



REGULATORY GUIDE

OFFICE OF STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT

REGULATORY GUIDE 1.125

PHYSICAL MODELS FOR DESIGN AND OPERATION OF HYDRAULIC STRUCTURES AND SYSTEMS FOR NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS

A. INTRODUCTION

Paragraph (a) (3) (ii) of §50.34, "Contents of Applications; Technical Information," of 10 CFR Part 50, "Domestic Licensing of Production and Utilization Facilities," requires that the Preliminary Safety Analysis Report (PSAR) include information on the design bases of the facility and the relation of the design bases to the principal design criteria. Paragraph (a) (4) of §50.34 requires, in part, a preliminary analysis of the adequacy of structures, systems, and components provided for the prevention of accidents and the mitigation of the consequences of accidents.

This guide describes the desired coordination of an applicant with the NRC staff and the detail and documentation of data and studies that an applicant should include in the PSAR to support the use of physical hydraulic model testing for predicting performance of safety-related hydraulic structures and systems for nuclear power plants. The regulatory position of this guide is applicable only to physical models used to predict the action or interaction of surface waters with features located outside of containment. The recommendations of this guide are not applicable to internal plant systems or structures.

The Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards has been consulted concerning this guide and has concurred in the regulatory position.

B. DISCUSSION

Physical hydraulic models are often used to predict prototype performance. They are particularly useful where hydraulic structures and systems are of unusual

design or configuration and hydraulic parameters cannot be adequately evaluated by state-of-the-art analytical methods. Hydraulic models may also be used to establish conservative and reasonable design or operating bases for sites, structures, or systems involving thermal and erosional problems.

Examples of types of physical modeling studies include, but are not confined to, the following:

1. Intake structures.
2. Discharge structures.
3. Energy dissipation structures.
4. Spillway and tailwater ratings for dams (waterlevel discharge relations).
5. Release of water resulting from dam failures..
6. Wave runup, including tsunami effects.
7. Stability of structure when exposed to waves and protection therefrom.
8. Erosion and deposition in streams and other water bodies and protection therefrom.
9. Flow patterns and dispersion of heated or contaminated effluents in receiving water bodies.
10. Heat dissipation in receiving water bodies.
11. Response of moored floating bodies to incident wave systems.
12. Response of harbors to waves.

It has been the experience of the NRC staff that some applicants have not furnished sufficiently detailed information on physical hydraulic model studies for the staff to perform an adequate review. In some instances, staff involvement in the early planning of a model study would have resulted in savings of both NRC and applicant funds and time in the review and acceptance of the results.

Accordingly, the regulatory position describes the

* Lines indicate substantive changes from previous issue.

USNRC REGULATORY GUIDES

Regulatory Guides are issued to describe and make available to the public methods acceptable to the NRC staff of implementing specific parts of the Commission's regulations, to delineate techniques used by the staff in evaluating specific problems or postulated accidents, or to provide guidance to applicants. Regulatory Guides are not substitutes for regulations, and compliance with them is not required. Methods and solutions different from those set out in the guides will be acceptable if they provide a basis for the findings requisite to the issuance or continuance of a permit or license by the Commission.

Comments and suggestions for improvements in these guides are encouraged at all times, and guides will be revised, as appropriate, to accommodate comments and to reflect new information or experience. This guide was revised as a result of substantive comments received from the public and additional staff review.

Comments should be sent to the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, Attention: Docketing and Service Branch.

The guides are issued in the following ten broad divisions:

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Power Reactors | 6. Products |
| 2. Research and Test Reactors | 7. Transportation |
| 3. Fuels and Materials Facilities | 8. Occupational Health |
| 4. Environmental and Siting | 9. Antitrust and Financial Review |
| 5. Materials and Plant Protection | 10. General |

Requests for single copies of issued guides (which may be reproduced) or for placement on an automatic distribution list for single copies of future guides in specific divisions should be made in writing to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, Attention: Director, Division of Technical Information and Document Control.

documentation that should be furnished and the type of coordination between the staff and the applicant that should minimize the time necessary for acceptance of the results of model studies.

The information described in the regulatory position should be incorporated in the PSAR. However, the staff recognizes that it will not always be possible to incorporate such information in the initial application for a construction permit since studies of this type may not be undertaken until after the PSAR is submitted. Such information may, therefore, be added to the PSAR by amendment, either by reference to separate reports or by insertion into the PSAR.

