Florida Power **&** Light Company, **6501** South Ocean Drive, Jensen Beach, FL **34957** 



June **28,** 2001

L-2001- 153 10 CFR **50.12**  10 CFR 50.4

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

Re: St. Lucie Unit 1 Docket No. 50-335 Supplemental Risk Information to Support 10 CFR 50 Appendix R Ki Exemption Clarification/Request

Pursuant to commitments made in LER 50-335/1999-009-00 and pursuant to the requirements of 10 CFR 50.12, FPL resubmitted the original 10 CFR 50 Appendix R exemption request Kl for St. Lucie Unit 1 via FPL letter L-2000-164 dated October 4, 2000. The Kl Appendix R exemption dealt with separation issues inside the Unit 1 reactor containment building.

On April 9, 2001, during a telephone conference between FPL and Messrs. Salley, Lain, Jabbour, and Moroney of your staff, FPL committed to submit risk-informed information to support the K1 exemption request. Attached is the information to show that the exemption request meets the criteria of 10 CFR 50.12(a)(2)(ii), where application of the regulation in the particular circumstandes is not necessary to achieve the underlying purpose of the rule.

 $FPL$  would like to hold a management level meeting to discuss this submittal once the NRC review process starts. My staff will coordinate this meeting with the NRC.

Very truly yours,

Donald E. Jernigan Vice President St. Lucie Plant

DEJ/EJW/KWF

Attachment

cc: Regional Administrator, USNRC, Region II Senior Resident Inspector, USNRC, St. Lucie Plant Mr. W. A. Passetti, Florida Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services ST. LUCIE UNIT **1**

 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 

# RISK ASSESSMENT OF THE APPENDIX R VERTICAL SEPARATION DISCREPANCY IN EXEMPTION K1 PRIMARY CONTAINMENT BETWEEN RADIAL LINES 2 AND 6

L-2001-153 Attachment

# **Table of Contents**

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2}$ 





#### **1.0** ABSTRACT

The purpose of this evaluation is to provide an engineering evaluation that addresses the risk significance of discrepancies between FPL's Appendix R exemption request K1 and the related NRC safety evaluation reports (SERs) dated February 21, 1985 and March 5, 1987. Specifically, the March 5, 1987 NRC SER states that 25 feet of vertical separation exists between raceways containing redundant divisions of safe shutdown cables in the Unit 1 Containment annular area. The statement in the SER does not match the actual plant condition. This engineering evaluation addresses the physical separation of certain redundant safe shutdown components necessary for safe shutdown capability associated with a postulated fire in containment.

Redundant safe shutdown components were determined from recent engineering reviews and/or walkdown to be separated by less vertical distance than implied by the February 21, 1985 NRC SER and stated in the March 5, 1987 SER. FPL letter L-200-164, dated October 4, 2000 [Reference 4], evaluated this condition and concluded that the existing design features provide adequate protection to prevent fire damage to cables and associated nonsafety related circuits of redundant trains, and resubmitted the St. Lucie Unit **1** K1 exemption request. This submittal provides an evaluation to address the condition from a risk perspective in terms of core damage frequency (CDF) contribution.

The evaluation concludes that the existing configuration is not risk significant. A very conservative estimate found the CDF increase to be less than 1.28E-07 per year.

#### 2.0 **PURPOSE/SCOPE**

The purpose of this assessment is to evaluate the risk significance of the raceway configuration within the containment structure. The analysis is focused on a specific portion of the containment as defined below. The configuration of raceways within the containment structure does not comply with the specific requirements of 10 CFR 50, Appendix R. However, the configuration as described in the NRC SER was determined to adequately meet the intent of the regulation as evidenced by the NRC approval of Appendix R exemption K1. In general, the exemption relies on the horizontal and vertical separation of raceways. The details of this exemption is discussed and evaluated further in FPL letter L-2000-164. The assessment described herein presents the results of a bounding fire risk assessment to determine the calculated CDF associated with the existing configuration (no vertical separation assumed).

The specific scope of this assessment involves the space defined by the containment structure and the interior biological shield between radial column lines 2 and 6. The width of this area is approximately 20 feet. The electrical raceways in this area are divided into two separate sections defined by the divisional assignment of circuits (system SA, MA, MC, and SB, MB, MD). The electrical raceways in the containment structure are arranged with 'system' SA raceways installed along the biological shield wall (inner wall of the area). The 'system' SB raceways are installed along the outer wall of the area. Between radial column lines 2 and 6, raceways are installed to allow the routing of circuits around the containment structure at both the 23'-0" and 45'-0" elevations.

The risk significance of the existing raceway configuration between radial column lines 2 and 6 will be determined by estimating the CDF contribution associated with a postulated fire event.

## **3.0** REFERENCES

- **1.** St. Lucie Plant, Unit No. **1,** Updated Final Safety Analysis Report, Volume 9.5A
- 2. EPRI FIVE Methodology, TR-100370, Final Report, April 1992
- 3. EPRI Fire PRA Implementation Guide, TR-105928, Final Report, December 1995
- 4. FPL Letter L-2000-164, dated October 4, 2000 subject "10 CFR 50 Appendix R K1 Exemption Clarification/Request."
- 5. Regulatory Guide 1.174, "An Approach for Using Probabilistic Risk Assessment in Risk Informed Decisions on Plant Specific Changes to Licensing Basis."
- 6. Electric Power Research Institute, "EPRI Fire Events Database," 1992 Update

## 4.0 METHOD OF **ANALYSIS**

This evaluation is performed using fire risk assessment techniques from the EPRI FIVE Methodology [Reference 2] and the EPRI Fire PRA Implementation Guide [Reference 3]. Simplified fire modeling analyses using the FIVE worksheets are used to characterize the severity of fire that must occur to cause damage to redundant circuits. Insights related to the fire severity are then used in the risk assessment to ensure a bounding estimate of the core damage frequency (CDF) impact is obtained by proper selection of fire ignition frequency.

