

50-390

WATTS BAR 1

TVA

NRC Bulletin 88-11 Pressurizer Surge Line Thermal Stratification

Rec'd w/ltr dtd 3/30/92...9204060097

-NOTICE-

THE ATTACHED FILES ARE OFFICIAL RECORDS OF THE RECORDS & REPORTS MANAGEMENT BRANCH. THEY HAVE BEEN CHARGED TO YOU FOR A LIMITED TIME PERIOD AND MUST BE RETURNED TO THE RECORDS & ARCHIVES SERVICES SECTION P1-122 WHITE FLINT. PLEASE DO NOT SEND DOCUMENTS CHARGED OUT THROUGH THE MAIL. REMOVAL OF ANY PAGE(S) FROM DOCUMENT FOR REPRODUCTION MUST BE REFERRED TO FILE PERSONNEL.

-NOTICE-

~~PROPRIETARY~~

ENCLOSURE 2

WCAP-12778
NONPROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED,
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED

~~PROPRIETARY~~

WCAP-12778

Structural Evaluation of
Sequoyah and Watts Bar Units 1 and 2 Pressurizer
Surge Lines, Considering the Effects of
Thermal Stratification

December 1990

E. L. Cranford
T. H. Liu

L. M. Valasek
R. Brice-Nash

C. B. Bond
S. Tandon

Verified by:

D. H. Roarty

Approved by:

S. S. Palusamy
S. S. Palusamy, Manager
Diagnostics and Monitoring
Technology

Approved by:

R. B. Patel
R. B. Patel, Manager
System Structural Analysis
and Development

Work Performed under Shop Orders SZXP-964 and SZXP-145

WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC CORPORATION
Nuclear and Advanced Technology Division
P.O. Box 2728
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15230-2728

© 1990 Westinghouse Electric Corp.

9102060178 9488
PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED,
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED

PROPRIETARY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Title</u>
	Executive Summary
1.0	Background and Introduction
1.1	Background
1.2	Description of Surge Line Stratification
1.3	Scope of Work
2.0	Surge Line Transient and Temperature Profile Development
2.1	General Approach
2.2	System Design Information
2.3	Development of Normal and Upset Transients
2.4	Monitoring Results and Operator Interviews
2.5	Historical Operation
2.6	Development of Heatup and Cooldown Transients
2.7	Axial Stratification Profile Development
2.8	Striping Transients
3.0	Stress Analysis
3.1	Sequoyah/Watts Bar Units 1 and 2 Surge Line Layouts
3.2	Piping System Global Structural Analysis
3.3	Local Stresses - Methodology and Results
3.4	Total Stress from Global and Local Analysis
3.5	Thermal Striping
4.0	Displacements at Support Locations

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED.
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

PROPRIETARY

<u>Section</u>	<u>Title</u>
5.0	Fatigue Usage
5.1	Methodology
5.2	Fatigue Usage Factors
5.3	Fatigue Due to Thermal Striping
5.4	Fatigue Usage Results
6.0	Summary and Conclusions
7.0	References
Appendix A	Computer Codes
Appendix B	USNRC Bulletin 88-11
Appendix C	Transient Development Details

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Thermal stratification has been identified as a concern which can affect the structural integrity of piping systems in nuclear plants since 1979, when a leak was discovered in a PWR feedwater line. In the pressurizer surge line, stratification can result from the difference in densities between the hot leg water and generally hotter pressurizer water. Stratification with large temperature differences can produce very high stresses, and this can lead to integrity concerns. Study of the surge line behavior has concluded that the largest temperature differences occur during certain modes of plant heatup and cooldown.

This report has been prepared to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of NRC Bulletin 88-11 for the Sequoyah and Watts Bar Units 1 and 2. Prior to the issuance of the bulletin, the Westinghouse Owners Group had a program in place to investigate the issue, and recommend actions by member utilities. That program provided the technical basis for the plant specific transient development reported here for the Sequoyah and Watts Bar plants.

This transient development utilized a number of sources, including plant operating procedures, surge line monitoring data, and historical records for each plant. This transient information was used as input to a structural and stress analysis of the surge line for the four plants. A review and comparison of the piping and support configurations for the plants led to the conclusion that the surge lines are nearly identical, and thus one analysis could be done to apply to all four plants, for the stratification transient development. Separate analyses were completed for the structural and leak-before-break (LBB) analyses, and the LBB analyses results are reported in a separate WCAP report.

The results of the structural analysis, and the fatigue analysis which followed, showed that the Sequoyah and Watts Bar Units 1 and 2 meet the stress limits and usage factor requirements of the ASME Code for the remainder of the licensed operation of the plants. The support loads and displacements resulting from stratification have also been provided, for use in

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY

re-evaluating the adequacy of the supports, and ensuring proper gaps in pipe whip restraints to allow free pipe movement at all thermal conditions. The structural analysis resulted in recommendation to remove pipe whip restraints where possible and increase gaps where removal is not cost effective, as discussed in Section 4.

This work has led to the conclusion that the Sequoyah and Watts Bar Units 1 and 2 are in full compliance with the requirements of NRC Bulletin 88-11.

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED,
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED

PROPRIETARY

SUMMARY OF RESULTS, AND STATUS OF 88-11 QUALIFICATION

Sequoyah 1 Sequoyah 2 Watts Bar 1 Watts Bar 2

Operating History

Date of commercial operation	7-1-81	6-1-82	N/A	N/A
Years of water-solid heatups	0	0	0	0
Years of steam-bubble heatups	6.0	5.0	0	0
System delta T limit	320F	320F	320F	320F
Number of exceedances	Four	Six	Two	None

Maximum Stress and Usage Factor Results

Equation 12 stress/allowable* (ksi)	39.5/53.0	39.5/53.0	44.2/51.3	44.2/51.3
Fatigue usage/allowable	0.35/1.0	0.35/1.0	0.25/1.0	0.25/1.0

Pressurizer Surge Nozzle Results

Maximum stress intensity range/ allowable (ksi)	32.86/80.1	32.86/80.1	26.96/38.91	26.96/38.91
Fatigue usage/allowable	0.1/1.0	0.1/1.0	0.36/1.0	0.36/1.0

Restraint Modifications Required adjust pipe whip restraint gaps

Remaining Actions by Utility

Schedule	Fall 91	Spring 92	Fall 91	Fall 92
----------	---------	-----------	---------	---------

Status of 88-11 Requirements All analysis requirements met

* Results for future configuration. See Table 3-2 for results for present configuration.

PROPRIETARY

SECTION 1.0 BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

Sequoyah and Watts Bar Units 1 and 2 are four loop pressurized water reactors, designed to be as nearly identical as practical, in both hardware and operation. This report has been developed to provide the technical basis and results of a plant-specific structural evaluation for the effects of thermal stratification of the pressurizer surge lines for each of these plants.

The operation of a pressurized water reactor requires the primary coolant loop to be water solid, and this is accomplished through a pressurizer vessel, connected to the loop by the pressurizer surge line. A typical four loop arrangement is shown in Figure 1-1, with the surge line highlighted.

The pressurizer vessel contains steam and water at saturated conditions with the steam-water interface level typically between 25 and 60% of the volume depending on the plant operating conditions. From the time the steam bubble is initially drawn during the heatup operation to hot standby conditions, the level is maintained at approximately 25%. During power ascension, the level is increased to approximately 60%. The steam bubble provides a pressure cushion effect in the event of sudden changes in Reactor Coolant System (RCS) mass inventory. Spray operation reduces system pressure by condensing some of the steam. Electric heaters, at the bottom of the pressurizer, may be energized to generate additional steam and increase RCS pressure.

As illustrated in figure 1-1, the bottom of the pressurizer vessel is connected to the hot leg of one of the coolant loops by the surge line, a 14 inch schedule 160 stainless steel pipe, a portion of which is almost horizontal, but slightly pitched down toward the hot leg.

1.1 Background

During the period from 1982 to 1988, a number of utilities reported unexpected movement of the pressurizer surge line, as evidenced by crushed insulation, gap closures in the pipe whip restraints, and in some cases unusual snubber movement. Investigation of this problem revealed that the movement was caused by thermal stratification in the surge line.

PROPRIETARY

Thermal stratification had not been considered in the original design of any pressurizer surge line, and was known to have been the cause of service-induced cracking in feedwater line piping, first discovered in 1979. Further instances of service-induced cracking from thermal stratification surfaced in 1988, with a crack in a safety injection line, and a separate occurrence with a crack in a residual heat removal line. Each of the above incidents resulted in at least one through-wall crack, which was detected through leakage, and led to a plant shutdown. Although no through wall cracks were found in surge lines, inservice inspections of one plant in the U.S. and another in Switzerland mistakenly claimed to have found sizeable cracks in the pressurizer surge line. Although both these findings were subsequently disproved, the previous history of stratified flow in other lines led the USNRC to issue Bulletin 88-11 in December of 1988. A copy of this bulletin is included as Appendix B.