C. REGULATORY POSITION

Because not all hydraulic design problems can be resolved by the mechanics of similitude and because there are limitations to hydraulic modeling, the NRC staff should be furnished with certain documentation for any structural, thermal, erosional, or other physical hydraulic models used by the applicant to establish design or operating bases. The regulatory position contained in this guide applies only to physical models used to predict the action or interaction of surface waters with safety-related features located outside of containment.

Generally, regulatory positions 1 and 3 describe information that should be furnished prior to actual model testing, and regulatory positions 4 through 6 describe information needed after testing is completed. Additionally, partial test results should be provided for staff review and acceptance during the course of testing to ensure reconsideration of parameters whose importance emerges after partial data collection. After completing the entire study, all the information should be consolidated either (1) as a separate report with appropriate reference added in the PSAR or (2) for insertion into the PSAR.

1. Prior to construction of the model, the applicant should submit information outlining (a) the problem to be resolved, (b) reasons for selecting the hydraulic model chosen to resolve the problem, (c) expected results to be obtained, (d) a detailed description of the model, including a description of materials, methods used to measure parameters, scale relations, and other physical characteristics of the model, (e) methods that will be used to analyze the data obtained from the model studies, and (f) a schedule of expected tests, proposed completion dates, and estimated dates for submittal of information for NRC staff review.

2. It is desirable that staff views and recommendations be solicited prior to model construction and following or coincident with the submittal of the information listed in regulatory position 1 and that arrangements also be made for appropriate members

of the staff to be present periodically during model operation to observe the actual performance of the model.

3. Furnish documentation on how the various conditions of geometric, kinematic, dynamic, and thermodynamic similitude that take into account the physical properties and flow state of the fluid (i.e., Froude, Reynolds, Euler, Cauchy, Weber, and other related numbers) have been considered. Because certain forces may act differently in a model than in a prototype, documentation should be provided to justify the neglect of any forces by showing that these forces (a) are of negligible magnitude, (b) compensate for other neglected forces in such a manner that the effects of both are negligible, or (c) are such that their neglect leads to conservative model results and establishment of conservative design or operating bases.

Documentation should be furnished on the methods used to satisfy the equations of similitude in the model. Also document the effects of scale distortions on data obtained from the model studies. Where applicable, model adjustment and verification procedures should be described, and information should be furnished on the validity of the model over a range of likely flow conditions, heat regimes, atmospheric conditions, and other physical parameters. Where applicable, demonstrate that the model will simulate known flow conditions, and provide this verification when historical data are available.

4. Where full-scale structures or systems having characteristics similar to those being modeled exist and information relative to the observed or measured performance of the existing structures or systems is available, the physical model results should be compared with the available information generated by the existing structures. If testing is or has been performed on existing full-scale structures or systems, such tests and their results should be described. Document the applicability of such tests to the problem in question, and discuss any conclusions derived from the tests. If the results of other model tests are used by the applicant, justify the use of these results and verify the ability of these other models to reproduce or predict prototype performance.

Detailed documentation of data obtained from existing full-scale structures and systems should be provided, including (a) instrumentation used, (b) description of the data collection network, (c) frequency of collection, (d) methods of collection, and (e) physical parameters existing at the time of collection, such as heat regimes, flow conditions, and atmospheric conditions.

5. Any changes to the original design of the prototypes as a result of the model test should be discussed. Document the designs that were modeled and the basis for modifying the design. Undesirable

flow characteristics or failure modes for the design tested, as well as any other problems, should be discussed.

6. The report covering the completed model tests should include (a) instrumentation used, (b) description of the data collection network, (c) frequency of collection, and (d) method of collection. Figures, drawings, photographs, and text submitted as documentation for regulatory positions 3, 4, and 5 should be provided in sufficient detail to allow the staff to evaluate independently the applicability of the model to the design problem in question. (A typical model investigation report¹ as published by the U.S. Army Waterways Experiment Station has been found acceptable in the past.) Provide bases for the interpretation of model results and for any conclusions

¹ Further information may be obtained by writing to the Commander and Director, U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Corps of Engineers, P.O. Box 631, Vicksburg, Mississippi 39180.

reached. In many instances, it may be advisable to provide partial test results for review. The models should not be dismantled² until the staff has reviewed the submittals.

D. IMPLEMENTATION

The purpose of this section is to provide information to applicants regarding the NRC staff's plans for using this regulatory guide.

This guide reflects current NRC practice. Therefore, except in those cases in which the applicant proposes an acceptable alternative method for complying with specified portions of the Commission's regulations, the method described herein will be used in the evaluation of submittals for construction permit applications until this guide is revised as a result of suggestions from the public or additional staff review.

² Preserving the model for a maximum of one year will be acceptable in most cases.