The potential set of cable/circuit targets were determined by reviewing the entire scope of Appendix R circuits located in the containment. The routing of these circuits were then reviewed to identify those that are located between radial column lines 2 and 6. The St. Lucie Unit **1** safe shutdown analysis (SSA) was reviewed to establish the consequences of postulated circuit damage. The scope of circuit damage was then characterized in terms of failures were then used to interface with the plant PSA model to calculate a conditional core damage probability (CCDP). The CCDP was then combined with a fire ignition frequency to obtain a CDF estimate.

The analysis for the risk significance of the in-situ raceway configuration conservatively assumes that the entire calculated CDF is equal to the risk increase. This effectively treats a configuration that would not require an exemption as having zero calculated risk.

## **5.0 BASES AND ASSUMPTIONS**

### **5.1** Bases

The risk assessment is based on the current plant probabilistic safety assessment (PSA) model. The significance of the risk contribution of the containment raceway configuration is evaluated based on a calculated change in core damage frequency **(CDF)** and change in large early release frequency (LERF). The calculated change in **CDF** and change in LERF can be compared to the acceptance guidelines provided in Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.174.

## **5.2** Assumptions

The cables installed in the Unit **I** containment are a mixture of those that are **IEEE 383**  qualified and those that are not. In order to simplify the analysis and provide bounding results, all cables are assumed to be non-IEEE 383 cables for the purposes of determining fire ignition frequency and damage threshold temperature.

The calculation of the self-initiated cable fire frequency is based on the volume of cable in the area of interest. It is conservatively assumed that the area between radial column lines 2 and 6 contains 50% of the total cable mass (total Btu value) in the containment structure.

The occurrence of a postulated fire in the containment has the potential to cause instrumentation circuit failures. One of these failures involves the pressurizer pressure instruments. A postulated failure of these circuits could result in a spurious process control system signal to open the power operated relief valves (PORVs). This spurious signal can be bypassed (overridden) by the control room operator using a control switch. A screening human error probability (HEP) of 0.10 is assumed for this action. The use of a screening HEP of 0.1 reflects an acknowledged HRA convention. A value of 0.1 is sufficiently high not to mask any dependent operator actions in accident sequences.

The occurrence of a postulated fire in the containment has the potential to cause loss of steam generator (SG) level instruments. The loss of level instruments is conservatively assumed to cause functional loss of the SG. Potential operator action to reduce auxiliary feedwater (AFW) system flow to minimum levels based on decay heat removal requirements to maintain SG function without level indication is not credited.

The analysis for the risk significance of the in-situ raceway configuration conservatively assumes that the entire calculated **CDF** is equal to the risk increase. This effectively treats a configuration that would not require an exemption as having zero calculated risk.

## **6.0 BACKGROUND/LICENSING & DESIGN BASIS**

The Background/Licensing and Design Basis discussion applicable to this submittal is the same as that for Reference 4. The text is summarized below to assist the reader of this document.

## **6.1** Background

On December 16, 1999, and as a result of FPL's ongoing Appendix R review activities, FPL discovered inconsistencies between FPL's exemption request K1 and the related NRC SERs dated February 21, 1985 and March 5, 1987.

The March 5, 1987 NRC SER states that 25 feet of vertical separation exists between raceways containing redundant divisions of safe shutdown cables in the Unit **1** containment annular area. The statement in the SER does not match the actual plant condition. There is a 25-foot vertical separation between floor elevations in the Unit **1** containment, but a 25 foot vertical separation does not exist between raceways containing redundant divisions of safe shutdown cables. As part of the engineering review of the resulting condition report operability and reportability determinations were performed. FPL determined that the fire protection program remained operable. An appropriate 50.72 notification was made on the date of discovery. The condition was determined to be "outside the design basis" and on January 18, 2000, LER 1999-009 was submitted pursuant to 10 CFR 50.73(a)(2)(ii). The corrective action for that LER stated that FPL would resubmit exemption request K1 to clarify the vertical separation criteria. This submittal was made by Reference 4 on October 4, 2000.

## **6.2** Licensing Basis

St. Lucie Unit 1 was licensed to operate prior to January 1, 1979 and 10 CFR 50.48(a) establishes the requirement that Unit I must have a fire protection plan that satisfies Criterion 3, "Fire Protection," of 10 CFR 50 Appendix A, "General Design Criteria for Nuclear Power Plants." Part (b) of 10 CFR 50.48 requires nuclear power plants licensed to operate prior to January 1, 1979 to satisfy the applicable requirements of Appendix R to 10 CFR 50, including specifically the requirements of Sections Il.G, Ill.J, and **111.0.** 

PSL Unit **1** has a number of exemptions from Appendix R requirements, including exemption K1 for the Unit 1 containment. Exemption K1 is the subject of this evaluation. exemption K1 was originally granted by the NRC as discussed in NRC SER dated February 21, 1985 and subsequently revised in NRC SER dated March 5, 1987. Exemption K1 identifies conditions in the Unit 1 containment that deviate from Appendix R Section III.G.2.d.

## **6.3** Appendix R Requirements

Appendix R, Section III.G.2.d-f;

*...Inside noninerted containments one of the fire protection means specified above or one of the following fire protection means shall be provided:* 

- *d. Separation of cables and equipment and associated nonsafety circuits of redundant trains by a horizontal distance of more than 20 feet with no intervening combustibles or fire hazards;*
- *e. Installation of fire detectors and an automatic fire suppression system in the fire area; or*
- *f. Separation of cables and equipment and associated nonsafety circuits of redundant trains by a noncombustible radiant energy heat shield*

The subject of this evaluation, exemption K1 for the Unit 1 containment, is an approved exemption to the requirements of Appendix R Section III.G.2.d.

