Tappert, Karen

From: Ann Dunlap [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: Ann Dunlap [Ann.Dunlap@NETL.DOE.GOV]
Sent: Thursday, September 09, 2010 9:12 AM
To: danese@comcast.net
Cc: Augustine, John; Tappert, Karen
Subject: FOIA Request

Mr. Danese:

The best way to file your FOIA request is on HQ's electronic FOIA request webpage: http://management.energy.gov/FOIA/foia_request_form.htm.

The documents you have mentioned in our email are being collected in the meantime.

Please let me know if you have any questions. I can be reached at (412) 386-6167.

Thank you.

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: Ann Dunlap [Ann.Dunlap@NETL.DOE.GOV]
Sent: Tuesday, September 07, 2010 8:10 AM
To: Augustine, John; Tappert, Karen
Subject: Fwd: NeuCon FOIA Issues

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: Larry Danese [danese@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, September 01, 2010 6:02 PM
To: Tappert, Karen
Subject: Re: Telecon Record

Thank you for the clarifications. I will use these in our records.

I would have preferred arguing with you about why we have not been paid.

Thanks again.

----- Original Message -----
From: Tappert, Karen <mailto:Karen.Tappert@Nuclear.Energy.gov>
To: 'Larry Danese' <mailto:danese@comcast.net>
Cc: Soo-hoo, Lang <mailto:LANG.SOO-HOO@nuclear.energy.gov> ; Augustine, John <mailto:john.augustine@netl.doe.gov> ; Dunlap, Ann <mailto:ann.dunlap@netl.doe.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, September 01, 2010 4:24 PM
Subject: RE: Telecon Record

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

Tappert, Karen

From: Larry Danese [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

Tappert, Karen

From: Larry Danese [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: Bechtel, Ryan
Sent: Wednesday, September 01, 2010 11:26 AM
To: Tappert, Karen
Subject: RE: NeuCon Submittal/FOIA Request

Karen,

Let's plan on a 45 min meeting starting at 2. Please ask him to have a copy of my thesis (electronic or hardcopy) and copy of the Chart of the Nuclides, for the discussion. We know he has the former, and ANY nuclear engineer should have copy of the latter easily accessible. If not the information is available online, it will just be more cumbersome for him to read through.

-Ryan

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

Tappert, Karen

From: Bechtel, Ryan
Sent: Wednesday, September 01, 2010 10:59 AM
To: Tappert, Karen
Subject: RE: NeuCon Submittal/FOIA Request

I have like 48 microseconds I can spare between 2:30 and 3:00. Between now and 1:30 looks awful. What time are they proposing?

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

Tappert, Karen

From: Ann Dunlap [Ann.Dunlap@NETL.DOE.GOV]
Sent: Wednesday, September 01, 2010 10:58 AM
To: Augustine, John; Tappert, Karen
Cc: Lanauze, Angela
Subject: RE: FW: FOIA Request - NeuCon

Karen -

I do not think that I need to be involved in the call. At this time, it is not a FOIA request. As a result of your conference call, it may then become one, but for now, I don't believe my involvement is necessary.

Thanks.

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

>>> "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: Larry Danese [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: Larry Danese [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: Larry Danese [danese@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, August 18, 2010 2:08 PM
To: Tappert, Karen
Subject: Re: FOIA Request - NeuCon

Thank you for the quick responce. I am presently out of my office, and I will need a few days to look at the thesis.

Larry Danese
Sent from my iPhone

On Aug 18, 2010, at 1:06 PM, "Tappert, Karen" <Karen.Tappert@Nuclear.Energy.gov> wrote:

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/>
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: <mailto:ann.dunlap@netl.doe.gov> ann.dunlap@netl.doe.gov

<20100817110903972.pdf>

Tappert, Karen

From: Ann Dunlap [Ann.Dunlap@NETL.DOE.GOV]
Sent: Wednesday, August 18, 2010 11:19 AM
To: Tappert, Karen
Cc: Augustine, John
Subject: FOIA Request - NeuCon

Attachments: 20100817110903972.pdf

2010081711090397
2.pdf (106 KB)...

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

NeuCon
Technology, LLC

P.O. Box 80653
Atlanta, Ga 30366

F.L. Danese
Member
CFO

J.S. Hobbs
Member

A.H. Wells
Member

August 6, 2010

Ms. Ann Dunlap
FOIA/Privacy Act Officer
National Energy Technology Laboratory
P.O Box 10940
Pittsburgh, PA 15236-6167

Subject: FOIA Application Regarding an Unsolicited Proposal, "Analysis and Evaluation of a Passive Actinide Burner."