The bulletin requested utilities to establish and implement a program to confirm the integrity of the pressurizer surge line. The program required both visual inspection of the surge line and demonstration that the design requirements of the surge line are satisfied, including the consideration of stratification effects.

Prior to the issuance of NRC Bulletin 88-11, the Westinghouse Owners Group had implemented a program to address the issue of surge line stratification. A bounding evaluation was performed and presented to the NRC in April of 1989. This evaluation compared all the WOG plants to those for which a detailed plant specific analysis had been performed. Since this evaluation was unable to demonstrate the full design life for all plants, a generic justification for continued operation was developed for use by each of the WOG plants, the basis of which was documented in references 1 and 2.

The Westinghouse Owners Group implemented a program for generic detailed analysis in June of 1989, and this program involved individual detailed analyses of groups of plants. This approach permitted a more realistic

PROPRIETARY

approach than could be obtained from a single bounding analysis for all plants, and the results were published in June of 1990 [3].*

The followup to the Westinghouse Owners Group Program is a demonstration of the applicability of reference [3] to each individual plant, and the performance of evaluations which could not be performed on a generic basis. The goal of this report is to accomplish these followup actions, and to therefore complete the requirements of the NRC Bulletin 88-11 for the Sequoyah and Watts Bar Units 1 and 2.

1.2 Description of Surge Line Thermal Stratification

It will be useful to describe the phenomenon of stratification, before dealing with its effects. Thermal stratification in the pressurizer surge line is the direct result of the difference in densities between the pressurizer water and the generally cooler RCS hot leg water. The lighter pressurizer water tends to float on the cooler heavier hot leg water. The potential for stratification is increased as the difference in temperature between the pressurizer and the hot leg increases and as the insurge or outsurge flow rates decrease.

At power, when the difference in temperature between the pressurizer and hot leg is relatively small, the extent and effects of stratification have been observed to be small. However, during certain modes of plant heatup and cooldown, this difference in system temperature could be as large as 320°F, in which case the effects of stratification are significant, and must be accounted for.

Thermal stratification in the surge line causes two effects:

- o Bending of the pipe is different than that predicted in the original design.

*Numbers in brackets refer to references listed in Section 7.

PROPRIETARY

- o Potentially reduced fatigue life of the piping due to the higher stress resulting from stratification and striping.

1.3 Scope of Work

The primary purpose of this work was to develop transients applicable to the Sequoyah and Watts Bar plants which include the effects of stratification and to evaluate these effects on the structural integrity of the surge lines. This work will therefore complete the demonstration of compliance with the requirements of NRC Bulletin 88-11.

The transients were developed following the same general approach originally established for the Westinghouse Owners Group. Conservatism inherent in the original approach were refined through the use of monitoring results, plant operating procedures and operator interviews, and historical data on plant operation.

The resulting transients were used to perform an analysis of the surge line, wherein the existing support configuration was carefully modeled, and surge line displacements, stresses and support loadings were determined. This analysis and its results are discussed in Section 3 and 4.

The stresses were used to perform a fatigue analysis for the surge line, and the methodology and results of this work are discussed in Section 5. The summary and conclusions of this work are summarized in Section 6.

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY




Figure 1-1. Typical A Loop Plant Component Layout

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED.
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED

PROPRIETARY

SECTION 2.0 SURGE LINE TRANSIENT AND TEMPERATURE PROFILE DEVELOPMENT

2.1 Overall Approach

The transients for the pressurizer surge line were developed from a number of sources, including the most recent systems standard design transients. The heatup and cooldown transients, which involve the majority of the severe stratification occurrences, were developed from review of the plant operating procedures, operator interviews, monitoring data and historical records for each plant. The total number of heatup and cooldown events specified remains unchanged at 200 each, but a number of sub-events have been defined to reflect stratification effects, as described in more detail later.

The normal and upset transients, except for heatup and cooldown, for Sequoyah and Watts Bar Units 1 and 2 surge lines are provided in Table 2-1. For each of the transients the surge line fluid temperature was modified from the original design assumption of uniform temperature to a stratified distribution, according to the predicted temperature differentials between the pressurizer and hot leg, as listed in the table. The transients have been characterized as either insurge/outsurges (I/O in the table) or fluctuations (F). Insurge/outsurge transients are generally more severe, because they result in the greatest temperature change in the top or bottom of the pipe. Typical temperature profiles for insurges and outsurges are shown in Figure 2-1.

Transients identified as fluctuations (F) typically involve low surge flow rates and smaller temperature differences between the pressurizer and hot leg, so the resulting stratification stresses are much lower. This type of cycle is important to include in the analysis, but is generally not the major contributor to fatigue usage.

The development of transients which are applicable to Sequoyah and Watts Bar Units 1 and 2 was based on the work already accomplished under programs

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY

completed for the Westinghouse Owners Group [1,2,3]*. In this work all the Westinghouse plants were grouped based on the similarity of their response to stratification. The three most important factors influencing the effects of stratification were found to be the structural layout, support configuration, and plant operation.

The transient development for the Sequoyah and Watts Bar plants took advantage of the similarity in the surge line layout for the four plants, as well as the similarity of the plants' operating procedures. Two sets of transients were developed to cover all four plants. A detailed comparison of the piping and support configurations for all plants appears in Section 3.1.

The transients developed here, and used in the structural analysis, have taken advantage of the monitoring data collected during the WOG program, as well as operator interviews and historical operation data for the Sequoyah and Watts Bar plants. Each of these will be discussed in the sections which follow.

2.2 System Design Information

The thermal design transients for a typical Reactor Coolant System, including the pressurizer surge line, are defined in Westinghouse Systems Standard Design Criteria.

The design transients for the surge line consist of two major categories:

- (a) Heatup and Cooldown transients
- (b) Normal and Upset operation transients (by definition, the emergency and faulted transients are not considered in the ASME Section III fatigue life assessment of components).

*Numbers in brackets refer to references listed in Section 7.

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY

In the evaluation of surge line stratification, the typical FSAR chapter 3.9 definition of normal and upset design events and the number of occurrences of the design events remains unchanged.

The total number of current heatup-cooldown cycles (200) remains unchanged. However, sub-events and the associated number of occurrences ("Label", "Type" and "Cycle" columns of tables 2-1 and 2-2 have been defined to reflect stratification effects, as described later.

2.3 Stratification Effects Criteria and Development of Normal and Upset Transients

[

]a,c,e

PROPRIETARY

]a,c,e

2.4 Monitoring Results and Operator Interviews

2.4.1 Monitoring

Monitoring was performed at plants with similar layout to the TVA plants. The monitoring programs used existing and installed temporary sensors on the surge line piping, as shown in figure 2-2. Monitoring information collected as part of the Westinghouse Owners Group generic detailed analysis[3] was utilized in this analysis.

The pressurizer surge line monitoring programs utilized externally mounted temperature sensors (resistance temperature detectors or thermocouples). The temperature sensors were attached to the outside surface of the pipe at various circumferential and axial locations. In all cases these temperature sensors were securely clamped to the piping outer wall using hose clamps, taking care to properly insulate the area against heat loss due to thermal convection or radiation.

PROPRIETARY

The typical temperature sensor configuration at a given pipe location consists of five sensors mounted as shown in figure 2-2. Temperature sensor configurations were mounted at various axial locations. The multiple axial locations give a good picture of how the top to bottom temperature distribution may vary along the longitudinal axis of the pipe. In addition, many pressurizer surge line monitoring programs utilized displacement sensors mounted at various axial locations to detect vertical movements, as shown in figure 2-2. Typically, data were collected at []^{a,c,e} intervals or less, during periods of high system delta T.

Existing plant instrumentation was used to record various system parameters. These system parameters were useful in correlating plant actions with stratification in the surge line. A list of typical plant parameters monitored is given below.

[

]a,c,e

Data from the temporary sensors was stored on magnetic floppy disks and converted to hard copy time history plots with the use of common spreadsheet software. Data from existing plant instrumentation was obtained from the utility plant computer.

2.4.2 Operational Practices

An operations interview was conducted at the Sequoyah plant on August 22, 1989. Sequoyah and Watts Bar units operate with similar if not identical procedures, so the following is applicable to all four Sequoyah and Watts Bar plants. Since the maximum temperature difference between the pressurizer

and the reactor coolant loop occurs during the plant heatup and cooldown, operations during these events were the main topic of the interview. Figure 2-3 describes the heatup process, and figure 2-4 is the corresponding plot for the cooldown process.

In both heatup and cooldown, the plants have administrative limits of 320°F on temperature difference between pressurizer and reactor coolant system.

2.5 Historical Operation

A review of historical records from each plant (operator logs, surveillance test reports, etc.) was performed. From this review, two pieces of information were extracted; a characteristic maximum system delta T for each heatup and cooldown recorded and the number of maximum delta T exceedences.

The number of actual heatup and cooldowns experienced to date and their associated system delta temperature are listed below for each plant.