## 6.4 Unit **I** Operating License

Unit I License Condition 2.C(3), Fire Protection, states;

*The licensee shall implement and maintain in effect all provisions of the approved fire protection program as described in the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report for the facility (The fire protection program and features were originally described in licensee submittals L-83-514 dated October 7, 1983, L-83-227 dated April 22 [12], 1983, L-83-261 dated April 25, 1983, L-83-453 dated August 24, 1983, L-83-488 dated September 16, 1983, L-83-588 dated December 14, 1983, L-84-346 dated November 28, 1984, L-84-390 dated December31, 1984 and L-85-71 dated February 21, 1985) and* as *approved by NRC letter dated July 17, 1984 and supplemented by NRC letters dated February 21, 1985, March 5, 1987 and October 4, 1988 subject to the following provisions:* 

*The licensee may make changes to the approved fire protection program without prior approval of the Commission only if those changes would not adversely affect the ability to achieve and maintain safe shutdown in the event of a fire.* 

In the above excerpt, the date referenced for L-83-227 is incorrect. The correct date is April 12, 1983 and will be used throughout the evaluation. This administrative error will be corrected by an amendment to the operating license. FPL corrected this error by FPL letter L-2001-078, dated April 18, 2001, subject "Proposed License Amendments Minor Changes/Corrections."

## **6.5** FPL Appendix R Exemption Submittals

Each of the submittals identified in the Operating License is summarized below with regard to the vertical and horizontal separation provided in the Unit I containment annular area.

- 6.5.1 FPL submittal to NRC dated April 12, 1983 (L-83-227) does not specifically address the actual vertical or horizontal separation provided in exemption K1. The letter states only that the requirement to maintain 20 feet of horizontal separation is not met. No discussion of vertical separation is provided.
- 6.5.2 FPL submittal to NRC dated April 25, 1983 (L-83-261) is limited to a discussion of exemption K2 that requested exemption from Section **111-0** of Appendix R regarding the oil collection system.
- 6.5.3 FPL submittal to NRC dated August 24, 1983 (L-83-453) provides a minor revision (revised wording resulting from completion of detection modifications and removal of outdated "Zone" references) to the submittal dated April 12, 1983 (L-83-227) and does not specifically address the actual vertical or horizontal separation provided in exemption K1 - only that 20 feet of horizontal separation is not provided. No discussion of vertical separation is provided.
- 6.5.4 FPL submittal to NRC dated September 16, 1983 (L-83-488) provides a detailed fire hazard analysis of the Unit I containment (Fire Area K). As part of this analysis, a discussion of the cable routes for specific components is provided on pages FA-K-16 through FA-K-18 (see Attachment 1). Certain sections of the discussions (pressurizer pressure and level, RCS temperature, and SG **1A** and **1B**  level and pressure) state that;

*...Associated cables are routed in separate trays on the 18. 00' and 45.00' elevations. In addition to the vertical separation, the cable trays are routed 7 to 11 ft apart horizontally....* 

Note that in the context of the fire hazard analysis, the terminology "routed on 18.00' elevation" indicated the routing was between the 18.00' and 45.00' elevations. Further, the terminology "routed on the 45.00" indicated the routing was between 45.00' and 62.00' elevations. Throughout the fire hazard analysis, components are listed by floor elevation, not actual elevation of the component.

- 6.5.5 FPL submittal to NRC dated December 14, 1983 (L-83-588) does not address exemption K1.
- 6.5.6 FPL submittal to NRC dated October 7, 1983 (L-83-514) does not address exemption K1.
- 6.5.7 FPL submittal to NRC dated November 28, 1984 (L-84-346) provides a minor address the actual vertical or horizontal separation provided in exemption K1 - only that 20 feet of horizontal separation is not provided. No discussion of vertical separation is provided.

NOTE: It is this submittal that revised exemption K1 by adding "no intervening combustibles" between raceways containing redundant divisions of safe shutdown cables to the description of the exemption.

6.5.8 FPL submittal to NRC dated December 31, 1984 (L-84-390) does not address exemption K1.

### **6.6** Excerpts from NRC SERs

- 6.6.1 NRC Safety Evaluation Report dated July 17, 1984 does not address exemption K1.
- 6.6.2 NRC Safety Evaluation Report dated February 21, 1985 states:

*...Redundant cable trays are separated from each other by horizontal distance of more than* 7 feet. *They are installed on separate elevations separated by approximately 25 feet...* 

6.6.3 NRC Safety Evaluation Report dated March 5, 1987 states:

**...** *Separation of redundant cables was by more than 7 feet horizontally and 25 feet vertically...* 

The revised SER included the statement "no intervening combustibles" as part of the exemption.

6.6.4 NRC Safety Evaluation Report dated October 4, 1988 does not address exemption KI.

#### **6.7** Exemption **KI**

FPL's submittal to NRC dated November 28,1984 (Revision 3) regarding exemption K1 is as follows:

#### FIRE AREA K

This fire area is the reactor containment building previously designated as Fire Area 26. Essential equipment within this area is shown in the attached equipment list (this list is provided in this submittal).

The following exemptions to Appendix R to 10 CFR 50 are requested:

#### Exemption K1

An exemption is requested from Section IlI-G.2.d of Appendix R because the containment cables and associated nonsafety circuits of redundant trains are not in all cases separated by 20 feet with no intervening combustibles.

#### Evaluation K1

- 1) A new reactor coolant pump oil collection system is provided to collect pressurized and unpressurized leaks from each of the reactor coolant pump lube oil systems. This installation will confine the major portion of combustible inventory to a separate oil collection tank in accordance with Appendix R, Section **111-0.** The remaining combustible oil in the fire area is light.
- 2) Fire detection is provided as shown on drawings 8770-G-413.
- 3) Redundant safety-related equipment is protected from exposure to localized combustible sources by spatial separation and/or the use of existing barriers and partitions (i.e., concrete walls, floors and ceilings) having a greater than three hour fire resistive rating.