Dear Ms. Dunlap:

First, let me apologize for submitting this request in hard copy. I tried for several days to submit it electronically from the NETL FOIA page and was unsuccessful. This is not a request for any personal information.

Requestor Identification
Larry Danese
CFO, NeuCon Technology, LLC
P.O. Box 80653
Atlanta, GA 30366

Telephone: 770-458-0534
Email: Danese@comcast.net

I certify that I am the original submitter of the subject unsolicited proposal and that I am an Officer of NeuCon Technology, LLC.

Description of Requested Records
Those Documents, Reports, Papers, Studies, Data, Analysis, and Research Records or Narratives that form the basis of the rejection of the subject unsolicited proposal submitted by NeuCon Technology. The rejection notice cites prior research using the same analytical tools as was proposed in our submittal. This request seeks copies of the documents used to form the reason(s) for rejection. It is not necessary to provide interoffice emails related to the proposal submittal.

To assist in identifying the requested records, I offer the following partial email sent by Ms. Angela Lanauze on Thursday, July 15, 2010, with the subject line "Abstract Response":

Dear Mr. Danese,

Your abstract entitled "Analysis and Evaluation of a Passive Actinide Burner" has been reviewed by technical personnel at the Department of

NETL AUG 10 '10 AM 8:43

NeuCon
Technology, LLC

P.O Box 80653
Atlanta, Ga 30366

F. L. Danese
Member
CFO

J. S. Hobbs
Member

A. H. Wells
Member

Energy (DOE), National Energy Technology Laboratory (NETL), Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology.

After review, it was concluded that your project has already been researched through the DOE. Analyses with the same tools on the same problem have been completed. Therefore, we cannot consider funding this project as an unsolicited proposal.

If you would like ...(boilerplate regarding submittals deleted) ... 8f9438f.

If you have further questions, please contact me.

John N. Augustine
DOE Unsolicited Proposal Manager
john.augustine@netl.doe.gov
end of partial email – emphasis added.

Type of Requester
The requester is affiliated with a private corporation and seeking information for the use in the company's business.

Fees and Fee Waivers
I agree to Pay up to $1,000.00 in applicable fees and reproduction costs, but will consider higher amounts if notified and required.
I do not request expedited processing

NeuCon Technology personnel, including the undersigned, have reviewed almost 2,600 reports currently available on the DOE Information Bridge, without finding any reference to the technology that was proposed in the unsolicited proposal. While that does not mean that such documents and reports do not exist, we have spent $15,000 on studies and analysis thus far and would like to terminate that effort if the analysis named in the rejection email has in fact been done.

The email trail related to this request will show that we have made every effort to obtain this information informally.

Thank you for your assistance. Please let me know if any additional information in needed.

Best Regards,

Larry Danese

Larry Danese

Tappert, Karen

From: Bechtel, Ryan
Sent: Monday, July 26, 2010 9:05 AM
To: Tappert, Karen
Subject: RE: Information request for Danese Abstract

Karen,

Understood, thank-you.

I am a little concerned about the potential FOIA request, further down in the email. 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/

Thanks,

Ryan

-----Original Message-----
From: Tappert, Karen
Sent: Friday, July 23, 2010 4:35 PM
To: Bechtel, Ryan
Subject: FW: Information request for Danese Abstract

Ryan,

I have spoken to Angela about our response and this should be the end of it.

Thank you for your forbearance.

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: Angela Lanauze [mailto:Angela.Lanauze@PR.NETL.DOE.GOV]
Sent: Friday, July 23, 2010 4:03 PM
To: Tappert, Karen
Cc: Bechtel, Ryan
Subject: Information request for Danese Abstract

Hello Karen,

We have received a comment from Mr. Danese indicating that he could not find literature for his proposed R&D (his email is listed below). Would it be possible to give Mr. Danese Ryan Bechtel's contact information, so Mr. Danese could

speak directly with him.

His Abstract was sent through the Unsolicited Proposal Program to you on 6/10/10 and forwarded for review by Ryan on 6/11/10.

The formal response (in email below) was sent on 7/15/10.

Thank you.

