

## PMLevyCOLPEm Resource

---

**From:** Habib, Donald  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 03, 2012 5:03 PM  
**To:** Snyder, Amy  
**Subject:** Public Documents for Levy 7/5 Public Call (2 of 3)  
**Attachments:** Pages from NRC Letter 108 RAI L-0998 Response - Draft 07-02-12\_Part2 Section 2 ML12185A087.pdf

Hello –

I am providing these documents to you in reference to your request related to call in to a public call between NRC and Progress Energy-Florida related to the Levy combined license application.

All documents are considered publicly available. However, in case any are not available through the NRC public website ADAMS search tool prior to the call, I am providing them at this time so that you have them for the call.

This is the SECOND OF THREE emails (1 attachment)

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Donald C. Habib  
Project Manager  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Office of New Reactors, DNRL/LB4  
Room T-6D14  
Washington, DC 20555  
301-415-1035  
[Donald.Habib@nrc.gov](mailto:Donald.Habib@nrc.gov)

**Hearing Identifier:** Levy\_County\_COL\_Public  
**Email Number:** 1162

**Mail Envelope Properties** (Donald.Habib@nrc.gov20120703170200)

**Subject:** Public Documents for Levy 7/5 Public Call (2 of 3)  
**Sent Date:** 7/3/2012 5:02:37 PM  
**Received Date:** 7/3/2012 5:02:00 PM  
**From:** Habib, Donald

**Created By:** Donald.Habib@nrc.gov

**Recipients:**  
"Snyder, Amy" <Amy.Snyder@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None

**Post Office:**

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	801	7/3/2012 5:02:00 PM
Pages from NRC Letter 108 RAI L-0998 Response - Draft 07-02-12_Part2 Section 2 ML12185A087.pdf 3617452		

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




Figure 2.5.2-322: CEUS SSC model logic tree for the Charleston RLME source







Figure 2.5.2-323: Alternative Charleston source geometries for the Charleston source.




**Figure 2.5.2-324:** Location of seven demonstration sites used for hazard calculations in NUREG-2115 and the location of the LNP site. Approximate location of the LNP site is shown by the red star.




**Figure 2.5.2-325:** Comparison of hazard curves computed using AMEC E&I software with those listed in Chapter 8 of NUREG-2115 for the Central Illinois demonstration site



**Figure 2.5.2-326:** Comparison of hazard curves computed using AMEC E&I software with those listed in Chapter 8 of NUREG-2115 for the Chattanooga demonstration site




**Figure 2.5.2-327:** Comparison of hazard curves computed using AMEC E&I software with those listed in Chapter 8 of NUREG-2115 for the Houston demonstration site




**Figure 2.5.2-328:** Comparison of hazard curves computed using AMEC E&I software with those listed in Chapter 8 of NUREG-2115 for the Jackson demonstration site







**Figure 2.5.2-329:** Comparison of hazard curves computed using AMEC E&I software with those listed in Chapter 8 of NUREG-2115 for the Manchester demonstration site




**Figure 2.5.2-330:** Comparison of hazard curves computed using AMEC E&I software with those listed in Chapter 8 of NUREG-2115 for the Savannah demonstration site




**Figure 2.5.2-331:** Comparison of hazard curves computed using AMEC E&I software with those listed in Chapter 8 of NUREG-2115 for the Topeka demonstration site




**Figure 2.5.2-332:** Comparison of hard rock hazard for 0.5 Hz spectral accelerations for the LNP Site computed using updated EPRI-SOG model with those obtained using the CEUS SSC model.




**Figure 2.5.2-333:** Comparison of hard rock hazard for 1 Hz spectral accelerations for the LNP Site computed using updated EPRI-SOG model with those obtained using the CEUS SSC model.



**Figure 2.5.2-334:** Comparison of hard rock hazard for 2.5 Hz spectral accelerations for the LNP Site computed using updated EPRI-SOG model with those obtained using the CEUS SSC model.




**Figure 2.5.2-335:** Comparison of hard rock hazard for 5 Hz spectral accelerations for the LNP Site computed using updated EPRI-SOG model with those obtained using the CEUS SSC model.




