AmerGen Energy Company LLC 2oo Exelon Way Suite 345 Kennett Square, PA 19348

January 12, 2001 2130-00-20309

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Attn: Document Control Desk Washington, DC 20555-0001

- SUBJECT: OYSTER CREEK GENERATING STATION (OYSTER CREEK) OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR- 16 DOCKET NO. 50-219 RADIOLOGICAL CONSEQUENCE ANALYSIS FOR CONTROL ROOM OPERATORS AT OYSTER CREEK GENERATING STATION (TAC No. MA3465)
- REFERENCE: LETTER TO THE NRC DATED MARCH 31, 1997 (6730-97-2099), "RADIOLOGICAL CONSEQUENCE ANALYSIS FOR CONTROL ROOM OPERATORS AT OYSTER CREEK NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION"

The above referenced letter provided the Oyster Creek control room operator dose calculation incorporating application of the NUREG-1465 source terms as a pilot plant application of alternate source-term methodology for a BWR 2, Mark 1 containment plant. This application is currently under NRC review.

As a result of a meeting with NRC on this topic held July 28, 2000, AmerGen committed to revise Attachment 1 of the referenced letter to incorporate several changes. These changes include: (1) use of NRC Standard Review Plan 6.4 control room occupancy factors, (2) revised containment spray shut-off pressure of 1.0 psig containment pressure to reflect current plant Emergency Operating Procedures (EOPs), and (3) use of ARCON96 methodology and updated meteorological data (1995-1999) for determining atmospheric dispersion parameters for ground level release applied to the control room air intake closest to the radiological source.

A detailed description of implementation of the ARCON96 methodology and the updated meteorological data set (1995 - 1999) utilized is provided in AmerGen's letter to the NRC, dated December 19, 2000 (2130-00-20264), entitled, "License Amendment Request No. 283 - Control Room Habitability."

2130-00-20309 Page 2

A revised Attachment 1 - "Application of the NUREG-1465 Revised Design Basis Accident Source Term to the AmerGen Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station for the Assessment of Post-DBA Control Room Habitability," dated October 6, 2000, is provided as an enclosure to this letter. This revised document incorporates the above noted changes. It is noted that control room operator dose remains well within the 5 rem TEDE limit.

Also enclosed is a copy of the Polestar Calculation No. PSAT 05201H.08, Revision 1, "Dose Assessment for Oyster Creek Control Room Habitability", and Polestar Document No. PSAT 05201U.03, Revision 3, "Dose Calculation Data Base For Application of the Revised DBA Source Term To The AmerGen Oyster Creek Generating Station." These documents provide the dose calculation and major parameters and assumptions used in the calculation, as requested in NRC Request for Additional Information, Item No. 3, dated October 10, 2000.

If any additional information is needed, please contact David J. Distel at (610) 765-5517.

Very truly yours,

George B. Puble for James A. Hutton

Director - Licensing Mid-Atlantic Regional Operating Group

JAH/djd/vvg

- Enclosures: 1. Application of the NUREG-1465 Revised Design Basis Accident Source Term to the AmerGen Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station for the Assessment of Post-DBA Control Room Habitability, October 6, 2000
	- 2. Polestar Calculation No. PSAT 05201H.08, Revision 1, "Dose Assessment for Oyster Creek Control Room Habitability"
	- 3. Polestar Document No. PSAT 05201U.03, Revision 3, "Dose Calculation Data Base For Application of the Revised DBA Source Term To The AmerGen Oyster Creek Generating Station"
- **cc:** H. J. Miller, Administrator, USNRC, Region I H. N. Pastis, USNRC Senior Project Manager, Oyster Creek L. A. Dudes, USNRC Senior Resident Inspector, Oyster Creek File No. 96059

Application of the NUREG-1465 Revised Design Basis Accident Source Term to the AmerGen Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station for the Assessment of Post-DBA Control Room Habitability

Prepared by:

Polestar Applied Technology, Inc. Los Altos, CA

Under Contract No. W04280-03 to:

Electric Power Research Institute Palo Alto, CA

And revised

Under Purchase Order No. 01031110 to:

PECo Energy - Limerick Generating Station Pottstown, PA (Agent for AmerGen)

Approved by *Limes Milian* Date *(0/6/00)*

Table of Contents

 $- - - -$

 $\cdots \cdots \cdots$

———

a company of the company's

 $\bar{}$ $\ddot{}$

 $\ddot{}$

Summary of Dose Analysis for OCNGS Control Room Habitability

Introduction

The purpose of this document is to provide a detailed description of the way in which satisfactory Control Room (CR) habitability is being demonstrated for the AmerGen Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station (OCNGS). The principal issue is one of demonstrating compliance with Item III.D.3.4 of NUREG-0737 (Reference **1).** This item requires that each licensee evaluate CR habitability to determine if they are able to meet the CR habitability requirements of Standard Review Plan (SRP) 6.4, or alternatively, to "provide assurance that the habitability systems will operate under all postulated conditions to permit the control room operators to remain in the control room to take appropriate actions required by General Design Criterion [GDC] 19." Licensees are also required to submit sufficient information to permit "an independent evaluation of the adequacy of the habitability systems".

Important Plant Features

The OCNGS employs a General Electric BWR2 reactor with a five-recirculation pump reactor coolant system (RCS), two main steamlines, and a Mark I vapor suppression primary containment. The primary containment consists of a drywell (housing the RCS), a torus or wetwell which contains a vapor
suppression pool, and a vent system which connects the drywell to the torus with the vents terminating
beneath the level of the vents conduct the resulting steam into the vapor suppression pool thereby limiting the pressure response in the primary containment. When the steam in the drywell subsequently condenses, wetwell-to-drywell vacuum breakers permit the return of non-condensable gases to the drywell from the wetwell airspace, thereby avoiding negative pressure in the drywell.

The purpose of the containment is to isolate the remainder of the plant from the thermal-hydraulic effects of the LOCA and also to contain any radioactivity that may be released with the reactor coolant. The primary containment is surrounded by a reactor building (RB) which serves as a secondary containment. Under accident conditions the secondary containment is maintained at a slightly negative pressure by the standby gas treatment system (SGTS) which collects any residual primary containment leakage by filtering the building exhaust. The filtered exhaust is directed to the plant stack to obtain an elevated release of any radioactivity which may escape filtration, in particular radioactive noble gases.

Leaktightness is verified by designing the primary containment and its penetrations in a way that facilitates leak rate testing. The primary containment, including its penetrations and isolation valves, is designed, tested, and maintained so that even with peak accident pressure inside the containment, not more than 1% per day of the primary containment contents will leak out. Most of that leakage would then be processed by the SGTS.

Because of the effectiveness of the secondary containment as an accident mitigation feature of the plant. there is a particular concern with respect to primary containment penetrations which connect to conduits (i.e., piping or ductwork) which also penetrate the secondary containment. Such conduits may provide a continuous path for bypass of the secondary containment. For OCNGS these pathways include not only the main steamlines specifically cited in SRP 6.4, but also the isolation condenser vents mentioned in Reference 2 and four other pathways: the 2" gaseous nitrogen line which penetrates the RB on the east side, the 8" gaseous nitrogen line which penetrates the RB on the east side, the instrument air backup to the containment nitrogen supply which terminates in the turbine building (TB), and potentially, one of two drywell spray service air test lines (in the event that spray has not operated in one of the two loops as discussed below) which also terminates in the TB. All of these RB bypass pathways are specifically included in the LOCA dose model which is discussed below.

There are two fluid systems which have the potential to greatly influence the course of a postulated LOCA at OCNGS. One is the core spray system (with two independent and redundant loops) which draws water from the suppression pool and sprays it into the core region as an emergency core cooling system (ECCS), and the second is a containment spray system (with two independent and redundant loops) which draws water from the suppression pool, cools it by passing it through heat exchangers, and then returns it to the containment either as a simple cooling water flow directly to the vapor suppression pool or as a fine spray injected into the drywell (with a small parallel spray flow delivered to the airspace of the torus).

Characterization of the Design Basis Event for Control Room Habitability

The Design Basis Accident (DBA) event for CR habitability is a postulated accident intended to present challenges to the accident mitigation features of OCNGS at least as great as those presented by any other credible acci those consequences to the radiation dose limits established by Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10CFR), one can be reasonably assured of the protection of public health and safety. The definition of such an event must also include the potential for the loss of all offsite electrical power (if such a loss would make the consequences of the accident more severe) and also must include the worst single-failure of the Safety-Related equipment incorporated into the plant design for the purpose of accident mitigation. Such a single-failure could be system-wide (e.g., the failure of a diesel generator to start which would fail one electrical power division) or it could be limited to a single component such as a main steam isolation valve (MSIV) failing to close.

The consequences of the accident must also be assessed conservatively; i.e., in any aspect of the accident analysis involving uncertainty or stochastic behavior the assessment must make use of worst-case conditions or conditions which would have a more adverse impact only rarely (e.g., less than 5% of the time). An example of one such aspect is the atmospheric dispersion (or "X/Q") of airborne releases of radioactivity which is a stochastic process. Several additional conservatisms are discussed in the next section, and a list of conservatisms is included at the end of this report.

The OCNGS DBA event for CR habitability is defined to be a complete, "double-ended" rupture (DER) of the piping in one of the five reactor coolant recirculation loops. Furthermore, regardless of the "single failure" assumption referred to above, a complete failure of the ECCS for an extended period of time is also postulated. This extended failure of the ECCS permits substantial melting of the reactor core as required by 1 OCFR Part 100 for the definition of the DBA event for CR habitability. The duration of this complete ECCS failure is assumed to conform to the first two release periods of Reference 3.

Two single-failures were considered for the definition of the OCNGS DBA event for CR habitability. One was the loss of one of the two loops of containment spray/pool cooling. Current procedures instruct the operators to run only one system loop in spray mode even if both loops are available. Having the remaining loop operate in pool cooling actually increases the likelihood of having containment sprays shut off due to low drywell pressure; therefore, it is conservative to assume that both loops operate. The other, more limiting single-failure considered is the failure of an outboard MSIV to close in one of the two main steamlines. This failure eliminates a second point of leakage control in one of the two main steamlines and increases the assumed leak rate for that steamline. This failure also eliminates any delay and removal of airborne activity that could have occurred in the "dead" space between two closed MSIVs in the affected steamline.

A chronology of the assumed DBA event for CR habitability is given on Table I. The timing is taken principally from the assumptions of Reference 3, but details are taken from a MAAP4 (Reference 4) analysis of a recirculation loop LOCA with no ECCS for two hours after the onset of core damage. The onset of core damage is assumed to occur 30 seconds after the start of the LOCA. As stated in Reference 3, thirty seconds is a time-frame for onset of core damage that is more appropriate for a PWR, but it is being conservatively applied to OCNGS.

