

# WOLF CREEK NUCLEAR OPERATING CORPORATION

November 16, 2004

Donna Jacobs  
Vice President Operations and Plant Manager

WO 04-0051

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

Reference: 1) Letter dated June 12, 2003, from D. B. Matthews, USNRC, to  
WCNOC

2) Letter WO 03-0048, dated August 8, 2003, from B. T. McKinney,  
WCNOC, to USNRC

Subject: Docket 50-482: Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Corporation response to  
Generic Letter 2003-01: Control Room Habitability

Gentlemen:

Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Corporation's (WCNOC's) preliminary response to NRC Generic Letter 2003-01, "Control Room Habitability" identified that WCNOC would need to develop an alternate method of integrated inleakage testing because of the Control Room/Control Building design. WCNOC contracted with Brookhaven National Laboratory and performed this alternate integrated inleakage testing on August 14-16, 2004. The enclosure to this letter provides a comparison of the alternate test method used to the ASTM E741 test standard.

Attachment II to this letter provides the preliminary results of this testing and the status of WCNOC's chemical and smoke evaluations. Attachment III to this letter provides a list of commitments contained in this letter, including a schedule for submittal of a Technical Specification change.

A102

If you have any questions concerning this matter, please contact me at (620) 364-4246, or Mr. Kevin Moles at (620) 364-4126.

Very truly yours,

  
Donna Jacobs

DJ/rig

Attachment I Oath  
II Response  
III Commitments

Enclosure Brookhaven National Laboratory

cc: J. N. Donohew (NRC), w/a, w/e  
D. N. Graves (NRC), w/a, w/e  
B. S. Mallett (NRC), w/a, w/e  
Senior Resident Inspector (NRC), w/a, w/e



### Follow-Up Response to the Requested Information of NRC Generic Letter 2003-01

Below is Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Corporation's (WCNOC's) follow-up response to NRC Generic Letter 2003-01, "Control Room Habitability," dated June 12, 2003. The information requested by the Generic Letter is shown in bold followed by WCNOC's response. Please note that the inleakage values shown are still "preliminary" as the final report has not yet been provided by Brookhaven National Laboratory.

#### Requested Information

- 1. Confirm that your facility's Control Room meets its applicable habitability regulatory requirements (e.g., GDC 1, 3, 4, 5, and 19) and that the CRHSs are designed, constructed, configured, operated, and maintained in accordance with the facility's design and licensing basis.**

#### WCNOC Response:

WCNOC is committed to the General Design Criteria of Appendix A of 10CFR50 as documented in its Updated Final Safety Analysis Report.

The preliminary results of confirmatory testing performed at Wolf Creek in August 2004, showed that the Wolf Creek Control Room is capable of meeting the regulatory habitability requirements. The testing demonstrated that the Control Room Habitability systems (CRHS) limited control room inleakage to acceptable values when configured, operated, and maintained as designed and constructed. The programs described in the reference submittal remain in place and the systems were operated in accordance with these procedures for this test.

Preliminary calculations (using the preliminary test results with the maximum tolerance applied) indicate that dose to the Operators remains under the regulatory limits. The values calculated using these preliminary values are shown in Table 1 below and compared to the regulatory limits.

Table 1

Control Room Dose to:	At 12.7 CFM (Prelim. Results + Tolerance)	Regulatory Limits
Thyroid	19.91 Rem	30 Rem
Whole Body	0.2002 Rem	5 Rem
Beta Skin	3.271 Rem	30 Rem

The WCGS/SNUPPS (Wolf Creek Generating Station/Standardized Nuclear Unit Power Plant System) Control Room Envelope (CRE) design is unique. The control building by and large surrounds the CRE. The CRE is required by Technical Specifications to be at a positive pressure with respect to its surrounding environment. The Control Building is also designed to be at a positive pressure with respect to its surrounding environment although not positive with respect to the CRE. In the emergency pressurization and filtration mode, the Control Room air volume receives air through a filtration system that takes a suction on the Control Building. The Control Building in turn receives filtered air from the outside environment.

The Generic Letter proposed ASTM E741 test methodology is designed for testing a single zone and basically implicitly assumes that all air can be categorized as either unfiltered outside air or filtered inside air. As described above, the SNUPPS plant design has two separate

control zones, the Control Building and the CRE. It is invalid to treat them as merely different volumes within a common zone. Based on the SNUPPS plant design the CRE dose model has three categories of air; unfiltered outside air, single filtered control building air, and double filtered Control Room air.

The Control Building has multiple common boundaries with the CRE. With the CRE pressurized, a substantial fraction of the outleakage from the CRE will go into the Control Building. This air could then be drawn back into the filtered pressurization system and put back into the Control Room. The current ASTM E741 tracer gas test does not account for re-introduction of tracer gas back into the test volume, potentially leading to erroneous and non-conservative inleakage test results. In order to provide valid test results for this configuration WCNOG chose to perform an alternate tracer gas test using the Atmospheric Tracer Depletion Method described below.