Angela

Angela Lanauze, PRC
DOE Unsolicited Proposals
angela.lanauze@netl.doe.gov <mailto:angela.lanauze@netl.doe.gov>

>>> "Larry Danese" <danese@comcast.net> 7/22/2010 3:58 PM >>>

Ms. Lanauze -

I know this is not the only thing that you are working on, but has there been any progress on this request for document citation(s)?

We have reviewed some 2300 documents on the OSTI Information Bridge and have been unable to find anything relevant to our proposal.

This is not a challenge to the denial of the unsolicited submittal, it is just that we have $11,000 invested in studying the method suggested by our proposal, and would like to abandon the effort in place if it has already been studied.

We would appreciate any help that the DOE could give on studies that were the basis of rejection of the proposal.

Would it be better to go through the Freedom of Information process? and if so, should that be addressed to Mr. Augustine?

Thank you for the help.

Larry Danese

----- Original Message -----
From: Larry Danese <mailto:danese@comcast.net>
To: Angela Lanauze <mailto:Angela.Lanauze@PR.NETL.DOE.GOV>
Cc: John Augustine <mailto:John.Augustine@NETL.DOE.GOV>
Sent: Thursday, July 15, 2010 5:19 PM
Subject: Re: Abstract Response

Ms. Lanauze -

We did rather extensive research in trying to find if this process had been tried before we considered it, but had not been able to locate any papers on the process we proposed.

Would it be possible for you, or perhaps Mr. Augustine, to provide citations for the research that has been done?

Thank you for the help.

Larry Danese

----- Original Message -----
From: Angela Lanauze <mailto:Angela.Lanauze@PR.NETL.DOE.GOV>
To: danese@comcast.net
Sent: Thursday, July 15, 2010 1:44 PM
Subject: Abstract Response

Dear Mr. Danese,

Your abstract entitled "Analysis and Evaluation of a Passive Actinide Burner" has been reviewed by technical personnel at the Department of Energy (DOE), National Energy Technology Laboratory (NETL), Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology.

After review, it was concluded that your project has already been researched through the DOE. Analyses with the same tools on the same problem have been completed. Therefore, we cannot consider funding this project as an unsolicited proposal.

If you would like to identify future opportunity announcements and register to obtain grant e-mail notifications of those that may interest you, go to www.grants.gov <http://www.grants.gov/> . After clicking on 'Find Grant Opportunity,' you may apply for notifications under 'e-mail subscriptions'; then click on 'Notices Based on Advanced Criteria' to subscribe for specific areas that interest you. You will have to insert a Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number on this page. The General Services Administration provides access to the CFDA, which is a government-wide compendium of Federal programs, projects, services, and activities that provide assistance or benefits to the American public. The website contains financial and non-financial Federal assistance programs. The CFDA website is located at www.cfda.gov <http://www.cfda.gov/> ; under "Search" (right side of screen), click "Find Programs by Agency". The Dept. of Energy CFDA numbers can be located at: https://cfda.symplicity.com/?s=agency&mode=form&tab=program&id=f9b483c381bd2a656b43cec368f9438f <https://cfda.symplicity.com/?s=agency&mode=form&tab=program&id=f9b483c381bd2a656b43cec368f9438f> .

If you have further questions, please contact me.

John N. Augustine

DOE Unsolicited Proposal Manager

john.augustine@netl.doe.gov <mailto:john.augustine@netl.doe.gov>

Angela Lanauze, PRC
DOE Unsolicited Proposals
angela.lanauze@netl.doe.gov <mailto:angela.lanauze@netl.doe.gov>

Tappert, Karen

From: Angela Lanauze [Angela.Lanauze@PR.NETL.DOE.GOV]
Sent: Friday, July 23, 2010 4:03 PM
To: Tappert, Karen
Cc: Bechtel, Ryan
Subject: Information request for Danese Abstract

Hello Karen,

We have received a comment from Mr. Danese indicating that he could not find literature for his proposed R&D (his email is listed below). Would it be possible to give Mr. Danese Ryan Bechtel's contact information, so Mr. Danese could speak directly with him.

His Abstract was sent through the Unsolicited Proposal Program to you on 6/10/10 and forwarded for review by Ryan on 6/11/10.

The formal response (in email below) was sent on 7/15/10.

Thank you.