OCNGS Dose Model for Control Room Habitability

The overall dose calculation model consists of seven control volumes to represent the damaged core and RCS (CORE), the drywell portion of the primary containment (DW), the torus airspace or wetwell portion of the primary containment (WW), the suppression pool (SP), the reactor building or secondary containment (RB), the space between the two MSIVs in the one steamline wherein both MSIVs are assumed to successfully close (SL), and the control room, itself (CR). These control volumes are arranged as shown on Figure 1 with the various junctions that connect them. These junctions are associated with volumetric flows which determine the rate at which radioactivity is exchanged between the control volumes. In addition removal processes such as spray impaction, sedimentation, adsorption, pool scrubbing, filtration and others are modeled within and between the control volumes, as appropriate.

The junctions related to containment transport and environmental release include:

- Drywell-to-wetwell vent flow,
- Wetwell-to-drywell vacuum breaker flow.
- SGTS exhaust flow (via plant stack),
- Leakage flow to the RB from the drywell, the wetwell, and the suppression pool, and
- * Bypass pathways (MSIV leakage, isolation condenser vent valve leakage, and service air leakage to the TB, and gaseous nitrogen leakage to the yard).

÷.

 $\ddot{}$

 \overline{a}

Figure 1

The core junctions effect the release of radioactivity to both the drywell and the suppression pool in parallel. The drywell and suppression pool releases are an example of conservative "double-counting" in that the same amount of activity is assumed to be in both places at the same time.

Control room junctions exist in the model to take activity out of the environment (after it has been diluted by the appropriate X/Q) and bring it into the control room. The concentration of radioactivity within the control room is about the same as the concentration at the air intake, even on maximum recirculation flow.

There are several important aspects of the dose analysis model that require specific elaboration. These include MSIV Leak Rate, Reactor Building Bypass and Other Containment Leakage, Spray and Natural Removal, Containment Thermal -Hydraulics, and Meteorological Dispersion and Dose Calculation Methodology.

MSIV Leak Rate

The MSIV leak rate as a function of containment pressure is based on a model identical to that from
Reference 5 except that the MSIVs are assumed to be leaking at the current Technical Specification (TS)
limit of 15.975 s Reference 5 assumed a frictionless leak path for MSIV leakage and an isentropic expansion through that path. The flow can be modeled with the following expression:

Mass flow = $\rho AV = \rho A \{2c_pT_0[1-(P/P_0)^{(k-1)/k}]\}^{1/2}$

where: $V =$ velocity at the orifice

 $p =$ expanded density of the gas

 $A =$ orifice area

- **c=** specific heat capacity of the gas at constant pressure
- T_0 = source temperature of the gas
- $P =$ expanded pressure of the gas
- P_0 = source pressure of the gas
- $k =$ ratio of specific heats for the gas

Since $T_0 = P_0/(R\rho_0)$ and since $M^2 = 2/(1-k)[1-(P_0/P)^{(k-1)/k}]$ (where M is the maximum local Mach Number), then:

$$
1-(P/P_0)^{(k-1)/k} = 1 - 2/[2-(1-k)M^2]
$$

Mass flow =
$$
\rho A \{2c_pT_0[1-(P/P_0)^{(k-1)k}]\}^{1/2} = \rho A \{2c_pP_0/R\rho_0\}^{1/2} \{1-2/[2+(k-1)M^2]\}^{1/2}
$$

Then, since $\rho = \rho_0 / \{(2+(k-1)M^2)/2\}^{1/(k-1)}$, and defining $f(M,k) = (2+(k-1)M^2)/2$:

Mass flow = A {2c_pP₀ p_0/R }^{1/2}{1-1/f(M,k)}^{1/2}/{f(M,k)}^{1/(k-1})

Mass flow = A {2c_pP₀ ρ_0/R }^{1/2}{f(M,k)^{2/(1-k)}-f(M,k)^{(k+1)/(1-k)}}^{1/2}

Thus, the mass flow rate can be determined from the area, A, the upstream state, P_0p_0 , the gas composition, c_p/R and k, and the local Mach Number. The local Mach Number, in turn, is a function of k and P/P_0 except it cannot exceed unity. The Mach Number is:

$$
M = [2/(k-1)]^{1/2} [(P/P_0)^{(1-k)/k} - 1]^{1/2} \le 1
$$

The value of P/P_0 corresponding to $M = 1$ is the critical pressure ratio. Since P is always assumed to be 14.7 psia (the environment), there is a containment pressure which maximizes M to 1. Increasing the containment pressure beyond this point has no effect on P/P_0 as used in this expression.

The ratio c_p/R and the value of k are both determined by the nature of the gas. For steam k is approximately 1.3 and for nitrogen (or air) k is approximately 1.4. A linear interpolation is made between these two values for k in the drywell, based on the mole fractions of steam and air/nitrogen. The ratio c_p/R is simply $k/(k-1)$.

As noted previously, this model is the same as that used for Reference 5. Based on this model, Reference 5 assumed that the orifice diameter corresponding to a single MSIV leaking at its maximum rate was 0.51 mm. At that time, the maximum allowable leak rate was approximately 12 scfh at 20 psig (34.7 psia).

For the present TS leak rate limit of approximately 16 scfh at 35 psig (49.7 psia), the orifice size is slightly smaller (i.e., the limit is more restrictive). The orifice size corresponding to the current test is 0.49 mm, i.e.:

Mass flow

$$
= [\pi (0.49 \text{ mm}/305 \text{ mm/ft})^2 / 4][\sqrt{g_c(2)(3.5)(49.7 \text{ psia})(144 \text{ in}^2/\text{ft}^2)(3.38)(0.075 \text{ lbm/ft}^3)]}
$$

\n[(1.2)^{2/0.4} - (1.2)^{2.4/0.4}]^{1/2}
\n= (2.03E-6 ft²)(639.5 lbm/ft²-sec)(0.402 - 0.335)^{1/2} = 3.36E-4 lbm/sec = 16 sch

This orifice size is used with the above expression to determine the mass flow as a function of drywell absolute pressure and maximum local Mach Number (a function of the pressure ratio). The drywell density used to determine the mass flow is the sum of the steam and non-condensable gas masses divided by the volume of the drywell. The drywell volume leaked per unit time is the mass flow divided by the drywell density.

The only remaining question is the manner in which the leakages are affected by two closed isolation valves in series. If the Mach Number is very low (i.e., less than about 0.3, corresponding to a pressure difference of ab MSIVs in series leaking at the same rate would be the same for each valve. Such an assumption would be acceptable up to a total pressure difference of about 2 psi, 1 psi per valve. Under these conditions, the flow rate ac increases and more and more of the pressure drop occurs across the second valve in series, the pressure between the valves becomes almost as great as P_0 . This can be illustrated with the equation used above for the test case. For the fixed orifice area and gas properties, the expression reduces to:

Mass flow (SCFH) = $1.25P_0{f(M,k)}^{-6}$ - $f(M,k)^{-5}$ ^{1/2}

A plot of this equation is shown on Figure 2 assuming P_0 remains constant and P is increased (solid line). At P = 49.7 psia the flow rate is the test value of approximately 16 SCFH. This is the leak rate through the inboard MSIV that would occur as the outboard MSIV becomes increasingly leak tight. One can also observe the result for the outboard valve as P_0 increases, where P_0 for the outboard valve is the pressure between the valves (the same pressure as P for the inboard valve). The outboard valve leak rate is the dashed line. Where the two lines cross the mass leak rate is the same. One can see that the leak rate is that corresponding to a P_0 (for the outboard valve) of about 40 psia, and the leak rate is about 13 SCFH or 81% of the maximum 16 SCFH.

Therefore, the following assumption is made for two valves in series: below a containment pressure of 16.7 psia (2 psig) it is assumed that the flowrate for two valves in series is 71% ($\sqrt{2}/2$) of that for a single valve. Between 2 psig and 35 psig (49.7 psia) the multiplier is assumed to increase linearly to 81%; i.e., an increase of 0.3% per psig.

The same isentropic expansion flow model is used for the other RB bypass pathways discussed in the next section. However, for these other bypass pathways only a single closed valve is credited.

Reactor Building Bypass and Other Containment Leakage

There are several important containment leakage paths which have the potential to bypass the leakage collection, filtration, and elevated release features of the OCNGS SGTS. In order to exhibit "bypass" characteristics, a the RB and terminate at a point beyond the RB secondary containment boundary. Besides the MSIVs, there are RB bypass pathways for OCNGS terminating in the TB as well as on the East wall of the RB.

One potential RB bypass pathway which was evaluated but judged not to exhibit bypass characteristics is the drywell ventilation supply. This pathway terminates on the TB roof very near the air intake for the CR. but it employs standard, fabricated sheet-metal ductwork in sections common to the RB ventilation supply outboard of the containment isolation valves (CIVs) V-27-3 and -4. With the SGTS in operation, the RB ventilation supply is isolated (by V-28-42 and -43, as well as by other dampers) and the RB is maintained at a negative pressure. Under these conditions, the standard ductwork sections (which are not leak-tight) would be expected to transfer any leakage to the RB atmosphere for collection by the SGTS.

The other bypass pathways (which must be evaluated in parallel with the MSIV leakage into the main steamlines) are as follows:

8-inch N.• pathway

This pathway is connected to the drywell ventilation supply inboard of the CIV V-27-4. It is isolated by CIVs V-23-14 (inboard) and V-23-13 (outboard). It is also connected to the torus via CIVs V-23 16 and -15.

2-inch N2 pathway

This pathway is connected to the drywell ventilation supply inboard of CIV V-27-4, tapping off of the 8" N₂ pathway upstream of V-23-14. It is isolated by CIVs V-23-18 (inboard) and V-23-17 (outboard). There is also a run of this line which ties into the $8"$ N₂ pathway inboard of the torus CIV V-23-16. This extension of the $2''$ N₂ pathway is isolated from the containment by CIVs V-23-20 and -19. The composite 8" and 2" N_2 pathways are shown on Figure 3. The total leakage evaluated for these pathways is 13 scfh in the 2" line and 8.5 scfh in the 8" line. Maximum leakage is assumed in the 2" line to minimize removal.

TIP Pmuge

This is a 1/2" flowpath that ultimately connects to the 2" N_2 line discussed above. With an administrative limit of only 0.05 SCFH (for V-23-70) its impact is negligible (compared to the 13 SCFH assumed in the $2"$ N₂ line).

Instrument Air

This is a straightforward bypass flowpath in that CIVs V-6-0393 (an inboard check valve) and V-6-0395 (an outboard pneumatic valve) serve to isolate the nitrogen supply to the drywell for pneumatically operated valves loca

instrument air system that provides the bypass flowpath to the TB. The administrative leak rate limit for this flowpath is 2 SCFH.