#### Tracer Gas Test Using the Brookhaven National Laboratory Atmospheric Tracer Depletion (ATD) Method

It has been shown that Control room inleakage can be determined by using a tracer gas test methodology. Tracer gases can be injected into a controlled volume or the tracer gases that are already present in the atmosphere can be used for tracer gas testing. Performing a tracer gas test utilizing the tracer gases (perfluorocarbons) that are present in the air is described as an Atmospheric Tracer Depletion (ATD) inleakage method. Both the ATD and injection tracer gas tests methods are very similar in that they both have the ability to accurately measure air leaking into a controlled environment (control room). In both tracer gas test methods air that is leaking into the controlled area (control room) causes a dilution of the tracer gas that is being measured.

- 1) In the tracer gas injection method a measured quantity of test gas is injected into the controlled area. The volume of the controlled area is a known quantity and the amount of filtered air entering and leaving the controlled volume is also known. After it has been determined a steady state condition is reached the concentration of injected tracer gas can be determined. The amount of tracer that should exist in the controlled area can be determined for zero or a given inleakage. If the amount of tracer dilution is greater than the value calculated then an inleakage value can be determined by comparing calculated difference dilution values to the measured dilution values.
- 2) For the ATD method the air leaking into the controlled area (control room) affects the measured tracer gas very similar to the injection method. For the ATD method the concentration of perfluorocarbons that exist in the air before the test begins are measured and used as a reference value. The WCGS control room Filter/Adsorber units (F/A) are located inside the controlled area and are capable of removing the perfluorocarbons to a percent equivalent to their removal efficiency, which is typically greater than 99.9 percent. One of the steps of the ATD test is to measure the concentration of tracer gas at both the inlet and outlet of the F/A units. This measurement is taken throughout the duration of the test. With this measurement verification the removal efficiency of the emergency F/A units is achieved. Since the volume of the controlled area is a known quantity and the amount of filtered air entering and leaving the controlled volume is also known a dilution of the tracer gas in the controlled area can be calculated. Similar to the injection tracer gas method, the ATD method equates the deviation from a determined dilution as inleakage into the controller area. The ATD method measures the increase of the tracer gas caused by the inleakage where as the injection method is measuring the decrease to the tracer caused by inleakage. The F/A units remove the tracer gases from the atmosphere and any inleakage will be indicated by the increase of the concentration of tracer gas inside the controlled volume. When steady state conditions are reached, with zero inleakage into the controlled area the quantity of tracer gas present would be equivalent to the

removal efficiency of the F/A units. **Example:** If the quantity of perfluorocarbon tracer that is naturally existing in the air is 10 ppb and the F/A unit provides 99.9% removal efficiency, then after steady state is reached the amount of tracer gas remaining in the controlled area would be 0.1%, with zero inleakage. Air leaking into the controlled area would cause the concentration to increase above the 0.1%. The increase above the 0.1% is equated to CFM inleakage value. The method of determining inleakage relative to the dilution of a tracer gas is a similar process in both the Tracer Gas Injection and ATD testing methods and both methods comply with the intent of the E741 requirements.

A detailed comparison of this test to the ASTM E741 method is provided in the enclosure to this letter from Brookhaven National Laboratory, the vendor who performed the test.

These results are in agreement with the May 2000 Strategic Teaming and Resource Sharing (STARS) self-assessment that concluded the Control Room design and operation were adequate. This along with the following administrative controls ensures continued compliance with the Control Room Habitability design and licensing bases.

These controls include:

#### Barrier Breach Control

Barriers important to maintaining control room habitability are controlled in procedure AP 10-104, "Breach Authorization." The procedure contains provisions for obtaining authorization to affect the operability of plant barriers required for fire, security, pressure boundary, train operability, flooding, harsh environment, radiation, and missile protection. The procedure provides the mechanism to assure that the proper compensatory measures are in place prior to the breach being performed.

#### Procedure Control

The preparation, revision, review and approval of procedures is controlled by AP 15C-004, "Preparation, Review and Approval of Procedures, Instructions and Forms." Interdisciplinary reviews are required, as appropriate, which prompts the control room HVAC System Engineer to review related procedure changes.

#### Design Change Control

The Design Change Control Program at WCNOG is established by procedure AP 05-005, "Design, Implementation and Configuration Control of Modifications." The procedure describes the program for the design and implementation of permanent changes to controlled Structures, Systems and/or Components (SSC's) documentation and hardware, which may or may not change Design Basis information. Procedure AP 05-002, "Dispositions and Change Packages," requires the completion of the Engineering Screening form, APF 05-002-01. The screening form results cause additional programmatic or interdisciplinary reviews or evaluations to be performed when required. Questions specific to Control Room Habitability considerations are asked on the screening form. Additionally, independent verification is performed by an independent and qualified engineer for all safety related plant modifications in accordance with procedure AP 05F-001, "Design Verification."

Temporary modifications to the plant are controlled by procedure AP 211-001, "Temporary Modifications." Temporary modifications are evaluated for applicable hazards analysis affects including impact on Control Room Habitability by engineers

qualified to perform these activities.

