist

FOIA Officer

National Energy Technology Laboratory

U. S. Department of Energy

626 Cochrans Mill Road

P. O. Box 10940

M/S 922/M210

Pittsburgh, PA 15236

(412) 386-6167

(412) 386-5949 - fax

email: ann.dunlap@netl.doe.gov

Tappert, Karen

From: Tappert, Karen
Sent: Tuesday, August 31, 2010 11:32 AM
To: Augustine, John; Dunlap, Ann
Cc: Lanauze, Angela
Subject: FW: FOIA Request - NeuCon

Hello All,

Please let me know what further action needs to be taken. I am open to having a phone conference if that would help clarify matters.

Thank you,

Karen Tappert
Business Management Specialist
Office of Nuclear Energy, NE-42
US Department of Energy
Phone (301) 903-5905 Fax (301) 903-9480

-----Original Message-----
From: Tappert, Karen
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2010 3:26 PM
To: Lanauze, Angela; Dunlap, Ann; Augustine, John
Subject: RE: FOIA Request - NeuCon

Hi All,

Please let me know what the next steps are. This is my first FOIA and I'm not precisely sure just what Mr. Danese requires and who should be providing it.

I've left a phone message for Ann Dunlap and will wait to hear from your office as to what action is needed.

Thanks very much.

Regards,

Karen Tappert
Business Management Specialist
Office of Nuclear Energy, NE-42
US Department of Energy
Phone (301) 903-5905 Fax (301) 903-9480

-----Original Message-----
From: Larry Danese [mailto:danese@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2010 11:50 AM
To: Tappert, Karen
Cc: Lanauze, Angela; Dunlap, Ann; Augustine, John

Subject: Re: FOIA Request - NeuCon

Ms. Tappert –

Please accept my apology for the unavoidable delay in responding. Thank you for your email. We appreciate your assistance in providing information that assists us in understanding the reason(s) for the rejection of our USP.

NeuCon reviewed a copy of Mr. Bechtel's thesis more than a year ago while researching information on optimizing target/emitter ratios and other technical issues. The thesis presents the analysis of a neutron source using an uncommon material (somewhat impure 235U). However, in function and construct, it is little different than neutron sources that the DOE has been designing and fabricating since the 1940's. We consider the design and manufacturing of neutron sources to be a mature technology, there being some 2,600 documents on the subject in DOE's Information Bridge.

While the neutrons that a source generates are important, the particular material generating the neutrons is not. The USP considers the construct of a neutron source using a mix of actinide materials as they may be presented for use from waste processes, but proposes to capture many of the generated neutrons, and use them to accelerate the decay of those actinides that are part of the source material. It is this use that sets the USP apart from consideration of the sources themselves, and which we had hoped would be considered.

Based on the information in your email, I would agree with Mr. Bechtel's statement that "DOE would likely come back with no responsive documents," and I would acknowledge that it is not necessary to provide a copy of the thesis.

However, I wish to expand the FOIA request to include a copy of any written (including email) review, report, evaluation, and/or comparison to criteria, that Mr. Bechtel may have been created as part of the process to document the consideration of the USP. If there are none, please advise accordingly. I apologize for not including this in the original request. If it there is a formal process that must be followed to expand the FOIA, please let me know.

NeuCon Technology greatly appreciates the timely way in which you and your office have addressed this issue. Thank you so much for your assistance.

Larry Danese

CFO

NeuCon Technology

770-458-0534

----- Original Message -----
From: Tappert, Karen <mailto:Karen.Tappert@Nuclear.Energy.gov>
To: Dunlap, Ann <mailto:ann.dunlap@netl.doe.gov> ; Augustine, John <mailto:john.augustine@netl.doe.gov> ; 'Danese@comcast.net'
Cc: Lanauze, Angela <mailto:angela.lanauze@pr.netl.doe.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, August 18, 2010 1:06 PM
Subject: FW: FOIA Request - NeuCon

All,

Ryan Bechtel, the engineer reviewing this abstract, wrote in an email to me:

DOE would likely come back with no responsive documents, because the basis for my rejection of the USP was based on my master's thesis. My thesis is in the public domain, and was not funded by DOE and is not under DOE's control. Should it become necessary (if all he really wants is a paper showing that a very similar study was completed), a copy of my thesis can be found at:

http://etd.gatech.edu/theses/available/etd-08312006-144610/

NE's review was based on Mr. Bechtel's thesis, not on any initiative here at DOE. The underlined passage on the second page of the attached document is in error – the research in question was not accomplished here at DOE. The thesis was done at Georgia Tech and is in the public domain.

I hope this clears up any misunderstandings. Please confirm by return email if you need further information or wish to proceed with the FOIA request.

Thank you,

Karen Tappert

Business Management Specialist

Office of Nuclear Energy, NE-42

US Department of Energy

Phone (301) 903-5905 Fax (301) 903-9480

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

From: Ann Dunlap [mailto:Ann.Dunlap@NETL.DOE.GOV]

Sent: Wednesday, August 18, 2010 11:19 AM

To: Tappert, Karen

Cc: Augustine, John

Subject: FOIA Request - NeuCon

Dear Ms. Tappert:

I am attaching a FOIA request that was sent to me for processing which I believe should have been sent to your office for response.

After you get a chance to review it, would you please let me know if this should be answered by your office.

Thanks.

Ann C. Dunlap

Paralegal Specialist

FOIA Officer

National Energy Technology Laboratory

U. S. Department of Energy

626 Cochrans Mill Road

P. O. Box 10940

M/S 922/M210

Pittsburgh, PA 15236

(412) 386-6167

(412) 386-5949 - fax

email: ann.dunlap@netl.doe.gov