Sequoyah Unit 1

System ΔT Range (°F)	Number of Heatup & Cooldown Experienced to Date		Number of Heatup & Cooldown Considered in 40 Year Design		
	Heatups	Cooldowns	Heatups	Cooldowns	
[] a,c,e

*includes 6 heatups of unknown ΔT

PROPRIETARY

Sequoyah Unit 2

System ΔT Range ($^{\circ}F$)	Number of Heatup & Cooldown Experienced to Date		Number of Heatup & Cooldown Considered in 40 Year Design			
	Heatups	Cooldowns	Heatups	Cooldowns		
[]	a,c,e

Watts Bar Unit 1

System ΔT Range ($^{\circ}F$)	Number of Heatup & Cooldown Experienced to Date		Number of Heatup & Cooldown Considered in 40 Year Design			
	Heatups	Cooldowns	Heatups	Cooldowns		
[]	a,c,e

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION IS CONTAINED
HEREIN. WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED

Watts Bar Unit 2

System ΔT Range ($^{\circ}F$)	Number of		Number of	
	Heatup & Cooldown Experienced to Date Heatups	Cooldowns	Heatup & Cooldown Considered in 40 Year Design Heatups	Cooldowns
[a,c,e

A summary of the information given above is provided in Figure 2-5.

2.6 Development of Heatup and Cooldown Transients

The heatup and cooldown transients used in the analysis were developed from a number of sources, as discussed in the overall approach. The transients were built upon the extensive work done for the Westinghouse Owners Group [1,2,3], coupled with plant specific considerations for Sequoyah and Watts Bar Units 1 and 2.

The transients were developed based on monitoring data, historical operation and operator interviews conducted at a large number of plants. For each monitoring location, the top-to-bottom differential temperature (pipe delta T) vs. time was recorded, along with the temperatures of the pressurizer and hot leg during the same time period. The difference between the pressurizer and hot leg temperature was termed the system delta T.

From the pipe and system delta T information collected in the WOG[1,2,3] effort, individual plants' monitoring data were reduced to categorize stratification cycles (changes in relatively steady-state stratified conditions) using the rainflow cycle counting method. This method considers delta T range as opposed to absolute values.

PROPRIETARY

[

]a,c,e

The resulting distributions (for I/O transients) were cycles in each RSS range above 0.3, for each mode (5,4,3 and 2). A separate distribution was determined for each plant at the reactor coolant loop nozzle and a chosen critical pipe location. Next, a representative RSS distribution was determined by multiplying the average number of occurrences in each RSS range by two. Therefore, there is margin of 100% on the average number of cycles per heatup in each mode of operation.

Transients, which are represented by delta T pipe with a corresponding number of cycles were developed by combining the delta T system and cycle distributions. For mode 5, delta T system is represented by a historical system distribution developed from a number of WOG plants (generic distribution). Using data from a number of plants is beneficial as the resulting transients are more representative of a complete spectrum of operation than might be obtained from only a few heatups and cooldowns. This is particularly important for relatively new plants like the Sequoyah and Watts Bar plants.

For modes 4, 3 and 2, the delta T system was defined by maximum values. The values were based on the maximum system delta T obtained from the monitored plants for each mode of operation. An analysis was conducted to determine the average number of cycles per cooldown relative to the average number of cycles per heatup. [

]a,c,e The transients for all modes were then enveloped in ranges of ΔT pipe, i.e., all cycles from transients within each

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY

ΔT_{pipe} range were added and assigned to the pre-defined ranges. These cycles were then applied in the fatigue analysis with the maximum ΔT_{pipe} for each range. The values used are as follows:

For Cycles Within Pipe Delta T Range Pipe Delta T

[

]a,c,e

This grouping was done to simplify the fatigue analysis. The actual number of cycles used for the analysis of the heatup and cooldown is shown in Table 2-2.

Once the transients were generated, it was necessary to determine how many cycles of each should be considered with the past and future restraint configurations for Sequoyah Units 1 and 2. The maximum number of heatups either plant has experienced is 36 events. An additional 11 heatup events were considered with the past restraint configuration bringing the total number of events considered with the past restraint configuration to 47. The additional 11 heatups will account for operations until the modifications are made. Transients that account for past and future restraint configuration are shown in Table 2-2a as cycles before modification and cycles after modification. For Watts Bar Units 1 and 2 no whip restraint contact has been reported to date, therefore there was no need to generate transients for past restraint conditions.

The final result of this complex process is a table of transients corresponding to the subevents of the heatup and cooldown process. A mathematical description of the process is given in Appendix C. [

PROPRIETARY

]a,c,e

PROPRIETARY

The critical location is the location with the highest combination of pipe delta T and number of stratification cycles.

The total transients for heatup and cooldown are identified as HC1 thru HC9 for the pipe, and HC1 thru HC8 for the nozzle as shown in tables 2-2(a) and 2-2(b) respectively. Transients HC7 thru HC9 for the pipe and HC7 and HC8 for the nozzle represent transients which occur during later stages of the heatup.

[

ja,c,e

The fatigue analysis of the nozzle was then performed using the "nozzle transients" and the pipe transients. The analysis included both the stratification loadings from the nozzle transients, and the pressure and bending loads from the piping transients.

As indicated in Section 2.5, based on a review of the Sequoyah/Watts Bar operating records, there were events in which the system delta T exceeded the transient basis upper limit of [

ja,c,e

PROPRIETARY

[

]a,c,e

2.7 Axial Stratification Profile Development

In addition to transients, a profile of the [

]a,c,e

Two types of profile were generated to envelope the stratified temperature distributions observed and predicted to occur in the line. These two profiles are [

]a,c,e

Low flow profiles are characterized by non-linear top to bottom temperature distribution in association with low fluid velocities. A typical low flow profile is shown in Figure 2-7. Low flow profiles are a function of the density difference between the two fluids and the flow rates of each. During low flow conditions the two fluids do not mix, because of the density difference, but prefer to separate with the heavier (colder) fluid filling the lower portions of the pipe. The interface, the point at which the two fluids meet, has a constant elevation along its entire length for steady state conditions. This characteristic is present because stratification is a gravity induced phenomenon.

PROPRIETARY

For the Sequoyah and Watts Bar surge lines, two steady state low flow profile conditions are considered. The first condition considers the RCL surge nozzle stratified. Due to the immediate rise out of the loop piping by the surge line the axial length of the axial profile is very short and terminates before reaching the elevated horizontal segments of the line. Therefore, the surge line as a whole has a uniform axial temperature distribution and is modeled as a normal thermal expansion case without stratification. The second condition considers a state where the elevated horizontal section of the surge line is stratified. For this condition the RCL surge nozzle is at RCS temperature. This low flow profile is shown in Figure 2-8.

[

j a, c, e

PROPRIETARY

Review and study of the monitoring data for all the plants revealed a consistent pattern of development of delta T as a function of distance from the hot leg intersection. This pattern was consistent throughout the heat-up/cooldown process, for a given plant geometry. This pattern was used along with plant operating procedures to provide a realistic yet somewhat conservative portrayal of the pipe delta T along the surge line.

The combination of the hot/cold interface and pipe delta T as functions of distance along the surge line forms a signature profile for each individual plant analyzed. Since Sequoyah and Watts Bar Units 1 and 2 have similar surge line configurations, the signature profile applies to all four plants.

2.8 Striping Transients

The transients developed for the evaluation of thermal striping are shown in table 2-3.

[

]a,c,e

Striping transients use the labels HST and CST denoting striping transients (ST). Table 2-3 contains a summary of the HST1 to HST8 and CST1 to CST7 thermal striping transients which are similar in their definition of events to the heatup and cooldown transient definition.

These striping transients were developed during plant specific surge line evaluations and are considered to be a conservative representation of striping in the surge line[3]. Section 5 contains more information on specifically how the striping loading was considered in the fatigue evaluation.

PROPRIETARY

TABLE 2-1
SURGE LINE TRANSIENTS WITH STRATIFICATION
NORMAL AND UPSET TRANSIENT LIST

LABEL	TYPE	CYCLES	ΔT_{Strat}	TEMPERATURES (°F)	
				MAX	NOMINAL
				PRZ T	RCS T

[

j a, c, e

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED,
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED

PROPRIETARY

TABLE 2-1 (Cont'd.)
SURGE LINE TRANSIENTS WITH STRATIFICATION
NORMAL AND UPSET TRANSIENT LIST

LABEL	TYPE	CYCLES	TEMPERATURES (°F)		
			MAX ΔT_{Strat}	PRZ T	NOMINAL RCS T

[

]a,c,e

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED.
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED

PROPRIETARY

TABLE 2-2a
SURGE LINE PIPE TRANSIENTS WITH STRATIFICATION - SEQUOYAH PLANTS
HEATUP/COOLDOWN (HC) - 200 CYCLES TOTAL

LABEL	TYPE	CYCLES	ΔT_{Strat}	TEMPERATURES ($^{\circ}F$)		CYCLES BEFORE	CYCLES AFTER
				MAX	NOMINAL		
				PRZ T	RCS T	MODIFICATION	MODIFICATION

[

PROPRIETARY

ja.c.e

*.95 of values shown considered in Equation 12 stress evaluation

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION AND/OR
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED

