

44

**Erickson, Alice**

---

**From:** Galloway, Melanie *MARK*  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 13, 2011 8:39 AM  
**To:** Sheikh, Abdul; Lehman, Bryce; Erickson, Alice  
**Cc:** Manoly, Kamal; Hiser, Allen; Delligatti, Mark; Auluck, Rajender; Sakai, Stacie  
**Subject:** RE: Davis Bessee Shield Building

Thanks much, Abdul.

This will be useful information as part of the comparison presentation on the 22<sup>nd</sup>.

---

**From:** Sheikh, Abdul *MARK*  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 08, 2011 8:09 AM  
**To:** Lehman, Bryce; Erickson, Alice  
**Cc:** Manoly, Kamal; Galloway, Melanie; Hiser, Allen; Delligatti, Mark; Auluck, Rajender; Sakai, Stacie  
**Subject:** Davis Bessee Shield Building

During the briefing on December 6, 2011, there was a question about the similarity between Crystal River and Davis Bessee laminar cracking. The facts are:

- Davis Bessee shield building laminar crack widths are between 0.005 to 0.01 inch (5-10 mils)
- Crystal River containment laminar crack widths were between 0.5 to 4 inch (500 mil to 4000 mils)
- Ratio of crack widths between two structures: 50 to 400
- Crystal River cracking occurred 8-9 inches from the outside face of concrete
- Crystal River cracking is due to prestressing forces, lack of transverse shear reinforcement, and weak aggregate
- Davis Bessee shield building cracking is about 2-3 inches from outside face concrete
- Davis Bessee shield building is not prestressed
- Davis Bessee shield building has not been designed for containment accident pressure and temperature.
- Davis Bessee has a steel containment

All the above information indicates that laminar cracking at both structures are not similar.

Abdul

~~8~~ 44