Westinghouse Non-Proprietary Class 3

WCAP-16996-NP Revision 0 November 2010

Realistic LOCA Evaluation Methodology Applied to the Full Spectrum of Break Sizes (FULL SPECTRUM LOCA Methodology)

Volume II, Part 1 <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u> Assessment



WESTINGHOUSE NON-PROPRIETARY CLASS 3

WCAP-16996-NP Revision 0

Realistic LOCA Evaluation Methodology Applied to the Full Spectrum of Break Sizes (FULL SPECTRUM LOCA Methodology)

Author's Name	Author's Department
Dr. Cesare Frepoli*	LOCA Integrated Services
Dr. Katsuhiro Ohkawa*	LOCA Integrated Services
Dr. Liping Cao*	LOCA Integrated Services
Aaron M. Everhard*	LOCA Integrated Services
Jeffrey R. Kobelak*	LOCA Integrated Services
Dr. Jun Liao*	LOCA Integrated Services
Nikolay P. Petkov*	LOCA Integrated Services
Michael A. Shockling*	LOCA Integrated Services

November 2010

Reviewer: Mitchell E. Nissley* Safety Analysis and Licensing

Approved: Amy J. Colussy*, Manager LOCA Integrated Services

*Electronically approved records are authenticated in the electronic document management system.

Westinghouse Electric Company LLC 1000 Westinghouse Drive Cranberry Township, PA 16066, USA

© 2010 Westinghouse Electric Company LLC All Rights Reserved

WCAP-16996-NP.doc-111710

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The development of the FULL SPECTRUMTM LOCA methodology and this report has been a true team effort.

The principal contributors throughout the project were, in alphabetical order: John Besspiata, Dr. Liping Cao, Aaron Everhard, Randy Fittante, Dr. Cesare Frepoli, Robert Kemper, Jeff Kobelak, Dr. Vefa Kucukboyaci, Dr. Jun Liao, Mitch Nissley, Nikolay Petkov, Dr. Katsuhiro Ohkawa and Mike Shockling.

The development of this product span over a period of several years and individuals outside Westinghouse organization also contributed at various stages. Preliminary functional requirements benefited from the external reviewer of experts in the field such as Prof. Larry Hochreiter from the Penn State University and Dr. Tom Larson from the Idaho National Laboratory (INL). Marv Thurgood supported code activities as consultant while Prof. Satish Iyengar from the University of Pittsburgh was instrumental during the development of the statistical procedures utilized in the uncertainty methodology.

Carly Belovesick supported the first part of the development program as project manager and DFSS tools were implemented during the definition of the functional requirements by Dr. Luca Oriani as part of his CFL training.

Erin McGrew managed the second half of the project and led the completion of this report. Her project management skills were essential to the developers' team to navigate during the challenging phase of product integration and documentation and to ensure that a final quality product could be submitted for NRC review and approval on an expedited schedule.

The report benefited from the expertise of the Design Review Team which included Lou Grobmyer, Brian Ising, John Blaisdell, Naugab Lee, Andy Gagnon, Josh Hartz, Rich Schoff, Mike Young, Dr. Bob Perdue, Ray Tajc, Jason Eisenhauer, Yixing Sung, Bill Slagle and Dick Morrison. Ken Frederick from FENOC and Lou Cartin from SCE&G were also part of the Design Review Team. Moreover the support provided by Ken and Lou and their organizations represent the true motivation and driver behind this effort.

An extensive consistency review of the three volumes that comprises this topical report was performed by Meghan Leslie, therefore ensuring the various sections have been properly integrated from a technical standpoint.

Additional support provided by Doug Atkins, Fatih Aydogan, Kevin Barber, Hugo DaSilva, Dave DiBasilio, Ruben Espinosa, Dan Golden, Brian Ising, Molly McKain, Prudence Moon, Ajal Parikh and Bradley Slezak are also acknowledged.

Preparation of this report placed stringent demands on Technical and Online Publishing Services, particularly Jamie Hart and Carla Hamilton. The support of Dave Scherf for technical help for the preparation of this report and all the associated supporting documentation and calculation notes is deeply appreciated.

Finally, the authors would like to acknowledge the overall support provided by the Westinghouse organization management in general, particularly the LOCA Integrated Services groups which during the duration of the development program was led by Mike Corletti, then Cathy Sherbine and Amy Colussy (for LIS-I) and Chuck Boyd (for LIS-II).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES		xxii
LIST OF FIGURES		xxxii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY]	cxlviii

VOLUME 1

1	ROAJ	DMAP OF	FULL SPECTRUM LOCA (FSLOCA) METHODOLOGY	1-1
	1.1	BACKC	GROUND	1-1
	1.2	MAPPI	NG OF FSLOCA EM DEVELOPMENT TO REGULATORY	
		GUIDA	NCE, REGULATORY GUIDE 1.203 (EMDAP)	1-2
		1.2.1	EMDAP Element 1 (Step 1): Analysis Purpose, Transient Class and	
			Power Plant Class	1-4
		1.2.2	EMDAP Element 1 (Step 2): Specification of Figures of Merit	1-5
		1.2.3	EMDAP Element 1 (Steps 3 and 4): Phenomena Identification and	
			Ranking Table	1-5
		1.2.4	EMDAP Element 2 (Step 5): Specify Objectives for Assessment Base	1-5
		1.2.5	EMDAP Element 2 (Steps 6, 7 and 8): Definition of the Assessment	
			Base and Applicability	1-5
		1.2.6	EMDAP Element 2 (Step 9): Determine Experimental Uncertainties as	
			Appropriate	1-6
		1.2.7	EMDAP Element 3 (Steps 10, 11 and 12): Develop Evaluation Model	1-6
		1.2.8	EMDAP Element 4 (Steps 13, 14 and 15): Bottom-Up Evaluation of	
			Models	1-7
		1.2.9	EMDAP Element 4 (Steps 16, 17, 18 and 19): Top-Down Evaluation of	
			Models	1-7
		1.2.10	EMDAP Element 4 (Step 20): Determine Evaluation Model Biases and	
			Uncertainties	1-8
	1.3	ORGAN	NIZATION OF THE REPORT	1-9
	1.4	REFER	ENCES	1-12
2	EVAI	LUATION	MODEL FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS	2-1
	2.1	INTRO	DUCTION	2-1
	2.2	FIGUR	ES OF MERIT (EMDAP STEP 2)	2-2
	2.3	PHENC	MENA IDENTIFICATION AND RANKING TABLE (EMDAP STEPS 3	
		AND 4))	2-2
		2.3.1	LOCA Scenario Specification	2-3
		2.3.2	Identification of System, Components, Processes and Ranking	2-8
		2.3.3	PIRT: Summary and Conclusions	2-42
	2.4	REOUI	REMENT ANALYSIS/ASSESSMENT FOR WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2	
		MODE	LS	2-44
		2.4.1	Assessment Process	2-45
		2.4.2	Review of WCOBRA/TRAC and TRAC-PF1/MOD2 Capabilities and	
			Assessment Results	2-45

2.5	WCOB	RA/TRAC-TF2 DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY	2-50
	2.5.1	General Structure Functional Requirements for WCOBRA/TRAC-T	F2 2-50
	2.5.2	Functional Requirements for 3D Vessel Module	
	2.5.3	Functional Requirements for 1D (Loops) Module	
	2.5.4	Software Development Plan for WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2	
2.6	DEVEI	LOPMENT OF THE ASSESSMENT DATABASE	2-52
	2.6.1	Objective for the Assessment Base:	
	2.6.2	Definition of the Assessment Base (SETs and IETs)	
	2.6.3	Evaluation of the Assessment Base (SETs and IETs)	
	2.6.4	Additional Assessment	
2.7	REFER	ENCES	2-59
<u>w</u> cc	BRA/TRA	AC-TF2 CONSERVATION EQUATIONS	3-1
3.1	INTRO	DUCTION	3-1
3.2	VESSE	EL COMPONENT CONSERVATION EQUATIONS (MODEL BASIS)	3-1
	3.2.1	Three-Field Equation Formulation	
	3.2.2	Vessel Component Three-Field Conservation Equations	
	3.2.3	Subchannel Coordinate Formulation	3-8
3.3	VESSE	EL COMPONENT COMPUTATIONAL CELL STRUCTURE	
	(MODI	EL AS CODED)	
•	3.3.1	Introduction	
	3.3.2	Vessel Component Computational Mesh	3-12
	3.3.3	Vessel Component Finite-Difference Equations	
	3.3.4	Source, Viscous, and Turbulence Terms	
3.4	CONSI	ERVATION EQUATIONS FOR ONE-DIMENSIONAL COMPONENT	S
	(MODI	EL BASIS)	3-28
	3.4.1	Introduction	
	3.4.2	Conservation of Mass	
	3.4.3	Conservation of Momentum	
	3.4.4	Conservation of Energy	
	345	Closure of the Conservation Equations	3-32
35	ONE-D	DIMENSIONAL COMPONENT COMPUTATIONAL CELL	
5.5	STRUC	TURE (MODEL AS CODED)	3-33
	351	Introduction	3-33
	352	One-Dimensional Component Computational Mesh	3-33
	353	One-Dimensional Component Finite Difference Formulation	3-34
36	NIME	RICAL SOLUTION METHOD	3-59
5.0	361	Introduction	3-59
	362	Vessel Component Numerical Solution	3-59
	363	One-Dimensional Component Numerical Solution	3-68
	364	Network Matrix Fountion	3-70
	365	WCOBRA/TRAC-TE2 Solution Routines	3_74
	366	Numerical Stability	3-80
37	BEEEE	PROFES	3_80
2.1		۲	

