Poehler, Jeffrey 8

From: Poehler, Jeffrey
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 1:54 PM
To: Purtscher, Patrick
Subject: RE: Peer Review of SE Input for Vermont Yankee Core Plate Bolt Analysis (ME6248)

Thanks for your comments. I'll address.

Jeff

From: Purtscher, Patrick
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 1:53 PM
To: Poehler, Jeffrey
Subject: RE: Peer Review of SE Input for Vermont Yankee Core Plate Bolt Analysis (ME6248)

Jeff,

The 3rd sentence in Section 3.2.1 doesn't seem clear enough for the reader, I think it needs rewording.

Footnote 2, don't you mean displacement per atom?

Regarding Figure H-7 from MRP-175, I looked at it and I think 75% is a realistic lower bound, still better than the 50% line that is drawn, but more relaxation than the mean value. Would that 25% relaxation be a problem based on what we know?

Pat

From: Poehler, Jeffrey
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 9:25 AM
To: Cheruvenki, Ganesh
Cc: Purtscher, Patrick
Subject: RE: Peer Review of SE Input for Vermont Yankee Core Plate Bolt Analysis (ME6248)

Did you guys have time to comment?

From: Cheruvenki, Ganesh
Sent: Tuesday, February 07, 2012 12:07 PM
To: Poehler, Jeffrey
Subject: RE: Peer Review of SE Input for Vermont Yankee Core Plate Bolt Analysis (ME6248)

Will do.

From: Poehler, Jeffrey
Sent: Tuesday, February 07, 2012 10:45 AM
To: Cheruvenki, Ganesh
Cc: Purtscher, Patrick
Subject: Peer Review of SE Input for Vermont Yankee Core Plate Bolt Analysis (ME6248)

Ganesh,

As discussed yesterday, please peer review (technical only) my SE input for Vermont Yankee. Use TAC ME6248. Note that it is not a complete SE because Pani has the lead on the SE. He can integrate my inputs into the structure of his SE.

B123

If you can give me comments by the end of the week that would be fine.

Pat, I copied you so if you have time to review your comments would also be appreciated.

Thanks,

Jeff