Separation is provided to maintain independence of electrical circuits and equipment so that the protective function required during any design basis event can be accomplished. The degree and method of separation varies with the potential hazards in a particular area. This is accomplished by use of spatial separation, barriers, and radiant energy shields where required.

4) Electrical cables are concentrated at the penetration areas at elevation 23.00 ft between column lines 6 and 8. The cables are immediately separated and routed to several items of equipment.

Radiant energy shields are being provided between safety-related A and B cable trays in the cable penetration area to provide separation.

5) Non IEEE 383 1974 cables in Fire Area K were coated with Flamemastic fire protective coating system. New cables meet the IEEE-383 1974 criteria.

 $\sim$ 

- 6) Fire Area K is a high radiation area and personnel access is limited, thus minimizing the probability of introducing transient combustibles.
- 7) The large free volume (2.5 million cubic feet) of Fire Area K allows for dissipation of hot off-gases temperatures and reduces the effect of stratified hot gases at essential components.
- 8) Instrument cable trays are covered.

#### Conclusion K1

Based on our evaluation, the existing features in Fire Area K provide adequate separation for a fire in transient or in-situ combustibles. Additional modification would not augment or materially enhance the safety of the plant since it would not aid in the prevention of fire damage to redundant components essential for safe shutdown. Therefore, we conclude, this is an acceptable exemption to Appendix R to 10 CFR 50, Section lll-G.2.d.

## **7.0 ASSESSMENT DETAILS**

## **7.1** Potentially Affected Circuits

The scope of potentially affected circuits was determined by reviewing the St. Lucie Unit 1 SSA. The fire area report for Fire Area K provides a detailed listing of circuits of concern. These circuits are listed in Table 1. The routing of each circuit was researched to determine whether they were located between radial column lines 2 and 6. The results of this review are provided below in terms of the associated component.





 $\hat{\boldsymbol{\cdot} }$ 

 $\mathcal{A}$ 



 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 

 $\hat{\rho}$ 



 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$  and  $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$ 

 $\sim$   $\omega$ 

The information presented above on a per component basis was aggregated and a bounding fire scenario was developed. The characterization of this bounding fire scenario in terms of plant system functions is necessary in order to simplify the interface with the plant PSA model. The plant PSA model must be quantified with the associated plant system functions failed. In general, this is performed by selecting key model basic events and setting them to 'TRUE,' or to a failure probability of 1.0. The quantification being performed for this assessment were done without an initiating event frequency. As a result, the quantification of the model produces a CCDP value. This value must then be separately combined with a fire ignition frequency to obtain the CDF.

The scope of plant system failures includes consideration of fire induced failure of the PORVs. However, the specific set of cable failures could cause two different failure modes. In one case, the cable failures could result in the inability to open the PORVs. In another case, the failure of instrument cables could result in a spurious PORV open demand signal. The instrument circuit failures would have to occur on at least two of the four instrument loops to satisfy the logic requirements. Since these two scenarios are mutually exclusive, two separate cases are required in order to properly characterize the risk.

**Scenario 1** - This scenario evaluates the case wherein fire induced circuit failure results in the inability to open the PORVs and thus cannot be opened for feed and bleed cooling. This CCDP estimation assumes the fire results in a T1 (general reactor trip) initiating event (IE). The latest Unit **1** working baseline PSA model was used. The treatment of the individual fire induced system failures is summarized below.





In addition to the PSA events listed above, the probability of the following PSA events was adjusted:

Assumes  $T1 = 1$  and all other IEs = 0.

It is assumed that instead of a spurious signal there could be no signal from the pressurizer pressure input to the diverse trip:



The PSA only models failure of main spray valves to open. It is assumed that this is a valid fire-related failure mode. Spurious opening of the spray valve is not modeled. The spurious opening of the spray potentially alters the calculated CCDP value in that the failure probability of the safety valve(s) to reclose following an open demand could be higher if the pressurizer 'bubble' has collapsed. This is discussed further in Section 7.5.

Failed tag PCV-1100E Failed tag PCV-1100F

The PSA only models failure of auxiliary spray valves to open. It is assumed that this is a valid fire-related failure mode. The discussion of a postulated spurious spray event is discussed above.

Failed tag SE-02-3 Failed tag SE-02-4

The fire analysis assumes that if a fire fails V3652 to a closed position an operator can enter containment and manually open the valve when **SDC** is required. For this **CCDP**  estimation it is assumed that the valve cannot be opened and thus fails hot leg suction for the 'B' LPSI pump (i.e., **SDC** via 'B' LPSI pump):

Failed tag V3652

The quantification of the plant PSA model given the set of 'failures' described above produced a CCDP of:

**CCDP** = 1.72E-03 (@ 1E-09 truncation)

Scenario 2 - This scenario evaluates the case wherein fire induced circuit failures result in a spurious PORV open signal. This signal results from instrumentation circuit failures. Operator action to override the spurious signal from the control room is available, but is not specifically credited in the CCDP calculation. This CCDP estimation assumes the fire results in a T2 (PORV challenge) initiating event (IE). The latest Unit **1** working baseline PSA model was used. The treatment of the individual fire induced system failures is summarized below.





In addition to the PSA events listed above, the probability of the following PSA events was adjusted:

Assumes  $T2 = 1$  and all other  $IEs = 0$ .