**Figure 2.5.2-336:** Comparison of hard rock hazard for 10 Hz spectral accelerations for the LNP Site computed using updated EPRI-SOG model with those obtained using the CEUS SSC model.







**Figure 2.5.2-337:** Comparison of hard rock hazard for 25 Hz spectral accelerations for the LNP Site computed using updated EPRI-SOG model with those obtained using the CEUS SSC model.




**Figure 2.5.2-338:** Comparison of hard rock hazard for 100 Hz spectral accelerations (PGA) for the LNP Site computed using updated EPRI-SOG model with those obtained using the CEUS SSC model.





**Figure 2.5.2-339:** Contribution of the various source types to the total mean hazard at the LNP Site.




**Figure 2.5.2-340:** Comparison of hard rock UHRS based on updated EPRI-SOG model with results computed using the CEUS SSC model.

















**Figure 2.5.2-345:** Comparison of mean hazard curves for 0.5 Hz spectral acceleration computed with CAV for the finished grade elevation (left) and the GMRS elevation (right). Solid lines are results for the updated EPRI-SOG model with CAV applied to all magnitudes and dashed lines are for the CEUS SSC model with CAV applies only to magnitudes < M 5.5.




**Figure 2.5.2-346:** Comparison of mean hazard curves for 1 Hz spectral acceleration computed with CAV for the finished grade elevation (left) and the GMRS elevation (right). Solid lines are results for the updated EPRI-SOG model with CAV applied to all magnitudes and dashed lines are for the CEUS SSC model with CAV applies only to magnitudes < M 5.5.




**Figure 2.5.2-347:** Comparison of mean hazard curves for 2.5 Hz spectral acceleration computed with CAV for the finished grade elevation (left) and the GMRS elevation (right). Solid lines are results for the updated EPRI-SOG model with CAV applied to all magnitudes and dashed lines are for the CEUS SSC model with CAV applies only to magnitudes < M 5.5.



**Figure 2.5.2-348:** Comparison of mean hazard curves for 5 Hz spectral acceleration computed with CAV for the finished grade elevation (left) and the GMRS elevation (right). Solid lines are results for the updated EPRI-SOG model with CAV applied to all magnitudes and dashed lines are for the CEUS SSC model with CAV applies only to magnitudes < M 5.5.




**Figure 2.5.2-349:** Comparison of mean hazard curves for 10 Hz spectral acceleration computed with CAV for the finished grade elevation (left) and the GMRS elevation (right). Solid lines are results for the updated EPRI-SOG model with CAV applied to all magnitudes and dashed lines are for the CEUS SSC model with CAV applies only to magnitudes < M 5.5.




**Figure 2.5.2-350:** Comparison of mean hazard curves for 25 Hz spectral acceleration computed with CAV for the finished grade elevation (left) and the GMRS elevation (right). Solid lines are results for the updated EPRI-SOG model with CAV applied to all magnitudes and dashed lines are for the CEUS SSC model with CAV applies only to magnitudes < **M** 5.5.






**Figure 2.5.2-351:** Comparison of mean hazard curves for 100 Hz spectral acceleration computed with CAV for the finished grade elevation (left) and the GMRS elevation (right). Solid lines are results for the updated EPRI-SOG model with CAV applied to all magnitudes and dashed lines are for the CEUS SSC model with CAV applies only to magnitudes < M 5.5.




**Figure 2.5.2-352:** Comparison of UHRS for the GMRS elevation based on updated EPRI-SOG model with full CAV and the CEUS SSC model with modified CAV.





**Figure 2.5.2-353:** Comparison of UHRS for the PBSRS elevation based on the updated EPRI-SOG model with full CAV and the CEUS SSC model with modified CAV.



**Figure 2.5.2-354:** Development of horizontal GMRS based on the CEUS SSC model with modified CAV.





Figure 2.5.2-355 Comparison of GMRS based on updated EPRI-SOG and CEUS SSC models



**Figure 2.5.2-356:** Development of horizontal PBSRS based on the CEUS SSC model with modified CAV.