



U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

STANDARD REVIEW PLAN

15.6.5 LOSS-OF-COOLANT ACCIDENTS RESULTING FROM SPECTRUM OF POSTULATED PIPING BREAKS WITHIN THE REACTOR COOLANT PRESSURE BOUNDARY

REVIEW RESPONSIBILITIES

Primary - Organization responsible for the review of Reactor Systems (BWR and PWR)

Secondary - None

I. AREAS OF REVIEW

The specific areas of review are as follows:

1. Loss-of-coolant accidents (LOCAs) are postulated accidents that would result from the loss of reactor coolant, at a rate in excess of the capability of the normal reactor coolant makeup system, from piping breaks in the reactor coolant pressure boundary. The piping breaks are postulated to occur at various locations and include a spectrum of break sizes, up to a maximum pipe break equivalent in size to the double-ended rupture of the largest pipe in the reactor coolant pressure boundary. Loss of significant quantities of reactor coolant would prevent heat removal from the reactor core, unless the water is replenished. The build-up of boric acid due to coolant vaporization in a pressurized water reactor (PWR) if left uncontrolled, could reach precipitation limits and block the coolant channels in the core, preventing adequate heat removal for any size break.

Rev. 3 - [Month] 2007

USNRC STANDARD REVIEW PLAN

This Standard Review Plan, NUREG-0800, has been prepared to establish criteria that the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff responsible for the review of applications to construct and operate nuclear power plants intends to use in evaluating whether an applicant/licensee meets the NRC's regulations. The Standard Review Plan is not a substitute for the NRC's regulations, and compliance with it is not required. However, an applicant is required to identify differences between the design features, analytical techniques, and procedural measures proposed for its facility and the SRP acceptance criteria and evaluate how the proposed alternatives to the SRP acceptance criteria provide an acceptable method of complying with the NRC regulations.

The standard review plan sections are numbered in accordance with corresponding sections in the Regulatory Guide 1.70, "Standard Format and Content of Safety Analysis Reports for Nuclear Power Plants (LWR Edition)." Not all sections of the standard format have a corresponding review plan section. The SRP sections applicable to a combined license application for a new light-water reactor (LWR) will be based on Regulatory Guide 1.206, "Combined License Applications for Nuclear Power Plants (LWR Edition)," until the SRP itself is updated.

These documents are made available to the public as part of the NRC's policy to inform the nuclear industry and the general public of regulatory procedures and policies. Individual sections of NUREG-0800 will be revised periodically, as appropriate, to accommodate comments and to reflect new information and experience. Comments may be submitted electronically by email to NRR_SRP@nrc.gov.

Requests for single copies of draft or active SRP sections (which may be reproduced) should be made to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Attention: Reproduction and Distribution Services Section, or by fax to (301) 415-2289; or by email to DISTRIBUTION@nrc.gov. Electronic copies of this section are available through the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/nuregs/staff/sr0800/>, or in the NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS), at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>, under Accession # [MLxxxxxxx](#).

General Design Criterion 35 (Ref. 1) requires each pressurized water reactor (PWR) and boiling water reactor (BWR) to be equipped with an emergency core cooling system (ECCS) that refills the vessel in a timely manner to satisfy the requirements of the regulations for ECCS given in 10 CFR 50.46 and Appendix K to 10 CFR Part 50 (Ref. 2) and the applicable general design requirements discussed in Standard Review Plan (SRP) Section 6.3 (Ref. 3). The analysis of ECCS performance has an impact on the design of the piping and support structures for the reactor coolant system, the design of the steam generators, the containment design, and the possible need for pump overspeed protection.

The review of the applicant's analysis of the spectrum of postulated loss-of-coolant accidents is closely associated with the review of the ECCS, as described in SRP Section 6.3. As a portion of the review effort described in this SRP section and in SRP Section 6.3, the appropriate reactor systems reviewer evaluates whether the entire break spectrum (break size and location) has been addressed; whether the appropriate break locations, break sizes, and initial conditions were selected in a manner that conservatively predicts the consequences of the LOCA for evaluating ECCS performance; and whether an adequate analysis of possible failure modes of ECCS equipment and the effects of the failure modes on the ECCS performance have been provided. For postulated break sizes and locations, the reactor systems review includes the postulated initial reactor core and reactor system conditions, the postulated sequence of events including time delays prior to and after emergency power actuation, the calculation of the power, pressure, flow and temperature transients, the functional and operational characteristics of the reactor protective and ECCS systems in terms of how they affect the sequence of events, and operator actions required to mitigate the consequences of the accident.

