

From: Benson, Michael
To: Kirk, Mark; Stevens, Gary
Subject: RE: RG 1.161 PVP Paper
Date: Monday, July 30, 2012 9:16:00 AM

Not to mention all the other conservatism built into the method...

From: Kirk, Mark
Sent: Monday, July 30, 2012 9:08 AM
To: Benson, Michael; Stevens, Gary
Subject: RE: RG 1.161 PVP Paper

My understanding of the German view is that not "crediting" either crack stability (for ductile fracture issues) or crack arrest (for brittle fracture issues) is taken as an implicit conservatism (a.k.a. it makes them feel better). Oftentimes the degree of extra protection by dis-allowing crack arrest / ductile tearing is small, making the better feeling purely illusory ... but we humans (Germanic and otherwise) are masters at deceiving ourselves.

I know that this took a cynical term, but it is also correct, I believe

From: Benson, Michael
Sent: Monday, July 30, 2012 6:56 AM
To: Stevens, Gary; Kirk, Mark
Subject: RE: RG 1.161 PVP Paper

Just as a practical matter, the initiation criterion dominates the stability criterion. But, that's interesting. I would like to hear why the Germans object to the stability criterion.

From: Stevens, Gary
Sent: Wednesday, July 25, 2012 5:27 PM
To: Benson, Michael; Kirk, Mark
Subject: RG 1.161 PVP Paper

I talked to Cipolla today and he gave me a brief report on the presentation of this paper at PVP. There were a few minor questions, but he got some pushback on the tearing instability concept of the RG from the Germans. This is an old argument, as they have never allowed the use of this method in Germany. It ended with "we agree to disagree." Otherwise, an uneventful presentation.

Also, Russ owes Hardin a call-back from a few weeks ago – Hardin contacted him to try and escalate this issue since this is a proposed topic for an NRC/EPRI MOU Addendum.

Gary L. Stevens
Senior Materials Engineer
NRC/RES/DE/CIB
✉ Gary.Stevens@nrc.gov
☎ 301-251-7569

B/98