PROPRIETARY
TABLE 2-2a (con't)

SURGE LINE PIPE TRANSIENTS WITH STRATIFICATION - WATTS BAR PLANTS
HEATUP/COOLDOWN (HC) - 200 CYCLES TOTAL

LABEL	TYPE	CYCLES	TEMPERATURES (°F)		
			MAX ΔT_{Strat}	PRZ T	NOMINAL RCS T

[

]a.c.e

*.95 of values shown considered in Equation 12 stress evaluation

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED.
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED

PROPRIETARY TABLE 2-2b
 SURGE LINE NOZZLE TRANSIENTS WITH STRATIFICATION - SEQUOYAH PLANTS
 HEATUP/COOLDOWN (HC) - 200 CYCLES TOTAL

LABEL	TYPE	CYCLES	TEMPERATURES (°F)		CYCLES BEFORE MODIFICATION	CYCLES AFTER MODIFICATION
			MAX ΔT_{Strat}	NOMINAL PRZ T RCS T		

a.c.e

*.95 of values shown considered in Equation 12 stress evaluation

SURGE LINE NOZZLE TRANSIENTS WITH STRATIFICATION - WATTS BAR PLANTS
HEATUP/COOLDOWN (HC) - 200 CYCLES TOTAL

LABEL	TYPE	CYCLES	TEMPERATURES (°F)		
			MAX ΔT_{Strat}	NOMINAL PRZ T RCS T	

ja,c,e

*.95 of values shown considered in Equation 12 stress evaluation

PROPRIETARY

TABLE 2-3
SURGE LINE TRANSIENTS - STRIPING
FOR HEATUP (H) and COOLDOWN (C)

<u>Label</u>	<u>Initiation * Cycles</u>	<u>ΔT_{max} (°F)</u>
--------------	--------------------------------	---

[

] a, c, e

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED.
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED




Figure 2-1. Typical Insurge-Outsurge (I/O) Temperature Profiles





Figure 2-2. Monitoring Locations for a Plant With Layout Similar to Watts Bar and Sequoyah

2-24 PROPRIETARY


PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED.
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED



PROPRIETARY

Figure 2-3. Heatup Curve for Sequoyah Units 1 and 2 also Typical for Watts Bar Units 1 and 2

TEMPERATURE (°F)



PROPRIETARY INFORMATION NOT TO BE RELEASED OR REPRODUCED WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT


Figure 2-4. Cooldown Curve for Sequoyah Unit 1 and 2, also Typical for Watts Bar Units 1 and 2

Figure 2-5. Summary of Historical Data from the Sequoyah and Watts Bar Units 1 and 2, Compared to Design Heatup and Cooldown for 40 Years

4880/120390.10

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED

PROPRIETARY



a, c, e






Figure 2-6. Temperatures Profiles for High Flow Conditions
in the Sequoyah and Watts Bar Units 1 and 2

4880a/122180:10

PROPRIETARY
2-27

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED
WHEN SEPARATED. THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED

TEMPERATURE VS TIME AT VARIOUS LOCATIONS
ALONG THE PIPE DURING HEATUP
(LOW FLOW TYPE TRANSIENT)



SECTION A-A





SECTION B-B

SECTION C-C

SECTION D-D

TEMP (DEG. F)

400
300
200
100



TIME

TIME

TIME

TIME

Figure 2-7. Example Axial Stratification Profile for Low Flow Conditions

PROPRIETARY

2-28

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED.
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY



a,c,e

Figure 2-8. Temperature Profile for Low Flow Conditions in the Sequoyah and Watts Bar Units 1 and 2

PROPRIETARY

4880a/122190:10

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED




Figure 2-9. Geometry Considerations

PROPRIETARY
SECTION 3.0
STRESS ANALYSES

The flow diagram (figure 3-1) describes the procedure to determine the effects of thermal stratification on the pressurizer surge line based on transients developed in section 2.0. [

a,c,e

3.1 Sequoyah/Watts Bar Units 1 & 2 Surge Line Layouts

The Sequoyah Units 1 & 2 surge line layouts are documented in reference 8 and the Sequoyah Unit 1 layout is shown schematically in figure 3-2 and Watts Bar in Figure 3.3. The two Sequoyah units are mirror images of each other along plant East-West. The Watts Bar Units 1 & 2 surge line layouts are shown in reference 9. They are also mirror images of each other along plant North-South. The Watts Bar design is a replicate of the Sequoyah design. The support configurations of Sequoyah surge lines and the Watts Bar surge lines are not the same, although the layouts are the same. Below is a table summarizing the existing Sequoyah/Watts Bar surge line support configurations.

Sequoyah Units 1 and 2

<u>Support</u>	<u>Node</u>	<u>Type</u>
PD-66	1040	Pipe Whip Restraint
PD-67	1070	Pipe Whip Restraint
PD-68 (RCH 36-3)	1090	Pipe Whip Restraint

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED

PROPRIETARY

<u>Support</u>	<u>Node</u>	<u>Type</u>
PD-70	1119	Pipe Whip Restraint
PD-69(1)	1150	Pipe Whip Restraint
PD-69(2)	1170	Pipe Whip Restraint
RCH 36-1	1185	Spring Hanger
<u>RCH 36-2</u>	1190	Horizontal Rigid Strut

Note: After support modification, all pipe whip restraints will be removed and RCH 36-2 will also be removed.

Watts Bar Units 1 and 2

<u>Support</u>	<u>Node</u>	<u>Type</u>
PD03-2	1040	Pipe Whip Restraint
PD03-3	1090	Pipe Whip Restraint
PD03-1	1130	Pipe Whip Restraint
PD03-9	1210	Pipe Whip Restraint
PD03-4	1250	Pipe Whip Restraint
PD03-5	1300	Pipe Whip Restraint
PD03-10	1310	Pipe Whip Restraint
PD03-6	1350	Pipe Whip Restraint
PD03-7	1400	Pipe Whip Restraint
68-001	1120	Spring Hanger
68-002	1190	Snubber
68-003	1200	Snubber
68-004	1280	Snubber
68-005	1290	Spring Hanger
<u>68-006</u>	1380	Snubber

Note: After support modification, all pipe whip restraint will be removed.

It can be seen from the table above that all the Sequoyah and Watts Bar surge lines contain no vertical rigid supports which usually cause high thermal loads. As a result of the thermal stratification analysis, plans have been made to modify the available gap sizes at whip restraint locations for each

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED,
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED

PROPRIETARY

plants in the near future to allow sufficient gaps for thermal stratification movement. Therefore, in the global structural analysis, two models were prepared for existing support configuration and future support configuration. Plant specific models were developed for Sequoyah and Watts Bar separately.

Snubbers and springs are inactive to thermal loads and only their locations are considered in the model. The piping size is 14 inch schedule 160 and the pipe material is stainless steel for the surge lines in all four units. Sequoyah Units 1 and 2 has SA 376-Type 316, and both Watts Bar units have SA 376-Type 304.

Experience with the analysis of thermal stratification has indicated that surge line layout [

j^{a,c,e}

3.2 Piping System Global Structural Analysis

The piping system was modeled by pipe, elbow, and linear and non-linear spring elements using the ANSYS computer code in Appendix A. The geometric and material parameters are included. [

j^{a,c,e} The snubber supports and spring hangers are neglected in the model because they are inconsequential for the thermal condition although the potential for these members exceeding their displacement tolerance should be checked, as discussed in Section 4.

For the Sequoyah surge line design with the existing support configurations, under the thermal stratification loadings, many unintended thermal constraint conditions may occur at the pipe whip restraint locations. This is mainly due to the fact that the pipe whip restraints were originally designed with the

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY

considerations of the normal thermal expansion loading only, and consequently, less than adequate gap clearance for the higher displacements resulting from stratification can exist in the pipe whip restraints. [

] ^{a,c,e} For the future support configuration, all pipe whip restraints are to be removed. In the case of Watts Bar, no history has been shown of restraint contact. Therefore, both existing and future support configurations are the same.

The hot-cold temperature interface along the length of a surge line [

] ^{a,c,e}

Each thermal profile loading defined in section 2 was broken into [

] ^{a,c,e} Table 3-1 shows the loading cases considered in the analysis. Within each operation the [

] ^{a,c,e} Consequently, all the thermal transient loadings defined in section 2 could be evaluated.

The pressurizer and RCL temperature listed in table 3-1 reflect the approximate system ΔT . System temperatures are used only to define the boundary displacements at both RCL and pressurizer nozzles.

In order to meet the ASME Section III Code stress limits, global structural models of the surge lines were developed using the information provided by references 8 and 9 and the ANSYS general purpose finite element computer

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED.
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED

PROPRIETARY

code. Each model was constructed using []^{a,c,e} to reflect the layout of straight pipe, bends and field welds as shown in Figures 3-2 and 3-3.