A spectrum of both large and small break LOCAs are to be evaluated and the limiting break identified through sufficient analyses to determine the worst break peak clad temperature (PCT), the worst local clad oxidation, and the highest core wide oxidation percentage. The small break spectrum should have sufficient resolution to locate these limiting conditions. In the analysis of small breaks, evaluating integer diameter break sizes (i.e., 1, 2, 3, 4-inch, etc.) is considered insufficient to determine the worst break because the break areas associated with these integer diameters are too coarse to adequately identify the highest PCT. The analyses must also be carried out until the top of the active fuel has been recovered with a two-phase mixture and the cladding temperatures have been reduced to temperatures near the saturation temperature. The analyses must also consider the case with a severed ECC injection line, along with the degraded ECC injection into the intact loops. Break locations should include the side and top of the discharge leg to assure that the suction leg piping that fails to clear of liquid does not result in depression of the two-phase mixture level into the core and result in the worst case PCT. If operator action is required to maintain conditions within 10 CFR 50.46 limits, then the equipment and operator action times to achieve a successful core cooling condition should also be identified.

An evaluation of post-LOCA long term cooling should also be performed to identify the operator actions to successfully control and prevent boric acid precipitation. Analyses of both large break and small break LOCAs should be performed to identify the timing for boric acid precipitation. The timing for the switch to simultaneous injection for large breaks should be identified using acceptable analysis methods. A spectrum of small breaks should also be analyzed to identify other means to control boric acid precipitation when RCS pressure remains too high to enable flushing of the core through a simultaneous injection line-up during the long term. All equipment and operator action times should also be clearly identified in the analyses.

The calculational framework used for the evaluation of the ECCS system in terms of core short term behavior and long term cooling performance are referred to as an evaluation model. It includes one or more computer programs, the mathematical models used, the assumptions and correlations included in the program, the procedure for selecting and treating the program input and output information, the specification of those portions of the analysis not included in computer programs, the values of parameters, and all other information necessary to specify the calculational procedure. The evaluation model used by the applicant must comply with the acceptance criteria for ECCS given in 10 CFR 50.46 (Ref. 2). Should the LOCA blowdown calculations be modified for the purpose of studying structural behavior (for example, core support structure design, control rod guide structure design, steam generator design, reactor coolant system piping and support structure design), all differences should be identified and described by the applicant. The organization responsible for reactor systems evaluates these modifications, including analytical techniques, computer programs, values of input parameters, break size, type, and location, and all other pertinent information, and makes recommendations regarding their acceptability to other reviewers as required. The organization responsible for reactor systems initiates a generic computer program review as required.

The reactor systems review of this SRP section covers the following areas:

- A. The failure mode analysis of the ECCS to verify that an adequate analysis of possible failure modes of ECCS equipment and the effect of the failure modes on the ECCS performance has been provided in conjunction with the effort described in SRP Section 6.3.
- B. The analytical techniques and computer programs used by the applicant for the blowdown, refill, and reflood portions of the loss-of-coolant transient.
- C. The analytical techniques and computer programs used by the applicant for power transient calculations (including moderator temperature, void and fuel temperature feedback effects, and decay heat) and for the cladding temperature, cladding rupture and swelling calculations.
- D. Independent audit blowdown, refill, reflood and cladding calculations as required to verify the applicant's conclusions.
- E. For a small break loss-of-coolant accident, the reactor systems reviews the potential for the addition of un-borated water into the core from reactor coolant pump seals, and the potential for additional core damage caused by reactivity transients from the un-borated water.
- F. Verification that the core physics data used by the applicant, or by the staff in independent audit analyses, are the appropriate data to be used.
- G. The results of the large and small break post-LOCA long term cooling analyses and assures that an acceptable model has been employed to identify the timing for boric acid precipitation for large breaks (and hence the timing for the operator action to switch to simultaneous injection) and an adequate procedure has been devised to control boric acid precipitation for all small breaks that cannot successfully employ simultaneous injection to assure long term cooling.

The organization responsible for emergency preparedness and radiation protection reviews, as part of their review responsibility, provides an evaluation of fission product releases and radiological consequences. This effort is described in the appendices to this SRP section and SRP sections 15.6.5.A, 15.6.5.B and 15.6.5.D and their results are included in the safety evaluation report (SER) writeup. For applications under 10 CFR Part 52, this effort is described in SRP Section 15.0.3, "Radiological Consequences of Design Basis Accidents - for ESP, DC and COL Applications."

2. COL Action Items and Certification Requirements and Restrictions. COL action items may be identified in the NRC staff's final safety evaluation report (FSER) for each certified design to identify information that COL applicants must address in the application. Additionally, DCs contain requirements and restrictions (e.g., interface requirements) that COL applicants must address in the application. For COL applications referencing a DC, the review performed under this SRP section includes information provided in response to COL action items and certification requirements and restrictions pertaining to this SRP section, as identified in the FSER for the referenced certified design.

Review Interfaces

The listed SRP sections interface with this section as follows:

The organization responsible for the review of reactor systems evaluates fuel failure modes and burst correlations for compliance with 10 CFR 50.46 as part of its fuel design review in SRP Section 4.2.

