

XXX, 2010

MEMORANDUM TO: Stewart N. Bailey, Chief
Safety Issues Resolution Branch
Division of Safety Systems
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: Blake A. Purnell, Project Manager
Generic Communications and Power Uprate Branch
Division of Policy and Rulemaking
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF OCTOBER 4 AND 19, 2010, PHONE CALLS WITH
PERFORMANCE CONTRACTING, INC. AND LICENSEES TO DISCUSS
ITS LARGE FLUME TEST PROTOCOL

On October 4 and 19, 2010, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff held teleconferences with representatives of Performance Contracting, Incorporated (PCI) and its partners (the vendor) to discuss technical issues concerning PCI's large flume test protocol for testing pressurized-water reactor containment sump strainer performance. Client licensees of PCI also participated in the calls. These teleconferences were closed to the public due to the proprietary nature of the discussions. These teleconferences were a continuation of a teleconference held on August 4, 2010. A publicly available summary of the August 4 teleconference is available in the NRC Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) under Accession Number ML102180217.

The following proprietary PCI documents were discussed during these calls:

- PDT-2010.07.26-1 Rev 1, "Approach Velocity Analysis," prepared by Alden Research Laboratory, Inc., dated September 2010
- PCI Document No. PDT-2010.07.20-1 Rev 1, "Large Flume Test Protocol: Debris Addition Distance," prepared by Alden Research Laboratory, Inc., dated September 2010
- PCI Document No. PDT-2010.09.07 Rev 0, "Experiments on the Breakup of Liquid Jets and Sheets," prepared by Alden Research Laboratory, Inc., dated August 2010
- PDT-2010.07.26-2 Rev 0, "Narrow Flume Influence Evaluation Procedures," prepared by Alden Research Laboratory, Inc., dated July 2010
- "Narrow Flume Problem Statement & Response R01," dated October 2010

Comment [P1]: Bleigh – Edited for clarity.

DISCUSSION OF “APPROACH VELOCITY ANALYSIS”

The NRC staff agreed that computing 2000 pathlines in the computation fluid dynamics (CFD) model would be adequate. The vendor stated that it could justify using fewer pathlines by showing convergence of the calculations, but agreed to use 2000 pathlines.

The NRC staff agreed that using a shortened flume would be an acceptable approach in cases where more than 50 percent of pathlines do not extend the full flume length. The length of the shortened flume should be based on full inclusion of at least 50 percent of the pathlines. If a licensee plans to use an alternative approach of flow splitting to address the condition where less than 50 percent of the pathlines travel the full flume length, the staff recommends that the licensee discuss the approach with staff prior to implementation.

The staff noted that the vendor had revised its treatment of turbulence and bimodal flow distributions based on feedback from the NRC staff during a previous call. The staff considered the vendor’s revisions to be consistent with the intent of previous discussions and did not have further feedback or comments in these areas.

DISCUSSION OF “DEBRIS ADDITION DISTANCE”

The NRC staff stated that the outer surface of the strainer should be used, rather than its geometric center, when defining the debris addition distance. The staff considers the physical dimensions of plant strainers as too large to neglect in this determination. The vendor stated it can probably agree to this position but needs some more time to consider this change beforehand.

The NRC staff stated that, to represent debris sources entering the containment pool within one flume length of the strainer, debris should be added to the test flume at a representative distance associated with that specific location, rather than a procedurally specified distance that is fixed for all tests. The vendor stated it needed to look at this and work through an example.

Comment [P2]: Bleigh – FYI...Alden / PCI do agree with staff on this point. An example was provided in our revised debris distance traveled document.

DISCUSSION OF “BREAKUP OF LIQUID JETS AND SHEETS”

Although noting that useful insights may be provided, the NRC staff remained skeptical of the vendor’s approach for modeling the momentum transfer rate of plunging jets and sheets. The staff’s skepticism is largely due to uncertainties as to how the small-scale experiments can be scaled to the larger-scale plant conditions. For example, it was not clear to the staff whether the dimensionless scaling parameters proposed by the vendor would provide prototypical or conservative results when scaled to dimensions significantly beyond those tested. One source of uncertainty is that various important phenomena are described by different dimensionless numbers that scale differently.

The staff questioned whether the vendor had determined which of the dimensionless parameters are most important to preserve and how discrepancies in other parameters would be resolved. The staff particularly questioned the applicability of Froude number scaling for sheet flow based on the vendor’s analysis. Vendor clarified that the question of whether or not

the Froude number is uniformly 1 for scaling sheet flow over a weir is secondary to the fact that scaling for sheet flow is of far less concern than the scaling for jet flow. The vendor stated that the breakup length will be scaled by pipe diameter. Although the staff believes scaling by pipe diameter is appropriate, per the preceding remarks, it is not clear that this is sufficient by itself. The staff recommended that the vendor validate its scaling methodology against data from large-scale experiments to demonstrate the reliability of its predictions.