For the stratified condition, [

] ^{a,c,e}

The global piping stress analyses were based on two models for Sequoyah and two for Watts Bar. The first model represents the existing whip restraint gap configuration (without whip restraint) and the second model represents the future configuration for all 4 units. The results of the ANSYS global structural analysis provides the thermal expansion moments. The ASME Section III equation (12) stress intensity range was evaluated for both gapped and no restraint configurations. For the Sequoyah existing gapped configuration, system delta T's of 336°F, 332°F, 330°F, 329°F, and 327°F was evaluated in addition to 320°F. For the future no restraint configuration, a system delta T = 320°F was evaluated as discussed in Section 2.0. For the case of Watts Bar, the model reflected a unique existing and future configuration. The overtemperature system ΔT of 340°F and 338°F were evaluated in addition to system ΔT of 320°F. In Watts Bar and Sequoyah, the maximum ASME equation (12) stress intensity range in the surge line was found to be under the code allowable of 3Sm for future support configuration. Maximum equation (12) and equation (13) stress intensity ranges are shown in table 3-2.

The pressurizer nozzle loads from thermal stratification in the surge line were also evaluated according to the requirements of the ASME code. The evaluation using transients detailed in References [18] and [19] plus the moment loading from this analysis, included the calculations of primary plus secondary stress intensities and the fatigue usage factors. For Sequoyah Units the maximum stress intensity range is 32.86 ksi comparing to the code allowable value of 80.1, and the maximum fatigue usage factor will be reported in Section 5. The maximum stress intensity range calculated for the Watts Bar

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED.
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED

PROPRIETARY

units was 26.96 ksi compared an allowable of 38.91 ksi. It was found that the Sequoyah/Watts Bar pressurizer nozzles met the code stress requirements.

In order to superimpose local and global stresses, several stress analyses were performed using the 3-D pipe model. [

]a,c,e

3.3 Local Stresses-Methodology and Results

3.3.1 Explanation of Local Stress

Figure 3-3 depicts the local axial stress components in a beam with a sharply nonlinear metal temperature gradient. Local axial stresses develop due to the restraint of axial expansion or contraction. This restraint is provided by the material in the adjacent beam cross section. For a linear top-to-bottom temperature gradient, the local axial stress would not exist. [

]a,c,e

3.3.2 Finite Element Model of Pipe for Local Stress

A short description of the pipe finite element model is summarized below. The model with thermal boundary conditions is shown in figure 3-5. Due to symmetry of the geometry and thermal loading, only half of the cross section was required for modeling and analysis. [

]a,c,e

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED.
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED

PROPRIETARY

[

]a,c,e

3.3.3 Pipe Local Stress Results

Figure 3-6 shows the temperature distributions through the pipe wall [

]a,c,e

3.3.4 RCL Hot Leg Nozzle Analysis

A detailed surge line nozzle finite element model was developed to evaluate the effects of thermal stratification. The model is shown in figure 3-10.

[...]a,c,e A summary of stresses in the RCL nozzle location 1 due to thermal stratification is given in table 3-3. A summary of stresses for unit loading is shown in table 3-4.

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED

3.4 Total Stress from Global and Local Analyses

[

]a,c,e

3.5 Thermal Striping

3.5.1 Background

At the time when the feedwater line cracking problems in PWR's were first discovered, it was postulated that thermal oscillations (striping) may significantly contribute to the fatigue cracking problems. These oscillations were thought to be due to either mixing of hot and cold fluid, or turbulence in the hot-to-cold stratification layer from strong buoyancy forces during low flow rate conditions. (See figure 3-11 which shows the thermal striping fluctuation in a pipe). Thermal striping was verified to occur during subsequent flow model tests. Results of the flow model tests were used to establish boundary conditions for the stratification analysis and to provide striping oscillation data for evaluating high cycle fatigue.

PROPRIETARY

Thermal striping was also examined during water model flow tests performed for the Liquid Metal Fast Breeder Reactor primary pipe loop. The stratified flow was observed to have a dynamic interface region which oscillated in a wave pattern. These dynamic oscillations were shown to produce significant fatigue damage (primary crack initiation). The same interface oscillations were observed in experimental studies of thermal striping which were performed in Japan by Mitsubishi Heavy Industries. The thermal striping evaluation process was discussed in detail in reference 3 also discussed in references 13, 14, and 15.

3.5.2 Thermal Striping Stresses

Thermal striping stresses are a result of differences between the pipe inside surface wall and the average through wall temperatures which occur with time, due to the oscillation of the hot and cold stratified boundary. (See figure 3-12 which shows a typical temperature distribution through the pipe wall).

[

]a,c,e

The peak stress range and stress intensity was calculated from a 3-D finite element analysis. [

]a,c,e The methods used to determine alternating stress intensity are defined in the ASME code. Several locations were evaluated in order to determine the location where stress intensity was a maximum.

Stresses were intensified by K_3 to account for the worst stress concentration for all piping elements in the surge line. The worst piping element was the butt weld.

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED

PROPRIETARY

[

j a . c . e

3.5.3 Factors Which Affect Striping Stress

The factors which affect striping are discussed briefly below:

[

j a . c . e

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED.
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED

PROPRIETARY

]a,c,e

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED

PROPRIETARY

TABLE 3-1
TEMPERATURE DATA USED IN THE ANALYSIS

Type of Operation	Max System ΔT ($^{\circ}F$)	Analysis Cases	Pressurizer Temp ($^{\circ}F$)	RCL Temp ($^{\circ}F$)	T_{Top} ($^{\circ}F$)	T_{Bot} ($^{\circ}F$)	Pipe ΔT ($^{\circ}F$)
-------------------	---------------------------------------	----------------	----------------------------------	--------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------------

[

]a,c,e

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED.
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED

PROPRIETARY

TABLE 3-2(a)
 Summary of Sequoyah Surge Line
 Thermal Stratification Stress Results

<u>ASME Code Equation</u>	<u>Support Configuration</u>		<u>Code Allowable</u>
	<u>Existing+</u>	<u>Future*</u>	
12	[] a,c,e
13			

* Future represents the support configuration of no restraint contact and the deletion of RCH 36-2 with system $\Delta T=320^{\circ}F$

+ Existing represent the current support configurations with system $\Delta T=336^{\circ}F$

TABLE 3-2(b)
 Summary of Watts Bar Surge Line
 Thermal Stratification Stress Results

<u>ASME Code Equation</u>	<u>Support Configuration</u>		<u>Code Allowable</u>
	<u>Existing+</u>	<u>Future*</u>	
12	[] a,c,e
13			

+ No whip restraint contact configuration for existing with system $\Delta T=349^{\circ}F$

* No whip restraint contact support configuration for future with system $\Delta T=320^{\circ}F$

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED.
 WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
 DECONTROLLED

PROPRIETARY

TABLE 3-3
SEQUOYAH/WATTS BAR SURGE LINES
MAXIMUM LOCAL AXIAL STRESS AT []^{a,c,e}

Location	Surface	Local Axial Stress (psi)	
		Maximum Tensile	Maximum Compressive

] ^{a,c,e}

*RCL nozzle safe end

[

] ^{a,c,e}

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED.
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED

PROPRIETARY

TABLE 3-4
SUMMARY OF PRESSURE AND BENDING INDUCED STRESSES
IN THE SURGE LINE RCL NOZZLE FOR UNIT LOAD CASES

Location	Diametral Location	Unit Loading Condition	All Stress in psi			
			Linearized Stress Intensity Range		Peak Stress Intensity Range	
			Inside	Outside	Inside	Outside

a,c,e

--	--	--	--	--	--	--

PROPRIETARY


PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED

PROPRIETARY

TABLE 3-5
STRIPING FREQUENCY AT 2 MAXIMUM LOCATIONS FROM 15 TEST RUNS

Frequency (HZ)			Total
			Duration
			# Cycles
%	%	%	Lgth. in
Min (Duration)	Max (Duration)	Avg (Duration)	Seconds

Small Dia. Pipe



a,c,e

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED:
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED

DETERMINATION OF THE EFFECTS OF THERMAL STRATIFICATION




Figure 3-1. Schematic of Stress Analysis Procedure




Figure 3-2. Pressurizer Surge Line Layout: Sequoyah Unit 1

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED.
 WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
 DECONTROLLED




Figure 3-3. Pressurizer Surge Line Layout: Watts Bar

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED

PROPRIETARY

d, c, e




Figure 3-4. Local Axial Stress in Piping Due to Thermal Stratification

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED.
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED

PROPRIETARY



$T(\text{hot}) = 420 \text{ }^\circ\text{F}$ $T(\text{cold}) = 160 \text{ }^\circ\text{F}$
 $H(\text{hot}) = 207 \text{ BTU/HR-FT}^2\text{-}^\circ\text{F}$
 $H(\text{cold}) = 104 \text{ BTU/HR-FT}^2\text{-}^\circ\text{F}$

Figure 3-5. Piping Local Stress Model and Thermal Boundary Conditions

PROPRIETARY

Y9A1E1P091
3-21

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED




Figure 3-6. Surge Line Temperature Distribution at []^{a,c,e} Axial Locations

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED.
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED

PROPRIETARY

a,c,e




Figure 3-7. Surge Line Local Axial Stress Distribution at []^{a,c,e}
Axial Locations

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED




Figure 3-8. Surge Line Local Axial Stress on Inside Surface at
[]^{a,c,e} Axial Locations

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED.
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED

PROPRIETARY




Figure 3-9. Surge Line Local Axial Stress on Outside Surface at []^{a, c, e} Axial Locations

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED. WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS DECONTROLLED

PROPRIETARY

a,c,e




Figure 3-10. Surge Line RCL Nozzle 3-D WECAN Model: 14 Inch Schedule 160

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED,
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED





Figure 3-11. Thermal Stripping Fluctuation



0813 020014 020

Figure 3-12. Thermal Striping Temperature Distribution

PROPRIETARY
SECTION 4.0
DISPLACEMENTS AT SUPPORT LOCATIONS

The Sequoyah and Watts Bar plant specific support displacements along the surge lines were calculated under the thermal stratification loads for both existing and future support configurations. Table 4-1 shows the maximum values of the support displacements in the surge line. For the future design consideration after adequate gap is provided by removing all pipe whip restraints, the support displacements presented in the corresponding column of table 4-1 should be verified relative to their design.

