From: lawrence.salomone@srs.gov [mailto:lawrence.salomone@srs.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, September 07, 2010 9:58 AM
To: Kevin Coppersmith
Subject: Fw: CEUS Report Comments
Importance: High

Kevin,

Here below are the first industry comments received from the EPRI Structural Reliability and Integrity (SR&I) Working Group.
Regards,
Larry Salomone
Project Manager

From: Pandya, Dhiren [mailto:dhiren.pandya@pgnmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 01, 2010 1:07 PM
To: Kassawara, Bob; 'Richards, John M'; 'Greg S. Hardy'
Subject: CEUS Report Comments

Bob,

Here are my comments based on a quick review of chapters 8/9:

1. The draft report, section 8.2 states: "Calculations of hazard for all three models use the EPRI (2004, 2006) ground motion equations, so the differences in hazard presented here between the three models is attributable to differences in the source models themselves." It is not clear which of the source characteristics (as listed on page 6 of the presentation to SR&I) contribute significantly to the differences in hazard (for each of the sites and soil conditions). What new earthquake data or methodology (which was not factored in the other 2 models) has resulted in the larger hazard prediction using the CEUS Model across the 7 sites? A discussion on this aspect (perhaps in a tabular format) would help the user understand what is different between the 3 models. A study to show the impact of CAV in the comparisons of the three models would be useful, in light of the fact the CAV was used for new plant licensing efforts. Page 5 of the presentation lists a number of technical advancements. Some appear to be for developing the source model and some appear to be for the hazard calculation methodology. Is this correct? For the results presented in section 8, when the hazard was calculated for each of the three source models and compared, was the hazard calculation methodology identical for each of the 3 models? If different, discuss the differences in the methodology, and it's contribution to the differences in hazard between the three models.

Dhiren C. Pandya
Chief Engineer Section, Raleigh
Progress Energy
Mail Code: PEB6
(919) 546-7431
(919) 546-4361 (fax)