The organization responsible for the review of reactor systems will coordinate, as required and by request, other staff evaluations that interface with the overall review of this SRP section as follows:

1. The organization responsible for the review of containment systems and severe accident as part of its review of SRP Section 6.2.1 includes an evaluation of the functional capability of the containment for the spectrum of loss-of-coolant events. The reviewer verifies, upon request from reactor systems reviewer, that the assumptions used for the containment response analysis have been selected in a conservative manner for the LOCA analysis performed, the containment pressure calculations utilized by the applicant, or by the staff in an audit analysis, for the reflood portion of the ECCS performance analyses.
2. The organization responsible for the review of instrumentation and controls as part of its reviews of SRP Sections 7.2 and 7.3 to include reactor protection system and associated ECCS controls and instrumentation with regard to automatic actuation, remote sensing and indications, remote control, and redundancy. The reviewer verifies that the reactor protection system and associated ECCS controls and instrumentation function as described in the applicant's events sequence for the safety analyses performed.
3. The organization responsible for the review of instrumentation and controls also, upon request from reactor systems reviewer, evaluates the failure modes analysis of the ECCS to verify that an adequate analysis of possible failure modes of ECCS instrumentation and controls equipment and the effect of the failure modes of that equipment on the ECCS performance has been provided.

4. The organization responsible for the review of electrical engineering as part of its review of SRP sections 8.3.1 and 8.3.2 includes the emergency onsite power functional capabilities. The electrical engineering reviewer, upon request from reactor systems reviewer, will verify that the control systems power sources needed to function to mitigate the event are available as required by the applicant's description of the event.
5. The organization responsible for the review of electrical engineering also, upon request from the reactor systems reviewer, evaluates the failure modes analysis of the ECCS to verify that an adequate analysis of possible failure modes of ECCS equipment and the effect of the failure modes on the ECCS performance has been provided.
6. The organization responsible for the review of balance of plant systems upon request from reactor systems reviewer evaluates Chapters 9 and 10 of the applicants SAR including an evaluation of auxiliary systems (e.g., auxiliary feedwater, service water system, component cooling system, ultimate heat sink, condensate storage facility) to confirm that these systems can supply all the functions required to support the ECCS in performing its function during and following a loss-of-coolant accident. The balance of plant systems reviewer also evaluates the integrity of the reactor coolant pump seals as part of its primary review responsibility for SRP Section 9.2.2.
7. The organization responsible for reviews of mechanical engineering under SRP Sections 3.6.2, 3.9.2, 3.9.3, 3.9.4, and 3.9.5 includes a review of the effects of the combined blowdown and seismic loads on core support structures and on control rod guide structures. The mechanical engineering reviewer verifies, upon request from reactor systems reviewer, that the core remains in a coolable geometry following a loss-of-coolant accident and that the control rods can also be inserted for breaks crediting this function. Analyses of the deformed bundle in the core should be performed to show that the acceptance criteria of 10 CFR 50.46 are met.
8. The organization responsible for the review of mechanical engineering also evaluates the effects of blowdown loads on the piping of the reactor coolant system and on the support structures of the components of the reactor coolant system. Upon request from the reactor systems reviewer, mechanical engineering reviewer verifies that acceptable criteria (Ref. 4) have been employed in the design of the reactor coolant system and its supports to prevent failures of the reactor coolant pressure boundary and engineered safety feature equipment in the event of a LOCA.
9. The organization responsible for reviews of human factors assessment evaluates plant operating procedures as a part of its review of SRP Section 13.5.2.1. Upon request from reactor systems reviewer, human factors assessment reviewer verifies that the plant operating procedures include actions relative to reactor coolant pump trip following small break LOCAs that are based on plant-specific safety evaluations.

The specific acceptance criteria and review procedures are contained in the referenced SRP sections.

II. ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA

Requirements

Acceptance criteria are based on meeting the relevant requirements of the following Commission regulations:

1. 10 CFR 50.46 as it relates to ECCS equipment being provided that refills the vessel in a timely manner for a loss-of-coolant accident resulting from a spectrum of postulated piping breaks within the reactor coolant pressure boundary.
2. GDC 13 as to the availability of instrumentation to monitor variables and systems over their anticipated ranges to assure adequate safety, and of appropriate controls to maintain these variables and systems within prescribed operating ranges.
3. General Design Criterion (GDC) 35 as it relates to demonstrating that the ECCS would provide abundant emergency core cooling to satisfy the ECCS safety function of transferring heat from the reactor core following any loss of reactor coolant at a rate that (1) fuel and clad damage that could interfere with continued effective core cooling would be prevented, and (2) clad metal-water reaction would be limited to negligible amounts. The analyses should reflect that the ECCS has suitable redundancy in components and features; and suitable interconnections, leak detection, isolation, and containment capabilities available such that the safety functions could be accomplished assuming a single failure. In addition, consideration should be given to the availability of onsite power (assuming offsite electric power is not available with onsite electric power available; or assuming onsite electric power is not available with offsite electric power available).
4. 10 CFR 100.20 (Ref. 5) as they relate to mitigating the radiological consequences of an accident.

