

Time History Time Step Shift

Dryer Natural Frequencies Non-Proprietary Version



[[

]]

Time History Time Step Shift

Participation Factors Non-Proprietary Version



[[

]]

Time History Time Step Shift

Modal Bandwidth Approach Non-Proprietary Version



Nuclear

[[

]]

Time History Time Step Shift

Dryer Natural Frequencies Non-Proprietary Version



[[

]]

Time History Time Step Shift

Participation Factors Non-Proprietary Version



[[

]]

Time History Time Step Shift

Non-Proprietary Version

QC1: Group 1 Components from Report

ExelonSM

Nuclear

[[

]]

Time History Time Step Shift

Non-Proprietary Version

QC1: Group 1 Components from Report (cont.)



Nuclear

[[

]]

Time History Time Step Shift

Non-Proprietary Version

QC1: Group 1 Components from Report (cont.)



Nuclear

[[

]]

Non-Proprietary Version

Time History Time Step Shift: QC1



Nuclear

[[

]]

Non-Proprietary Version



Nuclear

Effect on Design Margin

Additional Time History Cases: QC1

[[

]]

Non-Proprietary Version



Nuclear

Effect on Design Margin

Additional Time History Cases: QC2

[[

]]

Strain Gage Sensitivity

Leslie Wellstein
General Electric

The next 6 slides contain information that is
proprietary to GE

Non-Proprietary Version

Dryer Strain Gage Locations




[[

]]

Non-Proprietary Version


Measured vs. Analytical Strains



[[

Strain Gage Sensitivity Study

- Study examined three strain gages: S5, S7, and S9
- The strains in the FEM node closest to each strain gage (i.e., location E) and the eight nodes surrounding that node were evaluated
- Strain at each FEM node was examined at the correct horizontal or vertical orientation and then with a $[[\quad]]$ degree rotation
- Since the real strain gage location is known within $[[\quad]]$ inches, only four nodes around the actual strain gage are used to compare with the measured strains (locations A, B, D, and E in the diagram below)



Non-Proprietary Version

S5 Sensitivity Results



[[

S7 Sensitivity Results



[[

]]

Non-Proprietary Version

S9 Sensitivity Results



[[

Strain Gage Sensitivity

Conclusions

Non-Proprietary Version



Nuclear

- Analytically determined strain is higher than measured strain at all three strain gage locations in the study, within the tolerance that the gages were applied to the QC2 dryer, by the following percentages
 - S5: [[]]
 - S7: [[]]
 - S9: [[]]

Structural Analysis Conclusions

- The three original time history analyses are adequate to represent the dryer fatigue stresses
- Minimum dryer design margins
 - QC1 = [[]]
 - QC2 = [[]]
- Analytically determined strains, within the tolerance of the applied gage location, bound the measured strain at all strain gage locations
- Both QC1 and QC2 replacement steam dryers are structurally adequate for long-term EPU operation

QC2 Dryer Design Margin

Guy DeBoo
Asset Management Engineer

Item 2

- Quantify the "end to end" uncertainty of the entire stress analysis and provide the technical basis.

QC2 Dryer Design Margin

- Dryer stress margins are determined using the stress analysis predicted strains with location and orientation uncertainties compared with the measured strains
- However, adjustments must be made to the measured strain before a comparison can be made

$$\text{Adjusted Strain Margin} = \frac{\text{Predicted Strain} - \text{Adjusted Measured Strain}}{\text{Adjusted Measured Strain}}$$

- Dryer design margins are determined by combining the margin between the predicted and measured strains with the margin between the predicted stress and the design endurance limits

QC2 Dryer Design Margins (cont.)

[[

]]

$$\text{Adjusted Strain Margin} = \frac{\text{Predicted Strain} - \text{Adjusted Measured Strain}}{\text{Adjusted Measured Strain}}$$

- Predicted component stress margins are obtained from QC2 EPU design margins with stresses extrapolated to 2957 MWt
- Stress margin to design endurance limit is the sum of the adjusted strain margin and the predicted stress margin for the dryer components

QC2 Dryer Design Stress Margin

- Dryer design stress margin based on strain gage measurements has been determined to be a minimum of [[]] when compared to the ASME code material endurance limit
- Dryer structural integrity is demonstrated for EPU operation

Startup Test Criteria for S-5, S-7, and S-9

Richard Wu
General Electric

Item 9

- Demonstrate that the startup test criteria on QC2 for strain gage locations S-5, S-7, and S-9 was met using calculated stress.