WCAP-16996-NP

3

v

4 1	DIGUIIG	AC-1F2 FLOW REGIME MAPS AND INTERFACIAL AREA	
4.1	INTRO	DUCTION	
4.2	VESSE	L COMPONENT NORMAL WALL FLOW REGIMES	
	4.2.1	Introduction	
	4.2.2	Small Bubble Regime	
,	4.2.3	Small to Large Bubble Regime	
	4.2.4	Churn-Turbulent Flow Regime	
	4.2.5	Film/Drop Flow Regime	
4.3	VESSE	EL COMPONENT HOT WALL FLOW REGIMES	4
	4.3.1	Introduction	4
	4.3.2	Inverted Annular Flow Regime	
	4.3.3	Inverted Liquid Slug Flow Regime	
	4.3.4	Dispersed Droplet Flow Regime	
	4.3.5	Falling Film Regime	
	4.3.6	Ton Deluge Flow Regime	
	4.3.7	Interfacial Area Transport Equation.	
44	ONE-D	DIMENSIONAL COMPONENT FLOW REGIMES	۷
	441	Introduction	
	442	Bubbly Slug Flow Regime	 2
	443	Churn Flow Regime	۲
	444	Annular-Mist Flow Regime	Z
	445	Horizontal Stratified Flow	
	446	Wavy-Dispersed Flow	Z
	4.4.0		
45	REFER	ENCES	4
4.5	REFER	ENCES	4
4.5 <u>W</u> CO	REFER BRA/TRA	ENCES	
4.5 <u>W</u> CO 5.1	REFER BRA/TRA INTRO	ENCES AC-TF2 MOMENTUM TRANSFER MODELS DUCTION	
4.5 <u>W</u> CO 5.1 5.2	REFER BRA/TRA INTRO VESSE	ENCES AC-TF2 MOMENTUM TRANSFER MODELS DUCTION EL COMPONENT WALL SHEAR MODELS	
4.5 <u>W</u> CO 5.1 5.2 5.3	REFER BRA/TRA INTRO VESSE VESSE	ENCES AC-TF2 MOMENTUM TRANSFER MODELS DUCTION EL COMPONENT WALL SHEAR MODELS EL COMPONENT FORM LOSS	
4.5 <u>W</u> CO 5.1 5.2 5.3 5.4	REFER BRA/TRA INTRO VESSE VESSE VESSE	ENCES AC-TF2 MOMENTUM TRANSFER MODELS DUCTION CL COMPONENT WALL SHEAR MODELS CL COMPONENT FORM LOSS CL COMPONENT INTERFACIAL SHEAR MODELS	
4.5 <u>W</u> CO 5.1 5.2 5.3 5.4	REFER BRA/TRA INTRO VESSE VESSE VESSE 5.4.1	ENCES AC-TF2 MOMENTUM TRANSFER MODELS DUCTION EL COMPONENT WALL SHEAR MODELS EL COMPONENT FORM LOSS EL COMPONENT INTERFACIAL SHEAR MODELS Small Bubble Flow Regime Interfacial Drag.	
4.5 <u>W</u> CO 5.1 5.2 5.3 5.4	REFER BRA/TRA INTRO VESSE VESSE VESSE 5.4.1 5.4.2	AC-TF2 MOMENTUM TRANSFER MODELS DUCTION EL COMPONENT WALL SHEAR MODELS EL COMPONENT FORM LOSS EL COMPONENT INTERFACIAL SHEAR MODELS Small Bubble Flow Regime Interfacial Drag Small-to-Large Bubble Flow Regime Interfacial Drag	
4.5 <u>W</u> CO 5.1 5.2 5.3 5.4	REFER BRA/TRA INTRO VESSE VESSE VESSE 5.4.1 5.4.2 5.4.3	AC-TF2 MOMENTUM TRANSFER MODELS DUCTION CL COMPONENT WALL SHEAR MODELS CL COMPONENT FORM LOSS CL COMPONENT INTERFACIAL SHEAR MODELS Small Bubble Flow Regime Interfacial Drag Small-to-Large Bubble Flow Regime Interfacial Drag. Churn-Turbulent Flow Regime Interfacial Drag.	
4.5 <u>W</u> CO 5.1 5.2 5.3 5.4	REFER BRA/TRA INTRO VESSE VESSE 5.4.1 5.4.2 5.4.3 5.4.3 5.4.4	AC-TF2 MOMENTUM TRANSFER MODELS DUCTION CL COMPONENT WALL SHEAR MODELS CL COMPONENT FORM LOSS CL COMPONENT FORM LOSS CL COMPONENT INTERFACIAL SHEAR MODELS Small Bubble Flow Regime Interfacial Drag. Small-to-Large Bubble Flow Regime Interfacial Drag. Churn-Turbulent Flow Regime Interfacial Drag. Film/Drop Flow Regime	4
4.5 <u>W</u> CO 5.1 5.2 5.3 5.4	REFER BRA/TRA INTRO VESSE VESSE 5.4.1 5.4.2 5.4.3 5.4.3 5.4.4 5.4.5	AC-TF2 MOMENTUM TRANSFER MODELS DUCTION EL COMPONENT WALL SHEAR MODELS EL COMPONENT FORM LOSS EL COMPONENT INTERFACIAL SHEAR MODELS Small Bubble Flow Regime Interfacial Drag Small-to-Large Bubble Flow Regime Interfacial Drag Churn-Turbulent Flow Regime Interfacial Drag Film/Drop Flow Regime Inverted Annular Flow Regime	
4.5 <u>W</u> CO 5.1 5.2 5.3 5.4	REFER BRA/TRA INTRO VESSE VESSE 5.4.1 5.4.2 5.4.3 5.4.3 5.4.4 5.4.5 5.4.6	AC-TF2 MOMENTUM TRANSFER MODELS. DUCTION EL COMPONENT WALL SHEAR MODELS COMPONENT FORM LOSS EL COMPONENT INTERFACIAL SHEAR MODELS Small Bubble Flow Regime Interfacial Drag. Small-to-Large Bubble Flow Regime Interfacial Drag. Churn-Turbulent Flow Regime Interfacial Drag. Film/Drop Flow Regime. Inverted Annular Flow Regime.	
4.5 <u>W</u> CO 5.1 5.2 5.3 5.4	REFER BRA/TRA INTRO VESSE VESSE 5.4.1 5.4.2 5.4.3 5.4.3 5.4.4 5.4.5 5.4.6 5.4.7	AC-TF2 MOMENTUM TRANSFER MODELS DUCTION CL COMPONENT WALL SHEAR MODELS CL COMPONENT FORM LOSS CL COMPONENT FORM LOSS CL COMPONENT INTERFACIAL SHEAR MODELS Small Bubble Flow Regime Interfacial Drag. Small-to-Large Bubble Flow Regime Interfacial Drag. Churn-Turbulent Flow Regime Interfacial Drag. Film/Drop Flow Regime Inverted Annular Flow Regime Inverted Liquid Slug Regime Dispersed Droplet Flow Regime	
4.5 <u>W</u> CO 5.1 5.2 5.3 5.4	REFER BRA/TRA INTRO VESSE VESSE 5.4.1 5.4.2 5.4.3 5.4.3 5.4.4 5.4.5 5.4.6 5.4.7 5.4.8	AC-TF2 MOMENTUM TRANSFER MODELS. DUCTION EL COMPONENT WALL SHEAR MODELS EL COMPONENT FORM LOSS EL COMPONENT INTERFACIAL SHEAR MODELS Small Bubble Flow Regime Interfacial Drag. Small-to-Large Bubble Flow Regime Interfacial Drag. Churn-Turbulent Flow Regime Interfacial Drag. Film/Drop Flow Regime Interfacial Drag. Inverted Annular Flow Regime. Inverted Liquid Slug Regime. Dispersed Droplet Flow Regime. Falling Film Flow Regime.	4 4 5 5 5 5 5 5
4.5 <u>W</u> CO 5.1 5.2 5.3 5.4	REFER BRA/TRA INTRO VESSE VESSE 5.4.1 5.4.2 5.4.3 5.4.3 5.4.4 5.4.5 5.4.6 5.4.7 5.4.8 5.4.9	AC-TF2 MOMENTUM TRANSFER MODELS DUCTION EL COMPONENT WALL SHEAR MODELS EL COMPONENT FORM LOSS EL COMPONENT INTERFACIAL SHEAR MODELS Small Bubble Flow Regime Interfacial Drag Small-to-Large Bubble Flow Regime Interfacial Drag Churn-Turbulent Flow Regime Interfacial Drag Film/Drop Flow Regime Inverted Annular Flow Regime Dispersed Droplet Flow Regime Falling Film Flow Regime Ton Deluge Flow Regime	
4.5 <u>W</u> CO 5.1 5.2 5.3 5.4	REFER BRA/TRA INTRO VESSE VESSE 5.4.1 5.4.2 5.4.3 5.4.4 5.4.5 5.4.6 5.4.5 5.4.6 5.4.7 5.4.8 5.4.9 VESSE	AC-TF2 MOMENTUM TRANSFER MODELS DUCTION COMPONENT WALL SHEAR MODELS COMPONENT FORM LOSS COMPONENT FORM LOSS COMPONENT INTERFACIAL SHEAR MODELS Small Bubble Flow Regime Interfacial Drag. Small-to-Large Bubble Flow Regime Interfacial Drag. Churn-Turbulent Flow Regime Interfacial Drag. Film/Drop Flow Regime Inverted Annular Flow Regime Inverted Liquid Slug Regime Dispersed Droplet Flow Regime Falling Film Flow Regime Top Deluge Flow Regime	
4.5 <u>W</u> CO 5.1 5.2 5.3 5.4 5.5 5.6	REFER BRA/TRA INTRO VESSE VESSE 5.4.1 5.4.2 5.4.3 5.4.4 5.4.5 5.4.6 5.4.7 5.4.6 5.4.7 5.4.8 5.4.9 VESSE VESSE	AC-TF2 MOMENTUM TRANSFER MODELS DUCTION EL COMPONENT WALL SHEAR MODELS EL COMPONENT FORM LOSS EL COMPONENT INTERFACIAL SHEAR MODELS Small Bubble Flow Regime Interfacial Drag Small-to-Large Bubble Flow Regime Interfacial Drag Churn-Turbulent Flow Regime Interfacial Drag. Film/Drop Flow Regime Inverted Annular Flow Regime Inverted Liquid Slug Regime Dispersed Droplet Flow Regime Falling Film Flow Regime Top Deluge Flow Regime EL COMPONENT INTERCELL DRAG.	
4.5 <u>W</u> CO 5.1 5.2 5.3 5.4 5.5 5.6	REFER BRA/TRA INTRO VESSE VESSE 5.4.1 5.4.2 5.4.3 5.4.4 5.4.5 5.4.6 5.4.7 5.4.8 5.4.7 5.4.8 5.4.9 VESSE VESSE MODE	AC-TF2 MOMENTUM TRANSFER MODELS. DUCTION. EL COMPONENT WALL SHEAR MODELS COMPONENT FORM LOSS EL COMPONENT INTERFACIAL SHEAR MODELS Small Bubble Flow Regime Interfacial Drag. Small-to-Large Bubble Flow Regime Interfacial Drag. Churn-Turbulent Flow Regime Interfacial Drag. Film/Drop Flow Regime. Inverted Annular Flow Regime. Inverted Liquid Slug Regime. Dispersed Droplet Flow Regime. Falling Film Flow Regime. Top Deluge Flow Regime. EL COMPONENT INTERCELL DRAG. EL COMPONENT ENTRAINMENT AND DE-ENTRAINMENT EL COMPONENT ENTRAINMENT AND DE-ENTRAINMENT	2
4.5 <u>W</u> CO 5.1 5.2 5.3 5.4 5.5 5.6	REFER BRA/TRA INTRO VESSE VESSE 5.4.1 5.4.2 5.4.3 5.4.4 5.4.5 5.4.6 5.4.7 5.4.8 5.4.9 VESSE VESSE MODE 5.6.1	AC-TF2 MOMENTUM TRANSFER MODELS. DUCTION. CL COMPONENT WALL SHEAR MODELS COMPONENT FORM LOSS CL COMPONENT INTERFACIAL SHEAR MODELS Small Bubble Flow Regime Interfacial Drag. Small-to-Large Bubble Flow Regime Interfacial Drag. Churn-Turbulent Flow Regime Interfacial Drag. Film/Drop Flow Regime. Inverted Annular Flow Regime. Inverted Liquid Slug Regime. Dispersed Droplet Flow Regime. Falling Film Flow Regime. Top Deluge Flow Regime. EL COMPONENT INTERCELL DRAG. CL COMPONENT ENTRAINMENT AND DE-ENTRAINMENT LS. Introduction.	2