SRP Acceptance Criteria

Specific SRP acceptance criteria acceptable to meet the relevant requirements of the NRC's regulations identified above are as follows for review described in Subsection I of this SRP section. The SRP is not a substitute for the NRC's regulations, and compliance with it is not required. However, an applicant is required to identify differences between the design features, analytical techniques, and procedural measures proposed for its facility and the SRP acceptance criteria and evaluate how the proposed alternatives to the SRP acceptance criteria provide acceptable methods of compliance with the NRC regulations.

Specific criteria necessary to meet the relevant requirements of the regulations identified above and necessary to meet the TMI Action Plan requirements (Ref. 6, 7 and 12) are as follows:

1. An evaluation of ECCS performance has been performed by the applicant in accordance with an evaluation model that satisfies the requirements of 10 CFR 50.46. Regulatory Guide 1.157 (Ref. 8) and Section I of Appendix K to 10 CFR Part 50 provide guidance on acceptable evaluation models. For the full spectrum of reactor coolant pipe breaks, and taking into consideration requirements for reactor coolant pump operation during a small break loss-of-coolant accident, (Refs. 10, 11, and 12) the results of the evaluation must show that the specific requirements of the acceptance criteria for ECCS are satisfied as given below. This also includes analyses of a spectrum of large break and small break LOCAs to assure boric acid precipitation is precluded for all break sizes and locations.

The analyses should be performed in accordance with 10 CFR 50.46, including methods referred to in 10 CFR 50.46(a)(1) or (2). The analyses must demonstrate sufficient redundancy in components and features, and suitable interconnections, leak detection, isolation, and containment capabilities such that the safety functions could be accomplished assuming a single failure in conjunction with the availability of onsite power (assuming offsite electric power is not available, with onsite electric power

available; or assuming onsite electric power is not available with offsite electric power available). Additionally the LOCA methodology used and the LOCA analyses should be shown to apply to the individual plant by satisfying 10 CFR 50.46(c)(2), and the analysis results should meet the performance criteria in 10 CFR 50.46(b).

- A. The calculated maximum fuel element cladding temperature does not exceed 1200 °C (2200 °F).
 - B. The calculated total local oxidation of the cladding does not exceed 17% of the total cladding thickness before oxidation. Total local oxidation includes pre-accident oxidation as well as oxidation that occurs during the course of the accident.
 - C. The calculated total amount of hydrogen generated from the chemical reaction of the cladding with water or steam does not exceed 1% of the hypothetical amount that would be generated if all of the metal in the cladding cylinders surrounding the fuel, excluding the cladding surrounding the plenum volume, were to react.
 - D. Calculated changes in core geometry are such that the core remains amenable to cooling.
 - E. After any calculated successful initial operation of the ECCS, the calculated core temperature is maintained at an acceptably low value and decay heat is removed for the extended period of time required by the long-lived radioactivity.
2. The radiological consequences of the most severe LOCA are within the guidelines of and 10 CFR 100.20. Reviewer should use SRP sections 15.6.5.A, 15.6.5.B and 15.6.5.D, as applicable for applications under 10 CFR Part 52. For applications under 10 CFR Part 52, reviewers should use SRP Section 15.0.3, "Radiological Consequences of Design Basis Accidents - for ESP, DC and COL Applications."
 3. The TMI Action Plan (Ref. 6, 7, and 11) requirements for II.E.2.3, II.K.2.8, II.K.3.5, II.K.3.25, II.K.3.30, II.K.3.31, and II.K.3.40 have been met.

Technical Rationale

The technical rationale for application of these acceptance criteria to the analysis of the consequences of loss-of-coolant accidents is discussed in the following paragraphs:

1. Compliance with 10 CFR 50.46 requires that light water cooled nuclear power reactors be equipped with an emergency core cooling system designed so that core performance following postulated loss-of-coolant accidents conforms to specified criteria related to limiting core damage.

The requirements specified in 10 CFR 50.46 provide an acceptable and conservative means of calculation of the consequences of LOCAs from a spectrum of pipe break sizes and locations that have been subject to careful review and experimental verification. If the calculations of the performance of the emergency core cooling system are conducted in accordance with these methods, there is a high level of probability that the acceptance criteria on core performance will not be exceeded and damage to the core and offsite consequences will be minimized. Regulatory Guide 1.157, "Best Estimate Calculations of Emergency Core Cooling System Performance," and Appendix K to 10 CFR Part 50, provide guidance and requirements

on evaluation models needed to demonstrate compliance with the acceptance criteria. Appendix K also specifies documentation required for evaluation models.

Meeting the requirements outlined in the references provides assurance that following a LOCA the reactor core will remain in a coolable geometry and offsite consequences will be within the guidelines specified in 10 CFR 100.20.

2. GDC 13 requires the provision of instrumentation that is capable of monitoring variables and systems over their anticipated ranges to assure adequate safety, and of controls that can maintain these variables and systems within prescribed operating ranges.

GDC 13 applies to this section because the reviewer evaluates the sequence of events, including automatic actuations of protection systems, and manual actions, and determines whether the sequence of events is justified, based upon the expected values for the relevant monitored parameters and instrument indications.

