

Steven L Grise

12/12/2001 03:26:26 PM

To: Debbie J Mulrooney/AE/DuPont@DuPont
cc: Bernard J Reilly/AE/DuPont@DuPont, Robert F Pinchot/DEV/AE/DuPont@DuPont
Subject: Re: C.O. Doc #2 - Vapor Scavenging Coefficients []

Rob, Bernie -

I'll assume you will add the red line to the paragraph as Debbie describes.

All -

I realize I didn't put the references in completely. Partly because I didn't have them, partly because I followed the logic and discussion rather closely from Seinfeld's book. I can put them in if we feel it is necessary, since they are easy to get. What does everyone think ?

Steve

Debbie J Mulrooney

 Debbie J Mulrooney
12/12/2001 10:57 AM

To: Steven L Grise/AE/DuPont@DuPont
cc: Bernard J Reilly/AE/DuPont@DuPont, Robert F Pinchot/DEV/AE/DuPont@DuPont, Steven L Grise/AE/DuPont@DuPont
Subject: Re: C.O. Doc #2 - Vapor Scavenging Coefficients []

Steve,

A couple of comments. First I would add to the wording of the last paragraph as follows in red:

Results of the numerical integration are shown below in tabular and graphical form. The maximum intensity value used was 30 mm/hr, which exceeded the maximum observed intensity of 27.9 mm/hr recorded at the Washington Works site during 1996. (This is the year of on-site meteorological data that has been processed for use in the ISC model.)

Also, details on a couple of the references seem to be missing (Marshall & Palmer; Fuller et al). Were you planning to include a list of references at the end? Alternatively, you could give the details in the text like you did for the Seinfeld reference.

Other than that, this looks really good. And it looks like it was a lot of work. I'm glad you were the one who had to deal with the integrals, etc. and not me!

Debbie

EDD0079293