#### Safety Analysis Control

The design change process, AP 05-002, "Dispositions and Change Packages," ensures that related safety analysis calculations are reviewed as part of the design change. Safety analysis calculations revised for purposes other than design change are independently verified in accordance with procedure AP 05F-001, "Design Verifications and the 50.59 process." This verification and screening will ensure that the appropriate considerations for control room habitability are included if applicable.

#### Maintenance Control

All work activities performed on plant systems, structures, or components, by WCNOC maintenance personnel, are controlled by the work controls process AP 16C-006, "MPAC Work Controls." Preventive Maintenance (PM) activities are administered in accordance with AI 16B-002, "Updating the PM Activity Module," and AP 16B-003, "Planning and Scheduling Preventive Maintenance." In addition, the May 2000 assessment reviewed representative PM's and found them to be adequate to maintain the control room boundary integrity.

In addition to the above controls, WCNOC is incorporating Control Room Habitability into the WCGS Chemical Control Program and will continue to work in alliance with STARS to build upon the synergy of the combined effort thus far to ensure that control room habitability is maintained in the long-term.

**1(a) That the most limiting unfiltered inleakage into your CRE (and the filtered inleakage if applicable) is no more than the value assumed in your design basis radiological analyses for Control Room habitability. Describe how and when you performed the analyses, tests, and measurements for this confirmation.**

#### **WCNOC Response:**

WCNOC design basis radiological analysis for control room habitability is described in USAR Appendix 15A for a postulated large break loss of coolant accident. This analysis was last performed in 2000 using the methods described in Regulatory Guide 1.4 and Standard Review Plan Section 6.4. The most limiting unfiltered inleakage from the outside environment into the control room envelope was assumed to be zero standard cubic feet per minute (scfm). However, an unfiltered inleakage rate of 300 scfm was assumed to account for some unfiltered air that may leak into the control building wherein the control room envelope is located. In addition, an infiltration rate of 10 scfm was assumed for opening and closing of doors associated with activities required by the plant emergency plans and procedures. The results of this analysis are presented in USAR Table 15.6-8, "Radiological Consequences of a Loss-of-Coolant-Accident."

WCNOC evaluated conducting an integrated test and component test for control room inleakage to be responsive to the intent of Generic Letter 2003-01 and NRC Regulatory Guide 1.197. This evaluation determined that ASTM E741 testing methods would not provide valid results for the WCGS CRE design.

Because of these design conditions WCNOC performed an integrated inleakage test using an alternate test technique. A test method developed by Dr. Russell Dietz of Brookhaven

National Laboratory (BNL) entitled Atmospheric Tracer Depletion (ATD) testing was selected. (See enclosure to this response for a comparison of the ATD test method to the standard ASTM E741 test methods.)

In conjunction with Dr. Dietz and BNL, WCNOC developed a test plan that measured the inleakage to the Control Room Envelope, the Control Building, and the associated Equipment Rooms. The test was performed over a three-day period in August 2004, and the results support the conclusion of a previous assessment, that the design, construction, and operation of the Control Room Habitability Systems were sufficient to limit inleakage to acceptable limits. The preliminary test results are shown in table 2 below, for each train of control room equipment. Note: for analysis purposes as discussed in response to Question 1, the values for inleakage into the equipment rooms were included with the inleakage into the control building and total inleakage into the building was conservatively assumed to be the 300 CFM described in the design basis.

The final test results will be submitted in response to this Generic Letter within 60 days of the receipt of the official results.

Table 2

Train	Inleakage CR (CFM)	Inleakage CB (CFM)	Inleakage ER (B/A)
A	8.9	<50	5.3/25
B	10.8	13.5	2.8/23

**1(b) That the most limiting unfiltered inleakage into your CRE is incorporated into your hazardous chemical assessment. This inleakage may differ from the value assumed in your design basis radiological analyses. Also confirm that the reactor control capability is maintained from either the control room or the alternate shutdown panel in the event of smoke.**

**WCNOC Response:**

WCNOC's current hazardous chemical assessment indicates that there are no onsite chemicals in quantities, or offsite storage or transportation of chemicals that would pose a credible threat to control room habitability. The WCGS Chemical Control program is being revised to incorporate features necessary to maintain control of hazardous chemicals with respect to Control Room Habitability.

WCNOC is working with the State of Kansas to obtain survey information regarding offsite mobile chemical sources. WCNOC will update both the offsite and onsite hazardous chemical assessments in accordance with Regulatory Guide 1.78, Rev 1, and the measured unfiltered inleakage results (when finalized).

An evaluation to confirm reactor control capability from either the Control Room or the alternate shutdown panel was performed in accordance with the current revision of NEI 99-03, Appendix A, which is now the smoke evaluation section. The evaluation was performed under WCNOC Work Order 03-254239-001, and the results confirmed that the WCGS meets this standard.

- 1(c) That your technical specifications verify the integrity of your CRE and the assumed inleakage rates of potentially contaminated air. If you currently have a  $\Delta P$  surveillance requirement to demonstrate CRE integrity, provide the basis for your conclusion that it remains adequate to demonstrate CRE integrity in light of the ASTM E741 testing results. If you conclude that your  $\Delta P$  surveillance requirement is no longer adequate, provide a schedule for: 1) revising the surveillance requirement in your technical specification to reference an acceptable surveillance methodology (e.g., ASTM E-741), and 2) making any necessary modifications to your CRE so that compliance with your new surveillance requirement can be demonstrated.