Isolation Condenser Vents

These are two parallel flowpaths from the isolation condensers to the main steamlines beyond the outboard MSIVs. Each flowpath includes two CIVs, V-14-1 (inboard, B), V-14-5 (inboard, A), V-14 19 (outboard, B), and V-14-20 (outboard, A). Most of the run to the steamlines is a common 3/4" line. Each flowpath accounts for one SCFH; therefore, in the common piping the total flow would be 2 SCFH.

Drywell Spray Test Line

With sprays in operation it is unlikely that this line would provide a RB bypass pathway. However, for conservatism, it is assumed to leak at the same rate as the other bypass pathways to the TB.

Other Containment Leakage

The TS allowable leak rate for the OCNGS containment is 1.0 %/day. In order to consistently account for the explicit treatment of MSIV leakage and other RB bypass leak paths discussed above, the summation of the leak rates for these bypass pathways is subtracted from the global **1.0** %/day primary containment leak rate used in the dose analysis model. Together, these RB bypass pathways account for approximately 10 % of the assumed containment leakage. Also, given that the OCNGS containment spray system is credited for primary containment pressure control as well as airborne radioactivity removal (see the next section), it is reasonable to apply the overall leak rate reduction of 50 % at 24 hours normally reserved for PWRs (see Reference 7) to OCNGS. This 50 % reduction is not applied to the RB bypass pathways since pressure-dependent leakage for these pathways is calculated explicitly using the isentropic expansion flow model discussed above.

Spray and Natural Removal

A key feature differentiating the dose analysis for OCNGS from that for most BWRs is the crediting of the containment sprays in removing airborne radioactivity from the containment atmosphere as well as in controlling the containment pressure. The two parallel capabilities of the spray system (airborne radioactivity and containment pressure control) must be taken into account in the dose analysis.

The design flowrate of 3000 gpm (one pump operation in spray mode) is used in calculating the radioactivity removal capability of the containment spray system. Moreover, it is conservatively assumed that only one containment spray loop ever operates in spray mode. The other containment spray loop is assumed to be immediately placed into operation in containment heat removal mode. This is a conservative assumption because it maximizes the removal of heat from the containment while minimizing credit for radioactivity removal by the drywell sprays. Since sprays are tripped by the operator based on containment pressure and temperature limits, maximum cooling results in intermittent spray operation for more than the first hour of the two-hour radioactivity release phase. To a point, cold service water exacerbates this problem; and therefore, a moderately low service water temperature of 45 F is assumed. Colder service water temperatures have been investigated, but because they also result in a lowering of the initial containment temperature (and an increasing of the initial mass of non-condensable gases in the containment), it was found that intermittent spray operation did not occur under extreme "winter" conditions.

Spray system flowrates considerably greater (i.e., > 50 %) than the design value of 3000 gpm appear in the MAAP4 analysis of the plant's thermal-hydraulic behavior, and these flowrates contribute to the heat removal and intermittent spray operation. However, a substantial fraction of the spray flow may be "lost" (in terms of droplet formation and the development of a full spray pattern) because of interference with the containment shell and/or the reactor shield wall. Therefore, no increase beyond the 3000 gpm design flow is credited.

The nozzles are Spraying System Company 1-7G25 multi-cap designs wherein seven "caps" are clustered on a single nozzle. One cap sprays along the axis of the nozzle connection, while the six remaining caps are located around the body of the nozzle spraying at an angle approximately 60[°] to the axis. The nozzles are located on independent, redundant headers at two elevations in the drywell (two headers per loop) and on a common header in the torus airspace.

The upper drywell header (located at approximately the elevation of the drywell knuckle) uses 32 nozzles and the lower header (about 30 feet below) uses 56. At 40 psid these high-capacity nozzles pass about 34 gpm; therefore, with a total of 88 nozzles per loop, the total flow would be 2992 gpm. At 3000 gpm the pressure across the nozzles would be somewhat greater than 40 psid. At this differential pressure the mass median spray droplet size is $2600 \mu m$ (2.6 mm), with a $5th$ and $95th$ percentile of 1000 and 5000 μ m.

The spray removal rates for airborne particulate in the DW are calculated with the STARNAUA computer code (Reference 8). The thermal-hydraulic input for this analysis comes from the data discussed in the next section.

As mentioned previously, in addition to the drywell sprays, there is a small spray header at the top of the torus airspace with 10 nozzles (flow of about 340 gpm based on 40 psid across the nozzles). For these nozzles the removal rate is calculated based on the simple model described in SRP 6.5.2. It is substantially lower than the removal rates calculated for the drywell sprays.

It is assumed that elemental iodine is removed by the containment sprays at a rate equal to that of the particulate. It is believed that the elemental iodine, being reactive, will adhere to the aerosol. Even if this were not so, elemental iodine would be removed from the containment atmosphere at a rate greater
than that of the particulate. Re-evolution of elemental iodine may occur to a limited degree as the pH
of the suppressio evolution that may occur will not contribute noticeably to the radiation dose from airborne iodine.

In bypass flowpaths aerosol sedimentation is considered. For the one steamline in which two MSIVs are closed, the space between the two MSIVs is considered to be well-mixed, and STARNAUA is

used to calculate the sedimentation. The elemental iodine is assumed to be deposited with the particulate. However, 50% of the deposited elemental iodine is assumed to be re-evolved.

For bypass pathways other than the MSIVs, plug-flow is calculated to exist (in the limiting cases), and an exponential particulate removal is calculated based on sedimentation velocity as the flow transits the line. Only horizontal lengths are considered. Here, too, 50% of the deposited elemental iodine is assumed to be re-evolved.

For the steamline with the outboard MSIV assumed to be failed open aerosol deposition due to impaction (as the flow enters the assumed 0.5 mm diameter leakpath of the closed inboard MSIV) is considered. Based on Reference 9, it is expected that this deposition will conservatively exceed a factor of two (and actually, that the aerosol will plug the leak path, but this effect is neglected); and therefore, a factor of two removal is applied to both the particulate iodine and to the elemental iodine assumed to be adhered to it. For the steamline with both MSIVs closed, this effect is included in the STARNAUA sedimentation calculation.

Containment Thermal-Hydraulics

As has been previously discussed, a MAAP4 analysis for a double-ended rupture of one of the five recirculation loops is used as the basis for the analysis of radioactivity transport through the OCNGS facility and for its release to the environment.

At the beginning of the postulated event there is a rapid increase in the containment pressure, but by
the time the assumed release of radioactivity begins 30 seconds later, the reactor blowdown is complete
and the contain would be about one-third thermally saturated by this time, and complete saturation would require only about four to five minutes more. Therefore, beyond five minutes, the containment pressure would be decreasing only slowly, and the containment would become essentially quiescent.

At ten minutes the containment sprays are assumed to be actuated and the containment pressure decreases rapidly. Figure 4 (which shows the drywell pressure and temperature response) shows this quite well. Following the rapid decrease in drywell pressure, the sprays are terminated at one psig by operator action as discussed above. For simplicity, only two actuations are included in the dose analysis model, one during the gap release phase and one during the early in-vessel release phase. In making this simplification, however, the correct fraction of time that the sprays are running in each phase is preserved. This fraction is approximately one-third for each of the two phases; e.g., between 1345 seconds (when the sprays are first tripped) and the time that debris quench steaming begins at 4065 seconds. It is during this period of intermittent spray operation that most particulate radioactivity is leaked from the containment.

The moderate pressure spike which occurs at about 4000 seconds on Figure 4 is the relocation of core debris to the lower plenum of the reactor vessel. At this time, about one half of the drywell non condensables are purged into the torus airspace bringing about the modest increase in drywell pressure.

Figure 4 - Design Basis DW T/H

This would be an opportunity for substantial suppression pool scrubbing; but with an allowable leakage area of 10.5 in² for pool bypass, about 30 percent of the flow bypasses the pool. Using the SRP 6.5.5 value for pool scrubbing $DF (DF = 5$ for flow through a Mark I suppression pool), the overall DF is limited to 2.3 because of the bypass.

Of much greater importance is the spray actuation that begins at 4065 seconds when the drywell meets the pressure and temperature conditions for manual initiation. After this spray actuation the sprays remain on for a substantial period of time - until 13600 seconds. It is this spray actuation that provides the bulk of the containment atmosphere "clean-up". When ECCS is restored at 7230 seconds the sprays are already running. Thus, the containment pressure response is not greatly affected.

Following spray shut-off at 13600 seconds, the sprays are returned to operation at 18800 seconds and then are not finally tripped off until nearly eight hours into the event. By 14 hours (50400 seconds) into the event (when the MAAP4 analysis ends) the containment pressure has nearly reached 3 psig; but because the MAAP4 analysis has ended, it is assumed that the containment pressure continues to increase with no further spray actuations until 24 hours into the event. Beyond 24 hours, it is assumed that the containment pressure is one psig. This is in recognition of the fact that a combination of spray cooling, decreasing decay power, and assumed containment leakage of 0.5 %/day (15 % over 30 days) would be reducing the pressure continuously. Given the 30-day dose integration period for the CR

habitability assessment, the tendency would be for the containment pressure to approach atmospheric or even sub-atmospheric over that period. However, maintenance of a minimum containment pressure of one psig is a goal of the emergency operating procedures to ensure that oxygen intrusion does not occur; and it is assumed in this analysis that that objective is met.

The timing of the spray actuations discussed above is representative of many kinds of events. The key feature is that up to the time of rapid steam production associated with core debris interaction with water in the vesse conditions of containment and service water temperature) to be intermittent. Once any substantial coolant water interaction has occurred, however, the combination of steaming and hydrogen production will keep the sprays in operation for a long period of time.

In addition to establishing the conditions under which containment sprays may be assumed to operate, containment pressure and temperature also affect the containment volumetric leak rate. Figure 5 focuses on this relationship for the bypass pathways for which the leak rate (in ACFM) is calculated using the isentropic expansion flow model as described above.

The plot concentrates on the first 10000 seconds of the event since that is the most radiologically significant period. The diamond-shaped data points are the drywell pressure plot file points from the MAAP4 analysis. The total RB bypass leakage, including MSIV leakage, (as modeled in this analysis) is shown as the solid line. For comparison, a one percent per day leak rate for the entire 308000 ft³ primary containment free volume would be about 2.1 ACFM; therefore, the bypass leakage is about 10 % (on average) of the overall containment leak rate.

Meteorological Dispersion and Dose Calculation Methodology

The methods of Reference 10 (i.e., the ARCON-96 computer code) were used in evaluating the ground-level release onsite meteorological dispersion for this analysis. This represents a change from the analysis presented in Reference 5 which used the method endorsed by SRP 6.4. However, the elevated release dispersion characteristics (i.e., for releases from the stack) are the same as those of Reference 5.