Formatted: Not Highlight
Comment [P3]: Bleigh – Text inserted to add vendor statements / position.

The staff stated that a lack of clarity as to the range of plant parameters for which the vendor intends to apply the test results for plunging jets and sheets prevents the determination of whether the proposed test conditions could be considered to envelop the plant conditions. Vendor agreed that scaling of the data to any particular plant condition would have to be justified and based on the collected information. If not bounded by prior tests, the specific plant condition may be tested to expand the applicability of the prior test results.

Comment [P4]: Bleigh – Text inserted to add vendor statements / position.

The staff stated that most or all plant post-accident conditions will involve partially filled pipes rather than completely filled pipes. The staff stated that the vendor had not shown that full-pipe results will bound partially filled pipe scenarios. The vendor stated that it believes this demonstration will be made during the testing.

The staff stated that it needs more information to understand the experimental setup with the water pool on the load cell to determine whether the test conditions would be prototypical of expected plant conditions and would permit sufficiently noise-free and reliable measurements of the momentum transfer rate. The staff recommended that the vendor benchmark the load cell setup against theoretical predictions for cases with minimal breakup and losses to demonstrate its accuracy.

The staff stated that it does not believe that a precise breakup length can be determined for plant-scale plunging jets or sheets. Although outer layers of the plunging jet may breakup and exhibit some degree of spreading, large-scale experiments show that the inner core remains intact well beyond the distance at which surface breakup begins. As such, the staff would not expect a full-scale plunging jet to have uniform properties. Therefore, the staff stated that the concept of breakup length may not be useful for modeling this phenomenon. The vendor indicated that it is primarily interested in the momentum profile as a function of elevation rather than measurement of the jet diameter or a breakup length. The staff agreed that the primary output of the experiments will be the measured momentum transfer to the water column. Vendor explained that break-up length is a tool to understand the experimental output rather than a primary measurement.

Staff agreed that the list of parameters proposed to characterize the plunging jet momentum transfer is complete. The Reynolds number, Froude number, Scaled height ratio (H/D) and Weber numbers are the critical parameters for plunging jet momentum transfer. Staff agreed that if the relationship among these parameters for momentum transfer was obtained from testing, the scaling from test to plant conditions could be accomplished with greater confidence.

Comment [P5]: Bleigh – Text inserted to add vendor statements / position.

The staff stated that using a weir to generate sheet flows may generate flows that are more similar to plant flows than the use of a slotted orifice. Vendor agreed to not use the slotted orifice as the primary method for generating sheet flow.

Comment [P6]: Bleigh – Text inserted to add vendor statements / position.

Based on the discussion above, the staff stated that it is not convinced that the experimental method for the breakup of liquid jets and sheets will provide a basis for licensees to reduce the momentum addition rate of water drainage into the containment pool. Currently, the accepted approach for considering momentum transfer from drainage to the containment pool is based on the conversion of the full gravitational potential of the fluid into kinetic energy, along with the kinetic energy of the fluid at the location where freefall begins. The vendor stated that the planned inputs to the CFD model for drainage into the containment pool are intended to bound the experimental results conservatively.

The vendor stated that they would undertake a limited scope test program to validate that the scaling is predictable before beginning the full test program. [The series of tests planned would be designed to confirm scaling by pipe diameter is sufficient to represent the postulated larger pipe breaks of post LOCA. Sheet flow may also be addressed in these tests.]

Comment [P7]: Bleigh – Text inserted to add vendor statements / position.

DISCUSSION OF “NARROW FLUME INFLUENCE EVALUATION PROCEDURE”

This discussion began with the October 4 call and was continued in the October 19 call. Prior to the October 19 call, PCI provided its assessment (Enclosure 2) of the outstanding issues and proposed method to reach a resolution to help facilitate the discussion.

The staff reiterated that its concerns are not just limited to the vendor’s treatment of small fibrous debris [that settles to the floor of the flume, but applies] to all debris sizes and types, including fine debris and chemical precipitate.

Comment [P8]: Bleigh – Text edited to clarify comment heard by PCI.

The staff noted that the vendor’s definition of the term “small fines” was not consistent with the definition of this term accepted in the NEI 04-07 guidance report. The NEI 04-07 guidance defines “small fines” as a superset of all small pieces and fines. The vendor’s definition of this term referred to “small fines” as fibrous prepared debris processed through a wood chipper and screened dry through 1” x 4” openings. This debris form includes a significant percentage of fines, and is a more conservative debris form than defined in the NEI 04-07 guidance report. The guidance report defines all dry fibers that pass through a 4” x 4” screen opening to be small fines. In prior discussions, staff agreed PCI can screen (not shake) their small fines debris form prior to testing to remove “loosely held fines”. [that was intended to represent only small pieces.]