It is assumed that instead of a spurious signal there could be no signal from the pressurizer pressure input to the diverse trip:

Set PSA Event NMM1P1102A to 1.0 Set PSA Event NMM1P1102C to 1.0

Set PSA Event NMMIP1102B to 1.0 Set PSA Event NMM1P1102D to 1.0

The PSA only models failure of main spray valves to open. It is assumed that this is a valid fire-related failure mode. Spurious opening of the spray valve is not modeled. The spurious opening of the spray potentially alters the calculated CCDP value in that the

failure probability of the safety valve(s) to reclose following an open demand could be higher if the pressurizer 'bubble' has collapsed. This is discussed further in Section 7.5.

Failed tag PCV-1100E Failed tag PCV-1100F

The PSA only models failure of auxiliary spray valves to open. It is assumed that this is a valid fire-related failure mode. The discussion of a postulated spurious spray event is discussed above.

Failed tag SE-02-3 Failed tag SE-02-4

The fire analysis assumes that if a fire fails V3652 to a closed position an operator can enter containment and manually open the valve when SDC is required. For this CCDP estimation it is assumed that the valve cannot be opened and thus fails hot leg suction for the 'B' LPSI pump (i.e., SDC via 'B' LPSI pump):

Failed tag V3652

CCDP =  $2.13E-03$  ( $@$  1E-09 truncation)

## **7.2** Treatment for Fire Induced Cable Failures

The containment fire analysis considered three potential fire induced cable failure modes open circuit, short circuit, and hot shorts. A key feature of the analysis is that the potential for spurious equipment actuation is considered for all three failure modes.

Open circuit  $-$  a postulated fire induced open circuit would result in the interruption of power or control signals. In this case, components would align themselves in a de energized state. Valves that require power to maintain a desired position would be assumed to change state. Relays that are normally energized would de-energize. The consequences of this relay action may include spurious actuation of mechanical system components. In no case were fire induced failures credited to assist components in achieving the desired state for this analysis. The open circuit failure mode was treated using a conditional failure probability of 1.0.

Short circuit - a postulated fire induced short circuit is defined as those fire induced failures wherein the conductors of an individual cable become 'connected' together in any combination. The failure modes that were considered included shorting of all conductors in power circuits, and the selected shorting of conductors within individual control cables to cause spurious equipment actuation. This latter case is often referred to as a conductor to conductor hot short. For example, a control cable between a motor control center and the valve actuator would be treated using failure modes that included the shorting of conductors to generate a spurious valve open or close signal. As in the prior case, fire induced cable failures were not credited to assist components achieve the desired state for this analysis. This short circuit failure mode was treated using a conditional failure probability of 1.0.

Hot short - this cable failure mode is a special case of the more general short circuit failure mode. This case involves an instance wherein the energized conductor(s) of a given cable becomes connected to the de-energized conductor(s) of another cable causing undesired spurious actuation of equipment associated with the second cable. This is typically referred to as a cable to cable hot short. This failure mode is very unlikely since it also requires that these 'shorted' conductors not include certain other conductors such as neutral or ground, and be connected long enough to cause the affected component to change state. As such, the application of a non-unity conditional failure probability is appropriate. While an explicit analysis to determine this value for each case was not performed, a simplified assessment was performed to provide a reasonable range of possible values.

The simplified assessment that was performed considered a hypothetical case involving two cables, each consisting of two conductors. Cable 1 is assumed to be connected to a de-energized solenoid valve whose desired post fire status is to remain de-energized. The conductors for this cable are identified as 'SI' (hot conductor) and 'S2' (neutral conductor). Cable 2 is assumed to be a power supply cable consisting of conductors 'P' (hot conductor) and 'N' (neutral conductor). The cables are assumed to be routed in a grounded raceway system. This configuration involves 5 conductors. The grounded raceway system is treated as a single 'virtual' conductor.

The possible cable shorting configurations involve pairs of conductors, groups of three, four, and a single case involving all five conductors. There are a total of 26 'shorting' combinations. However, only combinations that involve the connection of conductor *'Si'* of cable **1** with conductor 'P in cable 2 would spuriously energize the solenoid valve. This pair occurs in combinations 2, 11, 14, 15, 21, 22, 24, and 26 shown in the table below. However, only in combination 2 will the pair produce a hot short with no potential involvement by the other conductors. The statistical probability of this occurring is 1 in 26, i.e., 3.85E-2. In all other combinations, a hot short can be produced only if this pair is shorted for a sufficient time to energize the solenoid valve before another conductor in the combination enters the shorted configuration. Thus, the statistical probability in these cases is between zero (if another conductor is involved immediately) and an upper bound value greater than zero (determined by the delay before another conductor becomes involved).

The upper bound of the conditional probability of this temporal delay during which only conductors P and **S1** are shorted can be approximated by the statistical fraction of pairs within this combination which involve this specific pair. Therefore, in the case of combination 11 involving conductors **S1, S2,** and P, there are three possibilities for the 'initiating' pair - **S1/S2, S1/P,** and S2/P. Si/P is the hot short combination of concern and represents 1 out of 3 possible pairs. Therefore, the conditional probability of combination 11 producing a hot short is between zero and  $1/3<sup>rd</sup>$  out of 26. Repeating this process for all of the higher order combinations, the conditional probability of hot short in combinations 11, 14, and **15** is between zero and **<sup>1</sup> /3 rd** out of 26 each; in combination 21, 22 and 24 it is between zero and 1/6<sup>th</sup> out of 26 each; and in combination 26 it is between zero and 1/10<sup>th</sup> out of 26. Adding these fractions, the upper bound of the conditional probability of the higher order combinations producing a hot short is:

$$
\frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{6} + \frac{1}{6} + \frac{1}{6} + \frac{1}{10} = 1.6 \text{ out of } 26 = 6.15E - 2
$$

The overall probability of a hot short being produced is between 3.85E-2 (for the single combination of only conductors **S1** and P and the lower bound, i.e. zero, of the higher order combinations) and (3.85E-2 + 6.15E-2 = **1.OOE-1** (for the upper bound of all combinations involving conductors **S1** and P)). The analysis can not determine the actual probability more precisely without further information regarding the temporal characteristics of conductor pair shorting in the higher order combinations. However, it can be readily derived that any other cable configuration involving a larger number of conductors will produce a range of probability of hot short that is lower than in this case.