All support displacements listed in Table 4-1 should be verified, to ensure that the spring hangers have enough travel allowance. Insufficient allowance would result in an unevaluated condition for thermal stratification. For the displacements at pipe whip restraint locations, enough gaps should be maintained between the pipe outside surface and the whip restraint surface so that the pipe will be free to move during all normal and stratified thermal conditions.

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED.
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED

PROPRIETARY

TABLE 4-1(a)

Sequoyah Maximum Support Displacement* (in)
Under Thermal Stratification

Displacements at Support Locations

<u>Support</u>	<u>Node</u>	<u>Existing</u>			<u>Future</u>			
		<u>Gapped Configuration</u>			<u>Configuration +</u>			
		<u>DX</u>	<u>DY</u>	<u>DZ</u>	<u>DX</u>	<u>DY</u>	<u>DZ</u>	
RCH36-1	1185] a,c,e
RCH36-2	1190							

Displacement at Whip Restraint Locations

<u>Support</u>	<u>Node</u>	<u>Existing</u>			<u>Future</u>			
		<u>Gapped Configuration</u>			<u>Configuration +</u>			
		<u>DX</u>	<u>DY</u>	<u>DZ</u>	<u>DX</u>	<u>DY</u>	<u>DZ</u>	
PD-66	1040] a,c,e
PD-67	1070							
PD-68	1090							
PD-70	1119							
PD-69(1)	1150							
PD-69(2)	1170							

* With system $\Delta T=320^{\circ}F$; Unit 1 model; and X along plant North Y vertically upward and Z by the right hand rule

+ Future configuration represents all pipe whip restraints and support RCH 36-2 removed.

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED.
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED

PROPRIETARY

TABLE 4-1(b)

Watts Bar Maximum Support Displacement*
Under Thermal Stratification

Displacements at Support Locations

<u>Support</u>	<u>Node</u>	<u>DX (in)</u>	<u>DY (in)</u>	<u>DZ (in)</u>
68-001	1120	[]	a,c,e
68-002	1190			
68-003	1200			
68-004	1280			
68-005	1290			
68-006	1380			

Displacements at Restraint Locations

<u>Support</u>	<u>Node</u>	<u>DX (in)</u>	<u>DY (in)</u>	<u>DZ (in)</u>
PD03-2	1040	[]	a,c,e
PD03-3	1090			
PD03-1	1130			
PD03-9	1210			
PD03-4	1250			
PD03-5	1300			
PD-10	1310			
PD03-6	1350			
PD03-7	1400			

* With pipe whip restraint removed configuration and system $\Delta T=320^{\circ}F$; Unit 1 model; and X along plant North Y vertically upward and Z by the right hand rule

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED

PROPRIETARY

SECTION 5.0 ASME SECTION III FATIGUE USAGE FACTOR EVALUATION

5.1 Methodology

Surge line fatigue evaluations have typically been performed using the methods of ASME Section III, NB-3600 for all piping components [

]^{a,c,e} Because of the nature of the stratification loading, as well as the magnitudes of the stresses produced, the more detailed and accurate methods of NB-3200 were employed using finite element analysis for all loading conditions. Application of these methods, as well as specific interpretation of Code stress values to evaluate fatigue results, is described in this section.

Inputs to the fatigue evaluation included the transients developed in section 2.0, and the global loadings and resulting stresses obtained using the methods described in section 3.0. In general, the stresses due to stratification were categorized according to the ASME Code methods and used to evaluate Code stresses and fatigue cumulative usage factors. It should be noted that, [

]^{a,c,e}

5.1.1 Basis

The ASME Code, Section III, 1986 (Reference 7) Edition was used to evaluate fatigue on surge lines with stratification loading. This was based on the requirement of NRC Bulletin 88-11 (Appendix B of this report) to use the "latest ASME Section III requirements incorporating high cycle fatigue".

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY

Specific requirements for class 1 fatigue evaluation of piping components are given in NB-3653. These requirements must be met for Level A and Level B type loadings according to NB-3653 and NB-3654.

According to NB-3611 and NB-3630, the methods of NB-3200 may be used in lieu of the NB-3600 methods. This approach was used to evaluate the surge line components under stratification loading. Since the NB-3650 requirements and equations correlate to those in NB-3200, the results of the fatigue evaluation are reported in terms of the NB-3650 piping stress equations. These equations and requirements are summarized in Table 5-1.

The methods used to evaluate these requirements for the surge line components are described in the following sections.

5.1.2 Fatigue Stress Equations

Stress Classification

The stresses in a component are classified in the ASME Code based on the nature of the stress, the loading that causes the stress, and the geometric characteristics that influence the stress. This classification determines the acceptable limits on the stress values and, in terms of NB-3653, the respective equation where the stress should be included. Table NB-3217-2 provides guidance for stress classification in piping components, which is reflected in terms of the NB-3653 equations.

The terms in Equations 10, 11, 12 and 13 include stress indices which adjust nominal stresses to account for secondary and peak effects for a given component. Equations 10, 12 and 13 calculate secondary stresses, which are obtained from nominal values using stress indices C1, C2, C3 and C3' for pressure, moment and thermal transient stresses. Equation 11 includes the K1, K2 and K3 indices in the pressure, moment and thermal transient stress terms in order to represent peak stresses caused by local concentration, such as notches and weld effects. The NB-3653 equations use simplified formulas to

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED.
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED

PROPRIETARY

determine nominal stress based on straight pipe dimensions. [

]a,c,e

For the RCL nozzles, three dimensional (3-D) finite element analysis was used as described in Section 3.0. [

]a,c,e

Classification of local stress due to thermal stratification was addressed with respect to the thermal transient stress terms in the NB-3653 equations. Equation 10 includes a $T_a - T_b$ term, classified as "Q" stress in NB-3200, which represents stress due to differential thermal expansion at gross structural discontinuities. [

]a,c,e The impact of this on the selection of components for evaluation is discussed in Section 5.1.3.

PROPRIETARY

Stress Combinations

The stresses in a given component due to pressure, moment and local thermal stratification loadings were calculated using the finite element models described in Section 3.0. [

] ^{a,c,e} This was done for specific components as follows:

1) [

2)

] ^{a,c,e}

PROPRIETARY

SECTION 7.0

REFERENCES

1. Coslow, B. J., et al., "Westinghouse Owners Group Bounding Evaluation for Pressurizer Surge Line Thermal Stratification" Westinghouse Electric Corp. WCAP-12278, (proprietary class 2) and WCAP-12278 (non-proprietary), June 1989.
2. Coslow, B. J., et al., "Westinghouse Owners Group Pressurizer Surge Line Thermal Stratification Program MUHP-1090 Summary Report," Westinghouse Electric Corp. WCAP-12508 (proprietary class 2) and WCAP 12509 (non-proprietary), March 1990.
3. Coslow, B. J., et al., "Westinghouse Owners Group Pressurizer Surge Line Thermal Stratification Generic Detailed Analysis Program MUHP-1091 Summary Report," Westinghouse Electric Corp. WCAP-12639 (proprietary class 2) and WCAP-12640 (non-proprietary), June 1990.
4. Design Specification for General Pressurizer Vessel Assembly Series 84, 676440 Rev. 4, 9/16/71.
5. Addendum to Equipment Specification 676440 Rev. 4 Sequoyah Generating Station Units 1 & 2 Pressurizer Design Specification 677234 Rev. 4, 11/1/81.
6. Equipment Specification 952767, Revision 0, Dated 11/30/76 Watts Bar Piping Specification.
7. ASME B&PV Code Section III, Subsection NB, 1986 Edition.