If your facility does not currently have a technical specification surveillance requirement for your CRE, explain how and on what frequency you confirm your CRE integrity and why this is adequate to demonstrate CRE integrity.

**WCNOC Response:**

WCGS' Technical Specifications require, that a surveillance be performed on an 18 month staggered basis to verify that one Control Room Emergency Ventilation System (CREVS) train can maintain a positive pressure of  $\geq 0.25$  inches water gauge, relative to the outside during the pressurization mode of operation. The WCGS Technical Specification Bases state that this surveillance requirement verifies the integrity of the Control Room enclosure and the assumed inleakage rates of potentially contaminated air.

Positive pressure surveillance testing does verify the operability of the CREVS train and provides an indication of Control Room boundary integrity. However, this testing does not confirm Control Room integrity using inleakage values. WCNOC acknowledges that some form of inleakage testing appears to be the optimal method for confirming boundary integrity. WCNOC believes that it is inappropriate to submit changes to the current Technical Specifications until resolution has been achieved between the NRC and the industry on the programmatic guidance and technical specifications for verifying and maintaining Control Room Habitability to satisfy General Design Criterion (GDC) 19. WCNOC will submit a license amendment request to revise the Technical Specifications within one year after NRC resolution of TSTF-448, "Control Room Habitability." This license amendment request will utilize the guidance of TSTF-448, as appropriate.

WCNOC does not anticipate that any plant modifications will be required to incorporate a Control Room Integrity Program into the Technical Specifications as described above.

2. If you currently use compensatory measures to demonstrate CRE habitability, describe the compensatory measures at your facility and the corrective actions needed to retire these compensatory measures.

**WCNOC Response:**

WCNOC does not use compensatory measures to demonstrate Control Room envelope habitability.

3. **If you believe that your facility is not required to meet either the GDC, the draft GDC, or the "Principle Design Criteria" regarding control room habitability, in addition to responding to items 1 and 2 above, provide the documentation (e.g., Preliminary Safety Analysis Report, Final Safety Analysis Report sections, or correspondence, etc.) of the basis for this conclusion and identify your actual requirements.**

**WCNOC Response:**

WCNOC is committed to the General Design Criteria of Appendix A of 10CFR50 as documented in the USAR.

### LIST OF COMMITMENTS

The following table identifies those actions committed to by Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Corporation in Attachment II to this letter. Other statements in Attachment II to this letter are not considered to be regulatory commitments. Please direct questions regarding these commitments to Mr. Kevin Moles, Manager Regulatory Affairs at Wolf Creek Generating Station, (620) 364-4126.

<b>Commitment</b>	<b>Due Date</b>
WCNOC will submit the final test results when the official test report is received.	Within 60 days of receipt
WCNOC will submit a license amendment request to revise the Technical Specifications within one year after NRC resolution of TSTF-448, "Control Room Habitability." This license amendment request will utilize the guidance of TSTF-448, as appropriate.	Within 1 year of resolution of TSTF-448.

August 8, 2003

## APPLICABILITY OF ASTM E741 TO FOUR TECHNIQUES FOR MEASURING UNFILTERED IN-LEAKAGE

### 1. Overview

A review was made of each of the 18 major elements or sections of the standard with respect to the four techniques for measuring unfiltered in-leakage. The techniques – concentration decay and constant injection – have traditionally been performed with sulfur hexafluoride (SF<sub>6</sub>) but the standard indicates that any acceptable tracer and corresponding samplers and analyzers are acceptable. Perfluorocarbon tracers (PFTs) can also be used in both these techniques. The subcommittee E 06.41 on Air Leakage and Ventilation has prepared a ballot to include PFTs in the standard's Table X1.1 and X1.2 that list tracer gases used to determine air change; PFTs have been used for more than 20 years for this purpose<sup>1</sup>.

The other two techniques in this review are the Brookhaven National Laboratory (BNL) Air Infiltration Measurement System (AIMS) and Atmospheric Tracer Depletion (ATD). In practice, a one-zone AIMS test is a constant injection technique as defined by the standard. A further advantage of AIMS is the availability of multiple PFTs for tagging multiple zones simultaneously<sup>2,3</sup>. The multi-zone capability is invaluable for quantifying in-leakage from other zones contiguous to a control room envelope (CRE) or for testing CREs that are comprised of normally multiple well-mixed zones. Although this capability goes beyond the intended scope of the standard, AIMS will be shown to conform to the elements within the standard.

The last technique, ATD, was newly conceived in November 2002, and, therefore, was not in existence for consideration by the standard's subcommittee. Further, ATD can only be used in buildings or envelopes that are equipped with a charcoal filtration air handling system such as a nuclear power plant's control room emergency ventilation system (CREVS). The standard was not devised with consideration of such envelopes; in these cases, however, ATD is a perfect candidate for the direct determination of unfiltered in-leakage. This fourth and last technique is also evaluated with respect to its conformance to the standard.