4

5

November 2010 Revision 0

	5.6.3	Entrainment During Bottom Reflood	5-40
	5.6.4	Entrainment During Top Down Reflood	5-45
	5.6.5	Spacer Grid Droplet Breakup Model	5-52
	5.6.6	De-entrainment in Film Flow	5-58
	5.6.7	Crossflow De-entrainment	5-59
	5.6.8	De-entrainment at Area Changes	5-62
	5:6.9	De-entrainment at Solid Surfaces and Liquid Pools	5-64
5.7	ONE-D	IMENSIONAL COMPONENT INTERFACIAL DRAG MODELS	5-64
	5.7.1	Introduction	5-64
	5.7.2	Bubbly Slug Flow	5-64
	5.7.3	Annular Mist	5-70
	5.7.4	Churn Turbulent Flow	5-75
	5.7.5	Horizontal Stratified Flow	5-76
	5.7.6	Wavy Dispersed Flow	5-78
5.8	ONE-D	IMENSIONAL COMPONENT WALL DRAG MODELS	5-81
	5.8.1	Homogeneous Flow	5-82
	5.8.2	Horizontal Stratified Flow	5-85
5.9	ONE-D	IMENSIONAL COMPONENT FORM LOSS	5-88
5.10	FORM	LOSS AT THE JUNCTION BETWEEN A 1D COMPONENT AND	•
	3D VES	SEL COMPONENT	5-95
5.11	TEE CO	OMPONENT MOMENTUM CONVECTION	5-97
5.12	CRITIC	AL FLOW MODEL	5-104
	5.12.1	PF1 Critical Flow Model Option (ICFLOW=2)	5-104
	5.12.2	Homogeneous Relaxation Model Option (ICFLOW=3)	
	5.12.3	Model as Coded	5-115
	5.12.4	Model as Coded (ICFLOW=3 Option)	5-127
5.13	TEE CO	MPONENT OFFTAKE MODEL	
5.14	REFER	ENCES	5-136
	•		
<u>w</u> col	BRA/TRA	C-TF2 INTERFACIAL HEAT AND MASS TRANSFER MODELS	6-1
6.1	INTRO	DUCTION	6-1
6.2	VESSE	L COMPONENT INTERFACIAL HEAT AND MASS TRANSFER	
	MODEI	LS	6-1
	6.2.1	Small Bubble Regime	6-1
	6.2.2	Small to Large Bubble Regime	6-4
	6.2.3	Churn-Turbulent Regime	
	6.2.4	Film/Drop Regime	6-10
	6.2.5	Inverted Annular Regime	
	6.2.6	Inverted Liquid Slug Regime	
•	6.2.7	Dispersed Droplet Flow Regime	
	6.2.8	Falling Film Regime	
	6.2.9	Top Deluge Flow Regime	
,	6.2 10	Effect of Grid Spacers on Interfacial Heat Transfer	6-20
	6211	Effect of Non-Condensables	6-22
			······································

6

viii

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)