Angela

Angela Lanauze, PRC
DOE Unsolicited Proposals
angela.lanauze@netl.doe.gov <mailto:angela.lanauze@netl.doe.gov>

>>> "Larry Danese" <danese@comcast.net> 7/22/2010 3:58 PM >>>

Ms. Lanauze -

I know this is not the only thing that you are working on, but has there been any progress on this request for document citation(s)?

We have reviewed some 2300 documents on the OSTI Information Bridge and have been unable to find anything relevant to our proposal.

This is not a challenge to the denial of the unsolicited submittal, it is just that we have $11,000 invested in studying the method suggested by our proposal, and would like to abandon the effort in place if it has already been studied.

We would appreciate any help that the DOE could give on studies that were the basis of rejection of the proposal.

Would it be better to go through the Freedom of Information process? and if so, should that be addressed to Mr. Augustine?

Thank you for the help.

Larry Danese

----- Original Message -----
From: Larry Danese <mailto:danese@comcast.net>
To: Angela Lanauze <mailto:Angela.Lanauze@PR.NETL.DOE.GOV>
Cc: John Augustine <mailto:John.Augustine@NETL.DOE.GOV>
Sent: Thursday, July 15, 2010 5:19 PM
Subject: Re: Abstract Response

Ms. Lanauze -

We did rather extensive research in trying to find if this process had been tried before we considered it, but had not been able to locate any papers on the process we proposed.

Would it be possible for you, or perhaps Mr. Augustine, to provide citations for the research that has been done?

Thank you for the help.

Larry Danese

> ----- Original Message -----
> From: Angela Lanauze <mailto:Angela.Lanauze@PR.NETL.DOE.GOV>
> To: danese@comcast.net
> Sent: Thursday, July 15, 2010 1:44 PM
> Subject: Abstract Response
>
> Dear Mr. Danese,
>
> Your abstract entitled "Analysis and Evaluation of a Passive Actinide Burner" has been reviewed by technical personnel at the Department of Energy (DOE), National Energy Technology Laboratory (NETL), Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology.
>
> After review, it was concluded that your project has already been researched through the DOE. Analyses with the same tools on the same problem have been completed. Therefore, we cannot consider funding this project as an unsolicited proposal.
>
> If you would like to identify future opportunity announcements and register to obtain grant e-mail notifications of those that may interest you, go to www.grants.gov <http://www.grants.gov/> . After clicking on 'Find Grant Opportunity,' you may apply for notifications under 'e-mail subscriptions'; then click on 'Notices Based on Advanced Criteria' to subscribe for specific areas that interest you. You will have to insert a Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number on this page. The General Services Administration provides access to the CFDA, which is a government-wide compendium of Federal programs, projects, services, and activities that provide assistance or benefits to the American public. The website contains financial and non-financial Federal assistance programs. The CFDA website is located at www.cfda.gov <http://www.cfda.gov/> ; under "Search" (right side of screen), click "Find Programs by Agency". The Dept. of Energy CFDA numbers can be located at: https://cfda.symplicity.com/?s=agency&mode=form&tab=program&id=f9b483c381bd2a656b43cec368f9438f <https://cfda.symplicity.com/?s=agency&mode=form&tab=program&id=f9b483c381bd2a656b43cec368f9438f> .
>
> If you have further questions, please contact me.
>
> John N. Augustine
>
> DOE Unsolicited Proposal Manager

john.augustine@netl.doe.gov <mailto:john.augustine@netl.doe.gov>

Angela Lanauze, PRC
DOE Unsolicited Proposals
angela.lanauze@netl.doe.gov <mailto:angela.lanauze@netl.doe.gov>

Tappert, Karen

From: Angela Lanauze [Angela.Lanauze@PR.NETL.DOE.GOV]
Sent: Friday, July 23, 2010 4:00 PM
To: Tappert, Karen
Cc: ryan.bechtel@nuclear.energy.com
Subject: Information request for Danese Abstract

Hello Karen,

We have received a comment from Mr. Danese indicating that he could not find literature for his proposed R&D (his email is listed below). Would it be possible to give Mr. Danese Ryan Bechtel's contact information, so Mr. Danese could speak directly with him.

His Abstract was sent through the Unsolicited Proposal Program to you on 6/10/10 and forwarded for review by Ryan on 6/11/10.

The formal response (in email below) was sent on 7/15/10.

Thank you.

Angela

Angela Lanauze, PRC
DOE Unsolicited Proposals
angela.lanauze@netl.doe.gov <mailto:angela.lanauze@netl.doe.gov>

>>> "Larry Danese" <danese@comcast.net> 7/22/2010 3:58 PM >>>

Ms. Lanauze -

I know this is not the only thing that you are working on, but has there been any progress on this request for document citation(s)?