3. Compliance with GDC 35 requires that a means of providing abundant emergency core cooling be provided that will transfer heat from the reactor core in the event of a LOCA, and that suitable redundancy of components and features is provided so that the safety function can be accomplished assuming a single failure. GDC 35 specifies that an emergency core cooling system be installed in all nuclear power reactors. SRP Section 15.6.5 specifies the analytical procedures that are to be followed to establish that the ECCS will function to meet acceptance criteria specified in 10 CFR 50.46. 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix K and Regulatory Guide 1.157 provide guidance on calculational procedures needed to demonstrate compliance with the acceptance criteria.

Meeting the requirements of GDC 35 will provide assurance that following a LOCA that the reactor core will remain in a coolable geometry and offsite consequences will be within the guidelines specified in 10 CFR 100.20.

4. Compliance with 10 CFR 100.20, Reactor Site Criteria, describe criteria that guide the Commission in its evaluation of the suitability of proposed sites for nuclear power and testing reactors. 10 CFR 100.20 specify radiation dose guidelines that should not be exceeded in the event of postulated accidents including LOCAs.

In order to satisfy the requirements of 10 CFR 100.20, the applicant must demonstrate that the offsite doses resulting from various accidents presented in the SAR are within the guideline values. Meeting the guideline doses is achieved by a combination of engineered safety features installed in the nuclear facility, an effective emergency core cooling system, and siting the nuclear plant in an area that does not exceed population density requirements.

Meeting the nuclear power plant siting criteria provides a level of assurance that the plant will pose no undue risk to the public as a result of the consequences of LOCAs.

III. REVIEW PROCEDURES

The reviewer will select and emphasize material from the procedures described below, as may be appropriate for a particular case.

For each area of review specified in subsection I of this SRP section, the review procedure is identified below. These review procedures are based on the identified SRP acceptance criteria. For deviations from these specific acceptance criteria, the staff should review the applicant's

evaluation of how the proposed alternatives to the SRP criteria provide an acceptable method of complying with the relevant NRC requirements identified in subsection II.

The procedures below are used during the construction permit (CP), standard design certification, combined operating license (COL), and operating license (OL) reviews, as appropriate. During the CP or the standard design certification review, the values of system parameters setpoints used in the analysis are considered preliminary in nature and subject to change. At the OL or COL review, final values should be used in the analysis and the reviewer compares these to the limiting safety system settings included in the proposed technical specifications.

For the review of the ECCS performance analysis, as presented in the applicant's SAR, the reviewer verifies the following:

1. The calculations were performed using an evaluation model as specified in 10 CFR 50.46 following the guidance of Appendix K, Section I, or Regulatory Guide 1.157. The application should clearly state this and properly reference the evaluation model. If the analysis is done with a new evaluation model, a generic review of the new model is required. Evaluation models pertain to both the short term behavior following both large and small break LOCAs as well as post-LOCA long term cooling evaluations that properly address boric acid precipitation and prevention for both large and small break LOCAs.
2. An adequate failure mode analysis has been performed to justify the selection of the most limiting single active failure. This analysis is reviewed in part under SRP Section 6.3. If the design has been changed from that presented in previous applications, changes in the reactor coolant system, reactor core, and ECCS are reviewed with respect to the most limiting single failure.
3. A variety of break locations and the complete spectrum of break sizes were analyzed. If part of the evaluation is done by referencing earlier work, design differences (ECCS, reactor coolant system, reactor core, etc.) between the facilities in question are reviewed. If there are significant differences, sensitivity studies on the important parameters should have been made by the applicant. If such sensitivity studies are not presented in the SAR, the reviewer requests that they be made.
4. New generation LWRs for which core uncover is not expected during the entire period of a LOCA should be reviewed to ensure that a significant number of fuel rods will not be damaged due to local dryout conditions. This may be demonstrated by showing that the limiting fuel rod heat flux remains below the Critical Heat Flux (CHF) at a given pressure after depressurization has taken place. If, however, the heat flux exceeds the CHF, further analyses should be performed to estimate the amount of fuel damage expected from "burn-out" while the bulk of the core remains covered with water during the LOCA. Fuel damage and potential for radioactivity release to the environment must be consistent with 10 CFR 100.20. If such evaluations are not provided in the SAR, the reviewer requests that they be made.
5. The parameters and assumptions used for the calculations were conservatively chosen, including the following points:
 - A. The initial power level is taken as the licensed core thermal power for the number of loops initially assumed to be operating plus an allowance of 2% to account for power measurement uncertainties, unless a lower level of uncertainty can be justified by the applicant. The number of loops operating at the initiation

of the event should correspond to the operating condition which maximizes the consequences of the event.