When this review was conducted in the end of May 2003, the reviewer was not aware of the exceptions to the standard as noted in the NEI 99-03 (Rev. 1, 3/03)<sup>4</sup> report (Appendix EE, p. EE-1). It will be seen that many of the exceptions noted in the NEI document were also noted in this review as "not applicable" (na).

This description of that review comments on the answers given in the Appendix: Comparison Table on Conformance to the Standard. The summary of that review, given in Section 3, was presented at ANS and NHUG meetings. The Conclusion (Section 4) is that all four (4) techniques conform to about the same 90% or so.

## 2. Comments on Comparison Table

This section is numbered according to the 18 elements and steps in the standard. As mentioned earlier, with one tracer, AIMS is essentially identical to SF<sub>6</sub> constant injection, so the answers to conformance should be similar; differences will be discussed. During ATD testing, when the CREVS is first turned on, the ambient background concentration of PFTs is being depleted (decaying) in a fashion that mimics the concentration decay techniques. Thus, unfiltered in-leakage can be obtained from this initial ATD decay with time in a manner similar to total in-leakage from SF<sub>6</sub> concentration decay. The usual approach, however, is to perform measurements after steady state has been attained.

### *1. Scope*

1.1 All the techniques involved dilution of tracer gas. Concentration decay pertains to "decay" and ATD and constant injection to "inject" and AIMS.

1.2 The standard is restricted to a single tracer gas which all four (4) techniques can use. Additionally, the review asked the questions: Are multiple tracers used in a single zone (only ATD was Yes), and Are multiple tracers used in multiple zones (only AIMS was Yes).

1.3 All four techniques use gas analyses, instruments, etc.

1.4 This step asks the question: Are individual components testable. There are really three qualifiers:

- easily: only ATD is "Yes" (this is the answer used in the analysis)
- with special tagging: SF<sub>6</sub> inject and AIMS are "Yes",
- defined in E 741 (all "No").

1.5 Results pertinent to tested conditions: all "Yes".

1.6 And 1.7 General info; therefore na for all.

### *2. Reference Documents*

2.1 The first and last two references were not applicable. Packed column chromatography is practiced by all but ATD which uses capillary column GC.

### *3. Terminology*

3.1 The definitions are about the same for all four (4) techniques. Step 3.17.1 is an uncertain element. When there are two (2) or more distinct zones within the CRE or even multiple zones contiguous to the boundary, both SF<sub>6</sub> techniques as well as ATD may be uncertain in their applicability. AIMS is applicable.

3.2 Each of the techniques use a number of the symbols listed. This step was not considered.

### *4. Summary of Test Method*

4.1 All techniques perform tracer gas measurements in a single zone. Concentration is only needed for "inject" and AIMS, whereas, relative response is used by the other two (2). Measurement of a tracer injection rate is only by "inject" and AIMS and injection techniques are needed for all but ATD. All have to consider sampling strategies.

4.2 All techniques are available for choosing.

4.2.1 The air change quantity determined is different for the four techniques. "Decay" measures total air change rate, whereas, "inject" and AIMS measure a total air in-leakage flow rate; thus, "decay" only provides an indirect measure of total air in-leakage. Further, only ATD provides a direct measure of unfiltered in-leakage.

## 5. *Significance and Use*

General relevance; not used in ranking.

## 6. *Apparatus*

6.1 Distributing tracer is na for ATD (no tracer release required). Obtaining air samples and using a gas analyzer is "Yes" for all four (4).

6.2 Tracer gases are "used" in all four (4) techniques (Yes).

6.2.1 All four use a tracer gas standard (Yes). However, "decay" and ATD do not need the tracer standard for intended in-leakage results.

6.3 Tracer gas injection and distribution. ATD does not require tracer release.

6.3.1 And 6.3.2 All but ATD are "Yes"; ATD is na.

6.4 Tracer gas sampling (and all the sub-elements - 6.4.1 to 6.4.3) are "Yes" to all four (4) techniques.

6.5 All techniques use relevant tracer gas analysis capabilities.

6.6 Ancillary measurements.

6.6.1 Meteorological equipment was excluded here as well as in the NEI exceptions.<sup>4</sup>

6.6.2 And 6.6.3 The reviewer gave a "Yes" to all four (4) techniques. Temperature is important to AIMS for correcting source emission rates and is a good indicator of the stability of HVAC equipment. Timing is important to all techniques.

6.7 Data acquisition was na for all four (4) techniques. This was recognized by NEI as well.

## 7. *Hazards*

All four (4) techniques consider 7.1 (Safety) and 7.2 (Health).

7.3 Explosive limits is na to all four (4) techniques.

7.4 Only "decay" and "inject" must consider compressed gases at the site.

## 8/9. *Concentration Decay/Constant Injection Test Methods*

In the E 741 standard, both of these methods follow the same sub-elements. Therefore, only a single set of sub-elements was considered for conformance by all four (4) techniques.

