

From: Goutam Bagchi *NR*
To: Glenn Kelly, Joseph Staudenmeier
Date: Thursday, July 13, 2000 08:58 AM
Subject: Re: Revision:Seismic Risk: Spent Fuel Pool Failures at 69 Sites

Glenn,

Hey, it is indeed my opinion!!! Do you think that the industry would set up something that is not beneficial to the majority? I designed many plants myself. I expect that all spent fuel pools founded on the ground should pass the check list. There might be an occasional plant where the superstructure or an overhead crane may have to be examined closely. Above ground pools need more scrutiny. What I remember is that Bob wants the use of CDFM approach because he suspects that plants may not reveal their vulnerabilities if they only use the 0.5 g screening technique. I do expect most plants to pass the seismic screening. The aspect ratio of the pool structure, the thickness of walls, highly ductile liner plates all provide a lot more margin than is recognized in the working strength type code evaluation. In an ultimate strength evaluation one would consider yield line formation, membrane (in-plane) tension capacity etc. and the margin to a catastrophic failure (you need catastrophic failure to loose a lot of water almost instantaneously) is considerably higher than the Level 2 HCLPF value. This is my professional opinion as a PE.

Thank you,
Goutam
301-415-3305

>>> Glenn Kelly 07/13 8:28 AM >>>
Goutam,

Are you sure that the vast majority are expected to pass? I thought I had read something in Kennedy's report that said he thought many might not.

Glenn

CC: Frank Akstulewicz

4/20/07