Comment [P9]: Bleigh – Re-written to reflect the proper definition of PCI’s “small fines” debris form.

The staff believes the behavior of small pieces of fiber in the narrow flume will be different than what would be encountered in a plant. The narrow flume may tend to cause debris to be blocked such that the only transport path is over the top of the blockage; whereas, in the plant, the flow may go around the blockage and continue to transport debris along less impeded paths due to the increased width of the plant flow channels.

The vendor stated that the flume flow velocities are [sometimes] too low to transport small debris. The staff stated that small debris is a range of sizes—not just one size—some of which may be only slightly larger than fines and would be transportable at lower flow velocities. The vendor stated that batch testing could show acceptability. The staff noted that a flume that does not prototypically scale the quantity of floor-transporting debris per unit flow channel width would lead to an underestimate of debris transport to the strainer, regardless of the debris addition rate. [The vendor asked Staff why an over concentration of debris on the floor would understate debris transport to the strainer. The staff replied it was observed in tests of debris traps; wherein fiber clumps when pushed against the debris trap would not tumble over the debris]

Comment [P10]: Bleigh – Text inserted to clarify vendor statements / position.

stopped on the floor. The vendor's problem statement discussed potential issues with subsequent debris addition batches due to piling up of debris. The staff noted that, if batch sizes were too large, piling could potentially affect even the first batch. The vendor reminded staff that PCI was implementing a new methodology for introducing fibrous debris; and that it sufficiently prevented agglomeration of fibers in the water column upon introduction as has been observed by staff in recent tests. The vendor also reminded staff that "fines" debris form is separated from the "small fines" debris form category and introduced in advance of "small fines".

Comment [P11]: Bleigh – Text inserted to add vendor statements / position.

The vendor stated that while debris piles in a flow block transport to some extent, they also block flow and thereby generate a higher than prototypical velocity. The vendor stated that ongoing testing confirms there is a tradeoff between reduced transport due to pile presence and increased transport of the pile due to increased velocity over the pile. Staff agreed that the offsetting effects exist but needed data to support that the net effect of the debris pile presence is conservative to overall debris transport.

Comment [P12]: Bleigh – Text inserted to add vendor statements / position.

The staff noted that the specific matrix of tests proposed did not appear to envelope expected plant conditions or proposed test conditions. For example, it appeared to the staff that the density of debris per unit floor area and per unit flow channel width proposed for the narrow flume are not directly representative of plant conditions or proposed test conditions. The vendor acknowledged this was true; but questioned why the over concentration of debris causes any non-conservatism. In the vendor's experience, this represents a conservative condition. The staff further noted that testing with only small pieces of fibrous debris would not address questions with other types of debris. For example, fine fibers could agglomerate or become more difficult to re-suspend, depending on the batch size and batch addition rate. Fine particulate and chemical precipitates will interact more with debris piles the deeper they are, and are expected to be more difficult to re-suspend after they interact with deep piles of fibrous debris. The proposed test matrix would not address these expected effects. As a result, the staff did not have confidence that the proposed testing would demonstrate the validity of testing in a narrow flume.

Comment [P13]: Bleigh – Text revised to clarify what PCI believes was stated.

Comment [P14]: Bleigh – Text inserted to add vendor statements / position.

The vendor disagrees with staff that the entrapment of particulates in fibers on the floor in the test flume is materially different than would occur in the plant condition. The fact that the particulate(s) are "on the floor" indicates the natural settling characteristic of particulates. Additionally, tests have proven that many particulates and chemical precipitates do remain in suspension during recirculation in the water column in large flume tests up through test termination. Therefore, the possible presence of those particulates mixed with fibers on the flume floor does not necessarily translate to an increasing head loss since those tests generally see head losses declining over time at the time of termination.

Comment [P15]: Bleigh – Text inserted to add vendor statements / position.

The staff also expressed concern that the effects of the narrow flume may affect debris transport independently of debris interactions in addition to the potential for such interactions. For example the staff was concerned about debris interactions with the edges of the flume and the turbulence level within the flume compared to the plant. During this call, the staff further noted a question of whether large piles of settled debris could impact the proposed means to add turbulence to the test flume. The vendor agreed to consider and / or protect the operation of the turbulence generator for the flume from settled debris. The narrow flume test results are expected to provide evidence if the interface between fibrous debris on the floor that is also in contact against wall(s) limits or hinders the transport of fibers.