١

	6.2.12	Condensation Ramp Model at Low Pressure	6-25
	6.2.13	Vessel Component Interfacial Mass Transfer	6-26
6.3	ONE-D	IMENSIONAL COMPONENT INTERFACIAL HEAT AND MASS	•
	TRANS	FER MODELS	6-32
	6.3.1	Bubbly Slug Flow Regime	6-33
	6.3.2	Churn Flow Regime	6-38
	6.3.3	Annular-Mist Flow Regime	6-39
	6.3.4	Horizontal Stratified Flow Regime	6-44
	6.3.5	Wavy Dispersed Flow Regime	6-46
	6.3.6	Special Model: Cold Leg Condensation Model	6-48
·	6.3.7	Effect of Non-Condensables	6-57
•	6.3.8	One-Dimensional Component Interfacial Mass Transfer	6-59
	6.3.9	Additional Remarks on Interfacial Heat Transfer Models as Coded	6-61
6.4	REFER	ENCES	6-63
<u>w</u> co	BRA/TRA	C-TF2 WALL HEAT TRANSFER MODELS	7-1
7.1	INTRO	DUCTION	7-1
7.2	VESSE	L COMPONENT WALL HEAT TRANSFER MODELS	7-1
	7.2.1	Convection to Single-Phase Liquid.	7-2
	7.2.2	Saturated and Subcooled Nucleate Boiling	7-3
	7.2.3	Critical Heat Flux and Wall Temperature at CHF	7-11
	7.2.4	Transition Boiling	7-14
	7.2.5	Minimum Film Boiling Wall Temperature	7-19
	7.2.6	Inverted Annular Film Boiling	7-21
	7.2.7	Dispersed Flow Film Boiling.	: 7-25
	7.2.8	Single-Phase Vapor	7-33
	7.2.9	Grid Rewet Model	7-37
	7.2.10	Wall to Fluid Heat Transfer.	7-39
	7.2.11	Heat Flux Splitting in WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2.	
7.3	ONE-D	IMENSIONAL COMPONENT WALL HEAT TRANSFER	7-63
, 10	7.3.1	Single-Phase Liquid Natural Convection	7-63
	7.3.2	Single-Phase Liquid Forced Convection	7-65
	7.3.3	Nucleate Boiling	7-66
	7.3.4	Critical Heat Flux	
	7.3.5	Transition Boiling	
	7.3.6	Minimum Film Boiling Temperature	
	7.3.7	Film Boiling Heat Transfer	
	7.3.8	Convection to Single-Phase Vapor	
	7.3.9	Heat Transfer to Two-Phase Mixtures	
	7.3 10	Condensation Heat Transfer	
	7311	Wall to Fluid Heat Transfer	7-88
	/		

7

١

8	<u>W</u> CO	BRA/TRAC-TF2 MODELS FOR HEATED AND UNHEATED STRUCTURES	8-1
	8.1	INTRODUCTION	8-1
	8.2	CONDUCTOR GEOMETRIES MODELED IN THE VESSEL	8-1
		8.2.1 Conduction Equation	8-2
		8.2.2 Calculation of Thermal Conductance	8-6
	8.3	FUEL ROD MODELING	8-9
		8.3.1 Fuel Rod Quench Front Model	8-9
		8.3.2 Pellet-Cladding Gap Conductance Model	8-11
	8.4	FUEL ROD DEFORMATION MODEL	8-16
		8.4.1 Deformation Mechanisms	8-16
		8.4.2 Effects of Fuel Rod Deformation on Core Thermal-Hydraulics	8-29
	8.5	CLADDING REACTION MODEL	8-33
	8.6	[] ^{a,c} MODEL	8-36
		8.6.1 Fuel Relocation Following [] ^{a,c} Burst	8-41
		8.6.2 Thermal Conductivity Model of Relocated Fuel	8-43
		8.6.3 Burst Node Heat Transfer Enhancement Model	8-44
	8.7	UNHEATED CONDUCTOR MODEL IN THE VESSEL	8-47
	8.8	CONDUCTOR MODELING IN ONE-DIMENSIONAL COMPONENTS	8-48
	8.9	SCALING CONSIDERATIONS	8-56
	8.10	CONCLUSIONS	8-57
	8.11	REFERENCES	8-57
9	<u>W</u> COI	BRA/TRAC-TF2 REACTOR KINETICS AND DECAY HEAT MODELS	9-1
	9.1	INTRODUCTION	9-1
	9.2	DECAY HEAT SOURCE	9-1
	9.3	FISSION HEAT	9-3
	9.4	ACTINIDE DECAY HEAT SOURCE	9-5
	9.5	SPACE DEPENDENT HEAT SOURCE MODEL	9-7
	9.6	ENERGY DEPOSITION MODELING	9-12
		9.6.1 Introduction	9-12
		9.6.2 Generalized Energy Deposition Model	9-13
	9.7	DECAY HEAT UNCERTAINTY EVALUATION	9-19
	9.8	REACTOR POINT KINETICS VALIDATION	9-19
	9.9	JUSTIFICATION OF SIMPLIFICATIONS AND ASSUMPTIONS	9-20
		9.9.1 Actinide Decay Power	9-20
		9.9.2 WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Fission Energy Accounting	9-20
		9.9.3 Decay Heat Absorption Effects	9-21
	9.10	GENERALIZED ENERGY DEPOSITION MODEL (GEDM) VALIDATION	9-21
	9.11	INTERFACE BETWEEN NEUTRONICS AND THERMAL-HYDRAULICS	
		MODELS	9-22
	9.12	REACTOR KINETICS, DECAY HEAT, AND INTERFACE MODELS AS	
		CODED	9-22
•	9.13	REACTOR KINETICS, DECAY HEAT, AND INTERFACE MODELS	
		SCALING CONSIDERATIONS	9-22

	9.14	CONCLUSIONS	
	9.15	REFERENCES	
10	<u>W</u> COF	BRA/TRAC-TF2 ONE-DIMENSIONAL COMPONENT MODELS	10-1
	10.1	INTRODUCTION	10-1
	10.2	PIPE COMPONENT	10-1
	10.3	TEE COMPONENT	10-2
	10.4	PUMP COMPONENT	10-4
	10.5	STEAM GENERATOR	
	10.6	PRESSURIZER COMPONENT (PRIZER)	
	10.7	VALVE COMPONENT	10-12
	10.8	ACCUMULATOR MODELING WITH THE PIPE COMPONENT	
	10.9	BREAK AND FILL COMPONENTS	10-17
	10.10	HTSTR COMPONENTS	10-19
	10.11	COCO COMPONENT	10-21
	10.12	REFERENCES	10-22
11	THER	MOPHYSICAL AND TRANSPORT PROPERTIES	11-1
	11.1	INTRODUCTION	11-1
	11.2	THERMOPHYSICAL AND TRANSPORT PROPERTIES OF WATER	11-1
		11.2.1 Vessel Component Water Properties	11-1
		11.2.2 One Dimensional Component Water Properties	11-9
	11.3	THERMOPHYSICAL AND TRANSPORT PROPERTIES OF	
	·	NON-CONDENSABLE GASES AND STEAM GAS MIXTURES	11-33
		11.3.1 Vessel Component	11-33
		11.3.2 One-Dimensional Components	11-35
		11.3.3 Steam and Non-Condensable Gas Mixtures	11-38
	11.4	THERMAL PROPERTIES OF NUCLEAR FUEL ROD MATERIALS	11-42
		11.4.1 Uranium Dioxide	11-42
		11.4.2 Zircaloy-4	11-45
		11.4.3 ZIRLO [®]	11-46
		11.4.4 Fuel Rod Gas Mixtures	11-48
	11.5	THERMAL PROPERTIES OF STRUCTURAL MATERIALS	11-49
		11.5.1 Vessel Component Structural Material Properties	11-49
		11.5.2 One-Dimensional Component Structural Material Properties	11-50
	11.6	CONCLUSIONS	11-53
	11.7	REFERENCES	11-53