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED

PROPRIETARY

8. TVA Letter, "Sequoyah Nuclear Plants 1 and 2 - Pressurizer Surge Line Thermal Stratification and Leak-Before-Break Analysis - N2N-039," Letter #NB235 from P. G. Trudel to B. J. Gary, 6-21-90.
9. TVA Letter, "Watts Bar Nuclear Plants - Pressurizer Surge Line Stratification Program - input data required by Westinghouse - N3M-2-6," Letter #W-6837 (NAR), from W. S. Raughley to J. W. Irons, 7-10-90.
10. Bhowmick, D. C., "Technical Justification for Eliminating Pressurizer Surge Line Rupture as the Structural Design Basis for Sequoyah Units 1 and 2" Westinghouse Electric, WCAP 12775 Proprietary, December 1990.
11. Bhowmick, D. C., "Technical Justification for Eliminating Pressurizer Surge Line Rupture as the Structural Design Basis for Watts Bar Units 1 and 2" Westinghouse Electric, WCAP-12773 Proprietary, December 1990.
12. "Pressurizer Surge Line Thermal Stratification," USNRC Bulletin 88-11, December 20, 1988.
13. "Investigation of Feedwater Line Cracking in Pressurized Water Reactor Plants," WCAP-9693, Volume 1, June 1990 (Westinghouse Proprietary Class 2).
14. Woodward, W. S., "Fatigue of LMFBR Piping due to Flow Stratification," ASME Paper 83-PVP-59, 1983.
15. Fujimoto, T., et al., "Experimental Study of Striping at the Interface of Thermal Stratification" in Thermal Hydraulics in Nuclear Technology, K. H. Sun, et al., (ed.) ASME, 1981, pp. 73.
16. Holman, J. P., Heat Transfer, McGraw Hill Book Co., 1963.
17. Yang, C. Y., "Transfer Function Method of Thermal Stress Analysis: Technical Basis," Westinghouse Electric WCAP 12315 Proprietary.

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED.
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED

PROPRIETARY

18. Series 84 Pressurizer Stress Report, Section 3.1, Surge Nozzle Analysis, December 1979.
19. WNET-130 Volume 3, Model 84D Pressurizer Surge Nozzle Analysis (Generic Stress Report).

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED

PROPRIETARY

APPENDIX A LIST OF COMPUTER PROGRAMS

This appendix lists and summarizes the computer codes used in the analysis of stratification in the Sequoyah and Watts Bar Units 1 and 2 pressurized surge line. The codes are:

1. WECAN
2. STRFAT2
3. ANSYS
4. FATRK/CMS

A.1 WECAN

A.1.1 Description

WECAN is a Westinghouse-developed, general purpose finite element program. It contains universally accepted two-dimensional and three-dimensional isoparametric elements that can be used in many different types of finite element analyses. Quadrilateral and triangular structural elements are used for plane strain, plane stress, and axisymmetric analyses. Brick and wedge structural elements are used for three-dimensional analyses. Companion heat conduction elements are used for steady state heat conduction analyses and transient heat conduction analyses.

A.1.2 Feature Used

The temperatures obtained from a static heat conduction analysis, or at a specific time in a transient heat conduction analysis, can be automatically input to a static structural analysis where the heat conduction elements are replaced by corresponding structural elements. Pressure and external loads can also be include in the WECAN structural analysis. Such coupled thermal-stress analyses are a standard application used extensively on an industry wide basis.

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED,
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED

PROPRIETARY

A.1.3 Program Verification

Both the WECAN program and input for the WECAN verification problems, currently numbering over four hundred, are maintained under configuration control. Verification problems include coupled thermal-stress analyses for the quadrilateral, triangular, brick, and wedge isoparametric elements. These problems are an integral part of the WECAN quality assurance procedures. When a change is made to WECAN, as part of the reverification process, the configured inputs for the coupled thermal-stress verification problems are used to reverify WECAN for coupled thermal-stress analyses.

A.2 STRFAT2

A.2.1 Description

STRFAT2 is a program which computes the alternating peak stress on the inside surface of a flat plate and the usage factor due to striping on the surface. The program is applicable to be used for striping on the inside surface of a pipe if the program assumptions are considered to apply for the particular pipe being evaluated.

For striping the fluid temperature is a sinusoidal variation with numerous cycles.

The frequency, convection film coefficient, and pipe material properties are input.

The program computes maximum alternating stress based on the maximum difference between inside surface skin temperature and the average through wall temperature.

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED

PROPRIETARY

A.2.2 Feature Used

The program is used to calculate striping usage factor based on a ratio of actual cycles of stress for a specified length of time divided by allowable cycles of stress at maximum the alternating stress level. Design fatigue curves for several materials are contained into the program. However, the user has the option to input any other fatigue design curve, by designating that the fatigue curve is to be user defined.

A.2.3 Program Verification

STRFAT2 is verified to Westinghouse procedures by independent review of the stress equations and calculations.

A.3 ANSYS

A.3.1 Description

ANSYS is a public domain, general purpose finite element code.

A.3.2 Feature Used

The ANSYS elements used for the analysis of stratification effects in the surge line are STIF 20 (straight pipe), STIF 60 (elbow and bends) and STIF14 (spring-damper for supports).

A.3.3 Program Verification

As described in section 3.2, the application of ANSYS for stratification has been independently verified by comparison to WESTDYN (Westinghouse piping] analysis code) and WECAN (finite element code). The results from ANSYS are also verified against closed form solutions for simple beam configurations.

PROPRIETARY

EX-100-1000

A-3

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED

A.4 FATRK/CMS

A.4.1 Description

FATRK/CMS is a Westinghouse developed computer code for fatigue tracking (FATRK) as used in the Cycle Monitoring System (CMS) for structural components of nuclear power plants. The transfer function method is used for transient thermal stress calculations. The bending stresses (due to global stratification effects, ordinary thermal expansion and seismic) and the pressure stresses are also included. The fatigue usage factors are evaluated in accordance with the guidelines given in the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code, Section III, Subsections NB-3200 and NB-3600.

The code can be used both as a regular analysis program or an on-line monitoring device.

A.4.2 Feature Used

FATRK/CMS is used as an analysis program for the present application. The input data which include the weight functions for thermal stresses, the unit bending stress, the unit pressure stress, the bending moment vs. stratification temperatures, etc. are prepared for all locations and geometric conditions. These data, as stored in the independent files, can be appropriately retrieved for required analyses. The transient data files contain the time history of temperature, pressure, number of occurrence, and additional condition necessary for data flowing. The program prints out the total usage factors, and the transients pairing information which determine the stress range magnitudes and number of cycles. The detailed stress data may also be printed.

A.4.3 Program Verification

FATRK/CMS is verified according to Westinghouse procedures with several levels of independent calculations as described below = (1) transfer function method

PROPRIETARY

of thermal stresses as compared with direct WECAN finite element analyses.
(2) combined stresses as compared with hand calculations and WECEVAL,
WCAP-9376 analyses. (3) The fatigue usage factor results as compared with
WECEVAL analyses.

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED.
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED

PROPRIETARY

APPENDIX B

USNRC BULLETIN 88-11

In December of 1988 the NRC issued this bulletin, and it has led to an extensive investigation of surge line integrity, culminating in this and other plant specific reports. The bulletin is reproduced in its entirety in the pages which follow.

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED.
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED

PROPRIETARY

OMB No. 3150-0011
NRCB 88-11

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555

December 20, 1988

NRC BULLETIN NO. 88-11: PRESSURIZER SURGE LINE THERMAL STRATIFICATION

Addressees:

All holders of operating licenses or construction permits for pressurized water reactors (PWRs).

Purpose:

The purpose of this bulletin is to (1) request that addressees establish and implement a program to confirm pressurizer surge line integrity in view of the occurrence of thermal stratification and (2) require addressees to inform the staff of the actions taken to resolve this issue.

Description of Circumstances:

The licensee for the Trojan plant has observed unexpected movement of the pressurizer surge line during inspections performed at each refueling outage since 1982, when monitoring of the line movements began. During the last refueling outage, the licensee found that in addition to unexpected gap closures in the pipe whip restraints, the piping actually contacted two restraints. Although the licensee had repeatedly adjusted shims and gap sizes based on analysis of various postulated conditions, the problem had not been resolved. The most recent investigation by the licensee confirmed that the movement of piping was caused by thermal stratification in the line. This phenomenon was not considered in the original piping design. On October 7, 1988, the staff issued Information Notice 88-80, "Unexpected Piping Movement Attributed to Thermal Stratification," regarding the Trojan experience and indicated that further generic communication may be forthcoming. The licensee for Beaver Valley 2 has also noticed unusual snubber movement and significantly larger-than-expected surge line displacement during power ascension.

The concerns raised by the above observations are similar to those described in NRC Bulletins 79-13 (Revision 2, dated October 16, 1979), "Cracking in Feedwater System Piping" and 88-08 (dated June 22, 1988), "Thermal Stresses in Piping Connected to Reactor Coolant Systems."

8812150118

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED

Discussion:

Unexpected piping movements are highly undesirable because of potential high piping stress that may exceed design limits for fatigue and stresses. The problem can be more acute when the piping expansion is restricted, such as through contact with pipe whip restraints. Plastic deformation can result, which can lead to high local stresses, low cycle fatigue and functional impairment of the line. Analysis performed by the Trojan licensee indicated that thermal stratification occurs in the pressurizer surge line during heatup, cooldown, and steady-state operations of the plant.

