# ACRS Briefing on Spent Fuel Pool Accident Risk for Decommissioning Plants





**November 5, 1999** 

Diane Jackson, Technical Working Group Lead Engineer SPLB, DSSA

## **Presentation Purpose**

- **♦** Broad scope effort
- **♦** Following process
- **♦** Technical assessment progressing
- **♦ Addressing stakeholder concerns**
- ♦ Results will be incorporated into rulemaking and interim exemption criteria

# **Decommissioning Background**

- ♦ Most NRC operating reactor regulations were not developed considering the transition from power operations to decommissioning
  - ♦ Staff currently issues exemptions on EP and others on a case-by-case basis
- ♦ Commission directed staff to resolve this situation by issuing rules for decommissioning
  - ♦ Integrated
  - **♦ Risk-informed**
- ♦ Staff formed the Technical Working Group (TWG) to study spent fuel pool (SFP) accident risk

## **Technical Working Group (TWG) Product**

- ♦ TWG output is to provide a technical basis on spent fuel pool (SFP) accident risk that will assist NRR:
  - ♦ Develop an integrated rulemaking
  - ♦ Provide guidance for interim exemption criteria during rulemaking activities
  - ♦ Identify areas of large uncertainty that may merit additional work
- ♦ Expectation: Generic study such that licensees would not be required to perform site-specific SFP analysis for reduction in regulation

## **Technical Working Group (TWG) Study**

- ♦ A comprehensive review of SFP accidents and associated risk at decommissioning plants did not exist
- **♦** Key areas of draft report:
  - Decay time estimation based on thermal hydraulic code analysis
  - ♦ Risk assessment
- ♦ Risk assessment used a broad set of initiating events:

Loss of SFP cooling
Heavy load handling
Loss of SFP inventory

Tornado missiles Seismic Internal fire Aircraft

## TWG Study (cont.)

- Issued draft in June
  - ♦ Stakeholder interest in study
  - TWG to gather feedback and additional information
- ♦ Staff held several public meetings April, May, June, July (2-day workshop)
- ♦ Received comments and information from stakeholders (e.g., NEI, UCS, individuals) via meetings, telecons, and correspondence
- Major industry concern was that the risk analysis did not give sufficient credit for plant conditions and personnel actions

## **Areas of Stakeholder Comment**

- ♦ Probabilistic assessment:
  - **♦** Seismic events
  - ♦ Human reliability
  - ♦ Heavy loads
- **♦ Deterministic assessment:** 
  - **♦** Adiabatic spent fuel heatup calculation
  - **♦ Zirconium ignition temperature**
- **♦** Criticality
- **♦** Safeguards
- Normal operations
- ♦ Concrete aging
- ♦ Others

## **Human Reliability Analysis (HRA)**

Issue: HRA values do not give sufficient credit for operator actions

- Issued draft HRA approach for long term events to identify conditions needed to support a claim of high human reliability
- Provided approach to two HR experts and the public for comment
- ♦ No technical comments from public to date
- ♦ Based on expert feedback, TWG is revising HRA approach and it will be included in the independent review & final assessment

## **Heavy Loads**

Issue: Heavy load risk assessment does not give sufficient credit for NUREG-0612 actions (Control of Heavy Loads) and uses upper bound values

NEI Actions: Proposed that all decommissioning plants meet NUREG-0612 Phase I and II actions (operating reactors are required to meet Phase I) and provided raw data on cask lifts

- Reassessed assuming NEI's proposal, improved statistical methods and new information
- ♦ Risk values from the reassessment have been included in the independent review

## **Seismic Events**

Issue: Unique pool characteristics may result in vulnerabilities above the nominal plant (outside scope of TWG assessment)

NEI Action: Action item at workshop to propose seismic checklist

- ♦ TWG initial review finds the NEI input is useful for seismic screening of SFPs
- NEI's proposed checklist is included in the independent review
- **♦** Additional interactions in the future expected

## Criticality

Issue: Draft study did not sufficiently evaluate potential for criticality

♦ Evaluated using deterministic, physics approach

#### TWG Resolution/Actions:

 Reassessing criticality using expanded scope of scenarios

## **Other Activities**

- Continuing work to finalize study
  - **♦ Additional technical work by NRC contractors**
  - ♦ Independent, technical, quality review (ITQR)
  - **♦** Application of risk-informed principles

## **Risk-informed Decision Making**

- Conclusions from the technical study will be formulated using the risk-informed regulatory principles in RG 1.174:
  - ♦ Core damage frequency (CDF) & large early release frequency (LERF) goals
  - **♦** Defense in depth
  - **♦** Safety margins
  - **♦** Performance monitoring
- Based on all inputs, a realistic, risk-informed assessment will be developed

## **TWG Product And Schedule**

TWG is following its plan to finalize its assessment and address stakeholder concerns that will result in a solid technical basis for the development of rulemaking and interim exemption criteria

- ♦ Release draft report for public comment in early January 2000
- ♦ Release final report in early April 2000

# **BACKUP SLIDES**

# **Thermal Hydraulic Assessment**

- GSI-82 Severe accidents in SFPs for operating plants
  - Complete drain of the pool & heat up of the fuel and clad to the temperature of zirconium oxidation and subsequent ignition
  - ♦ 2-3 years required to provide sufficent decay such that could not raise clad tmeperute to oxidation temperature
  - Dependent on storage configuration and burnup

## **Thermal Hydraulic Assessment**

- Issue: Maximum clad temperature is too conservative (low) compared to zirconium ignition temperature
- ♦ Maximum temperature based on preventing temperature excursion due to "runaway" oxidation
- **♦ TWG Resolution/Actions:** 
  - ♦ Improve discussion in report to explain the zirconium oxidation reaction and structural limitations on temperature limit

## **Adiabatic Spent Fuel Heatup Calculation**

#### **Issue: Conservative calculation**

- Calculated time for one fuel rod to heat up to temperature of zirconium ignition
- ♦ Conservative, simple vs. realistic, complex

- Calculation performed as generic approach of site-specific application
- ♦ Conservative assumptions in deterministic calculations can simplify analysis and save licensee and staff resources
- ♦ No current plans to use as a generic criterion

## **Preliminary Risk Assessment**

- **♦** Estimated the frequency of fuel uncovery using:
  - Broad range of initiating events
  - Information gathered on visits to decommissioning sites on system configurations and procedures
  - ♦ Amount of redundancy and diversity of SFP heat removal systems, SFP makeup systems, and their support systems is an important assumption

## **Preliminary Risk Assessment (cont.)**

- The frequency of fuel uncovery is close but not equivalent to the frequency of zirconium fires in SFPs at decommissioned plants
- ♦ Personnel identification and response to adverse plant conditions influenced results
  - No automatically actuated systems
- ♦ TWG preliminary results identified several credible initiators for decommissioning plants