

**From:** Steven Long  
**To:** Michael Johnson  
**Date:** 9/12/02 9.20AM  
**Subject:** Subjects for MRP Meeting on PFM

Michael,

My purpose of the meeting is to understand how Pete "tuned" his model to "experience" and why they think that the results are "bounding "

For that, we will need to explore

1. The logical structure of the model. (I think I understand that well enough now, but there may be some details that we will find important that I don't recognize at the moment So, Pete should be ready to explain the details, but should not spend much time on an introductory presentation of modeling details.)
2. Exactly what are the numerical "experience" values and model outputs that Pete matched to perform the tuning and Pete's criteria for deciding that the model is "tuned."
3. Was any other parameter, in addition to the correlation coefficient between axial and circumferential crack growth rates, manipulated to achieve the tuning?
4. What is the rationale for the claim that the results of the "tuned" model bound the actual risk?
5. Additional or alternative "experience" data that can be used for tuning purposes and the results of alternative tuning
6. The degree to which the model can simultaneously match multiple "experience" data without retuning fro each comparison.

I hope this helps Pete and the MRP prepare for the meeting. These questions should not be news to Pete, since we have had several side-bar conversations about them at meetings where MRP has presented the results of his model

Steve

**CC:** Allen Hiser; Bill Bateman

B/141