VOLUME 2

12	ASSES	SSMENT (OF BREAK FLOW MODEL	12-1
	12.1	INTROD	UCTION	12-1
		12.1.1	Critical Flow in LOCA (Relation to LOCA PIRT)	12-1
		12.1.2	Assessment Objective	12-2

x

	12.2	CRITICAL FLOW DATA NEEDS FOR PWR LOCA MODEL VALIDATION	12-2
•	12.3	ASSESSMENT TEST MATRIX AND BASIS FOR SELECTION	12-6
•	12.4	DESCRIPTION OF DATASETS	12-12
		12.4.1 Ardron and Ackerman	12-12
		12.4.2 Boivin	12-14
		12.4.3 Fincke and Collins	12-16
		12.4.4 Jeandey	12-18
		12.4.5 Neusen	12-20
		12.4.6 Reocreux	12-22
		12.4.7 Seynhaeve	. 12-24
		12.4.8 Sozzi and Sutherland	. 12-26
		12.4.9 Marviken Tests 1 through 27	12-28
		12.4.10 Amos and Schrock	12-31
		12.4.11 Anderson and Benedetti (TPFL)	. 12-33
		12.4.12 Celata (1988)	12-35
		12.4.13 Overall	. 12-39
	12.5	ASSESSMENT RESULTS	12-42
		12.5.1 Assessment Method	. 12-42
		12.5.2 DATA COMPARISON	. 12-44
		12.5.3 PARAMETRIC TREND OF PREDICTION	. 12-53
		12.5.4 Model Performance as Implemented in WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2	. 12-67
	12.6	CRITICAL FLOW ASSESSMENT CONCLUSIONS	12-72
		12.6.1 Scaling Consideration	. 12-72
		12.6.2 Break Path Geometry and Application to PWR LOCA	. 12-73
	12.7	OFFTAKE ENTRAINMENT MODEL	12-73
		12.7.1 Introduction	. 12-73
		12.7.2 Offtake Phenomenon	. 12-73
		12.7.3 Relationship to PIRT	. 12-74
		12.7.4 Section Objectives	. 12-74
		12.7.5 Two-Phase Flow Loop Offtake Entrainment Tests	. 12-75
		12.7.6 Additional Offtake Model Validation	. 12-77
	12.8	REFERENCES	12-89
APPEN	NDIX A	RESULTS OF CRITICAL FLOW ASSESSMENT FOR INDIVIDUAL	
		DATASET	12-92
13	CORE	VOID DISTRIBUTION AND MIXTURE LEVEL SWELL	13-1
	13.1	INTRODUCTION	13-1
	13.2	PHYSICAL PROCESSES	13-1
	13.3	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 DETERMINATION OF THE MIXTURE LEVEL	13-2
	13.4	ASSESSMENT OF WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 MIXTURE LEVEL PREDICTIONS	13-2
		13.4.1 Introduction	13-2
		13.4.2 ORNL-THTF Small Break Tests	13-5
		13.4.3 Simulation of G-1 Core Uncovery Tests	. 13-37

		13.4.4	Simulation of G-2 Core Uncovery Tests	13-61
		13.4.5	JAERI-TPTF Rod Bundle Tests	13-82
	13.5	SUMM/	ARY AND CONCLUSIONS	13-97
	13.6	REFERI	ENCES	13-97
4	SEPA	RATE EFI	FECT TESTS USED TO ASSESS CORE HEAT TRANSFER MODEL	
	14.1	INTROI	DUCTION	14-1
	14.2	TEST FA	ACILITIES DESCRIPTION	14-11
		14.2.1	Test Facilities Used to Assess Single-Phase Vapor (SPV)	14-11
		14.2.2	Test Facilities Used to Assess Dispersed Flow Film Boiling (DFFB)	
			Heat Transfer	14-11
		14.2.3	Test Facilities Used to Assess Reflood Heat Transfer	14-34
	14.3	REFERI	ENCES	14-58
5	ASSE	SSMENT	OF THE VESSEL POST CHE HEAT TRANSFER	15-1
	15.1	INTROI	OUCTION	15-1
	15.1	ROADN	AAP TO THE ASSESSMENT	15-3
	15.2	ASSESS	SMENT OF CHE	15-5
	15.5	SINGLE	F PHASE VAPOR (SPV) HEAT TRANSFER ASSESSMENT	15-8
	10.4	15.4.1	ORNL-THTF Uncovered Bundle Heat Transfer Test Simulations	15-8
		15.4.2	FLECHT SEASET Single Phase Vapor Heat Transfer Test Simulations	
		15.4.3	Single Phase Vapor Heat Transfer Summary and Conclusion	15-20
	15.5	DISPER	SED FLOW FILM BOILING (DFFB)	15-20
		15.5.1	Assessment Using COBRAHT-TF2	15-20
		15.5.2	Assessment Using Test Simulations	15-22
		15.5.3	DFFB Heat Transfer Summary and Conclusions	1'5-95
	15.6	REFLO	OD	15-95
		15.6.1	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Simulations of FLECHT-SEASET Test Series.	15-95
		15.6.2	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Simulations of FLECHT Low Flooding	
			Rate (LFR) Test Series and One Supplemental Test	15-156
	~	15.6.3	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Simulations of FLECHT Skewed Power	
			Test Bundle	15-197
		15.6.4	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Simulations of G-2 Reflood Test Bundle	15-252
		15.6.5	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Simulations of FEBA	15-284
		15.6.6	Reflood Heat Transfer Assessment Summary and Conclusions	15-310
	15.7	GRID H	EAT TRANSFER MODELS	15-311
	15.8	TIME S	TEP STUDY	15-315
	15.9	HEAT T	RANSFER COMPOSITE RESULTS	15-318
		15.9.1	Prediction of Cladding Temperatures and Quench Times	15-320
		15.9.2	Droplet Assessment	15-327
		15.9.3	SIMULATION OF PARAMETRIC TRENDS	15-351
	15.10	SUMM	ARY AND CONCLUSIONS	15-370
	15.11	REFER	ENCES	15-371

1

16	HORI	ZONTAL STRATIFIED FLOW AND WAVY-DISPERSED FLOW	16-1
	16.1	INTRODUCTION	16-1
	16.2	KEY PHYSICAL PROCESSES	16-1
	16.3	TEST FACILITY DESCRIPTION	16-3
		16.3.1 Test Selection and Basis	16-6
	16.4	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 MODEL DESCRIPTION	16-7
	16.5	ASSESSMENT RESULTS	16-7
	16.6	CONCLUSIONS	16-9
	16.7	REFERENCES	16-9
17	COLE	D LEG CONDENSATION: COSI EXPERIMENTS, ROSA IV SB-CL-05	
	EXPE	RIMENT, AND UPTF-8A EXPERIMENT	17-1
	17.1	INTRODUCTION	17-1
	17.2	SMALL BREAK LOCA EXPERIMENTS - COSI AND ROSA SB-CL-05	17-2
		17.2.1 Test Facilities and Tests Description	17-2
		17.2.2 DESCRIPTION OF WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 MODELS	17-9
		17.2.3 <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 Results	17-10
		17.2.4 Small Break LOCA Experiments Conclusions	17-11
	17.3	LARGE BREAK LOCA EXPERIMENTS: UPTF TEST 8A	17-12
		17.3.1 Introduction	17-12
		17.3.2 <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 Model Description	17-13
		17.3.3 WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Results: Base Model	17-14
		17.3.4 WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Results: Sensitivity Studies	17-15
		17.3.5 Large Break LOCA Experiments Conclusions	17-17
	17.4	OVERALL CONCLUSIONS	17-18
	17.5	REFERENCES	17-19
18	LOOP	SEAL CLEARANCE	18-1
	18.1	INTRODUCTION	18-1
	18.2	IMPORTANT PHYSICAL PROCESSES AND SCALING LAWS	18-5
•		18.2.1 ROSA	18-5
		18.2.2 PWS 2.3 Loop Seal Tests	18-7
		18.2.3 Full-Scale Steam-Water Tests	18-25
	18.3	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 MODELING OF LOOP SEAL CLEARING PROCESS	18-29
		18.3.1 WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Simulation of the UPTF 3-Bar and	
		15-Bar Tests	18-29
	18.4	CONCLUSIONS	18-40
	18.5	REFERENCES	18-41
19	ADDI	TIONAL LOCA HYDRODYNAMIC ASSESSMENT AGAINST LARGE SCAL	E
	EXPE	RIMENTS	19-1
`	19.1	INTRODUCTION	19-1
	19.2	HYDRODYNAMIC MODELS ASSESSMENT	19-5
		19.2.1 <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Models for Entrainment</u>	19-8