We have reviewed some 2300 documents on the OSTI Information Bridge and have been unable to find anything relevant to our proposal.

This is not a challenge to the denial of the unsolicited submittal, it is just that we have $11,000 invested in studying the method suggested by our proposal, and would like to abandon the effort in place if it has already been studied.

We would appreciate any help that the DOE could give on studies that were the basis of rejection of the proposal.

Would it be better to go through the Freedom of Information process? and if so, should that be addressed to Mr. Augustine?

Thank you for the help.

Larry Danese

----- Original Message -----
From: Larry Danese <mailto:danese@comcast.net>
To: Angela Lanauze <mailto:Angela.Lanauze@PR.NETL.DOE.GOV>
Cc: John Augustine <mailto:John.Augustine@NETL.DOE.GOV>
Sent: Thursday, July 15, 2010 5:19 PM
Subject: Re: Abstract Response

Ms. Lanauze -

We did rather extensive research in trying to find if this process had been tried before we considered it, but had not been able to locate any papers on the process we proposed.

Would it be possible for you, or perhaps Mr. Augustine, to provide citations for the research that has been done?

Thank you for the help.

Larry Danese

> ----- Original Message -----
> From: Angela Lanauze <mailto:Angela.Lanauze@PR.NETL.DOE.GOV>
> To: danese@comcast.net
> Sent: Thursday, July 15, 2010 1:44 PM
> Subject: Abstract Response
>
> Dear Mr. Danese,
>
> Your abstract entitled "Analysis and Evaluation of a Passive Actinide Burner" has been reviewed by technical personnel at the Department of Energy (DOE), National Energy Technology Laboratory (NETL), Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology.
>
> After review, it was concluded that your project has already been researched through the DOE. Analyses with the same tools on the same problem have been completed. Therefore, we cannot consider funding this project as an unsolicited proposal.
>
> If you would like to identify future opportunity announcements and register to obtain grant e-mail notifications of those that may interest you, go to www.grants.gov <http://www.grants.gov/> . After clicking on 'Find Grant Opportunity,' you may apply for notifications under 'e-mail subscriptions'; then click on 'Notices Based on Advanced Criteria' to subscribe for specific areas that interest you. You will have to insert a Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number on this page. The General Services Administration provides access to the CFDA, which is a government-wide compendium of Federal programs, projects, services, and activities that provide assistance or benefits to the American public. The website contains financial and non-financial Federal assistance programs. The CFDA website is located at www.cfda.gov <http://www.cfda.gov/> ; under "Search" (right side of screen), click "Find Programs by Agency". The Dept. of Energy CFDA numbers can be located at: https://cfda.symplicity.com/?s=agency&mode=form&tab=program&id=f9b483c381bd2a656b43cec368f9438f <https://cfda.symplicity.com/?s=agency&mode=form&tab=program&id=f9b483c381bd2a656b43cec368f9438f> .
>
> If you have further questions, please contact me.
>
> John N. Augustine
>
> DOE Unsolicited Proposal Manager

john.augustine@netl.doe.gov <mailto:john.augustine@netl.doe.gov>

Angela Lanauze, PRC
DOE Unsolicited Proposals
angela.lanauze@netl.doe.gov <mailto:angela.lanauze@netl.doe.gov>

Tappert, Karen

From: Angela Lanauze [Angela.Lanauze@PR.NETL.DOE.GOV]
Sent: Friday, July 16, 2010 8:42 AM
To: Tappert, Karen
Subject: Larry Danese Abstract - Follow up question

Hello Karen,
We received a comment from Mr. Danese indicating that he could not find literature for his proposed R&D. Would it be possible to give Mr. Danese Ryan Bechtel's Contact information, so Mr. Danese could speak directly with him.
Thank you
Angeal

Angela Lanauze, PRC
DOE Unsolicited Proposals
angela.lanauze@netl.doe.gov <mailto:angela.lanauze@netl.doe.gov>

Tappert, Karen

From: Angela Lanauze [Angela.Lanauze@PR.NETL.DOE.GOV]
Sent: Monday, July 12, 2010 11:44 AM
To: Tappert, Karen
Subject: Abstracts past review date

Hello Karen,

Here is a list of abstracts that have been sent to you for technical review. Please review these and forward a response to me. Please let me know if you have any concerns.