This simplified assessment concluded that the lower and upper bound conditional probabilities were 3.85E-2 and **1.OOE-1,** respectively. It was noted that the hot short conditional probability of 6.8E-2 presented in NUREG/CR-2258 is approximately the mean of these upper and lower bound values. Based on this information, and the fact that the credible fire events are all self-initiated cable fires, the Unit **1** containment assessment conservatively used the upper bound conditional probability of **1.OOE-01** for all postulated cable to cable hot short failures. In cases where multiple hot short events are being considered, each event is considered to be a completely independent event. Common cause is therefore not applicable. Therefore, the spurious actuation of a three-phase motor due to hot shorts on the power cable would have a conditional probability of 1.OE-3 (0.10 x  $0.10 \times 0.10 = 1.0E-3$ ).



## Conductor Shorting Combinations

Conductor Definition: **Sl** - positive conductor to solenoid valve S2 - negative conductor to solenoid valve P - positive conductor of energized cable N - negative conductor of energized cable G - ground (neutral) of raceway

Notes:

- 1. All combination containing conductor G result in no voltage or are short circuit conditions wherein no potential would be available to the solenoid.
- 2. This combination represents a short circuit condition on the power supply circuit to the solenoid.
- 3. This combination involves the connection of neutral conductors only.
- 4. Higher order combination containing the conductors that could cause a spurious actuation.

# 7.3 Containment Area Self-Initiated Cable Fire Frequency

**<sup>A</sup>**review of the tier 2 documents from the original Fire IPEEE found that the cumulative plant-wide cable combustible load used to partition the fire frequency among the fire compartments was 1.26 x 1010 Btu. A review of the Unit **1** UFSAR found that the current cable combustible load within containment is 1.086 x **109** Btu. The baseline plant-wide fire frequency for self-initiated cable fires from the EPRI FIVE Methodology is 6.3E-3/yr. Using these values, the total self-initiated cable fire frequency in the Unit **<sup>I</sup>**containment can be calculated. This total frequency needs to be partitioned to reflect the fraction of cables physically located in the area of interest - between radial column lines 2 and 6. In order to ensure that the results of this analysis are bounding, it is assumed that 50% of the total combustible load in the Unit **1** containment occurs between radial column lines 2 and 6.

$$
\frac{1.086 \times 10^9}{1.26 \times 10^{10}} \times 6.3E - 3 \times 0.50 = 2.72E - 4 / yr
$$

## 7.4 Fire Scenario Development

The space between the containment structure and the interior biological shield between radial column lines 2 and 6 does not contain any significant fire ignition sources. An engineering walkdown conducted during refueling outage SL1-17 to identify potential fire ignition sources found a limited number of motor operated valves (MOVs) and electrical cabinets to be located in the area. However, the MOVs are not considered to be credible fire ignition sources because the of motor enclosure construction (NEMA TENV – totally enclosed non-ventilated) and the few electrical cabinets that were observed were totally enclosed. Based on these observations, the only credible fire scenario in the area of interest is a self-initiated cable fire.

The cables installed in the Unit *I* containment are a mixture of IEEE 383 and non-IEEE 383 qualified. The non-IEEE 383 cables are coated with Flamemastic. The Flamemastic coating provides a degree of fire protection that would tend to minimize the likelihood of cable damage and/or ignition due to fire exposure. The coating would impede the development of the fire and the extent of fire propagation and thereby reduce the magnitude of a postulated self-initiated cable fire event. However, in order to simplify the analysis and provide bounding results, the cables were assumed to be non-IEEE 383 cables for the purposes of determining fire ignition frequency and damage threshold temperature. This approach introduces conservatism into the analysis. The fire modeling was performed using the simplified analysis tools from the EPRI FIVE Methodology. This approach was used together with a conservative estimation of the source fire intensity in order to provide bounding results.

The trays are arranged in vertical stacks. All trays have solid bottoms. The bottom tray in each stack is an instrumentation tray that is provided with a solid cover. The top tray in each stack also has a solid cover where exposed to overhead traffic (i.e., directly beneath a grating or opening). All trays are coated with Flamemastic. The circuits in the instrumentation trays are considered to be low energy circuits that are not potential ignition sources. The top tray in each stack is a power circuit tray typically carrying 480 VAC power circuits. Between the top and bottom tray are either one or two control circuit trays.

In the area of interest, the system SA trays are arranged in two stacks as described above. One stack is located on the 23' nominal elevation with another located directly above it at the 45' nominal elevation. The highest tray on the 23' nominal elevation is at 42'-0". The lowest tray on the 45' nominal elevation is at 54'-2". A similar configuration exists for the system SB trays. The highest tray on the 23' nominal elevation is at 42'-0". The lowest tray on the 45' nominal elevation is at 57'-2". However, in the area between radial column lines 5 and 6, the 'lower' stack of system SB trays transitions to the upper elevation via cable tray risers. The arrangement of these trays is shown in the Figures 1 and 2.

L-2001-153 **Attachment** Page 23 of 40



 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 

 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 



		M127	59'-0"
		C121	$58 - 1"$
		L <sub>131</sub>	$57 - 2"$
M102	$55 - 8"$		
C103	$54' - 11"$		
L111	$54 - 2"$		
		M120	$51 - 2$
		C120	$50 - 3"$
		L120	49'-4"
M100	42'-0"		
C100	$41 - 2"$		
C101	40'-4"		
L <sub>101</sub>	$39' - 6"$		
System SA		System SB	

Figure 2 - Arrangement of Trays Between Radial Column Lines 5.5 and 6 - not to scale -

The system SA and SB tray stacks are separated by a horizontal distance of approximately 7'. Based on these elevations, the key interactions distances are 12' vertically and 7' horizontally.