The next seven slides contain information that is
proprietary to GE

Acceptance Criteria



[[

]]

Acceptance Criteria (cont.)



- [[

]]

Acceptance Criteria (cont.)



[[

]]

Acceptance Criteria

Strain Gages

Non-Proprietary Version



[[

]]

Criteria Calculation Methodology



- [[

]]

Conclusions

- All measured strains were below allowable limits at 2887 MWt
 - Margin compared with Level B criteria is [[]]
- Extrapolating to 2957 MWt maximum power, the margin to Level B criteria is [[]], based on extrapolation factor of [[]]

Basis and Justification for Continuous EPU Operations

Roman Gesior
Director – Asset Management

Technical Basis and Justification

- The acceptability for continuous operation of the Quad Cities units at EPU power levels is based on the following:
 - Startup testing results on both units
 - Conservative dryer design
 - FEA analysis
 - Strain gage predictions vs. measurements
 - Recent dryer performance
 - Periodic dryer inspection plan

Conservative Dryer Design

- ACM
 - Demonstrated to provide load predictions across the dryer surface with acceptable level of uncertainty
- FEM
 - Shown to accurately predict load frequencies when compared against hammer test results
- FEA
 - Conservatively utilized peak loads at +/- 10% frequency ranges using 2.5% intervals
 - Predicted strains on dryer components proven conservative when compared to measured values adjusted for uncertainty

Recent Dryer Performance

- Collection of strain gage data on the QC2 dryer during EPU operation following startup continued to demonstrate structural integrity of the dryer
- Site continues to monitor moisture carryover as an early indicator of potential structural degradation
- Moisture carryover on both units continues to remain below 0.1%

Periodic Dryer Inspection Plan

- Quad Cities will perform dryer inspections in accordance with GE SIL 644, Revision 1, and BWRVIP-139 supplemented with dryer specific inspections recommended by GE
- First dryer inspection is scheduled on QC2 in Spring 2006
- Inspections will focus on weld locations susceptible to fatigue from FIV
- Inspections will be performed on the interior and exterior of the dryer
- Frequency of inspections and recommended expansion criteria will ensure structural integrity of the dryer

Conclusion

- Sufficient technical basis exists to justify continued operation of QC1 and QC2 at full EPU power following installation of the replacement steam dryers

Summary and Conclusions

Patrick Simpson
Manager – Licensing

Evaluation of Data

Frequency Content

- Load ratios based on the integrals of the predicted and measured PSDs for each sensor were calculated
- Formulas to develop data were:

$$\text{PSDsumP} := \sum_{k=135}^{160} \text{PSD_D1}_k$$

$$\text{PSDsumM} := \sum_{k=135}^{160} \text{PSD_Dm}_k$$

$$\text{LoadRat} := \frac{\sqrt{\text{PSDsumP}}}{\sqrt{\text{PSDsumM}}}$$

Damping Values

Non-Proprietary Version

Hammer Test



[[

]]

Damping Values

Non-Proprietary Version

Hammer Test (cont.)



[[

]]

Damping Values Non-Proprietary Version Hammer Test vs. Flow Induced Vibration



[[

]]

Damping Values

Non-Proprietary Version



- [[

]]

Dryer Analysis Uncertainty Terms

RMS Pressure Band



Nuclear

<i>Uncertainty Term</i>	<i>Absolute Effect %</i>	<i>Effect on Analysis</i>
Strain Gage Measurement	5.03	+/- 5.03% based on assumption of linear model sensitivity
ACM Low Frequency Limitations		0.4% bias on RMS pressure
Pressure Sensor Measurement	3.9 Absolute 2.9 Relative	+/- 2.9%
Pressure Sensor Phenomenological	N/A	-3 to -8% bias on sensor reading
ACM Uncertainty		7.8% bias on RMS
Net Effect		5.2% net bias plus 5.81% (srss of measurement errors) Total= 11.0%

Dryer Analysis Uncertainty Terms

Interval RMS Pressure



Nuclear

<i>Uncertainty Term</i>	<i>Absolute Effect %</i>	<i>Effect on Analysis</i>
Strain Gage Measurement	5.03	+/- 5.03% based on assumption of linear model sensitivity
ACM Low Frequency Limitations		0.4% bias on RMS pressure
Pressure Sensor Measurement	3.9 Absolute 2.9 Relative	+/- 2.9%
Pressure Sensor Phenomenological	N/A	-3 to -8% bias on sensor reading
ACM Uncertainty		13.1% bias on RMS
Net Effect		10.5% net bias plus 5.81% (srss of measurement errors) Total= 16.3%