The N₂ bypass pathways are assumed to release on the East wall of the RB (RB/E) and are, therefore, closer to the "A" CR air intake than to "B" CR air intake. The isolation condenser, instrument air, and containment spray test bypass pathways are assumed to release from the same point as the MSIV leakage releases. This point is closer to the "B" CR air intake. In spite of the fact that both intakes would not be expected to operate at the same time, the most conservative dispersion characteristics are assumed for each point of release (RB(E) to the "A" intake and TB to the "B" intake).

The assumed RB/E release point bears **750** from the "A" CR air intake (i.e., ENE). For the TB release point the normal to the East wall of the TB is used as the direction from which the TB releases would approach the CR air intakes. This normal bears 255° (i.e., WSW) from the CR air intakes. Since the entire surface of the TB East wall is considered as the source of the TB release, the shortest distance to the wall along this normal is taken to be the separation distance between the source and the intake.

In connection with the question of what wind directions can affect the CR air intake, it should be noted that even though the assumed TB and RB/E release points are opposite, the contributions from each release point to the CR air intakes are applied simultaneously.

The STARDOSE computer code (Reference 11) is used to perform operator dose calculations for that radioactivity having entered the CR. Doses from sources external to the CR (other than plume shine) were calculated in 1985 (Reference 12), and are used in this analysis in the same way as they were used in the submittal of Reference 5. For plume shine a factor is applied to the whole body (WB) dose internal to the CR to account for this external contribution. With one foot of concrete shielding assumed, this factor is small.

Dose conversion factors (DCFs) are based on Reference 13 for inhalation doses and on Reference 14 for external doses (WB and skin) except where Reference 13 provides updated information. Following current NRC and international practice regarding radiation protection (e.g., revisions to **^I**OCFR Part 20 and Part 100), Total Effective Dose Equivalent (TEDE) doses are being reported in lieu of separate WB, skin, and thyroid doses. This is fully consistent with 1OCFR Part 50, Appendix A, GDC-19 which establishes an operator dose limit of 5 rem WB "or its equivalent to any part of the body". The TEDE concept is based on equivalent doses to all important organs and parts of the body; and since by definition TEDE includes the WB contribution, it is quite conservative to establish a 5 rem TEDE limit as that which corresponds to the 5 rem WB equivalency of GDC-19.

Results and Summary of Conservatisms

The 30-day dose to operator due to the DBA event for CR habitability is as follows (Reference 15):

• CEDE due to inhalation of organic iodine - 1.13 rem **CEDE** due to inhalation of elemental iodine - 0.29 rem **CEDE** due to inhalation of particulate iodine - 1.10 rem **CEDE** due to inhalation of cesium/rubidium - 0.19 rem **CEDE** due to inhalation of tellurium/antimony - 0.04 rem CEDE due to inhalation of barium - 0.01 rem CEDE due to inhalation of noble metals - 0.03 rem CEDE due to inhalation of lanthanum group - 0.02 rem CEDE due to inhalation of cerium group - 0.10 rem CEDE due to inhalation of strontium - 0.03 rem Whole body due to plume inside CR - 0.26 rem Whole body due to plume outside CR - 0.03 rem Whole body due to other external sources - 0.60 rem
TEDE 3.83 rem TEDE 3.83 rem 0.29 rem (including pool reevol.) **U U U U U U U U U**

The following are important conservatisms in this analysis:

- An assumed TEDE limit equal to the current WB limit of 5 rem (even though TEDE includes WB)
- Use of high initial drywell temperature with "average" service water temperature (contributing to intermittent spray operation)
- Maximum suppression pool bypass to minimize pool scrubbing
- No credit for more rapid removal of hygroscopic aerosols
- No credit for aerosol/elemental iodine deposition in intact steamlines (other than between closed MSIVs)
- No delay in the release of re-evolved gaseous iodine in RB bypass pathways
- $*$ No credit for aerosol plugging of sub-millimeter leakpaths
- Only a single closed valve credited in non-MSIV RB bypass pathways
- Use of minimum-calculated bypass pathway particulate removal efficiencies (by release point)
- ARCON 96 X/Qs (dispersion parameters) applied to the most conservative CR air intake ("A" or "B", based on the distance from point of release) simultaneously
- Simultaneous contribution to CR dose from release points nearly 180° opposed
- No credit for non-Seismic structures (TB, steamlines, main condenser)
- No credit for the CR particulate filter
- SRP Occupancy Factors
- Maximum suppression pool temperature at 24 hours (based on cooling water temperature of 85 F) used to determine I_2 partitioning at 30 days
- \bullet No attenuation of I_2 re-evolved from suppression pool
- Use of the same inhalation DCFs for organic iodine forms as for more soluble forms

Conclusions

The CR dose analysis contained in this report demonstrates that the OCNGS meets the radiological requirements of IOCFR Part 50, GDC-19 with respect to limiting the dose to the most exposed CR operator. Under the conditions imposed by the DBA event for CR habitability the most exposed operator would not be subjected to radiation exposure resulting in doses in excess of 5 rem whole body or its equivalent to any part of the body for the duration of the accident. By demonstrating compliance with GDC-19 NUREG-0737, Item III.D.3.4, is also satisfied.

References

I. NUREG-0737, "Clarification of TMI Action Plan Requirements", November 1980

2. GPUN Letter, DeVine to USNRC Document Control Desk, dated June 20, 1991

3. NUREG-1465, "Accident Source Terms for Light-Water Nuclear Power Plants", February 1995

4. GPUN Calculation C-1302-243-E610-074, "OC Thermal-Hydraulic Conditions Following a LOCA Using MAAP4"

5. GPUN Letter, Wilson to Zwolinski (NRC), dated June 17, 1985

6. OCNGS DCC File No. 20.1801.0005, "Primary Containment Leakage Rate Testing Program", Revision 0, October 11, 1996

7. USNRC Regulatory Guide 1.4, "Assumptions Used for Evaluating the Potential Radiological Consequences of a Loss of Coolant Accident for Pressurized Water Reactors", Revision 2, June 1974

8. PSAT C101.02, Rev. 1.02, "STARNAUA - A Code for Evaluating Severe Accident Aerosol Behavior in Nuclear Power Plant Containments: A Validation and Verification Report", December 31, 1996

9. Morewitz, H.A., "Leakage of Aerosols from Containment Buildings", Health Physics, Volume 42, No.2, February 1982

10. Ramsdell, J.V., Jr., et al., "Atmospheric Relative Concentration in Building Wakes", NUREG/CR 633 **1,** Revision **I**

11. PSAT C109.03, Rev 0, "STARDOSE Model Report", January 31, 1997

12. United Engineers & Constructors, Inc., "Analyses in Support of GPUN Responses to NRC RAIs Concerning Compliance with NUREG-0737, Item II.B.2", June 1985

13. Federal Guide 11, "Limiting Values of Radionuclide Intake and Air Concentration and Dose Conversion Factors for Inhalation, Submersion, and Ingestion", 1988

14. NUREG/CR-5106 (Manual for TACT5 - Version SAIC 9/23/87)

15. Polestar Applied Technology Calculation PSAT 05201 H.08, "Dose Assessment for OCNGS Control Room Habitability". Revision **I**

PSAT 05201H.08

CALCULATION TITLE **PAGE**

CALCULATION NUMBER: PSAT 05201H.08

CALCULATION TITLE: "Dose Assessment for Oyster Creek Control Room Habitability

ORIGINATOR Print/Sign/Date

CHECKER Print/Sign/Date **IND** REVIEWER Print/Sign/Date

avid Leaver
Dele*rn 10/5/00*

Nonconformance Rpt

REVISION: 0

 \prod Fred Henr ⁷9/29/00 2

REASON FOR REVISION:

Revision 0:

1. Initial Issue N/A

Revision 1:

- 1. Update revision number for Reference⁷3 and **+4** due to corrected Control Room X/Qs (Yard and Turbine Building), corrected Control Room Occupancy Factors based on SRP values, and use of 1.0 psig drywell spray cutoff pressure instead of 0.6 psig
- 2. Correct STARDOSE "Input.dat" file according to the revised Reference 3

0 L. tol *1-1* **&**

Pg I of **7**

PSAT 05201H.08

 $\overline{}$

 $\chi^{(1)}$

 ω

Table of Contents

—

 $-$

Purpose

The purpose of this calculation is to apply the revised DBA source term of Reference 1 and the STARDOSE Computer Code (Reference 2) to the calculation of Control Room (CR) Total Effective Dose Equivalent (TEDE) for the Oyster Creek Generating Station.

Methodology

The overall dose calculation model consists of seven control volumes to represent the damaged core and RCS (CORE), the drywell portion of the primary containment (DW), the torus airspace or wetwell portion of the primary containment (WW), the suppression pool (SP), the reactor building or secondary containment (RB), the space between the two MSIVs in the one steam line wherein both MSIVs are assumed to successfully close (SL), and the control room, itself (CR). These control volumes are arranged as shown on Figure 1 with the various junctions that connect them. These junctions are associated with volumetric flows which determine the rate at which radioactivity is exchanged between the control volumes. In addition removal processes such as spray impaction, sedimentation, adsorption, pool scrubbing, filtration and others are modeled within and between the control volumes, as appropriate.

The junctions related to containment transport and environmental release include:

- Drywell-to-wetwell vent flow,
- Wetwell-to-drywell vacuum breaker flow,
- SGTS exhaust flow (via plant stack),
- Leakage flow to the reactor building from the drywell, the wetwell, and the suppression pool, and
- Bypass pathways (MSIV leakage, isolation condenser vent valve leakage, service air leakage, and containment spray test line leakage to the turbine building, and gaseous nitrogen leakage to the yard).

$PSAT 05201H.08$ PSAT 05201 H.08

Rev: $0 \vert 1 \vert 2 3 4$

The core junctions effect the release of radioactivity to both the drywell and the suppression pool in parallel. The drywell and suppression pool releases are an example of conservative "double counting" in that the same amount of activity is assumed to be in both places at the same time. In fact, the release of radioactivity to the suppression pool is assumed in the analysis to be complete within the first two hours of the accident, even though it actually takes many hours for the sprays and other mechanisms to remove the radioactivity from the containment atmosphere and get it into the water of the suppression pool.

Control room junctions exist in the model to take activity out of the environment (after it has been diluted by the appropriate X/Q) and bring it into the control room. For Oyster Creek there are no credited filters in the control room ventilation; there are only redundant intakes and air-handling units and provision for recirculating the air so that intake can be minimized under accident conditions. As a practical matter, the concentration of radioactivity within the control room tracks very closely the concentration at the at the air intake, even on maximum recirculation flow (see Assumption 1).