During a typical plant heatup, water in the pressurizer is heated to about 440°F; a steam bubble is then formed in the pressurizer. Although the exact phenomenon is not thoroughly understood, as the hot water flows (at a very low flowrate) from the pressurizer through the surge line to the hot-leg piping, the hot water rides on a layer of cooler water, causing the upper part of the pipe to be heated to a higher temperature than the lower part (see Figure 1). The differential temperature could be as high as 300°F, based on expected conditions during typical plant operations. Under this condition, differential thermal expansion of the pipe metal can cause the pipe to deflect significantly.

For the specific configuration of the pressurizer surge line in the Trojan plant, the line deflected downward and when the surge line contacted two pipe whip restraints, it underwent plastic deformation, resulting in permanent deformation of the pipe.

The Trojan event demonstrates that thermal stratification in the pressurizer surge line causes unexpected piping movement and potential plastic deformation. The licensing basis according to 10 CFR 50.55a for all PWRs requires that the licensee meet the American Society of Mechanical Engineers Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code Sections III and XI and to reconcile the pipe stresses and fatigue evaluation when any significant differences are observed between measured data and the analytical results for the hypothesized conditions. Staff evaluation indicates that the thermal stratification phenomenon could occur in all PWR surge lines and may invalidate the analyses supporting the integrity of the surge line. The staff's concerns include unexpected bending and thermal striping (rapid oscillation of the thermal boundary interface along the piping inside surface) as they affect the overall integrity of the surge line for its design life (e.g., the increase of fatigue).

Actions Requested:

Addressees are requested to take the following actions:

1. For all licensees of operating PWRs:
 - a. Licensees are requested to conduct a visual inspection (ASME, Section XI, VT-3) of the pressurizer surge line at the first available cold shutdown after receipt of this bulletin which exceeds seven days.

This inspection should determine any gross discernable distress or structural damage in the entire pressurizer surge line, including piping, pipe supports, pipe whip restraints, and anchor bolts.

- b. Within four months of receipt of this Bulletin, licensees of plants in operation over 10 years (i.e., low power license prior to January 1, 1979) are requested to demonstrate that the pressurizer surge line meets the applicable design codes* and other FSAR and regulatory commitments for the licensed life of the plant, considering the phenomenon of thermal stratification and thermal striping in the fatigue and stress evaluations. This may be accomplished by performing a plant specific or generic bounding analysis. If the latter option is selected, licensees should demonstrate applicability of the referenced generic bounding analysis. Licensees of plants in operation less than ten years (i.e., low power license after January 1, 1979), should complete the foregoing analysis within one year of receipt of this bulletin. Since any piping distress observed by addressees in performing action 1.a may affect the analysis, the licensee should verify that the bounding analysis remains valid. If the opportunity to perform the visual inspection in 1.a does not occur within the periods specified in this requested item, incorporation of the results of the visual inspection into the analysis should be performed in a supplemental analysis as appropriate.

Where the analysis shows that the surge line does not meet the requirements and licensing commitments stated above for the duration of the license, the licensee should submit a justification for continued operation or bring the plant to cold shutdown, as appropriate, and implement Items 1.c and 1.d below to develop a detailed analysis of the surge line.

- c. If the analysis in 1.b does not show compliance with the requirements and licensing commitments stated therein for the duration of the operating license, the licensee is requested to obtain plant specific data on thermal stratification, thermal striping, and line deflections. The licensee may choose, for example, either to install instruments on the surge line to detect temperature distribution and thermal movements or to obtain data through collective efforts, such as from other plants with a similar surge line design. If the latter option is selected, the licensee should demonstrate similarity in geometry and operation.
- d. Based on the applicable plant specific or referenced data, licensees are requested to update their stress and fatigue analyses to ensure compliance with applicable Code requirements, incorporating any observations from 1.a above. The analysis should be completed no later than two years after receipt of this bulletin. If a licensee

*Fatigue analysis should be performed in accordance with the latest ASME Section III requirements incorporating high cycle fatigue.

is unable to show compliance with the applicable design codes and other FSAR and regulatory commitments, the licensee is requested to submit a justification for continued operation and a description of the proposed corrective actions for effecting long term resolution.

2. For all applicants for PWR Operating Licenses:
 - a. Before issuance of the low power license, applicants are requested to demonstrate that the pressurizer surge line meets the applicable design codes and other FSAR and regulatory commitments for the licensed life of the plant. This may be accomplished by performing a plant-specific or generic bounding analysis. The analysis should include consideration of thermal stratification and thermal striping to ensure that fatigue and stresses are in compliance with applicable code limits. The analysis and hot functional testing should verify that piping thermal deflections result in no adverse consequences, such as contacting the pipe whip restraints. If analysis or test results show Code noncompliance, conduct of all actions specified below is requested.
 - b. Applicants are requested to evaluate operational alternatives or piping modifications needed to reduce fatigue and stresses to acceptable levels.
 - c. Applicants are requested to either monitor the surge line for the effects of thermal stratification, beginning with hot functional testing, or obtain data through collective efforts to assess the extent of thermal stratification, thermal striping and piping deflections.
 - d. Applicants are requested to update stress and fatigue analyses, as necessary, to ensure Code compliance.* The analyses should be completed no later than one year after issuance of the low power license.
3. Addressees are requested to generate records to document the development and implementation of the program requested by Items 1 or 2, as well as any subsequent corrective actions, and maintain these records in accordance with 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix B and plant procedures.

Reporting Requirements:

1. Addressees shall report to the NRC any discernable distress and damage observed in Action 1.a along with corrective actions taken or plans and schedules for repair before restart of the unit.

*If compliance with the applicable codes is not demonstrated for the full duration of an operating license, the staff may impose a license condition such that normal operation is restricted to the duration that compliance is actually demonstrated.

2. Addressees who cannot meet the schedule described in Items 1 or 2 of Actions Requested are required to submit to the NRC within 60 days of receipt of this bulletin an alternative schedule with justification for the requested schedule.
3. Addressees shall submit a letter within 30 days after the completion of these actions which notifies the NRC that the actions requested in Items 1b, 1d or 2 of Actions Requested have been performed and that the results are available for inspection. The letter shall include the justification for continued operation, if appropriate, a description of the analytical approaches used, and a summary of the results.

Although not requested by this bulletin, addressees are encouraged to work collectively to address the technical concerns associated with this issue, as well as to share pressurizer surge line data and operational experience. In addition, addressees are encouraged to review piping in other systems which may experience thermal stratification and thermal striping, especially in light of the previously mentioned Bulletins 79-13 and 88-08. The NRC staff intends to review operational experience giving appropriate recognition to this phenomenon, so as to determine if further generic communications are in order.

The letters required above shall be addressed to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, ATTN: Document Control Desk, Washington, D.C. 20555, under oath or affirmation under the provisions of Section 182a, Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended. In addition, a copy shall be submitted to the appropriate Regional Administrator.

This request is covered by Office of Management and Budget Clearance Number 3150-0011 which expires December 31, 1989. The estimated average burden hours is approximately 3000 person-hours per licensee response, including assessment of the new requirements, searching data sources, gathering and analyzing the data, and preparing the required reports. These estimated average burden hours pertain only to these identified response-related matters and do not include the time for actual implementation of physical changes, such as test equipment installation or component modification. The estimated average radiation exposure is approximately 3.5 person-rem per licensee response.

Comments on the accuracy of this estimate and suggestions to reduce the burden may be directed to the Office of Management and Budget, Room 3208, New Executive Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20503, and to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Records and Reports Management Branch, Office of Administration and Resource Management, Washington, D.C. 20555.

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED,
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
UNCONTROLLED

PROPRIETARY

NRCB 88-11
December 20, 1988
Page 6 of 6

If you have any questions about this matter, please contact one of the technical contacts listed below or the Regional Administrator of the appropriate regional office.

Charles E. Rossi

Charles E. Rossi, Director
Division of Operational Events Assessment
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Technical Contacts: S. N. Hou, NRR
(301) 492-0904

S. S. Lee, NRR
(301) 492-0943

N. P. Kadambi, NRR
(301) 492-1153

Attachments:

1. Figure 1
2. List of Recently Issued NRC Bulletins

PROPRIETARY


PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED.
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED

PROPRIETARY

APPENDIX C

TRANSIENT DEVELOPMENT DETAILS

The process presented for transient development is represented mathematically as follows:



a,c,e

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED.
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
UNCONTROLLED.

3. The values used for the data distribution of (3) above were:

<u>Representative Pipe Location</u>					<u>Nozzle Location</u>			
	% Cyc for Mode					% Cyc for Mode		
RSS	5	4	3	2	5	4	3	2

a,c,e

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED.
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED

PROPRIETARY

a,c,e

PROPRIETARY

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ATTACHED,
WHEN SEPARATED, THIS PAGE IS
DECONTROLLED