Thank you.

	Nuclear Enegy, Science & Technology - Karen Tappert	
1	Danese, Larry	Passive Actnide Burner 6/10/2010

Angela Lanauze, PRC
DOE Unsolicited Proposals
angela.lanauze@netl.doe.gov <mailto:angela.lanauze@netl.doe.gov>

Tappert, Karen

From: Bechtel, Ryan
Sent: Friday, June 11, 2010 11:42 AM
To: Tappert, Karen
Subject: RE: Larry Danese Abstract

Karen,

In principle, this USP should go to the Fuel Cycle office for review as this is there area of research. However I have an extensive background using the codes described in this paper, and more to the point have already done an analysis with the same tools on the very same problem described in this paper during my first semester in grad school. So I am probably the best reviewer in NE for this USP. I have included my recommendation and hastily written review below.

In short, I do recommend NOT pursuing or funding this proposal. I recommendation is based on the following reasons:

1) The (a,n) neutron flux is too small to have an impact on the composition of the actinides. Reactor burners have fluxes 16+ orders of magnitude greater than isotopic systems. This means that few if any actinides will be activated to shorter lived isotopes. I did this analysis for my first master's degree (I can provide the thesis if needed), and the converted isotopes through (n,g) is very small; (n,f) is greater but not mentioned in the proposal (and that causes other regulatory issues)
2) The proposers should already know that the optimal ratio of (a,n) neutron generation is the 13:1 beryllide:actinide ratio. This is well established and does not need to be re-evaluated. So WBS-1 is not needed.
3) Making a homogenous mixture of beryllium and actinide (spent fuel) will be expensive, time consuming and highly technical, and I believe the process makes the waste a higher hazard category as neutrons and hard gammas are involved.
4) Optimizing a beryllium reflector shield (WBS-2) is fairly straight forward, and 1600 hrs is too extensive.
5) In WBS-3, the proposers wish to use origen-s code, which can actually do the same calculations required for their problem, listed in WBS-1 and 2, as was used in MCNP and Sources-4c (the latter of which has been integrated into origen). A 5 hour study using this code would prove my item 1.
6) Accelerator time would not be significantly cut using this proposal, see item 1.
7) A confirmatory test would cost much more than suggested here, and would take a long time. Plus new testing is not required. Old (a,n) sources could be cut open and examined to show that this method would not work.
8) The proposers would not be charged by RSICC for the computer codes, as they are on a DOE contract and therefore have access to the codes for free to perform this work. This of course only applies if we were to fund this study, which I recommend against.
9) The proposers list experience with working with the NRC and shipping regulations, but clearly do not know or mention extensive regulations that would be imposed on their product should it ever be built.

In conclusion, I don't think this should be funded. A firm literature review and back-of-the-envelope calculations should have been sufficient for the proposers to know that this is not viable or an effective means of eliminating long lived actinides.

-Ryan

-----Original Message-----
From: Tappert, Karen
Sent: Friday, June 11, 2010 10:16 AM
To: Bechtel, Ryan
Subject: FW: Larry Danese Abstract

Hi Ryan,

Attached is the most recent unsolicited proposal. If I'm not imposing on you, please review or let me know under whose purview this falls.

Hope you're not working too hard.

Thanks,

Karen Tappert

-----Original Message-----
From: Angela Lanauze [mailto:Angela.Lanauze@PR.NETL.DOE.GOV]
Sent: Thursday, June 10, 2010 4:15 PM
To: Tappert, Karen
Subject: Larry Danese Abstract

WITH THE INCREASED ACTIVITY OF FINANCIAL OPPORTUNITY ANNOUNCEMENTS (FOA'S) PUBLISHED AT THIS TIME, PLEASE ENSURE THAT THE REVIEWER DETERMINE ASAP IF THE PROPOSER'S TECHNOLOGY FITS UNDER THE SCOPE OF ANY CURRENT OR PENDING FOA'S UNDER THEIR COGNIZANT PROGRAM AREA SO THAT WE CAN NOTIFY THE SUBMITTER TO DETERMINE IF THEY WOULD CONSIDER APPLYING BEFORE THE CLOSING DATE....THANKS.

Karen...

The attached abstract was received by John Augustine, DOE Unsolicited Proposal Manager, NETL, Pgh., PA.