- B. The maximum linear heat generation rate used should be based on the proposed licensed core thermal power as discussed in Item A and the technical specification limit on peaking factors, or on the technical specification limits on maximum linear heat generation rate.
 - C. All permitted axial power shapes, as given in Section 4.3 of the SRP, should be addressed by the analyses. Normally, the evaluation model will identify the least favorable axial shape as a function of break size. If the evaluation model did not discuss axial shapes, or the discussion is not applicable to a given case, sensitivity studies are requested.
 - D. The initial stored energy was conservatively calculated by the applicant. The value used is checked against the applicant's steady-state temperatures, as given in SRP Section 4.4, similar calculations performed by the staff, or calculations done for similar plants by previous applicants.
 - E. Appropriate analyses are presented to support any credit taken for control rod insertion.
 - F. The applicant's analysis conservatively addresses the operation of the reactor coolant pump including requirements for reactor coolant pump trip during small break LOCAs as required by Generic Letters 85-012, 86-005, and 86-006.
 - G. The analysis of boric acid precipitation should include a justified mixing volume which is computed as a function of time as ECC injection enters the core region. Since the size of the mixing volume is controlled by the external loop resistance and the balance of hydrostatic heads between the downcomer and inner vessel regions containing voids, the model must account for these effects. The precipitation limit must also be justified in the evaluation model. If the system design includes high concentrate boric acid tanks and/or sources, then these systems must be assumed to be operating at the time of the break initiation.
 - H. The containment pressure response used during the ECCS performance evaluation reflects a conservatively low minimum containment pressure.
 - I. Debris wash-down into the containment sump has been adequately treated so as to result in a conservative recirculation flow rate after switch over from the reactor water storage supply to the containment sump.
 - J. The containment analysis should be reviewed to determine that adequate NPSH is available to support the low head pumps at the time of switch over from the reactor water storage supply to the containment sump.
6. Reactor protection system actions and safety injection actuation and delivery are consistent with the set points and the associated uncertainties and delay times listed in the SAR (OL, COL, or standard design certification review). The ECCS flow rates should be checked against the applicant's data on head-flow characteristics of the ECCS pumps given in SRP Section 6.3 and against typical safety injection tank discharge curves used for the analysis. The Regional Offices may be requested to provide data of this type from the startup tests for new designs and from periodic tests on duplicate designs.

In the case of new reactor designs that use passive rather than active systems to provide ECCS to the reactor vessel, pressure drop test results should be reviewed to determine that the passive ECCS flow rate is consistent with that in the analyses of the system performance.

7. The results of the applicant's calculations are consistent with those of staff calculations for typical plants and also with the results of calculations performed for similar systems by previous applicants. The following variables should be reviewed on a generic basis and spot-checked thereafter: power transients for various breaks; pressure transients at various system locations; flow transients near the break, in the core, and in the downcomer; reactor coolant temperature and quality at core inlet, core outlet, and in-core; cladding temperature transients (core average, hot assembly, hot pin); heat transfer coefficients during blowdown, refill, and reflood; heat flux transients from piping and vessel walls; primary-secondary heat transfer (PWRs only); timing of clad rupture (if the peak clad temperature could be appreciably higher when perforation occurs at a different but equally probable time, calculations with modified assumptions are requested); peak clad temperature as a function of break size (if it is uncertain whether the peak value has been found, additional calculations are requested); predicted "end-of-bypass" time compared to calculated downcomer flow and to staff calculations for typical plants; pump speed transients; containment pressure transients (if staff calculations are not available, these are requested from containment systems reviewer); and carryover fraction (if it is not an input to the calculations). The boric acid concentration should be shown as a function of time for the limiting large and small breaks. For small breaks where simultaneous injection is unable to flush the core, other procedures must be employed to show that the boric acid concentration does not achieve precipitation limits.

New reactor designs may base their ECCS and reactor coolant system designs on prevention of core uncovering. Should that be the case, the reviewer should compare the applicant's analysis with the staff independent analysis to determine if the predicted level of core coverage is consistent.

8. The calculated peak clad temperature, maximum local oxide thickness, and core average zirconium-water reaction meet the acceptance criteria for ECCS given in 10 CFR 50.46(b). Boric acid concentration should be shown to be controlled prior to reaching the precipitation limit and all equipment and operator action times identified for inclusion in the EOPs.
9. The applicant's analysis addresses the full LOCA sequence of events, for the full spectrum of break sizes and locations, to the point where the plant is in the long-term cooling mode and removal of decay heat has been well established for both large and small breaks. The reviewer checks the assumed sources of coolant water, redundancy of delivery routes, alignment of valves, control of boron concentration (PWR) and all required operator actions.
10. The following steps shall be included in PWR emergency operating procedures as a condition for reactor coolant pump startup after a small break LOCA:
 - A. Verify adequate single phase natural circulation,
 - B. If single phase natural circulation cannot be established, verify adequate two phase natural circulation,
 - C. Determine if reactor coolant pump restart is needed and desired, and