19.3	UPPER I	PLENUM TEST FACILITY TESTS	19-9
	19.3.1	Introduction	19-9
	19.3.2	UPTF Facility Description	19-9
	19.3.3	UPTF 6 ECC Bypass and Downcomer Countercurrent Flow Test	
		Descriptions	19-14
	19.3.4	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Model for UPTF Test 6	19-14
	19.3.5	Simulation of UPTF Test 6	19-15
	19.3.6	UPTF 8A Cold Leg Condensation Test Descriptions	19-29
	19.3.7	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Model for UPTF 8A	19-31
	19.3.8	Simulation of UPTF 8A	19-32
	19.3.9	UPTF 25A Downcomer Entrainment/De-Entrainment and Cold La	eg
		Condensation Test Descriptions	19-34
1	19.3.10	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Model for UPTF Test 25A	19-35
	19.3.11	Simulation of UPTF Test 25A	19-35
	19.3.12	UPTF 29B Upper Plenum Entrainment/De-Entrainment Test	
		Descriptions	19-39
	19.3.13	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Model for UPTF Test 29B	19-40
	19.3.14	Simulation of UPTF Test 29B	19-41
19.4	PERFOR	ATED PLATE FLOODING ANALYSIS	
	19.4.1	Correlations and Scaling for CCFL in a Perforated Plate	19-216
	19.4.2	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Model	19-218
	19.4.3	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Simulation	
19.5	FULL-L	ENGTH EMERGENCY COOLING/CORE HEAT TRANSFER	19-229
	19.5.1	FLECHT Test Facility	19-229
	19.5.2	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Simulation	19-231
19.6	CYLINE	DRICAL CORE TEST FACILITY (CCTF)	19-241
	19.6.1	CCTF Tests	19-241
	19.6.2	CCTF Facility Description	19-241
	19.6.3	CCTF Test Procedure	19-242
	19.6.4	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 CCTF Model	19-243
	19.6.5	CCTF Run 62 Transient Calculation	19-246
	19.6.6	DTMAX Sensitivity Study for CCTF 62	19-248
19.7	CONCLU	USIONS	19-294
19.8	REFERE	INCES	
ADDI	FIONAL C	COMPONENT MODEL ASSESSMENTS	20-1
20.1	ACCUM	ULATOR COMPONENT	20-1
	20.1.1	Introduction	20-1
	20.1.2	IPP Accumulator Test	20-2
	20.1.3	Callaway Accumulator Test	20-3
	20.1.4	Effect of Accumulator Nitrogen on PWR Reflood Transients	20-4
	20.1.5	Conclusion	20-9
	20.1.6	References	

20

				•
	20.2	PUMP C	OMPONENT MODEL	20-55
		20.2.1	Westinghouse Pump Data	20-55
		20.2.2	Pump Model Comparison to Data	20-58
		20.2.3	References	20-59
	20.3	MASS A	ND ENERGY CONSERVATION ACROSS 1D/3D JUNCTION	20-72
		20.3.1	Scenario Description and WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Model Description	20-72
		20.3.2	Results and Conclusions	20-72
	20.4	SUMMA	ARY AND CONCLUSIONS	20-76
21	ROSA	-IV TEST	SIMULATIONS	21-1
	21.1	INTROE	DUCTION	21-1
	21.2	TEST FA	ACILITY DESCRIPTION	21-2
		21.2.1	Important Physical Phenomena and Scaling Considerations	21-2
	21.3	DESCRI	PTION OF <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 MODEL FOR ROSA/LSTF-IV	21-4
	21.4	SIMULA	ATION OF SB-CL-18, 5-PERCENT COLD LEG SIDE BREAK	21-6
		21.4.1	Description of the SB-CL-18 Test Boundary and Initial Conditions	21-6
		21.4.2	Steady State Calibration and Transient Calculation Procedures	21-7
		21.4.3	Results and Conclusions From the SB-CL-18 Simulation	21-8
	21.5	SI-INJE(CTION SENSITIVTY STUDY: SIMULATION OF SB-CL-05,	
		5-PERCI	ENT COLD LEG SIDE BREAK	21-10
		21.5.1	Description of the Boundary and Initial Conditions	21-10
		21.5.2	Results and Conclusions from the SB-CL-05 Simulation	21-11
	21.6	SIMULA	ATION OF THE 10% SIDE BREAK TEST SB-CL-14	21-14
		21.6.1	Description of the Boundary and Initial Conditions	21-14
		21.6.2	Results and Conclusions for the SB-CL-14 Simulation	21-15
	21.7	BREAK	ORIENTATION STUDY: SIMULATION OF TOP/SIDE/BOTTOM	
		0.5% (SH	B-CL-16/12/15) AND 2.5% (SB-CL-03/01/02) COLD LEG BREAKS	21-16
		21.7.1	Description of the Boundary and Initial Conditions	21-16
		21.7.2	Discussion of Results	21-16
		21.7.3	Conclusions	21-20
	21.8	BREAK	SPECTRUM STUDY	21-20
	21.9	SIMULA	ATION OF ST-NC-02, 2% POWER NATURAL CIRCULATION TEST	21-21
,		21.9.1	Natural Circulation Phenomena	21-21
		21.9.2	Description of the ST-NC-02 Natural Circulation Test	21-21
		21.9.3	Description of the Test Simulation and Boundary and Initial	
			Conditions	21-22
		21.9.4	Results and Conclusions	21-23
	21.10	COUNT	ER-CURRENT FLOW (CCFL) RESULTS AND EVALUATION	21-25
		21.10.1	CCFL in the Steam Generator U-tubes	21-25
		21.10.2	CCFL in the Vicinity of the Hot Leg Elbow (Steam Generator Inlet)	21-26
		21.10.3	CCFL at the Upper Core Plate (UCP)	21-27
		21.10.4	Effects of Calculated CCFL on ROSA-IV SB-CL-18 Transient	
			Simulation	21-29

21.11	BYPASS	SENSITIVITY CALCULATIONS	21-32
	21.11.1	Hot Leg Nozzle Gap Modeling Sensitivity with the SB-CL-18 Test	21-32
	21.11.2	SB-CL-18 Simulation Without Hot Leg Nozzle Bypass Flow	21-33
	21.11.3	Spray Nozzle Bypass Ranging Sensitivity with the SB-CL-18 Test	21-33
21.12	SUB-COO	DLED BREAK DISCHARGE COEFFICIENT (CD1) SENSITIVITY	221-34
21.13	TWO-PH	ASE BREAK DISCHARGE COEFFICIENT (CD2) SENSITIVITY	21-34
21.14	BROKEN	LOOP PUMP RESISTANCE SENSITIVITY CALCULATION	21-35
21.15	YDRAG S	SENSITIVITY CALCULATIONS	21-36
21.16	HS_SLUC	G SENSITIVITY CALCULATIONS	21-36
	21.16.1	HS SLUG Sensitivity with 0.5% Side Break Test SB-CL-16	21-36
	21.16.2	HS_SLUG Sensitivity with 5% Top Break test SB-CL-18	21-37
	21.16.3	HS SLUG Sensitivity with 10% Side Break Test SB-CL-14	21-37
	21.16.4	Conclusion Regarding the HS_SLUG Sensitivity Simulations	21-38
21.17	KCOSI SI	ENSITIVITY CALCULATIONS	21-38
21.18	MSSV SE	TPOINT SENSITIVITY CALCULATION	21-39
21.19	CONCLU	SIONS	21-41
21.20	REFEREN	NCES	21-42
LOSS-	OF-FLUID	TEST (LOFT) INTEGRAL TEST	22-1
22.1	INTRODU	UCTION.	22-1
22.2	LOFT FA	CILITY AND SCALING	22-2
	22.2.1	LOFT Facility Description	22-2
	22.2.2	LOFT Scaling Consideration	22-3
22.3	LOFT TE	ST DESCRIPTION	22-4
22.4	WCOBRA	A/TRAC-TF2 LOFT MODEL	22-5
	22.4.1	General Modeling Considerations	22-5
	22.4.2	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Vessel Model of the LOFT Facility	22-7
	22.4.3	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Loop Model of the LOFT Facility	22-9
22.5	LARGE E	BREAK LOFT SIMULATIONS USING WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2	22-12
	22.5.1	Large Break LOFT Tests Description	22-12
	22.5.2	Steady-State Calculations	22-12
	22.5.3	Transient Calculations	22-13
	22.5.4	Conclusions	22-16
22.6	SMALL E	BREAK LOFT SIMULATION USING WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2	22-16
	22.6.1	Small Break LOFT Test Description	22-16
	22.6.2	Steady-State Calculations	22-17
	22.6.3	Transient Calculations	22-17
	22.6.4	Conclusions	22-19
22.7	INTERM	EDIATE BREAK LOFT SIMULATIONS USING	
	WCOBRA	٩/TRAC-TF2	22-19
	22.7.1	Intermediate Break LOFT Tests Description	22-19
	22.7.2	Steady-State Calculations	22-20
	22.7.3	Transient Calculations	22-20
	22.7.4	Conclusions	22-22
	1		

22

.