After a preliminary review by NETL technical personnel, it was determined that this abstract was best suited under your program area for review of programmatic interest.

NOTE: WHEN THE ABSTRACT IS FORWARDED ON FOR REVIEW, PLEASE NOTIFY THE DOE UNSOLICITED PROPOSAL OFFICE OF THE ASSIGNED PROGRAM REVIEWING OFFICIAL BY COMPLETING THE INFORMATION BELOW AND RETURNING TO OUR OFFICE VIA E-MAIL.

The subject abstract has been submitted for preliminary review to:

Name of Program Reviewing Official:

DOE Program Office Code:

Phone Number:

E-mail address:

This abstract is only a prelude to a full unsolicited proposal to determine if there is enough programmatic interest to warrant submission of a proposal and also to determine if the technology would fit under competitive announcements/solicitations within your program area.

Listed below are the three criteria requested in the abstract. If you determine that the abstract does not include sufficient information to conduct a preliminary review, please forward the abstract back to our office with any additional information to be requested so that we can notify the submitter to resubmit.

Abstract Sample Format: (3 different paragraphs)

1. What you propose to do and how (summary of at least 500 words.
2. Why it is beneficial to DOE.
3. How the technology meets DOE's mission (www.doe.gov/about/index.htm).

Review of this abstract is to be completed by 06/29/2010.

Please respond to John Augustine, DOE USP Manager at john.augustine@netl.doe.gov in order that we can draft a response and respond to the submitter to close out this action.

Thank you for your assistance.

Angela Lanauze, PRC
DOE Unsolicited Proposals
angela.lanauze@netl.doe.gov <mailto:angela.lanauze@netl.doe.gov>

Tappert, Karen

From: Angela Lanauze [Angela.Lanauze@PR.NETL.DOE.GOV]
Sent: Thursday, June 10, 2010 4:15 PM
To: Tappert, Karen
Subject: Larry Danese Abstract

Attachments: Larry Danese Abstract.pdf

Larry Danese Abstract.pdf (322...

WITH THE INCREASED ACTIVITY OF FINANCIAL OPPORTUNITY ANNOUNCEMENTS (FOA'S) PUBLISHED AT THIS TIME, PLEASE ENSURE THAT THE REVIEWER DETERMINE ASAP IF THE PROPOSER'S TECHNOLOGY FITS UNDER THE SCOPE OF ANY CURRENT OR PENDING FOA'S UNDER THEIR COGNIZANT PROGRAM AREA SO THAT WE CAN NOTIFY THE SUBMITTER TO DETERMINE IF THEY WOULD CONSIDER APPLYING BEFORE THE CLOSING DATE....THANKS.

Karen...

The attached abstract was received by John Augustine, DOE Unsolicited Proposal Manager, NETL, Pgh., PA.

After a preliminary review by NETL technical personnel, it was determined that this abstract was best suited under your program area for review of programmatic interest.

NOTE: WHEN THE ABSTRACT IS FORWARDED ON FOR REVIEW, PLEASE NOTIFY THE DOE UNSOLICITED PROPOSAL OFFICE OF THE ASSIGNED PROGRAM REVIEWING OFFICIAL BY COMPLETING THE INFORMATION BELOW AND RETURNING TO OUR OFFICE VIA E-MAIL.

The subject abstract has been submitted for preliminary review to:

Name of Program Reviewing Official:

DOE Program Office Code:

Phone Number:

E-mail address:

This abstract is only a prelude to a full unsolicited proposal to determine if there is enough programmatic interest to warrant submission of a proposal and also to determine if the technology would fit under competitive announcements/solicitations within your program area.

Listed below are the three criteria requested in the abstract. If you determine that the abstract does not include sufficient information to conduct a preliminary review, please forward the abstract back to our office with any additional information to be requested so that we can notify the submitter to resubmit.

Abstract Sample Format: (3 different paragraphs)

1. What you propose to do and how (summary of at least 500 words.
2. Why it is beneficial to DOE.
3. How the technology meets DOE's mission (www.doe.gov/about/index.htm).

Review of this abstract is to be completed by 06/29/2010.

Please respond to John Augustine, DOE USP Manager at john.augustine@netl.doe.gov in order that we can draft a response and respond to the submitter to close out this action.

Thank you for your assistance.

Angela Lanauze, PRC
DOE Unsolicited Proposals
angela.lanauze@netl.doe.gov <mailto:angela.lanauze@netl.doe.gov>