Note 1: The vertical spacing distances are applicable only between column lines 2 and 5.5. Between column lines 5.5 and 6, the trays of have limited vertical spacing, but maintain the 7 foot horizontal spacing.

The minimum 'available' vertical separation of the redundant systems of cable trays between column lines 2 and 5.5 is about 12 feet with a horizontal separation of 7 feet. Between column lines 5.5 and 6 only the horizontal separation of 7 feet is available. The configuration of this area involves grating that forms the nominal floor elevations at 23'-0", 45'-0", and 62'-0". An inside of plume scenario is not applicable to this configuration since the targets would be of the same system. An outside of plume scenario is also not applicable because the grating precludes the travs from exposure to ceiling jet effects (no ceiling). Therefore, radiant exposure case is the only credible scenario. The EPRI FIVE Radiant Exposure Worksheet was used to analyze the 7' of available spacing to determine the critical fire intensity. The critical fire intensity represents that value wherein the postulated fire is likely to cause damage to the target cable trays. The worksheet is provided in Table 2 and shows a critical fire intensity of 770 Btu/s.

The input parameters for the worksheet are summarized below.

- 1. Target Damage Threshold a critical radiant heat flux of 0.50 Btu/s/ft<sup>2</sup> is used. This value is consistent with guidance in FIVE and the EPRI Fire PRA Implementation Guide.
- 2. Radiant Heat Release Fraction a value of 0.40 is used based on recommendations in the EPRI FIVE Methodology.
- 3. Peak Fire Intensity the peak fire intensity was determined by iteration. A fire intensity was gradually increased to a point where the critical radiant flux distance was equal to the available target spacing (7').

The analysis determined that a postulated self-initiated cable fire would have to have an intensity greater than 770 Btu/s in order to represent a potential concern. This result is conservative because it does not credit the Flamemastic coating or the radiant shielding provided by the piping, structural steel, and other non-combustible features located between the system SA and SB cable tray stacks. In addition, the analysis methodology using the FIVE worksheets are derived based on the fire source and target points. The fire scenario being considered involves a linearly distributed fire along a distance that is much greater than the spacing. Therefore, the actual incident heat flux is much lower than calculated. The area also contains many features that limit the locations where line of sight exists between the redundant tray stacks (i.e., HVAC duct, safety injection tanks, structural/support steel, and process piping).

The characterization of a self-initiated cable fire having a fire intensity of 770 Btu/s can be determined using the data from Table **1E** of the EPRI FIVE Methodology Report. This table provides the heat release rates for a variety of cable types. Because the cables are a mixture of IEEE 383 and non-IEEE 383 cables, a composite heat release rate was developed based on the average of several values. The values in the table below are taken from the EPRI FIVE Methodology Report.



The equation for determining the heat release rate for a self-initiated cable fire is provided as equation (2) of Attachment 10.4 to FIVE and involves a combustion efficiency of 45%.

$$
Q_{fs} = 0.45 q_{bs} A \t\t 770 Btu/s = 0.45 x 37.24 Btu/s/ft2 x A
$$
  

$$
A = 45.9 ft2
$$

Based on the analysis present above, a postulated self-initiated cable fire would have to involve a surface area of greater than  $45.9$  ft<sup>2</sup> to result in a heat rate that presents a potential concern. A credible event involving a self-initiated cable fire is expected to be characterized by a relatively long development phase, a period of time where peak fire intensity occurs, and a burn out phase wherein the available combustible material is assumed to be depleted. For the scenario being considered, the 45.9  $\text{ft}^2$  'critical' area represents the surface area actively burning at any given time. It is not meant to represent the total area affected by a fire.

A self-initiated cable fire event is modeled in this analysis based on a nominal cable tray width of 24 inches. In order to achieve the calculated surface area, a total linear length of cable tray involved in the fire must be at least 22.9 feet. A review of the raceways in the area of interest found the system SA trays on the 23' nominal elevation to be configured in a stack of 4 trays (M100, **C100, C101,** and L101). The top and bottom trays have solid covers and are therefore effectively enclosed. While exposure of these trays to a postulated fire could result in damage to the cables contained in the trays, the solid enclosure effectively eliminates their contribution as a radiant heat source. Only the two middle trays (C100 and C101) represent a credible radiant heat source because of their open top configuration. Therefore, a linear length of approximately 11.4 feet of each tray must be actively burning to represent a potential challenge to the system SB trays located

on the opposite side of the annular space. The other tray stacks contain three trays each with only the one middle tray available as a radiant heat source. For these tray stacks, a minimum length of 22.9 feet of actively burning tray would be required.

The fire modeling analysis presented above is very conservative in that two key features are not credited. One is the presence of Flamemastic and the other is the radiant heat shielding provided by intervening non-combustible elements (.i.e., HVAC duct, safety injection tanks, structural/support steel, and process piping). Given that a self-initiated cable fire has been identified as the only credible ignition source, the Flamemastic will tend to prevent a fully involved fire from occurring. The significance of these variables can be assessed in the context of an uncertainty assessment by changing the target damage threshold from 0.50 Btu/s/ft<sup>2</sup> to 1.0 Btu/s/ft<sup>2</sup> and the radiant heat release fraction from 0.40 to 0.30. The 1.0 Btu/s/ft<sup>2</sup> value is the FIVE Methodology recommended value for IEEE 383 qualified cables. A heat release fraction of 0.30 is in the midpoint of the range of realistic values provided in FIVE. The worksheet in Table 3 shows that the corresponding peak fire intensity with these altered parameters is 2,050 Btu/s which is over 2 **Y2** times larger than the critical fire size.