8/9.1 The general summary was considered na for all four (4) techniques.

8/9.2 Preparation is important to all techniques.

8/9.2.1 Ancillary measurements were important to all four (4) during preparation with respect to how zones will be operated and volume of zones (for calculating time constants). This applies to 8/9.2.2 as well.

8/9.2.3 The requirements for estimating tracer gas injection rates and initial volumes is important to all three (3) techniques but ATD (no tracer injected). Accelerating time to steady state for "inject" and AIMS can also be considered here.

8/9.2.4 Where to sample is relevant to all four (4) techniques.

8/9.3 Only ATD does not have to implement tracer injection.

8/9.4 All four (4) techniques need to consider spatial and time-dependent sampling.

8/9.5 Analyses is different for the four (4) techniques.

8/9.5.1 The first two (2) techniques analyze on site and the last two (2), off site.

8/9.5.2 Uniformity of concentrations or adequately determined volume-weighted average concentrations must be determined.

8/9.5.3 The first three (3) techniques calculated total air change rate or flow rate; ATD does not. However, the first three (3) techniques do not directly determine unfiltered in-leakage; ATD does ("Yes").

10. *Constant Concentration Method*

This review and NEI considered this step to be na.

11. *Preparation of Zones*

11.1 Ancillary measurements (such as temperature), zone volumes, and estimated total zonal flow rates are important for all four (4) techniques. Temperatures indicate stability of HVAC systems. Zone volumes and flow rates are needed for times to steady state.

11.2 Status of zone being tested as well as contiguous zones is important to all techniques.

12. *Procedure for Distributing Tracer Gas*

For most steps in this section, ATD response is na since no tracer is intentionally released.

12.1 Avoiding contamination is always important.

12.1.1 Handling bottles and regulators ("decay" and "inject") as well as permeation sources (AIMS) is important for these techniques.

12.1.2 Anything that might adversely affect the conservation of the tracer, even that being depleted in ATD, must be considered.

12.1.3 A measure of potential interferences before testing is important to all.

12.2 Manual injection is used for "decay" and to accelerate approach to steady state for "inject" and AIMS.

12.3 Metered injection is only used for "inject" and AIMS

12.4 Uniformity of concentrations

12.4.1 Uniformity of released-tracer concentrations within a zone is to be within 10% of the average. Sampling done at several return air locations or averaged over many volume-weighted locations can assure appropriate values for the three techniques using tracer release. However, ATD is like a negative tracer release – i.e., depletion. Thus, the "source" location of that depleted air must also be uniformly determined. Therefore, "Yes" to all four (4) techniques.

12.4.2 Aids to mixing are important to all but ATD. With the latter, a volume-weighted determination is generally preferred in order to observe locations where unfiltered in-leakage might actually be occurring. Mixing would eliminate that observation without a real significant gain in reducing uncertainty in determining unfiltered in-leakage. That is not the case for "decay" or "inject". Because unfiltered in-leakage is obtained by difference, accuracy and precision needs to be much better; concentration variability needs to be much tighter than for ATD. Thus, only ATD is na.

13. *Sampling Tracer Gas*

Sampling tracer gas is important and "Yes" for all sub-elements in this section. No exceptions.

14. *Procedures for Gas Analysis*

Procedures for gas analysis are also all "Yes" with the exception of using standards for the GC during ATD analyses.

14.1 Calibration of the gas analyses for ATD is na. However, prior studies were made of gas analyzer accuracy (14.1.1.), gas analyzer precision (14.1.2), and other factors that affect estimated measurement precision (14.1.3) to assure that this step is not needed for each field test.

15. *Procedure for Ancillary Measurements*

This procedure is not used in the NEI recommendations. Outdoor temperature and wind (15.1) and correlation with in-leakge is na for all four (4) techniques.

15.2 Indoor temperature is important for AIMS sources, but, also to verify air handling system performance; all "Yes".

15.3 Zone volumes are needed for all techniques to estimate times to steady state.

16. *Report*

NEI recommendations were to not use the standard guidelines. The original review considered Sections 16.1 and 16.2 to be all "Yes" for all four (4) techniques.

16.3 Data analysis

16.3.1 Record of tracer injection is na for ATD.

16.3.2 All four (4) techniques consider a record of concentration or tracer response.

16.3.3 The first three (3) techniques calculate total air change rate or flow; ATD is na. However, only ATD directly calculates unfiltered in-leakage (ATD "Yes" and all others "No").

16.3.4 All techniques consider an error analysis.

17. *Precision and Bias*

Again, the NEI recommendations were to not follow the standard but use the vendor's procedures. This original review considered how the four (4) techniques would conform to the standard.

17.1 This overview statement was not ranked.

17.2 Precision is considered by all techniques ("Yes"). All look at variability in concentration or response as a function of time and sampling location.

17.2.1 All techniques use a tracer gas standard to verify performance of the analyzer prior to use – including precision across multiple samples.

