

RS-07-153

November 2, 2007

10 CFR 50.46

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
ATTN: Document Control Desk
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001

Clinton Power Station, Unit 1
Facility Operating License No. NPF-62
NRC Docket No. 50-461

Subject: Annual Report of Emergency Core Cooling System Evaluation Model
Changes and Errors for Clinton Power Station

In accordance with 10 CFR 50.46, "Acceptance criteria for emergency core cooling systems for light-water nuclear power reactors," paragraph (a)(3)(ii), AmerGen Energy Company, LLC (AmerGen) is submitting the annual report of the Emergency Core Cooling System (ECCS) Evaluation Model changes and errors for Clinton Power Station (CPS), Unit 1. This report covers the period from November 4, 2006 through November 2, 2007.

Should you have any questions concerning this letter, please contact Mr. Timothy A. Byam at (630) 657-2804.

Respectfully,



Jeffrey L. Hansen
Manager – Licensing

Attachments:

1. 10 CFR 50.46 Report
2. 10 CFR 50.46 Report Assessment Notes

bcc: Clinton Power Station Project Manager – NRR
Illinois Emergency Management Agency – Division of Nuclear Safety
Director – Licensing and Regulatory Affairs
Manager – Licensing, Clinton Power Station
Site Vice President – Clinton Power Station
Plant Manager – Clinton Power Station
Regulatory Assurance Manager – Clinton Power Station
Brenda Fore, Clinton Power Station (Electronic copy)
Document Control Desk, Licensing (Hard copy)
Director – Nuclear Fuels
Technical Support & Safety Analysis Manager, Nuclear Fuels
S. Ahmed, Nuclear Fuels
M. Vandermyde, Clinton Power Station

**Attachment 1
Clinton Power Station Unit 1
10 CFR 50.46 Report
Page 1 of 2**

PLANT NAME: Clinton Power Station, Unit 1
 ECCS EVALUATION MODEL: SAFER/GESTR - LOCA
 REPORT REVISION DATE: 11/02/07
 CURRENT OPERATING CYCLE: 11

ANALYSIS OF RECORD

Evaluation Model Methodology: The GESTR-LOCA and SAFER Models for the Evaluation of the Loss-of-Coolant Accident; Volume III, SAFER/GESTR Application Methodology, NEDC-23785-1-PA, Revision 1, General Electric Company, October 1984.

Calculation: Clinton Power Station, SAFER/GESTR-LOCA Analysis Basis Documentation, NEDC-32974P, GE Nuclear Energy, October 2000.

Fuel: GE 14

Limiting Fuel: GE 14

Limiting Single Failure: High Pressure Core Spray (HPCS) Diesel Generator

Limiting Break Size and Location: 1.0 Double Ended Guillotine of Recirculation Pump Suction Piping

Reference Peak Cladding Temperature (PCT): 1550°F

MARGIN ALLOCATION

A. PRIOR LOCA MODEL ASSESSMENTS

| | |
|--|----------------------------|
| 10 CFR 50.46 report dated November 13, 2000 (See Note 1) | $\Delta PCT = 0^{\circ}F$ |
| 10 CFR 50.46 report dated November 08, 2001 (See Note 2) | $\Delta PCT = 5^{\circ}F$ |
| 10 CFR 50.46 report dated November 05, 2002 (See Note 3) | $\Delta PCT = 35^{\circ}F$ |
| 10 CFR 50.46 report dated November 05, 2003 (See Note 4) | $\Delta PCT = 5^{\circ}F$ |
| 10 CFR 50.46 report dated November 05, 2004 (See Note 5) | $\Delta PCT = 0^{\circ}F$ |
| 10 CFR 50.46 report dated November 04, 2005 (See Note 6) | $\Delta PCT = 0^{\circ}F$ |
| 10 CFR 50.46 report dated November 03, 2006 (See Note 7) | $\Delta PCT = 0^{\circ}F$ |

**Attachment 1
Clinton Power Station Unit 1
10 CFR 50.46 Report
Page 2 of 2**

| | |
|---|--|
| 10 CFR 50.46 report dated April 19, 2007 (See Note 8) | $\Delta\text{PCT} = 6^{\circ}\text{F}$ |
| | |
| Net PCT | 1601$^{\circ}\text{F}$ |

B. CURRENT LOCA MODEL ASSESSMENTS

| | |
|--|--|
| None (Note 9) | $\Delta\text{PCT} = 0^{\circ}\text{F}$ |
| | |
| Total PCT change from current assessments | $\sum\Delta\text{PCT} = 0^{\circ}\text{F}$ |
| Cumulative PCT change from current assessments | $\sum \Delta\text{PCT} = 0^{\circ}\text{F}$ |
| Net PCT | 1601$^{\circ}\text{F}$ |

Attachment 2
Clinton Power Station Unit 1
10 CFR 50.46 Report Assessment Notes
Page 1 of 2

NOTES:

1. Prior LOCA Model Assessments

The referenced letter reported a new analysis of record for Clinton Power Station (CPS).