The STARDOSE Computer Code (Reference 2) is used for the dose calculation. All input to this model except for radionuclide data is documented in Reference 3. For plume shine a factor is applied to the WB dose internal to the CR to account for this external contribution. The factor is calculated below. With one foot of concrete shielding assumed, this factor is small.

A second factor from Reference 3 is used to account for re-evolved radioiodine from the suppression pool. This factor is applied to the organic radioiodine dose contribution over a specified time interval defined below.

Assumptions

- Assumption 1: The radionuclide concentration inside the CR is the same as that of the plume at the air intake.
- Justification: The CR volume from Reference 3, Item 3.5 is 27500 ft^3 . The volumetric exchange rate (with the environment) is assumed to be 14000 cfm (Item 3.13). Even on maximum recirculation flow, the volumetric flow is greater than 1/10 of the assumed 14000 cfm; and therefore, the exchange rate will always be greater than 0.05 per minute or 3 per hour. Since the time to come to equilibrium is about three inverse exchanges, it requires only one hour for the CR to equilibrate with the evironment. The total duration of the dose calculation is 720 hours with concentration changing slowly with time. Therefore, equilibrium can be assumed.

References

- 1. NUREG-1465, "Accident Source Terms for Light-Water Nuclear Power Plants", February 1995
- 2. PSAT C109.03, Rev 0, "STARDOSE Model Report", January 31, 1997

3. PSAT 05201U.03, "Dose Calculation Data Base for Application of the Revised DBA Source Term to the Oyster Creek Nuclear Power Plant", Revision 3

4. Federal Guide 11, "Limiting Values of Radionuclide Intake and Air Concentration and Dose Conversion Factors for Inhalation, Submersion, and Ingestion", 1988

5. NUREG/CR-5106 (Manual for TACT5 - Version SAIC 9/23/87)

6. NUREG/CR-4691, "MELCOR Accident Consequence Code System (MACCS)", February 1990

- 7. TID-14844, "Calculation of Distance Factors for Power and Test Reactor Sites", March 1962
- 8. Price, W.J., Nuclear Radiation Detection, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1958
- 9. NUREG-0737, "Clarification of TMI Action Plan Requirements", November 1980

Calculation

To perform operator dose calculations for radioactivity having entered the CR, the STARDOSE computer code is used (Reference 2). Dose conversion factors are based on Reference 4 for inhalation doses and Reference 5 for external doses (WB and skin) except where Reference 4 provides updated information. Radioactive decay rates are also taken from Reference 5. All radionuclide input data (including core inventory per Mw from Reference 3) is presented in the LIBFILE1 .TXT file (Attachment 1) used with STARDOSE. The radionuclides considered are those from Reference 6 (except the cobalt isotopes which are not significant) plus additional Kr and Xe isotopes, in particular those included in Reference 7.

The STARDOSE input file (INPUT.DAT) is included as Attachment 2. It has been manually annotated to show where the data appears in Reference 3.

Following current NRC and international practice regarding radiation protection (e.g., revisions to 1OCFR Part 20 and Part 100), Total Effective Dose Equivalent (TEDE) doses are being reported in lieu of separate WB, skin, and thyroid doses. This is fully consistent with 1OCFR Part 50, Appendix A, GDC-19 which establishes an operator dose limit of 5 rem WB or the equivalent to any other part of the body. The TEDE concept is based on equivalent doses to all important organs and parts of the body; and since by definition TEDE includes the WB contribution, it is quite conservative to establish a 5 rem TEDE limit as that which corresponds to the 5 rem WB equivalency of GDC-19.

To calculate the external plume contribution to the inside dose, the assumption of equal activity concentrations inside and outside the CR is used (Assumption 1). The STARDOSE code makes use of the following correction to the whole body dose inside the CR to account for the finite volume (note that the DCFs used from Reference 5 are for a semi-infinite volume):

Correction Factor = $(V_{CR})^{0.338}/1173 = (27500)^{0.338}/1173 = 0.027$.

Considering one foot of concrete shielding and an "average" gamma energy of 0.7 MeV (e.g., from Reference 7), the shielding effectiveness can be approximated as:

$$
Eff = e^{-\mu d}
$$

where the μ is the mass absorption coefficient and d is the thickness of the shield. From Figure 1-12 of Reference 8, the mass absorption coefficient for a 0.7 MeV gamma (normalized by density) is about 0.08 cm²/g. Assuming a concrete density of 2.5 g/cc (2.5 that of water) and a d of 30 cm (one foot) thickness, the coefficient becomes 0.2 and the overall expression becomes 2.5E-3. Therefore, the one foot concrete thickness is about ten times more effective in reducing gamma dose to the operator than the finite volume of the CR. To account for the external plume contribution to the operator dose, the whole body dose calculated by STARDOSE for sources inside the CR will be multiplied by a factor of 0.1.

Results

The results for the STARDOSE edits at 21 days and at 30 days are presented as Attachment 3 (excerpted from RESULTS.OUT). This is for the run identified as 03:47:26 PM September 15, 2000. From the 21-day edit, one can see that the organic iodine dose contribution to the CR dose is 1.08 rem CEDE. At 30 days the contribution is 1.13 rem CEDE. Therefore, the organic iodine dose contribution from 21 to 30 days is 0.05 rem CEDE. Multiplying this organic iodine dose contribution by the factor of 4 to account for elemental iodine re-evolution from the suppression pool (Reference 3, Item 7.6), one can obtain the overall dose results below:

Conclusions

The CR dose analysis contained in this report demonstrates that the Oyster Creek meets the radiological requirements of 1OCFR Part 50, GDC-19 with respect to limiting the dose to the most exposed CR operator. Under the conditions imposed by the DBA event for CR habitability the most exposed operator would not be subjected to radiation exposure resulting in doses in excess of 5 rem whole body or its equivalent to any part of the body for the duration of the accident. By demonstrating compliance with GDC-19 NUREG-0737 (Reference 9), Item III.D.3.4, is also satisfied.

PSAT 05201H.08 - Attachment 1 - LIBFILE.TXT

 \cdots

 $\overline{}$

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$

 \sim

PSAT 05201H.08 - Attachment 1 - LIBFILE.TXT

 $\frac{1}{2}$

$Pg1 of 2$ $\widetilde{\mathrm{Rev}}: 0 \text{ } 1234$

 $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$

 \Box

 \sim \sim \sim

 $\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{L}_{$

 \sim $\bar{\mathcal{A}}$

 $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$

 $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}$

 \sim $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{A}}$

 $\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2}$

 $\sim 10^{-11}$

Rev: $0|1|$ 2 3 4

OrgIodine PartIodine Solubles Insolubles Time NobleGas ElemIodine 7.8 1.129 1 1
1.296 1 2.3 1 **1 1** 2.3 $\begin{array}{ccc} 1.296 & 1 & 2 \\ 720 & 1 & 1 \end{array}$ 1 2.3 2.3 720 1 1 1 **1 1** 1 end decontamination factor end control_volume control volume OBJ **CV** obj_type name RB 1.8e+006 T tem 3.4 air volume 0 water volume 0 surface area has recirc filter false end control volume control volume OBJ CV obj_type SL name I tem 3.6 32.36 air volume Ω water volume 1 surface_area has recirc filter false removal_rate_to_surface OrgIodine PartIodine Solubles Insolubles Time NobleGas ElemIodine 0.5117 0 0 1.3604 1.3604 0 1.3604 1.0089 0 0 0 2.5427 2.5427 2.5427 2.2385 0 0 0 2.4120 2.4120 2.4120 Item 4. 2.8033 0 0 0 2.5895 2.5895 2.5895 3.0875 0 0 2.1079 0 2.1079 2.1079 5.0413 0 0 0 1.3937 1.3937 1. 3937 9.8705 0 0 0 0.6557 0. 6557 0.6557 \int 14.115 0 0 0 0.3987 0.3987 0.3987 24.008 0 0 0.3718 0 0.3718 0.3718 720.00 0 0 0 0.0 0.0 0.0 end removal rate to surface frac_4_daughter_resusp_from_surface Time NobleGas ElemIodine OrgIodine PartIodine Solubles Insolubles 0 0 720 1 1 0 0 720 1 1 1 0
end frac 4 daughter resusp_from_surface end control volume control-volume OBJ CV obj_type name SP J tem 3.3 8. 2e+004 air volume water volume Ω 0 surface_area has recirc filter false end-control volume control volume OBJ CR obj type Control Room name

Pg 4 of 14 **Rev:** $0 \vert 1 \vert 2 3 4$

air volume water-volume surface area has recirc filter breathing_rate
Time (hr) Value (cms) 720 0.000347 end breathing_rate 27500 *Item*, 3.5 **0 0 f** alse **:17** *,-. -2.* occupancy-factor Time (hr) 24 Value (frac) 1 96 0.6
720 0.4 720 end occupancy factor end_control_volume junction junction_type downstream_location upstream downstream flow rate $Time$ (hr) Rate (hr) R 0.508 720 1 end_flow_rate has_filter end_junction junction junction_type downstream location upstream downstream flow_rate Time (hr) 0.508 1 720 1 end_flow_rate has filter end~junction J *ta.,* **5.JS** AIR JUNCTION AIR SPACE CORE DW Rate (cfm) false AIR JUNCTION AIR SPACE CORE SP Rate (cfm) false junction junction_type downstream-location upstream downstream has filter flow_rate Time (hr) 1.129 0 1.296 918 2.008 0 720 3e+ 004 720
end flow_rate AIR JUNCTION WATER POOL **DW** WW false Value (cfm) 0 -n74, **³¹⁷**

 \sim

Pg 5 of 14 $\overline{\text{Rev}}$: 0 $\overline{1}$ 234

end_junction

 $\ddot{}$

 $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$

junction junction_type downstream_location . upstream downstream has filter flow rate Time (hr) Value
0.236 0.170 0.236 0.394 0.059 0.442 0.095
0.585 0.059 0.585 0.819 0.095 1.129 0.059
1.379 0.144 0.144
 0.073 2.008 0.073 3.778 4 0.076 5.222 0.096 0.059 7.844 0.059 8 0.072 14 0.092 24 0.105 720 0.059 end flow rate AIR JUNCTION AIR SPACE SL environment true Value (cfm) \int filter efficiency Time NobleGas ElemIodine 720 0 0.50 end_filter_efficiency frac 4 daughter resusp Time NobleGas ElemIodine 720 1 0 end frac 4 daughter_resusp OrgIodine PartIodine 0 OrgIodine PartIodine 0 Ω 0 Solubles Insolubles 0 0 Itim 4.6 Solubles Insolubles 0 0 X over **Q** 4 ctrl room Value $(s/m*3)$ 8 0.00271 24 0.000876 96 0.000863 720 0.000845 end X_over Q_4_ctrl_room X_over **Q** 4 siteboundary Time (hr) Value (s/m*3) 2.008 l.le-3 8 0 24 0 96 0 720 0 end_X_over_Q_4_site_boundary X over **Q** 4_low_population zone Value (s/m*3) \int \int Ita ... **S..** 5-, **)** T ta., **57** 4 **)-Gr9-S** *"rTt.e.,_* 3.14 **S** *L &.,,;-L*