17.2.2 Again, all techniques use zone volume to determine time constants to steady state and for mixing.

17.2.3 Scatter about a tracer decay result relates to magnitude of precision for that technique only.

17.2.4 Scatter in concentration versus time and location relates to precision in the other three techniques.

17.2.5 None of the four (4) techniques relate to the constant concentration technique.

17.3 All four (4) techniques consider bias. ATD is the likely technique least influenced by bias.

3. Summary

Major element in E 741 standard:	18
- specifically applicable	14
Total specific sub-elements	108

	<u>SF<sub>6</sub> Decay</u>	<u>SF<sub>6</sub> Inject</u>	<u>AIMS</u>	<u>ATD</u>
Sum of "Yes" (percentage of subtotal)	80 (89%)	83 (89%)	84 (91%)	69 (92%)
Sum of "No"	9	9	8	5
Uncertain	1	1	-	1
Subtotal	90	93	92	75
Not applicable	18	15	16	33
TOTAL	108	108	108	108

#### 4. Conclusion

All four (4) techniques equally conform to the ASTM E 741 standard – that is, each to about 90% of all sub-elements.

#### 5. References

1. Dietz, R.N. and Cote, E.A., *Air Infiltration Measurements in a Home Using a Convenient Perfluorocarbon Tracer Technique*, Environ. Int. 8, pp. 419-433, 1982.
2. Dietz, R.N., Goodrich, R.W., Cote, E.A., and Wieser, R.F., Detailed Description and Performance of a Passive Perfluorocarbon Tracer System for Building Ventilation and Air Exchange Measurements, In *Measured Air Leakage of Buildings, ASTM STP 904*, H.R. Trechsel and P.L. Lagus, Ed., American Society for Testing and Materials, Philadelphia, 1986, pp. 203-264.
3. D'Ottavio, T.W., Senum, G.I., and Dietz, R.N., *Error Analysis Techniques for Perfluorocarbon Tracer Derived Multizone Flow Rates*, Building and Environment, 23 (3), pp. 187-194, 1988.
4. *Control Room Habitability Guidance*, NEI 99-03 (Rev. 1), Nuclear Energy Institute, March 2003.

# Applicability of ASTM E 741 to Four Techniques for Measuring Unfiltered In-Leakage

Appendix:  
Comparison Table on Conformance to the Standard – yes, no, or na (not applicable)

No.	Item	SF <sub>6</sub> Decay	SF <sub>6</sub> Inject	AIMS	ATD
<b>1.</b>	<b>Scope</b>				
1.1	Tracer gas dilution	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	(1) Concentration decay	Yes	No	No	No
	(2) Constant injection	No	Yes	Yes	na
1.2	Single tracer gas for single zone	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Multiple tracer gas for single zone	No	No	No	Yes
	Multiple tracer gas for multiple zones	No	No	Yes	No
1.3	Gas analysis, instruments, units	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
1.4	Individual components testable	No	No	No	Yes
1.5	Results pertain to tested conditions only	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
1.6	Notes & footnotes	na	na	na	na
1.7	Safety & health	na	na	na	na
<b>2.</b>	<b>Referenced Documents</b>				
2.1	ASTM standards				
	D 4480 meas. surface winds	na	na	na	na
	E 260 Practice for packed column GC	na	na	na	na
	E 779 Fan pressurization testing	Yes	Yes	Yes	na
	E 1186 Air leakage site detection	na	na	na	na
<b>3.</b>	<b>Terminology</b>				
3.1	Definitions				
3.1.1	Air change flow	na	Q, m <sup>3</sup> /h	R, m <sup>3</sup> /h	R, m <sup>3</sup> /h
3.1.2	Air change rate	A, h <sup>-1</sup>	na	na	na
3.1.3	Envelope	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
3.1.3.1	discussion	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
3.1.4	Tracer gas	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
3.1.5	Tracer gas analyzer	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
3.1.6	Tracer gas concentration	m <sup>3</sup> /m <sup>3</sup>	m <sup>3</sup> /m <sup>3</sup>	nL/m <sup>3</sup>	cts/m <sup>3</sup>
3.1.7	Single zone	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
3.1.7.1	multiple zones	uncertain	uncertain	Yes	uncertain
3.2	Symbols	---	---	---	---
<b>4.</b>	<b>Summary of Test Method</b>				
4.1	Tracer gas measurement in single zones	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	– measurement of concentration	na	Yes	Yes	na
	– measurement of relative response	Yes	na	na	Yes

