HLWYM HEmails

From: Luis Ibarra
Sent: Friday, December 14, 2007 11:56 AM
To: John Stamatkos; Asadul Chowdhury
Cc: Mysore Nataraja; Robert Johnson (NMSS); Mahendra Shah; Biswajit Dasgupta
Subject: RE: Comments on Seismic Topical Report
Attachments: image002.gif; image001.gif

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

John,

Some comments about your email:

"This conclusion appears to presume that the target performance probability of 10e-6 is for each SSC, when in fact the target performance probability of 10e-6 is for the event sequence not the individual SSCs. "

The conclusion does not indicate whether one or more SSCs are used. The comment about the difference between design and performance levels applies for one SSC or the entire event sequence. Keep also in mind that some failure modes such as collapse of reinforced concrete structures may reduce the event sequence to the seismic initiating event.

"Thus the observation of a large difference between the design and performance probabilities leading to unprecedented performance demonstration appears to be an exaggeration."

We actually wrote "there are no precedents for seismic methodologies in which the MAPE difference between the design level and the performance level is more than two orders of magnitude (from MAPE of 5×10^{-4} to 1×10^{-6})." In any case, saying that something has never been done before is not an exaggeration.

Thanks.

Luis

From: John Stamatakos [mailto:jstam@cnwra.swri.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, December 11, 2007 9:54 AM
To: 'Asad Chowdhury'
Cc: 'Mysore Nataraja'; 'Robert Johnson'; 'Mahendra Shah'; 'Bis Dasgupta'; 'Luis Ibarra'
Subject: RE: Comments on Seismic Topical Report

I have no comments on the PSHA for this review. I would note that your summary statement is not consistent with my understanding of the PSCA.

"There are no precedents for seismic methodologies in which the MAPE difference between the design level and the performance level is more than two orders of magnitude (from MAPE of 5×10^{-4} to 1×10^{-6}). Thus, the simplified DOE seismic methodology based on $C_{1\%}$ (approximated by the HCLPF capacity) and a proposed composite log standard deviation (β) does not provide confidence in the computed probability of failure of seismically initiated event sequences, which is required to satisfy Part 63."

This conclusion appears to presume that the target performance probability of 10e-6 is for each SSC, when in fact the target performance probability of 10e-6 is for the event sequence not the individual SSCs. Thus the observation of a large difference between the design and performance probabilities leading to unprecedented performance demonstration appears to be an exaggeration.

JOHN

From: Asad Chowdhury [mailto:achowdhury@cnwra.swri.edu]
Sent: Saturday, December 08, 2007 6:03 PM
To: John Stamatakos; Robert K. Johnson
Cc: Asadul Chowdhury
Subject: Comments on Seismic Topical Report

Robert and John:

Comments on Seismic Topical Report are in the attachment.

Asad

-----Original Message-----
From: Asad Chowdhury [mailto:achowdhury@cnwra.swri.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, November 28, 2007 4:53 PM
To: Robert K. Johnson; Sheena Whaley; Yong Kim
Cc: Asadul Chowdhury; Biswajit Dasgupta; Luis Ibarra
Subject:

All:

CNWRA draft comments on the Seismic Topical Report are in the Attachment, except seismic hazards section. John Stamatakos and Buck need to look at that section. I have already left a message for John.

If you have any questions, please call me.

Asad

Hearing Identifier: HLW_YuccaMountain_Hold_EX
Email Number: 921

Mail Envelope Properties (libarra@cnwra.swri.edu20071214115600)

Subject: RE: Comments on Seismic Topical Report
Sent Date: 12/14/2007 11:56:16 AM
Received Date: 12/14/2007 11:56:00 AM
From: Luis Ibarra

Created By: libarra@cnwra.swri.edu

Recipients:
"Mysore Nataraja" <Mysore.Nataraja@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Robert Johnson (NMSS)" <Robert.Johnson@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Mahendra Shah" <Mahendra.Shah@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Biswajit Dasgupta" <bdasgupta@cnwra.swri.edu>
Tracking Status: None
"John Stamatkos" <jstam@cnwra.swri.edu>
Tracking Status: None
"Asadul Chowdhury" <achowdhury@cnwra.swri.edu>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office:

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	3500	12/14/2007 11:56:00 AM
image002.gif	160	
image001.gif	181	

Options
Priority: Standard
Return Notification: No
Reply Requested: No
Sensitivity: Normal
Expiration Date:
Recipients Received: Follow up

β

$C_{1\%}$