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)

	22.8	REFER	ENCES	
23	ADDI	TIONAL	VALIDATION AND NUMERICAL PROBLEMS	
	23.1	ADDIT	IONAL VALIDATION	23-2
		23.1.1	GE Vessel Blowdown Tests	23-2
		23.1.2	Semiscale Tests	23-51
	23.2	NUMEI	RICAL PROBLEMS	23-92
		23.2.1	1D PIPE Manometer Problem with Non-Condensable Gases	23-92
		23.2.2	3D VESSEL Manometer Problem with Non-Condensable Gases	23-97
		23.2.3	1D PIPE Steam Expulsion Test	23-102
		23.2.4	3D VESSEL Steam Expulsion Test	23-119
		23.2.5	1D PIPE Fill and Drain Test	23-136
		23.2.6	3D VESSEL Fill and Drain Test	23-143
		23.2.7	Condensation Test	23-153
24	ASSE	SSMENT	OF COMPENSATING ERROR IN EVALUATION MODEL USING	
	<u>W</u> COI	BRA/TRA	\C-TF2	24-1
	24.1	INTRO	DUCTION	24-1
	24.2	IDENTI	FICATION OF HIGHLY RANKED PHENOMENA AND MODEL	
		ASSES	SMENT	24-2
	24.3	IDENTI	FICATION OF POSSIBLE COMPENSATING ERRORS IN MODEL	
		ASSESS	SMENT	24-6
		24.3.1	Possible Compensating Errors in Separate Effects Test Simulations	24-6
		24.3.2	Possible Compensating Errors in Integral Effects Test Simulations	24-10
	24.4	COMPE	ENSATING ERROR ASSESSMENT OF SELECTED HIGHLY	
		RANKE	ED PHENOMENA IN SETS AND IETS	24-10
	24.5	DELIVI	ERY AND BYPASSING OF ECC	24-12
	24.6	POST C	CHF HEAT TRANSFER	24-19
		24.6.1	Summary of Assessment with Stand-alone COBRAHT-TF2	24-19
		24.6.2	ORNL Film Boiling Test Simulation	24-25
		24.6.3	G1-Blowdown Test Simulation	24-29
		24.6.4	FLECHT SEASET 31504 Reflood Test Simulation	24-60
		24.6.5	FLECHT-SEASET Test 31805	24-77
		24.6.6	FLECHT-SEASET Test 31701	24-98
		24.6.7	Conclusions	24-112
	24.7	BLOWI	DOWN AND POST BLOWDOWN THERMAL-HYDRAULICS/	
		ENTRA	INMENT	24-112
		24.7.1	LOFT Test L2-3	24-112
		24.7.2	LOFT Test L2-5	24-151
		24.7.3	CCTF Run 62	24-186
	24.8	CORE I	LEVEL PREDICTION IN SB-CL-18 TEST	24-242
		24.8.1	Core Collapsed Liquid Level	24-242
		24.8.2	Core Mixture Level/Cladding Heat-up Elevation Prediction	24-245
		24.8.3	Level Swell Prediction	24-245

WCAP-16996-NP

24.9	SUMMARY OF COMPENSATING ERROR ASSESSMENT.	
24.10	REFERENCES	

VOLUME 3

25	PLAN	T SOURCES OF UNCERTAINTY	25-1
	25.1	PLANT PHYSICAL CONFIGURATION	25-1
	25.2	PLANT INITIAL OPERATING CONDITIONS	25-7
		25.2.1 Core Power Parameters	
		25.2.2 Plant Fluid Conditions	25-24
	25.3	REACTOR ACCIDENT BOUNDARY CONDITIONS	25-45
	25.4	MODEL PARAMETERS	25-49
	25.5	OPERATOR ACTIONS	25-49
		25.5.1 EOP Sequences for a Small Break LOCA	25-50
		25.5.2 Variability of Plant Conditions Due to Operation Actions	25-51
	25.6	CONTAINMENT RESPONSE	25-57
	25.7	PUMP LOCKED ROTOR	25-57
	25.8	REFERENCES	25-61
26	WCOF	RRA/TRACTE2 MODEL OF PILOT PLANTS	26-1
20	<u>76 1</u>	MODELING APPROACH	26-1
	20.1	2611 Introduction	26-1
		26.1.2 Modeling Consistency	26-7
		26.1.3 Conclusions	26-5
	26.2	V C SUMMER NUCLEAR POWER PLANT	26-10
	20.2	26.2.1 V.C. Summer WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Nodalization	26-10
		26.2.7 V.C. Summer Reference Case and Allowable Plant Operating	
		Conditions	26-17
		26.2.3 Plant Operating Range	26-20
	26.3	BEAVER VALLEY UNIT 1 NUCLEAR POWER PLANT	
		26.3.1 Beaver Valley Unit 1 WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Nodalization	
		26.3.2 Beaver Valley Unit 1 Reference Case and Allowable Plant Operation	ng
		Conditions	
		26.3.3 Plant Operating Range	
	26.4	STEADY STATE CALCULATION/CALIBRATION	
	26.5	REFERENCES	26-63
27	REFEI	RENCE BREAK SPECTRUM ANALYSIS	27-1
27	27.1	LARGE INTERMEDIATE AND SMALL BREAK SPECTRA	27-1
	27.1	27.1.1 V C Summer (CGE)	27-1
		27.1.2 Beaver Valley Unit 1 (DLW)	
	27.2	V C. SUMMER (CGE) REFERENCE TRANSIENTS	27-49
	-,	27.2.1 CGE Large Break Reference Transient Description	
		27.2.2 CGE Intermediate Break Reference Transient Description	27-64
			······································

		27.2.3	CGE Small Break Reference Transient Description	
	27.3	BEAVEI	R VALLEY UNIT 1 (DLW) REFERENCE TRANSIENTS	
		27.3.1	DLW Large Break Reference Transient Description	
		27.3.2	DLW Intermediate Break Reference Transient Description	
		27.3.3	DLW Small Break Reference Transient Description	27-118
28	SCOP	ING AND	SENSITIVITY STUDIES	28-1
20	28.1	LARGE	BREAK SCOPING STUDY RESULTS	28-3
		28.1.1	Axial Power Distributions – LBLOCA	28-3
		2812	Offsite Power Availability – LBLOCA	28-17
		28.1.3	Time Step and Convergence Criteria Studies – LBLOCA	
		28.1.4	Break Path Resistance – LBLOCA	28-43
		28.1.5	Treatment of Accumulator Elevation – LBLOCA	28-83
		2816	Steam Generator Hydraulics: Tube Plugging – LBLOCA	28-94
	28.2	SMALL	BREAK SCOPING STUDY RESULTS	28-102
	20.2	28.2.1	Small Break Reference Transient Re-Baseline	28-102
		28.2.2	Axial Power Distributions – SBLOCA	28-111
		28.2.3	Initial and Accident Boundary Conditions and Offsite	
		2012.0	Power – SBLOCA	28-131
		28.2.4	Time Step and Convergence Criteria Studies – SBLOCA	
		28.2.5	Treatment of Accumulator Elevation – SBLOCA	
		28.2.6	Treatment of Accumulator and SI Lines in the Broken Leg a	nd
			Break Location – SBLOCA	
		28.2.7	Break Orientation Studies – SBLOCA	
		28.2.8	Interfacial Drag in the Core (Level Swell) – SBLOCA	
		28.2.9	Steam Generator Hydraulics: Tube Plugging – SBLOCA	
		28.2.10	Steam Generator Hydraulics: Interfacial Drag – SBLOCA	
		28.2.11	Loop Seal Clearance – SBLOCA	
		28.2.12	Horizontal Stratified Flow (HS_SLUG) – SBLOCA	
20	ACCE			20.1
29	ASSE:	CENED	ATION OF MODEL LINCEDTAINTY DAD AMETEDS AND	
	29.1	DIGTDI	ATION OF MODEL UNCERTAINTT FARAMETERS AND .	
		20 1 1	Proof Flow	
		29.1.1	DICAK FIOW - [20.8
	,	20.1.2	Proken Cold Log Nozzla Flow Posistence (KN) and Proken	
		29.1.2	Loon Pump Resistance	29-17
		29.1.3	Delivery and Bypassing of ECC – Bounding Approach	
		29.1.4	Condensation in the Downcomer.	
		29.1.5	Interfacial Drag in the Core Region [1 ^{a,c}
		29.1.6	Cold Leg Condensation (KCOSI)	
•		29.1.7	Horizontal Stratified Flow Regime Transition Boundary (HS	SLUG) 29-34
		29.1.8	Minimum Film Boiling Temperature (T _{min})	29-34
		29.1.9	Steam Binding and Entrainment – Bounding Approach	
		-	5 5 FF	