No.	Item	SF <sub>6</sub> Decay	SF <sub>6</sub> Inject	AIMS	ATD
	Measurement of tracer injection rate	na	Yes	Yes	na
	Injection techniques	Yes	Yes	Yes	na
	Sampling strategies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
4.2	Choice of techniques	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
4.2.1	Air change quantity				
	– total air change rate	Yes	No	No	No
	– total air change flow	No	Yes	Yes	No
	– direct unfiltered flow	No	No	No	Yes
<b>5.</b>	<b>Significance and Use (general relevance)</b>				
<b>6.</b>	<b>Apparatus</b>				
6.1	Distributing tracer	Yes	Yes	Yes	na
	– obtaining air samples	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	– gas analyzer	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
6.2	Tracer gases	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
6.2.1	Tracer gas standard	na	Yes	Yes	na
6.3	Tracer gas injection/distribution				
6.3.1	Tracer gas metering	Yes	Yes	Yes	na
6.3.2	Tracer gas distribution	Yes	Yes	Yes	na
6.4	Tracer gas sampling	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
6.4.1	Materials for sampling	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
6.4.2	Manual samplers	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
6.4.3	Automatic samplers	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
6.4.3.1	Sampling network	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
6.4.3.2	Automated samplers	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
6.5	Gas analyzers	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
6.6	Ancillary measurement devices				
6.6.2&3	Temperature and timing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
6.7	Data acquisition and control	na	na	na	na
<b>7.</b>	<b>Hazards</b>				
7.1	Safety	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
7.2	Health	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
7.3	Explosive limits	na	na	na	na
7.4	Compressed gases	Yes	Yes	na	na
<b>8/9.</b>	<b>Concentration decay/Constant injection</b>				
8/9.1	Summary	na	na	na	na
8/9.2	Preparation				
8/9.2.1	Ancillary measurements	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
8/9.2.2	Zonal operation	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
8/9.2.3	Tracer gas injection volume	Yes	Yes	Yes	na
8/9.2.4	Sampling	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

No.	Item	SF <sub>6</sub> Decay	SF <sub>6</sub> Inject	AIMS	ATD
8/9.3	Tracer injection	Yes	Yes	Yes	na
8/9.4	Sampling	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
8/9.5	Analysis				
8/9.5.1	– analyze on site	Yes	Yes	No	No
	– analyze off site	No	No	Yes	Yes
8/9.5.2	Uniformity of concentration	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
8/9.5.3	– calc air change rate or flow	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
	– calc direct unfiltered in-leakage	No	No	No	Yes
<b>10.</b>	<b>Constant Concentration Method</b>	na	na	na	na
<b>11.</b>	<b>Preparation of Zone</b>				
11.1	Auxillary measurements	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
11.2	Preparation of zone	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>12.</b>	<b>Procedures for Distributing Tracer Gas</b>				
12.1	Avoid contamination				
12.1.1	Handling tracer gases	Yes	Yes	Yes	na
12.1.2	Conservation of tracer gas	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
12.1.3	Pre-existing tracer gas	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
12.2	Manual injection	Yes	Yes	Yes	na
12.3	Metered injection	na	Yes	Yes	na
12.4	Uniformity of concentration				
12.4.1	Uniformity determined	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
12.4.2	Aids to mixing	Yes	Yes	Yes	na
<b>13.</b>	<b>Sampling Tracer Gas</b>				
13.1	Manual sampling	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
13.2	Automated sampling	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
13.3	Spatial sampling				
13.3.1	When to sample	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
13.3.2	Where to sample	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
13.4	Avoid contamination/dilution	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>14.</b>	<b>Procedures for Gas Analysis</b>				
14.1	Calibration of analyzer	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
14.2	Tracer gas sampling records	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
14.3	Tracer gas measurements	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>15.</b>	<b>Procedure for Ancillary Measurements</b>				
15.1	Outdoor temperature & wind	na	na	na	na
15.2	Indoor temperature	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
15.3	Zone volume	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
15.4	Correlation with air change	na	na	na	na

No.	Item	SF <sub>6</sub> Decay	SF <sub>6</sub> Inject	AIMS	ATD
16.	<b>Report</b>				
16.1.1	Background information				
16.1.1.1	Description of enclosure	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
16.1.1.2	Zone description(s)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
16.1.2	Design of test				
16.1.2.1	Test method	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
16.1.2.2	Zone operation	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
16.1.2.3	Tracer gas distribution	Yes	Yes	Yes	na
16.1.2.4	Tracer gas sampling	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
16.1.2.5	Gas analyzer	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
16.1.2.6	Data gathering	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
16.1.2.7	Ancillary measurements	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
16.1.3	Data analysis				
16.1.3.1	Record of tracer injection	Yes	Yes	Yes	na
16.1.3.2	Record of tracer concentration	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
16.1.3.3	- Calculation of total air change	Yes	Yes	Yes	na
	- Calc. of direct unfiltered in-leakage	No	No	No	Yes
16.1.3.4	Error analysis	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
17.	<b>Precision and Bias</b>				
17.1	Overview	---	---	---	---
17.2	Precision	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
17.2.1	Gas analyzer (stds, repetitive samples, etc)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
17.2.2	Zone volumes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
17.2.3	Tracer decay scatter	Yes	na	na	na
17.2.4	Constant tracer injection	na	Yes	Yes	Yes
17.2.5	Constant concentration	na	na	na	na
17.3	Bias				
17.3.1-3	Identified biases	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
18.	<b>Key Words</b>	---	---	---	---
<b>Summary</b>					
	Sum of "Yes"	80	83	84	69
	(percentage of subtotal)	(89%)	(89%)	(91%)	(92%)
	Sum of "No"	9	9	8	5
	Uncertain	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	---	<u>1</u>
	Subtotal	90	93	92	75
	Not applicable	<u>18</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>33</u>
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>108</b>