- D. Verify that all reactor coolant pump restart criteria are met.
11. The TMI Action Plans (Ref. 6 and 7) items are reviewed to assure compliance with the acceptance criteria, Ref. 11.
- A. The reviewer evaluates the uncertainty analyses performed by the applicant to assure that the modeling assumptions and phenomena for small-break LOCA calculations are properly accounted for to determine the acceptability of the ECCS performance pursuant to 10 CFR 50.46 and Regulatory Guide 1.157 or Appendix K of 10 CFR Part 50 (Item II.E.2.3, Ref. 12).
- B. For Babcock and Wilcox designs, the reviewer confirms that the auxiliary feedwater system upgrade and automatic auxiliary feedwater initiation performed under this TMI action plan item have been properly accounted for in the LOCA analyses (Item II.K.2.8, Ref. 12).
- C. The reviewer evaluates the assumptions made regarding reactor coolant pump trip to assure that they are consistent and conservatively modeled with respect to the final pump trip criteria which result from resolution of TMI action plan (Item II.K.3.5, Ref. 12).
- D. If, as a result of a LOCA, or as a result of loss of A/C power, containment isolation is indicated to occur, the reactor coolant pump component cooling water may be lost. The reviewer evaluates the applicant's submittal to determine that the reactor coolant pump seal integrity is not lost. If it cannot be established that seal integrity is assured, the reviewer assures that the evaluation of this event correctly accounts for seal failure (Item II.K.3.25 and II.K.3.40, Ref. 11).
- E. The reviewer evaluates the small-break LOCA model verification performed by the applicant and assures that any modifications required are incorporated into the specific plant analyses (Item II.K.3.30 and II.K.3.31, Ref. 11).
12. Upon request from the primary reviewer, reviewers representing other technical disciplines branches will provide input for the areas of review stated in subsection I. The primary reviewer obtains and uses such input as required to assure that this review procedure is complete.
13. The review of fission product releases and radiological consequences of design basis (most severe) LOCA is performed by the emergency preparedness and radiation protection reviewer as described in the SRP Sections 15.6.5.A, 15.6.5.B and 15.6.5.D or Section 15.0.3, based on the licensing basis or application, as appropriate.
14. For reviews of DC and COL applications under 10 CFR Part 52, the reviewer should follow the above procedures to verify that the design set forth in the safety analysis report, and if applicable, site interface requirements meet the acceptance criteria. For DC applications, the reviewer should identify necessary COL action items. With respect to COL applications, the scope of the review is dependent on whether the COL applicant references a DC, an ESP or other NRC-approved material, applications, and/or reports.

After this review, SRP Section 14.3 should be followed for the review of Tier I information for the design, including the postulated site parameters, interface criteria, and ITAAC.

IV. EVALUATION FINDINGS

The reviewer verifies that the applicant has provided sufficient information and that the review and calculations (if applicable) support conclusions of the following type to be included in the staff's safety evaluation report. The reviewer also states the bases for those conclusions.

The reviewer verifies that the SAR contains sufficient information and that the review supports the following kinds of statements and conclusions, which should be included in the staff's safety evaluation report:

1. The staff concludes that the loss-of-coolant analysis resulting from a spectrum of postulated piping breaks within the reactor coolant pressure boundary is acceptable and meets the relevant requirements of 10 CFR 50.46, GDC 13, GDC 35, and 10 CFR 100.20. This conclusion is based on the following:
 2. The applicant meets GDC 13 requirements by demonstrating that all credited instrumentation was available, and that actuations of protection systems, automatic and manual, occurred at values of monitored parameters that were within the instruments' prescribed operating ranges.
 3. The applicant has performed analyses of the performance of the emergency core cooling system (ECCS) in accordance with the Commission's regulations (10 CFR 50.46). The analyses considered a spectrum of postulated break sizes and locations and were performed with an evaluation model that follows the guidance contained in Regulatory Guide 1.157 or Section I of Appendix K to 10 CFR Part 50 and meets the requirements of 10 CFR 50.46. The results of the analyses show that the ECCS satisfy the following criteria:
 - A. The calculated maximum fuel rod cladding temperature does not exceed 1200 °C (2200 °F).
 - B. The calculated total maximum local oxidation of the cladding does not exceed 17% of the total cladding thickness before oxidation.
 - C. The calculated total amount of hydrogen generated from the chemical reaction of the cladding with water or steam does not exceed 1% of the hypothetical amount that would be generated if all of the metal in the cladding cylinders surrounding the fuel, excluding the cladding surrounding the plenum volume, were to react.
 - D. Calculated changes in core geometry are such that the core remains amenable to cooling.
 - E. After any calculated successful initial operation of the ECCS, the calculated core temperature is maintained at an acceptably low value and decay heat is removed for the extended period of time required by the long-lived radioactivity.
 - F. The applicant has met the requirements of TMI Action Plan items.
 - G. Boric acid precipitation can be prevented for all break sizes and locations during post-LOCA long term cooling.
4. The radiological consequences meet 10 CFR 100.20 requirements for the postulated spectrum of loss-of-coolant accidents (LOCA) which were evaluated from the viewpoint of site acceptability. For the purposes of this analysis, large fractions of the fission

products were assumed to be released from the core even though these releases would be precluded by the performance of the ECCS.