Pg 7 of 14 Rev: $0 \vert 1 \vert 2 \vert 3 \vert 4$

8 5.6e-5
24 9.0e-6 24 9.Oe-6 i •_ **5.** 4) *L P?-6•* 96 5.4e-6
720 1.9e-6 720 **1.** 9e-6 **I** end_X_over_Q_4_low_population_zone end-junction junction AIR JUNCTION junction type AIR SPACE downstream-location DW upstream environment downstream true has filter flow rate Time (hr) Value
0.236 0.12 Value (cfm) $\overline{7}$ 0.236 0.394 0.046
 0.442 0.074 0.074
 0.046 0.585 0.046
0.819 0.074 0.819 1.129 0.046 **1.** 14) M\$IV I 1.379 0.109
2.008 0.057 0.057
 0.052 3.778 4 0.059 5.222 0.075 5.556
7.844 0.046 8 **0.057** 14 0.072 24 0.082 **i** 720 0.046 end flow rate filter efficiency Time NobleGas ElemIodine OrgIodine Part Iodine Solubles Insolubles T tem 4.5 0.5 0.5 720 0 0.5 Ω 0.5 end_filter_efficiency frac 4 daughter resusp OrgIodine PartIodine Time NobleGas ElemIodine Insolubles 0 0 0 720 1 1 Ω end frac_4_daughter_resusp *X* over **Q** 4 ctrl room Time (hr) Value $(s/m*3)$ 8 0.00271 **I** *5'* **1. T6** 24 0.000876 96 0.000863 720 0.000845 end_X_over_Q_4_ctrl_room X over **Q** 4 siteboundary Time (hr) $Value (s/m*3)$
2.008 $1.1e-3$ Ttem 5.4, EAB - Ground 2.008 **8 0**

 I *(Item S.4, EAB-Ground (continued)* $\frac{24}{25}$ 0 720 0 end X over Q 4 site boundary $X_{over Q_4}$ low_population_zone
Time (hr) Value (s/m*3) Time (nr) Value $(s/m*3)$
8 5.6e-5 8 5.6e-5
24 9.0e-6 24 9.0e-6 **Filem 5.4, LPZ** - Grou 96 5.4e-6
720 1.9e-6 $1.9e-6$ end X over Q_4 low population zone end-junction junction AIR JUNCTION junction_type downstream location AIR SPACE DW upstream environment downstream has filter true flow_rate Time (hr) Value (cfm) **0.236** 0.045 0.394 0.017 0.442 0.028 **0.585** 0.017 **0.819** 0.028 **1.129** 0.017 **1.379** 0.041 $Item$ 3.14, TS **2.008** 0.021 **3.778** 0.020 4 0.022 5.222 0.028 5.556 0.018 7.844 0.018 8 0.021 14 0.027 24 0.031 720 0.018 end_flow_rate filter efficiency OrgIodine PartIodine Time NobleGas ElemIodine Solubles Insolubles I tem 4.7 0.965 0.965 0 0.965 720 0 0.5 end_filter_efficiency frac 4 daughter resusp Solubles Insolubles Time NobleGas ElemIodine OrgIodine PartIodine 0 0 0 720 1 1 0 end frac 4 daughter resusp X over **Q** 4 ctrl room Time (hr) Value (s/m*3) -8 0.00271 $Itom 5.1, 78$ 24 0.000876 96 0.000863

```
Pg 9 of 14 
Rev: 0 \parallel 2 \parallel 3 \parallel 4
```
720 0.000845 endX overQ_4_ctrl room $X_{over Q_4}$ site_boundary
Time (hr) Value (s) Value $(s/m*3)$
1.1e-3 2.008 8 $\frac{24}{96}$ 0 $\begin{matrix}0\\0\end{matrix}$ 96 0 720 0 end X over Q 4 site boundary -7 \int \mathcal{I} to X_over_Q_4_low_population_zone
Time (hr) Value (s/m^{*3)} 8
24 5.6e-5
9.0e-6 24 9.0e-6 **The S.4, LPZ** - *Cround*
96 5.4e-6 **The S.4, LPZ** - *Cround* 96 5.4e-6
720 1.9e-6 $1.9e-6$ end X over Q 4 low population zone end-junction junction junction_type downstream location upstream downstream has filter flow_rate
Time (hr) Value (cfm) 0.236 0.0301
0.394 0.0114 0.0114 0.442 0.0185
0.585 0.0114 0.0114 0.819 0.0185 1.129 0.0114 1.379 0.0273
2.008 0.0143 2.008 0.0143
3.778 0.0128 0.0128 4 0.0148 5.222 0.0187 5.556 0.0116
7.844 0.0115 0.0115 8 0.0141 14 0.0180 24 0.0204 720 0.0115 end_flow_rate filter efficiency Time NobleGas ElemIodine $720 \t 0 \t 0.5$ end_filter_efficiency frac_4_daughter resusp Time NobleGas ElemIodine 720 1 1 AIR JUNCTION AIR SPACE DW environment true "jTte,, **3.** 14 **&S (i>Vj)** OrgIodine PartIodine Solubles Insolubles 0 0.916 OrgIodine PartIodine 0 0 0.916 1nsolubles
0.916 0.916 1**tem** 4.7 Solubles Insolubles
0 0 0 0 4 *A* **ⁱ**12:t&1.1- **57. 1)** -r **P, (C"")**

end frac_4_daughter_resusp

Pg 10 of 14 Rev: $0 \vert 1 \vert 2 \, 3 \, 4$

```
X overQ_4_ctrl room 
Time (\bar{h}r) J Value (s/m*3)<br>8 2.59e-003
               8 2.59e-003 
24 1.15e-003 
96 8.44e-004<br>720 7.18e-004
               7.18e-004
end_X_over_Q_4_ctrl_room
X_over_Q_4_site_boundary
Time (hr) Value (s/m*3)<br>2.008 1.1e-3
2.008
8 0
24 0 
96 0 
720 0 
end X_over_Q_4_site_boundary
                            \int Ita
                             Item 5.4, EBB - Ground) 
X_over_ Q4 lowpopulationzone 
Time (nr) Value (s/m*3)<br>8 5.6e-5
8 5.6e-5 4 
24 9.0e-6 I~ St P G~ 
96 5.4e-6 
720 1.9e-6 
end X over Q 4 low population zone
end-junction
junction 
junction_type 
downstream location 
upstream 
downstream 
has filter 
flow rate 
Time (hr)1.296 0<br>1.463 9180
\begin{array}{ccc} 1.463 & 9 \\ 2.008 & 0 \end{array}2.008
720 3e+0 
04 1
720<br>end flow rate
end junction
                                      AIR JUNCTION 
                                      AIR SPACE
                                      WW 
                                      DW 
                                      false
               Value (cfm)
                             2T6i '5.6
junction 
junction_type 
downstream location 
upstream 
downstream 
has filter 
flow rate 
Time (hr)0.236 0.76 
0.394 0.84 
0.442 0.81 
0.585 0.84 
0.819 0.81
                                      AIR JUNCTION
                                      AIR SPACE
                                      WW 
                                      RB 
                                       false
               (c fm)
                           Xtem 3.15, WW to RB
```
PSAT 05201 H.08 - Attachment 2 - INPUT.DAT Pg **11** of 14

1.129 1.379 2.008 3.778 4 5.222 5.556 7.844 8 14 24 720 end flow rate end-junction 0.84 0.77 0.83 0.83 0.82 0.81 0.84 0.84 0.83 0.81 0.80 $\left[\begin{array}{c} 0.84 \ 0.83 \ 0.81 \ 0.80 \ 0.39 \end{array}\right]$ -7Lc- **3A'- L*J** *W* **t** *0* **R('ý(** junction junction_type downstream location upstream downstream has filter flow rate Time (hr) 0.236 0.394 0.442 **0.585 0.819 1.129 1.379 2.** 008 3.778 4 5.222 5.556 7.844 8 14 24 720 end_flow_rate Value (c **fm)** 0.13 0.050 0.081 0.050 0.081 0.050 0.12 0.063 0.056 **0.065** 0.082 **0.050 0.050 0.062 0.079 0.090 0.050** AIR JUNCTION AIR_SPACE WW environment true *5 &,* 3-14/ R *r3* **(** LWK' filter efficiency Time NobleGas ElemIodine OrgIodine PartIodine Solubles Insolubles 720 0 0.5 end_filter_efficiency frac 4 daughter_resusp Time NobleGas ElemIodine 720 1 1 end frac_4_daughter_resusp 0 OrgIodine PartIodine 0 0.916 0 Solubles Insolubles
0.916 0.916 Solubles Insolubles 0 0 X over Q 4 ctrl room Time (hr) Value (s/m*3) 8 2.59e-003 24 1.15e-003 *Item* 5.1, Yan 24 1.15e-003
96 8.44e-004 *4.7*

PSAT 05201H.08 - Attachment 2 – INPUT.DAT Pg 12 of 14

```
Rev: 0 | | | 2 3 4
```
Item 5.1, Yard 720 7.18e-004
end X over_Q_4_ctrl room X_over_Q_4_site_boundary
Time (hr) Value (s $\begin{bmatrix} 1 \ \text{Time (hr)} \end{bmatrix}$ Value (s/m*3)
2.008 1.le-3 8 0
24 0
96 0 Idem 5.4, EAB - Eround **8 0** $\begin{array}{c|c}\n\bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\
\bullet & \bullet & \bullet\n\end{array}$ 720 0 end X over Q 4 site boundary X over **Q** 4_low_populationzone Time (hr) Value (s/m*3) **8** 5.6e-5 Item 5.4, LPZ - Ground 96 5.4e-6 720 1.9e-6 end X over Q 4 low population_zone end_junction junction junction type AIR JUNCTION downstream location AIR SPACE upstream SP downstream RB has filter true flow rate Time (hr) Rate (cfm) **-21 4., 3. 1 Z-**720 0.13 end flow rate filter efficiency OrgIodine Solubles I₁
0 0 Time NobleGas ElemIodine PartIodine Insolubles Item 4.9 720 0 .9 .9 .9 end_filter_efficiency frac 4 daughter resusp Time NobleGas ElemIodine OrgIodine PartIodine Solubles Insolubles 0 0 720 1 0 0 0 end frac_4_daughter_resusp end junction junction AIR JUNCTION junction_type AIR SPACE downstream location RB upstream downstream environment has filter true flow rate Time (hr) Value (cfm) Mte".- **3. 1** 720 2600 end flow rate filter efficiency