[Reference: Letter from M. A. Reandeau (AmerGen Energy Company) to U.S. NRC, "Report of a Change to the ECCS Evaluation Model Used for Clinton Power Station (CPS)," dated November 13, 2000.]

2. Prior LOCA Model Assessments

An inconsistent core exit steam flow was used in the pressure calculation in the SAFER code when there is a change in the two-phase level. The incorrect calculated pressure may result in premature termination of ECCS condensation and will impact the second peak clad temperature (PCT). GE evaluated the impact of this error and determined that the impact is an increase of 5°F in the PCT. This error was reported to the NRC in the referenced letter.

[Reference: Letter from K. A. Ainger (Exelon Generation Company) to U.S. NRC, "Annual Report of Emergency Core Cooling System Evaluation Model Changes and Errors for Clinton Power Station," dated November 8, 2001.]

3. Prior LOCA Model Assessments

In the referenced letter to the NRC, the impact of the Low Pressure Coolant Injection (LPCI) and Low Pressure Core Spray (LPCS) minimum flow valve flow diversion was reported and was found to have a 0°F impact. Also in the referenced letter GE LOCA errors were reported all of which had a 0°F PCT increase except for a SAFER Core Spray sparger injection elevation error that resulted in a 15°F increase in the PCT. The Extended Power Uprate (EPU) has resulted in an increase of 20°F in the PCT. The EPU was implemented in Cycle 9 Reload.

[Reference: Letter from Patrick R. Simpson (Exelon Generation Company) to U.S. NRC, "Annual Report of Emergency Core Cooling System Evaluation Model Changes and Errors for Clinton Power Station," dated November 5, 2002.]

4. Prior LOCA Model Assessments

In the referenced letter to the NRC, the impact of an error found in the initial level/volume table for SAFER was reported. The level/volume tables were generated with incorrect initial water levels. This resulted in an incorrect volume split in the nodes above and below the water surface, and incorrect initial liquid mass. This error resulted in a 5°F increase in the PCT for all fuel types (i.e., GE 10 & GE14).

[Reference: Letter from Patrick R. Simpson (Exelon Generation Company) to U.S. NRC, "Annual Report of Emergency Core Cooling System Evaluation Model Changes and Errors for Clinton Power Station," dated November 5, 2003.]

Attachment 2
Clinton Power Station Unit 1
10 CFR 50.46 Report Assessment Notes
Page 2 of 2

5. Prior LOCA Model Assessments

In the referenced letter to the NRC, the impact of a GE postulated new heat source applicable to the LOCA event was reported. This heat source is due to recombination of hydrogen and excess oxygen drawn into the vessel from containment during core heatup. The PCT impact for all fuel types was 0°F and the effect on local oxidation was negligible.

[Reference: Letter from Patrick R. Simpson (Exelon Generation Company) to U.S. NRC, "Annual Report of Emergency Core Cooling System Evaluation Model Changes and Errors for Clinton Power Station," dated November 5, 2004.]

6. Prior LOCA Model Assessments

In the referenced letter to the NRC, the impact of the 24-month cycle operation was reported. The evaluation determined that the LOCA analysis of record was performed with bounding assumptions and hence is not impacted with the 24-month cycle. A 0°F PCT impact was assigned.

[Reference: Letter from Patrick R. Simpson (Exelon Generation Company) to U.S. NRC, "Annual Report of Emergency Core Cooling System Evaluation Model Changes and Errors for Clinton Power Station," dated November 4, 2005.]

7. Prior LOCA Model Assessments

In the referenced letter to the NRC, the impact of the top peak axial power shape on the small break LOCA was reported. The impact of the top peak axial power shape on the licensing basis PCT was 0°F for GE 14 Fuel for CPS.

[Reference: Letter from Kenneth M. Nicely (Exelon Generation Company) to U.S. NRC, "Annual Report of Emergency Core Cooling System Evaluation Model Changes and Errors for Clinton Power Station," dated November 3, 2006.]

8. Prior LOCA Model Assessments

In the referenced letter, the impact of the core shroud repair on the PCT was reported to the NRC. The leakage flows through the repair holes result in slightly increased time to core recovery, following core uncover. The effect has been conservatively assessed to increase the PCT for the limiting LOCA by less than 6 °F.

[Reference: Letter from Patrick R. Simpson (Exelon Generation Company) to U.S. NRC, "Updated Annual Report of Emergency Core Cooling System Evaluation Model Changes and Errors for Clinton Power Station," dated April 19, 2007.]

9. Current LOCA Model Assessments

For the current reporting period there is no LOCA model assessment for the CPS LOCA analysis.