These areas of conservatism, taken together with the calculated results, indicate that redundant cable damage is not likely to occur due to self-initiated cable fires. However, the assessment will evaluate the risk significance of a hypothetical case where fire damage to redundant cables does occur.

## **7.5** Core Damage Frequency Estimate

Section 7.3 develops a self-initiated cable fire frequency of 2.72E-04/yr. This frequency was calculated using methods consistent with the EPRI FIVE Methodology and represents all postulated fire events. The fire modeling analysis presented in Section 7.4 shows that a severe fire must occur. A severity factor of 0.20 is applied to address this fact. The application of this severity factor effectively treats 80% of the postulated fire events as being relatively small fires that cannot challenge redundant cables given the configuration of the area. This value was developed by reviewing the fire events reported in the EPRI Fire Events Database using a process described in the EPRI Fire PRA Implementation Guide. The severity factor of 0.20 is consistent with the EPRI recommended severity factor for control room electrical cabinets (0.20), and more conservative than the recommended severity factor for switchgear room electrical cabinets (0.12).

Section 7.1 provides the **CCDP** for the two bounding cases associated with the postulated containment fire. Scenario 1 assumes the fire causes functional failure of the PORVs and resulted in a CCDP of 1.72E-03.

Scenario 2 assumes the fire causes a spurious instrument signal that opens the PORVs. The CCDP for this case does not include crediting of operator action to override the signal and resulted in a CCDP of 2.13E-03. The operator action to mitigate this initiating event involves the use of control room switches to override the spurious signal. This operator action is assigned a screening human error probability (HEP) of 0.10.

The development of Scenario 1 did not explicitly treat fire induced spurious spray actuation. Spurious pressurizer spray can collapse the 'bubble' and increase the likelihood of failure of a safety valve to close following an open demand. The consequences of this

sequence of event is bounded by the **CCDP** for Scenario 2. Therefore, the full scope of potential fire induced failures for Scenario 1 can be conservatively treated by using the Scenario 2 **CCDP** value.

Combining the various elements of the risk assessment provides the bounding **CDF**  estimate for the postulated fire event.



The total estimated change in **CDF** is 1.28E-07/yr. Since the baseline **CDF** is approximately 2E-05/yr., the change in **CDF** calculated above is in Region **III** of RG 1.174 Figure 3 and is, therefore, considered very small and is thus not risk significant.

The change in LERF due to the postulated fire event can be estimated as follows:

Change in LERF = change in Steam Generator Tube Rupture (SGTR) contribution + ISLOCA contribution + (1% of the change in non-SGTR **CDF** contribution) [note: it is estimated that 1% of the non-SGTR related **CDF** would lead to a large early release]

- Change in SGTR contribution: The fire scenarios addressed do not impact the SGTR contribution and thus there is no LERF impact.
- **-** Change in ISLOCA The only postulated fire-related impact related to LERF would be from a hot short causing a spurious opening of V3652 (SDC hot leg suction). It is estimated that there is a IE-03 failure probability for the three-phase hot short related to this valve (see section 7.2 of this evaluation). Both V3651 and V3652 must open to initiate an ISLOCA. The fire scenario of concern does not impact V3651. V3651 is a motor operated valve with power removed from the valve with the unit at power. The valve, therefore, is essentially a manually operated valve from a non fire-related spurious transfer perspective. If it is assumed that there is a 24 hour exposure to V3651 spuriously opening following the postulated fire event, a conservative change in ISLOCA can be calculated as follows:

 $(1E-03 \times 2.72E-04/yr \times .2) \times (24 \text{ hours} \times 1.3E-07/hr) = \varepsilon$ 

where 1.3E-07/hr is the assumed manual valve transferring open failure rate

**- 1%** of the non-SGTR related change in **CD** : 0.01 x 1.28E-07 = 1.28E-09

The total change in LERF is estimated to be 1.28E-09/yr. The baseline LERF is less than IE-05/yr. The change in LERF is in Region **III** of RG 1.174 Figure 4 and is, therefore, considered very small. The change in LERF is thus not risk significant.

L-2001-153 Attachment Page 28 of 40

Table **1** 

 $\sim$   $\sim$ 

 $\mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}$ 

APPENDIX R CONTAINMENT CABLE LISTING

 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 

 $\cdot$ 



 $\sim 10^{11}$ 

 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 



L-2001-153 Attachment Page 31 of 40  $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 



#### L-2001-153 Attachment Page 32 of 40

 $\mathbf{v}$ 

 $\bar{\mathbf{v}}$ 

 $\sim$ 



 $\sim$ 

#### L-2001-153 Attachment Page 33 of 40

 $\mathcal{L}^{\pm}$ 

 $\hat{A}$ 



 $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$ 

 $\mathbb{Z}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ 



 $\Delta$ 

 $\overline{a}$ 



 $\mathcal{A}^{\pm}$ 

 $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$ 



#### L-2001-153 Attachment Page 37 of 40

 $\mathcal{L}^{\pm}$ 

 $\mathcal{F}^{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{G})$ 



 $\mathcal{L}$ 

 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 



#### L-2001-153 Attachment Page 39 of 40

 $\sim$ 

 $\mathcal{L}$ 

 $\langle \hat{q} \rangle$ 



## Table 2

 $\sim$ 

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ 

## FIRE MODELING WORKSHEET Peak Fire Intensity 770 Btu/sec

# FIXED COMBUSTIBLE/ RADIANT EXPOSURE ENGLISH UNITS VERSION



# Table 3

## FIRE MODELING WORKSHEET Peak Fire Intensity 1540 Btu/sec

# FIXED COMBUSTIBLE / RADIANT EXPOSURE ENGLISH UNITS VERSION