PSAT 05201 H.08 - Attachment 2 **-** INPUT.DAT **Pg 13** of 14

Rev: $0|1|234$

Time NobleGas ElemIodine
720 0 0.9 OrgIodine Part Iodine Solubles
0.9 0.9 Insolubles **0.9** 4.1 720 0.9 0.9 end filter efficiency frac 4 daughter resusp Time NobleGas ElemIodine OrgIodine PartIodine Solubles Insolubles 720 1 1 0 0 0 0 end_frac_4_daughter_resusp X over **Q** 4 ctrl room Value $(s/m*3)$ 1.508 1.8e-004
2.008 1.8e-004 2.008 1.8e-004 Itam S.I, Stack 8 1.8e-004
24 9.67e-00 24 9.67e-005 96 2.5e-005
720 3.6e-006 3.6e-006 end_X_over_Q_4_ctrl_room $X_{over Q} = 4$ site boundary
Time (hr) Value (s) Time (hr) Value (s/m*3)
1.508 1.9e-6 1.508 1.9e-6
2.008 1.9e-6 $2.9e-6$
0 .7ire. **.**4) **6 /1 G-** *E&,-* 8 0 24 0 96 0 720 0 end X over Q 4 site boundary X over Q 4 low population zone Time $(\bar{h}r)$ \bar{f} value $(s/m*3)$
1.508 5.3e-7 5.3e-7 Item $5.4, \text{LPZ}$ - Elev 2.008 5.3e-7 8 5.3e-7 24 1.8e-7
96 1.1e-7 1.1e-7 720 4.8e-8 end_X_over_Q_4_low_population_zone end_junction junction AIR JUNCTION junction type AIR SPACE downstream location upstream environment Control Room downstream has filter false flow rate Time (hr) Value (cfm) **V,,,- 1. 13**720 14000 end flow rate end junction junction junction_type AIR JUNCTION AIR SPACE downstream location upstream Control Room

PSAT 05201H.08 - Attachment 2 – INPUT.DAT Pg 14 of 14 Rev: 0 $\[\eta\]$ 2 3 4

downstream environment has filter false flow_rate Time (hr) Value (cfm) -r *C,* **I13** 14000 720 end flow rate X over **Q** 4 ctrl room $\begin{bmatrix} V \text{value} & (s/m^*3) \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ 720 end X_over Q_4_ctrl_room $X_{over Q_4 site_{\text{nonday}}}$
Time (hr) Value (s, Value ($s/m*3$) 720 0 end_X_over_Q_4_site_boundary X over **Q** 4_low_population zone Value ($s/m*3$) 720 0 end_X_over_Q_4_low_population_zone end junction environment breathing_rate_sb
Time (hr) V_8 Value (cms) 8 0.000347
24 0.0 *Tc,5.* 2 0.0 720 0.0 end_breathing_rate_sb $\frac{1}{1}$ breathing_rate_lpz Time (hr) Value (cms) 8 0.000347
24 0.000175 I_{tum} 5.2 24 0.000175
720 0.000232 0.000232 end_breathing_rate_lpz end environment

 $\overline{}$

PSAT 05201H.08 - Attachment 3 Excerpts of RESULTS.OUT (21-Day and 30-Day CR/Env)

Pg 1 of 2 Rev: 0 [1] 2 3 4

 ϵ

STARDOSE 1.0 (c) 1996 Polestar Applied Technology, Inc. 03:47:26 PM September 15, 2000

edit time 504.000000

Control Room

 $\ddot{}$

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$

environment

edit time 720.000000

Control Room

PSAT 05201H.08 - Attachment 3 Excerpts of RESULTS.OUT (21-Day and 30-Day CR/Env)

 \sim \sim \sim

Pg 2 of 2 Rev: $0|1|234$

environment

 $\ddot{}$

 \sim

STARDOSE 1.0 (c) 1996 Polestar Applied Technology, Inc. 03:54:32 PM September 15, 2000 Total elapsed hours: 00, mins: 07, secs: 06

- - - - - - -

 $\begin{tabular}{ll} \multicolumn{1}{l}{} & \multicolumn{1}{l}{} & \multicolumn{1}{l}{} & \multicolumn{1}{l}{} \\ \multicolumn{1}{l}{} & \multicolumn{1}{l}{} & \multicolumn{1}{l}{} & \multicolumn{1}{l}{} \\ \multicolumn{1}{l}{} & \multicolumn{1}{l}{} & \multicolumn{1}{l}{} & \multicolumn{1}{l}{} \\ \multicolumn{1}{l}{} & \multicolumn{1}{l}{} & \multicolumn{1}{l}{} \\ \multicolumn{1}{l}{} & \multicolumn{1}{l}{} & \multicolumn{1}{l}{} \\ \multicolumn{1}{l}{} & \multic$

DOSE CALCULATION DATA BASE FOR

APPLICATION OF THE REVISED DBA **SOURCE** TERM

TO THE **AMERGEN** OYSTER CREEK **GENERATING STATION**

REVISION **0 12** *N* 4

Reasons for Revision 0

1. First Issue of the document

Reasons for Revision 1

- 1. Corrected Rev 0 signature data typo for Dave Leaver
- 2. Provided final references for Items 3.7 and 3.8 and clarified basis for long-term mixing rate
- 3. Provided final references for Item 3.14 and 3.15
- 4. Added preliminary Item 3.17, ICV/IA (i.e., RB bypass to TB) leak rate multiplier to account for spray test line
- 5. Corrected Item 4.2, removal lambda for t= **1.129** to t=1.294 hours
- 6. Corrected and increased the resolution of Item 4.10, preliminary maximum ratio of re-evolved elemental iodine to organic in the containment atmosphere
- 7. Added "Mobil 78" to Item 6.4 and finalized references for Items 6.3 and 6.4
- 8. Added Item 6.5, minimum suppression pool pH values
- 9. Provided final reference for Item 7.5
- 10. Added Item 7.6, preliminary organic iodine dose multiplier to account for pool reevolution of 12
- 11. Provided final reference for Item 8.1 and clarified table headings
- 12. Added Item 8.3, maximum spray HX cooling water temperature
- 13. Finalized reference for Item 9.1
- 14. Added Items 9.6 and 9.7, midplane elevation of the torus and nominal pool depth
- 15. Added References 21 24

Reasons for Revision 2

1. Provided final references for Items 3.17, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.7, 4.8, 4.10, and 7.6

Reasons for Revision 3

- 1. Update name of plant owner on title page
- 2. Change tables and update references for Items 3.14, and 3.15
- 3. Update references for Items 4.2, and 4.4
- 4. Change filter efficiency for all particulates in Item 4.7, and update related references
- 5. Change TB and Yard CR X/Qs in Item 5.1, and update related references
- 6. Change CR occupancy factor in Item 5.3, and update related reference
- 7. Change reference for Item 6.1

1. Radionuclide Data

1.1 Core Power - Radiological Calculations - 1969 MW(t) (Reference 1 for power of 1930 MW(t) and 102% multiplier)

1.2 Core Inventory @ t=0

(Reference 2 except for * which are from Reference 3)

 $\bar{\mathcal{A}}$

i.

 \overline{a}

1.3 Core Inventory by Mass (Reference 2)

2. Source Terms (Reference 4, except as noted)

2.1 Fraction of core inventory, 0 - 0.008 hours: no releases (conservative for BWR - expected to be >)

2.2 Fraction of core inventory, 0.008 - 0.508 hours: Gases - Xe, Kr - **0.1** /hr (0.05 total) Elemental I - 4.9E-3 /hr (2.4E-3 total) Organic I - 1.5E-4 /hr (7.5E-5 total)

> Aerosols - I, Br - 0.095 /hr (0.0475 total) Cs, Rb - 0.1 /hr (0.05 total)

2.3 Fraction of core inventory, 0.508 - 2.008 hours: Gases - Xe, Kr - 0.63 /hr (0.95 total) Elemental I - 8.1E-3 /hr (1.2E-2 total) Organic I - 2.5E-4 /hr (3.8E-4 total)

> Aerosols - I, Br - 0.158 /hr (0.2375 total) Cs, Rb - 0.133 /hr (0.2 total) Te Group - 0.033 /hr (0.05 total) Ba, Sr - 0.0 13 /hr (0.02 total) Noble Met - 1.7E-3 /hr (2.5E-3 tot) La Group - 1.3E-4 /hr (2E-4 tot) Ce Group - 3.3E-4 /hr (5E-4 tot)

2.4 Aerosol mass release rates, 30 - 1830 seconds (based on Items 1.3 and 2.2):

I, Br - 0.095 /hr x 2.04E4 /3600 = 0.54 g/sec Cs, Rb - 0.1 /hr x 2.74E5 /3600 **=** 7.6 g/sec Inert material assumed equal to sum = 8.14 g/sec (conservatively* low based on Reference 4) Total = 16.3 g/sec

2.5 Aerosol mass release rates, 1830 - 7230 seconds (based on Items 1.3 and 2.3):

I, Br - 0.158 /hr x 2.04E4 /3600 = 0.90 g/sec Cs, Rb - 0.133 /hr x 2.74E5 /3600 **=** 10.1 g/sec Te Group - 0.033 /hr x 4.34E4 /3600 = 0.40 g/sec Ba, Sr - 0.013 /hr x 2.01E5 /3600 = 0.73 g/sec Noble Metals - 1.7E-3 /hr x 6.66E5 /3600 = 0.31 g/sec La Group - 1.3E-4 /hr x 9.6E5 /3600 = 0.035 g/sec Ce Group - 3.3E-4 /hr x 1.03E6 /3600 = 0.094 g/sec Inert material assumed equal to sum = 12.6 g/sec (conservatively* low based on Reference 4) Total = 25.2 g/sec

* Total inert release prorated - conservative for maximizing airborne activity in second phase

 $\ddot{}$ \sim $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$

3. Volumes and Volumetric Flowrates

From t=0 to t=720 hours - 14000 cfm

Reference 10, Section 5.3)

3.14 RB Bypass Volumetric Flowrates (cfm) (* hours): (Reference - Calc PSAT 0520 1H.02, Rev 1)

"MSIV1" = one valve from DW, "MSIV2" = first valve into closed SL, "SL Out" = <u>out of</u> closed SL, " $2"N2"$ = for deposition in $2"N2$ line, " $ICV"$ = for deposition in ICV line, "TB" = $D\overline{W}$ to TB, "RB(DW)" = DW to East wall of RB, "RB(WW)" **=** WW to East wall of RB.