The staff concludes that the calculated performance of the emergency core cooling system following a postulated loss-of-coolant accident and the conservatively calculated radiological consequences of such an accident conform to the Commission's regulations and to applicable regulatory guides and staff technical positions and, accordingly, the ECCS is considered acceptable.

For DC and COL reviews, the findings will also summarize (to the extent that the review is not discussed in other SER sections) the staff's evaluation of ITAAC, including design acceptance criteria, as applicable, interface requirements, and combined operating license action items that are relevant to this SRP section.

V. IMPLEMENTATION

The staff will use this SRP section in performing safety evaluations of DC applications and license applications submitted by applicants pursuant to 10 CFR Part 50 or 10 CFR Part 52. Except when the applicant proposes an acceptable alternative method for complying with specified portions of the Commission's regulations, the staff will use the method described herein to evaluate conformance with Commission regulations.

The provisions of this SRP section apply to reviews of applications docketed six months or more after the date of issuance of this SRP section, unless superseded by a later revision.

VI. REFERENCES

1. 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix A, General Design Criterion 35, "Emergency Core Cooling."
2. 10 CFR 50.46, "Acceptance Criteria for Emergency Core Cooling Systems for Light Water Nuclear Power Reactors," and Appendix K to 10 CFR Part 50, "ECCS Evaluation Models."
3. Standard Review Plan Section 6.3, "Emergency Core Cooling System."
4. NUREG-0609, "Asymmetric Blowdown Loads on PWR Primary Systems Resolution of Generic Task Action Plan A-2."
5. NUREG-0718, "Licensing Requirements for Pending Applications for Construction Permits and Manufacturing Licenses."
6. NUREG-0737, "Clarification of TMI Action Plan Requirements," November 1980.
7. Regulatory Guide 1.157, "Best-Estimate Calculations of Emergency Core Cooling System Performance."
8. Generic Letter 85-012, "Implementation of TMI Action Item II.K.3.5, "Automatic Trip of Reactor Coolant Pumps" for Westinghouse Designed Nuclear Steam Supply Systems."
9. Generic Letter 86-005, "Implementation of TMI Action Item II.K.3.5, "Automatic Trip of Reactor Coolant Pumps" for Babcox and Wilcox Designed Nuclear Steam Supply Systems."

10. Generic Letter 86-006, "Implementation of TMI Action Item II.K.3.5, "Automatic Trip of Reactor Coolant Pumps" for Combustion Engineering Designed Nuclear Steam Supply Systems."
11. Technical Desk Reference, TMI items: II.E.2.3, II.K.2.8 , II.K.3.5 , II.K.3.25 , II.K.3.30, II.K.3.31, and II.K.3.40

PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT STATEMENT

The information collections contained in the draft Standard Review Plan are covered by the requirements of 10 CFR Part 50 and 10 CFR Part 52, and were approved by the Office of Management and Budget, approval number 3150-0011 and 3150-0151.

PUBLIC PROTECTION NOTIFICATION

The NRC may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a request for information or an information collection requirement unless the requesting document displays a currently valid OMB control number.

SRP Section 15.6.5
Description of Changes

This SRP section affirms the technical accuracy and adequacy of the guidance previously provided in (Draft) Revision 3, dated April, 1996 of this SRP. See ADAMS accession number ML052070734.

In addition this SRP section was administratively updated in accordance with NRR Office Instruction, LIC-200, Revision 1, "Standard Review Plan (SRP) Process." The revision also adds standard paragraphs to extend application of the updated SRP section to prospective submittals by applicants pursuant to 10 CFR Part 52.

The technical changes are incorporated in Revision 3, dated 2007.

Review Responsibilities - Reflects changes in review branches resulting from reorganization and branch consolidation. Change is reflected throughout the SRP.

I. AREAS OF REVIEW

1. Reformatted the section with new numbering system. Incorporated reference to 10 CFR Part 52 from draft revision 1 - April 1996. Incorporated generic paragraphs relating to certified designs, ESPs, and COLs.
2. Added item G to include the results of the large and small break post-LOCA long term cooling analyses.

II. ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA

1. Reformatted the section with new numbering system. Incorporated reference to 10 CFR Part 52 from draft revision 1 - April 1996. Incorporated generic paragraphs relating to certified designs, ESPs, and COLs.
2. Added item 2 to expand application of General Design Criterion (GDC) 35 as it relates to demonstrating that the ECCS would provide abundant emergency core cooling.
3. Expanded review under Specific Acceptance criteria (item 1) to scope in analyses performed to comply with 10 CFR 50.46.

III. REVIEW PROCEDURES

1. Reformatted the section with new numbering system. Incorporated reference to 10 CFR Part 52 from draft revision 1 - April 1996. Incorporated generic paragraphs relating to certified designs, ESPs, and COLs.
2. Item 4 added to include analyses for new generation LWRs under core uncover conditions.

3. Number of review procedures additions highlighted throughout the section.

V. IMPLEMENTATION

None

VI. REFERENCES

1. Modified reference 5 and added reference 11 for TMI Action items Technical Reference.