Comment [P16]: Bleigh – Text inserted to add vendor statements / position.

During these calls and in previous calls, the NRC staff discussed with the vendor a number of significant challenges and scaling compromises inherently associated with performing a single test that attempts to simultaneously scale parameters associated with both debris transport and debris head loss. Based on the concerns discussed above, the staff questioned whether consideration of alternate approaches, such as separating the transport and head loss aspects of the current testing approach, could be beneficial. However, no details of such alternate approaches were discussed during the call.

The vendor believes the staff has been satisfied with changes proposed to the large flume protocol thus far, and that very few issues remain unresolved. The vendor believes all issues can and should be resolved to re-instate the large flume protocol which is following the guidance in NEI 04-07, the SE for same, and the March 2008 guidance document which allows the use of an integrated test that addresses both debris transport and head loss testing in a single test. These meetings were specifically undertaken to refine the test protocol to resolve the staff's concerns regarding the large flume protocol.

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Comment [P17]: Bleigh – Text inserted to add vendor statements / position.

The vendor indicated that it plans to complete the narrow flume testing and will provide its results to staff by November 9. The vendor stated after the staff has reviewed the results it would like to discuss how to proceed.

The vendor indicated in the meeting it does not share the staff's concerns for the narrow flume issue; and will therefore prepare more information and justifications to staff for their consideration. Data from the narrow flume test trials will be part of this response. The vendor also stated the staff positions appear to be based on theories or engineering judgment rather than on testing or technical references. The vendor requests the staff to provide either testing data and / or technical references to support their positions stated herein, if available.

Comment [P18]: Bleigh – Text inserted to add vendor statements / position.

Enclosure 1: List of Attendees

Enclosure 2: PCI Narrow Flume Problem Statement and Response (Proprietary)

cc: James Bleigh/PCI

~~question of whether large piles of settled debris could impact the proposed means to add turbulence to the test flume.~~

Comment [P19]: Duplicated above.

~~During these calls and in previous calls, the NRC staff discussed with the vendor a number of significant challenges and scaling compromises inherently associated with performing a single test that attempts to simultaneously scale parameters associated with both debris transport and debris head loss. Based on the concerns discussed above, the staff questioned whether consideration of alternate approaches, such as separating the transport and head loss aspects of the current testing approach, could be beneficial. However, no details of such alternate approaches were discussed during the call.~~

~~The vendor indicated that it plans to complete the narrow flume testing and will provide its results to staff by November 9. The vendor stated after the staff has reviewed the results it would like to discuss how to proceed.~~

Comment [P20]: Duplicated above.

Enclosure 1: List of Attendees

Enclosure 2: PCI Narrow Flume Problem Statement and Response (Proprietary)

cc: James Bleigh/PCI

DISTRIBUTION: See last page

ADAMS ACCESSION NUMBER: ML

OFFICE	LA:DPR:PGCB	PM:DPR:PGCB	BC:DSS:SSIB	PM:DPR:PGCB
NAME	CHawes	BPurnell	SBailey	BPurnell
DATE	11/ /10	11/ /10	/ /10	/ /10

**List of Participants for October 4 and 10, 2010,
Meetings With PCI and Licensees**

Name	Affiliation
Ron Holloway	Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Corp.
Wes Schulz*	STP Nuclear Operating Co.
Bill Beckius	Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc. (Palisades)
Keith Smith*	Palasades
Tom Kendall*	FPL Energy Point Beach, LLC (Point Beach)
Jim Bleigh	PCI
Chris Kudla	PCI
P.J. Reyes**	PCI
Fariba Gartland	AREVA
Ludwig Haber	Alden Research Laboratory
Stu Cain*	Alden Research Laboratory
Steve Smith	NRC
John Lehning	NRC
Blake Purnell	NRC
Stewart Bailey	NRC

* Only participated in October 4, 2010, call

** Only participated in October 10, 2010, call

Memorandum to Stewart Bailey from Blake Purnell

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF OCTOBER 4 AND 19, 2010, PHONE CALLS WITH
PERFORMANCE CONTRACTING, INC. AND LICENSEES TO DISCUSS
ITS LARGE FLUME TEST PROTOCOL

DISTRIBUTION:

E-Mail:

RidsNrrOd
RidsNrrAdro
RidsNrrAdes
RidsNrrDss
RidsNrrDci
RidsNrrDpr
RidsNrrDprPgcb
RidsEdoMailCenter
RidsAcrcAcnwMailCenter
RidsOgcMailCenter

Blake Purnell
Stacey Rosenberg
Paul Klein
John Lehning
Stewart Bailey
Stephen Smith
Sher Bahadur
Robert Taylor