3.15 Primary Containment to RB Volumetric Flowrates (cfm):

(Reference - Calc PSAT 05201H.02, Rev **1)**

3.16 Design Basis Leakrates:

Oyster Creek)

4. Filter Efficiencies, Removal Lambdas, and Decontamination Factors

• For All Iodines Except Particulate - 90%

4.1 Filter Efficiency - SGTS: (Reference 6, Pg 6.5-9)

-
- For Particulates 90% (conservative for particulates, especially for particulate iodine)
- For Noble Gas 0%

4.2 Removal (Spray + Sedimentation) Lambdas in Drywell: (Ref- Calc PSAT 05201H.03, Rev 1)

For All Particulates and Elemental Iodine:

- From $t=0$ to $t=0.166$ hours 0.19 /hour
- From $t=0.166$ to $t=0.371$ hours 29.1 /hour
- From $t=0.371$ to $t=0.414$ hours 0.14/hour
- From $t=0.414$ to $t=0.465$ hours 31.7 /hour
- From $t=0$ 465 to $t=0.702$ hours 0.27 /hour
- From $t=0.702$ to $t=0.934$ hours 43.1 /hour
- From $t=0.934$ to $t=1.129$ hours 0.32 /hour
- From $t=1.129$ to $t=1.294$ hours 47.8 /hour
- From $t=1.294$ to $t=1.434$ hours 38.3 /hour
- From $t=1.434$ to $t=1.5$ hours 22.1 /hour
- From $t=1.5$ to $t=1.57$ hours 18.8 */hour*
- From $t=1.57$ to $t=1.657$ hours 17.4 /hour
- From $t=1.657$ to $t=1.754$ hours 16.7 /hour
- From $t=1.754$ to $t=2.007$ hours 16.5 /hour
- From $t=2.007$ to $t=2.339$ hours 5.62 /hour
- From $t=2.339$ to $t=3.775$ hours 6.4 /hour
- From $t=3.775$ to $t=4.633$ hours 0.06 /hour
- From $t=4.633$ to $t=5.933$ hours 2.36 /hour
- From $t=5.933$ to $t=6.353$ hours 3.48 /hour
- From $t=6.353$ to $t=6.804$ hours 4.49 /hour
- From $t=6.804$ to $t=7.244$ hours 5.49 /hour
- From $t=7.244$ to $t=7.675$ hours 6.49 /hour
- From $t=7.675$ to $t=7.791$ hours 7.44 /hour
- From $t=7.791$ to $t=24$ hours 0.2 /hour
- From $t=24$ hours to end 0 /hour

For Organic Iodine and Noble Gas:

- From $t=0$ to end 0/hour
-

4.3 Removal (Spray) Lambdas in Torus: (Reference - Calc PSAT 0520 1H.06, Rev 0)

For All Particulates and Elemental Iodine:

- From $t=0$ to $t=1.129$ hours 0/hour
- From $t=1.129$ to $t=3.778$ hours 1.5/hour
- From $t=3.778$ to $t=5.222$ hours 0 /hour
- From $t=5.222$ to $t=7.844$ hours 0.15 /hour
- From $t=7.844$ hours to end 0/hour

For Organic Iodine and Noble Gas:

• From $t=0$ to end - 0 /hour

4.4 Removal (Sedimentation) Lambdas in Closed Steamline: (Ref- Calc PSAT 05201H.03, Rev 1)

For All Particulates:

- From $t=0$ to $t=0.512$ hours 1.36 /hour
- From $t=0.512$ to $t=1.009$ hours 2.54 /hour
- From $t=1.009$ to $t=2.239$ hours 2.41 /hour
- From $t=2.239$ to $t=2.803$ hours 2.59 /hour
- From $t=2.803$ to $t=3.088$ hours 2.11 /hour
- From $t=3.088$ to $t=5.041$ hours 1.39 /hour
- From $t=5.041$ to $t=9.871$ hours 0.66 /hour
- From $t=9.871$ to $t=14.12$ hours 0.4 /hour
- From $t=14.12$ to $t=24$ hours 0.37 /hour
- From $t=24$ hours to end 0 /hour

For Elemental and Organic Iodine and Noble Gas:

PSAT 05201U.03 Page **10** of **15** Revision: 0 1 2 **M** 4

- From $t=0$ to end $0/h$ our
- 4.5 Filter Efficiency for MSIV1 (in Line with One MSIV Failed Open) (Reference 12)
	- For All Particulates and Elemental Iodine (assumed adsorbed on particulate): 50% For Organic Iodine and Noble Gas: 0%
- 4.6 Filter Efficiency for MSIV2 (Closed Steamline)
	- For All Particulates: 0% (see Item 4.4)
	- For Elemental Iodine: 50% (assumed adsorbed on particulate but 50% re-evolved - see Reference 13 where elemental iodine surface fixation rate is observed to equal or bound corresponding resuspension rate between 300 and 560 K)
	- For Organic Iodine and Noble Gas: 0%
- 4.7 Filter Efficiency for Other Bypass Leakpaths

For $2"N_2/8"N_2$ (i.e., Releases from East Wall of RB):

• For All Particulates: 91.6% (References – Calc PSAT 05201H.04, Rev 0

and Calc PSAT 05201H.02, Rev 1)

- **For Elemental Iodine: 50%** (assumed adsorbed on particulate but 50% re-evolved - see Reference 13 where elemental iodine surface fixation rate is observed to equal or bound corresponding resuspension rate between 300 and 560 K)
- For Organic Iodine and Noble Gas: 0%

For Iso Cond Vent/ Instr Air/DW Spray Test (i.e., Releases for TB):

- For All Particulates: 96.5% (References Calc PSAT 05201H.04, Rev 0 and Calc PSAT 05201H.02, Rev 1)
- For Elemental Iodine: 50% (assumed adsorbed on particulate but 50% re-evolved - see Reference 13 where elemental iodine surface fixation rate is observed to equal or bound corresponding resuspension rate between 300 and 560 K)
- For Organic Iodine and Noble Gas: 0%

4.8 Suppression Pool DF: (Reference - Calc PSAT 05201H.06, Rev 0)

For Particulates and Elemental Iodine:

- From $t=0$ to $t=1.129$ hours 0
- From $t=1.129$ to $t=1.296$ hours 2.3
- From $t=1.296$ hours to end -0

For Organic Iodine and Noble Gas:

• From $t=0$ to end -0

4.10 Maximum Ratio of Re-Evolved Elem Iodine to Organic in Containment Atmosphere:

 $(Reference - Calc PSAT 05201H.06, Rev 0)$

- **0** First21 days: 1:18
- **0** 21 to 24 days: 1:2
- **S** 24 to 27 days: 2:1
- **S** 27 to 30 days: 11:1

5. **X/Q** Values, Breathing Rates, and Occupancy Factors

6. Chemistry Data

6.1 Initial Pool pH - 6.23

(Reference - Calc PSAT 05201H.10, Rev 0)

6.2 Water Volume in Containment (including RCS): 82000 ft³ minimum in the suppression pool + 7600 ft³ for the RCS = 89600 ft³ (Note that this does not include all possible in-containment water which is conservative for iodine concentration effect; pH not greatly sensitive) (See Item 3.1 and Reference 6, Pg 6.2-7)

 \sim - \sim

 $\label{eq:1} \begin{array}{lllllllllllll} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{1}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{1}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{1}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{1}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{1}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{1}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{1}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{1}}\mathbf{1}_{\math$

 \sim \sim \sim \sim \sim \sim

 \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{L}

 $- 4"$ Dia Part: $47' + 22' = 69'$ Total = 154' Instr Air Diameter: $\{[(2'')^2(79')+(2.5'')^2(6')+(4'')^2(69')]/154\}^{1/2} = 3''$ effective

7.5 RB Bypass Pathway Minimum Plug-Flow Residence Times (Ref- Calc PSAT 05201H.02, Rev 0)

2"N2 - 92.8 minutes **8"N2** - 2472 minutes Iso Cond Vent - 74.8 minutes Instrument Air - 946.8 minutes

7.6 Organic Iodine Dose Multiplier to Account for Pool Re-Evolution of $I_2 - 4$ (Reference - Calc PSAT 05201H.06, Rev 0)

8. Thermal-Hydraulic Data

8.1 STARNAUA input (Reference PSAT 05201H.01)

* NAUA t=O is actually t=30 seconds (since STARNAUA analysis begins with gap release)

8.2 Maximum Suppression Pool Temperature - 140 F **@** 1 hour, 105 F @ 24 hours

(for $T_{initial} = 90 \text{ F}$) (Reference 6, Fig 6.2-5)

 \Box

Revision: $012\overline{3}4$

References

- 1. Enclosure to June 17, 1985 Letter, Wilson (GPUN) to Zwolinski (NRC)
- 2. GPUN Calc C-i 302-226-E620-369, "Oyster Creek Source Terms for Two Year Cycles" by R.V. Furia, 12/6/96
- 3. TACT5 User's Manual, File MLWRICRP.30
- 4. NUREG-1465
- 5. Oyster Creek Technical Specifications
- 6. Oyster Creek UFSAR
- 7. Oyster Creek Post-Accident Shielding Study, June 1985 (CMT # 171570)
- 8. GPUN Calc C-1302-411-5310-057
- 9. Oyster Creek Dwg JCP- 19442
- 10. TDR 893, "Control Room Habitability", April 1988
- 11. "Primary Containment Leakage Rate Testing Program", Revision 0, October 1996 (CMT # 171570)
- 12. Morewitz, "Leakage of Aerosols from Containment Buildings", Health Physics Vol. 42, No. 2, February 1982
- 13. Cline, "MSIV Leakage Iodine Transport Analysis", prepared for USNRC under Contract NRC 03-87-029, Task Order 75, March 26, 1991
- 14. SRP 15.6.5
- 15. Murphy-Campe (cited in SRP 6.4)
- 16. Regulatory Guide 1.3
- 17. Reference deleted.
- 18. Oyster Creek Dwg CB&I 9-0971
- 19. Letter with Attachments, Radvansky (GPUN) to Metcalf (Polestar), dated January 20, 1997 (CMT # 171570)
- 20. Spraying Systems Dwg 12135-5
- 21. GPUN Calc C- 1302-900-E540-012, Rev 0
- 22. Email, Radvansky (GPUN) to Metcalf (Polestar), Subject: "Drywell Coating Information", 1/28/97
- 23. Fax, Radvansky (GPUN) to Metcalf (Polestar), 3/27/96
- 24. GPUN Calc C-1302-241-E540-077, Rev 0
- 25. GPUN Calc C-1302-826-E540-017, Rev 0 per emails from A Baig (Amergen) to J. Metcalf (Polestar) dated 8/10/00 and 9/8/00