WCAP-16996-NP

		29.1.10	Non Condensable Gases/Accumulator Nitrogen – Bounding Appr	roach
		29 1 11	Uncertainty in Loon Seal Clearance Phenomenon	29-43
		29 1 12	Steam Generator Thermal-Hydraulics	29-47
	29.2	BREAK	LOCATION, TYPE (SPLIT VS. DEGCL) AND SPLIT BREAK A	REA29-47
	_,	29.2.1	[] ^{a,c}	
		29.2.2	Determination of the Minimum Break Size (Amin)	
		29.2.3	Break Type, Split Break Area and Break Flow Model Uncertainty	r
			Methodology	
		29.2.4	Modeling of DECLG Breaks	
		29.2.5	Modeling of Split Breaks	
		29.2.6	Compliance with Regulatory Guide 1.157 on Break Type and Siz	e 29-59
	29.3	REVIEW	OF PLANT SCOPING STUDIES AND UNCERTAINTY IN PLA	ANT .
		INPUT P	ARAMETERS	
		29.3.1	Bounded Parameters	
• .		29.3.2	Initial and Boundary Conditions (Ranged Parameters)	
		29.3.3	Uncertainty Associated with Maximum Time Step Size	
	29.4	CORE A	ND FUEL ROD MODEL UNCERTAINTIES	
		29.4.1	Initial Reactor State Uncertainties	
		29.4.2	Hot Rod Local Models Uncertainty	
		29.4.3	Fuel Rod: Uncertainty on Heat Transfer to the Fluid	
	29.5	EVALUA	ATION MODEL BIASES AND UNCERTAINTY (EMDAP STEP)	20) 29-119
		29.5.1	Fuel Rod	
		29.5.2	Core	
		29.5.3	Upper Head	
		29.5.4	Upper Plenum	
		29.5.5	Steam Generator	
		29.5.6	Pump Suction Piping/Loop Seal	
		29.5.7	Pump	
		29.5.8	Cold Leg/Safety Injection	
		29.5.9	Accumulator	
		29.5.10	Downcomer	
		29.5.11	Lower Plenum	
		29.5.12	Break	29-129
	29.6	EXPERI	MENTAL UNCERTAINTIES (EMDAP STEP 9)	
	29.7	REFERE	NCES	
30	TECH	NICAL BA	ASIS OF STATISTICAL PROCEDURES APPLIED IN FULL	
	SPECT	RUM LO	CA UNCERTANTY METHODOLOGY	
	30.1	STATIST	ICAL METHODOLOGY ROADMAP	
	30.2	STATIST	TCAL SAMPLING APPROACH (MONTE CARLO)	
	30.3	NON-PA	RAMETRIC ORDER-STATISTICS TOLERANCE LIMITS	
		FORMU	LATION	
		30.3.1	Tolerance Intervals and Sample Size	

30.4	[- - па.с	20.12
a a a			
30.5	OVERV	TEW OF FULL SPECTRUM LOCA STATISTICAL PR	OCEDURE
	(ASTRI	JM-FS)	
30.6	CONCL	USIONS ON COMPLIANCE WITH 10 CFR 50.46 AC	CEPTANCE
	CRITE	RIA	
	30.6.1	[
] ^{a,c}	
	30.6.2	[] ^{a,c}	
30.7	REFER	ENCES	
FULL	SPECTR	UM LOCA DEMONSTRATION ANALYSIS	
31.1	DEVEL	OPMENT OF INITIAL RUN MATRIX	
	31.1.1	Break Area Ranges	
	31.1.2	Plant Operating Range	
31.2	[] ^{a,c} 31-7
	31.2.1	[] ^{a,c}	²
	31.2.2	_ ا	^{,c}
	31.2.3	Conclusion	
['] 31.3	ANALY	SIS OF RESULTS [] ^{a,c}	
31.4	ANALY	SIS OF RESULTS [] ^{a,c}	
31.5	SUMM	ARY REPORT AND COMPLIANCE WITH 10 CFR 50	.46 CRITERIA31-55
METH	IODOLO	GY SUMMARY	
32.1	COMPL	JANCE WITH 10 CFR 50.46	
32.2	COMPL	JANCE WITH REGULATORY GUIDE 1.203	
	32.2.1	Regulatory Position 1, "Evaluation Model Developme	ent and
		Assessment Process"	32-2
	32.2.2	Regulatory Position 2. "Quality Assurance"	32-15
	32.2.2	Regulatory Position 3 "Documentation"	32-15
	32.2.5	Regulatory Position 4 "General Purpose Computer Pu	nograms" 32-16
	32.2.1	Regulatory Position 5, "Graded Approach to Applying	the FMDAP
	52.2.5	Process"	30_17
323	COMPI	IANCE WITH REGULATORY POSITION WITH RES	SPECT TO THE
52.5	UNCER	TAINTY METHODOLOGY	32.17
	32 3 1	Regulatory Position 4 "Estimation of Overall Calcula	tional
	1.د.يەد	Lincertainty"	20 17
37 4	BEEED	FNCFS	
JZ. 7			J_=_1

31

32

LIST OF TABLES

VOLUME 1

Table 2-1	PIRT for Full Spectrum LOCA for Westinghouse and Combustion Engineering Plants
Table 2-2	Requirement Assessment Against FSLOCA PIRT: Model Availability and Need
Table 2-3	V&V Matrix for Large Break LOCA Sub-Scenario, Phases: Blowdown and Refill
Table 2-4	V&V Matrix for Large Break LOCA Sub-Scenario, Phases: Reflood and Refill
Table 2-5	V&V Matrix for Small Break LOCA Processes, Separate Effect Tests
Table 2-6	V&V Matrix for Small Break LOCA Processes, Integral Effect Tests 2-82
Table 3-1	Timestep Size Reduction Limits
Table 3-2	Code Backup Limits
Table 4.2-1	Summary of Flow Regime Number in Vessel Components
Table 4.4-1	Summary of Flow Regime Number in 1D Components
Table 4.4.5-1	[] ^{a,c} 4-36
Table 5-1	Comparisons of Pressure Loss at Sudden Contraction (Vessel Component) 5-141
Table 5-2	Comparisons of Pressure Loss at Sudden Expansion (Vessel Component) 5-141
Table 5-3	Comparisons of Pressure Loss at Combination of Sudden Contraction and Expansion (Vessel Component)
Table 5-4	Wall Shear Dependence Upon Pipe Diameter
Table 5-5a	Irreversible Pressure Loss Coefficient
Table 5-5b	[] ^{a,c} 5-142
Table 5-6	Comparisons of Pressure Loss at Sudden Contraction (1-D Loop Component)
Table 5-7	Comparisons of Pressure Loss at Sudden Expansion (1-D Loop Component)
Table 5-8	Comparisons of Pressure Loss at Combination of Sudden Contraction and Expansion (1-D Loop Component)
Table 5-9	Critical Height Correlation Constant 5-144
Table 6-1	The Selection Logic for Condensation, Evaporation, and Flashing for 3D Vessel
Table 7.3-1	One-Dimensional Component Heat Transfer Regimes



Table 8-1	Cladding Thermal Expansion Correlations	L
Table 8-2	Cladding Correlations for Modulus of Elasticity (E) and Shear Modulus (G) 8-62	2
Table 8-3	[] ^{a,c} 8-63	;
Table 8-4	[] ^{a,c}	ŀ
Table 8-5	[] ^{a,c}	, .
Table 8-6		
] ^{a,c}	ĵ
Table 9-1	ANSI/ANS 5.1-1979	ł
Table 9-2	ANSI/ANS 5.1-1979	,
Table 9-3	ANSI/ANS 5.1-1971	•
Table 9-4	ANSI/ANS 5.1-1971)
Table 9-5	Typical Normalized Interaction Frequency Fit Data)
Table 9-6	Actinide Heat Source Data)
Table 9-7	Typical Radiation Source Timing, Strength, and Range)
Table 9-8	Typical Values for Redistribution Fraction Values)
Table 9-9	Neutron Heating Transfer Model	
Table 9-10	Gamma Photon Energy Spectrum	
Table 9-11	BUGLE-80 Gamma Kerma Data9-33	;
Table 9-12	Typical 15x15 GEDM Gamma Transfer Matrix	ļ
Table 9-13	[] ^{a,c}	
Table 9-14	Decay Group Uncertainty Factors Per One Sigma (%)	;
Table 9-15	Point Reactor Kinetics Validation	r
Table 9-16	Actinide Isotope Nuclear Data 9-38	;
Table 9-17	Prompt Fission Energy Release Data)
Table 9-18	[] ^{a,c})
Table 10-1	The Four Segments of Pump Homologous Curves 10-24	ŀ
Table 10-2	Pump Control Input Parameter	ŀ
Table 10-3	Valve Control Options	
Table 11-1	Constants for Saturated Liquid Enthalpy	5
Table 11-2	Constants for Saturated Vapor Enthalpy	,

4



xxiv

LIST OF TABLES (cont.)

Table 11-3	Vessel Component Saturated Water Thermal Properties11-57
Table 11-4	Subcooled Water Density Constants
Table 11-5	Saturated Steam Internal Energy Constants
Table 11-6	Saturated Steam Enthalpy Constants
Table 11-7	Saturated Liquid Internal Energy Constants
Table 11-8	Constants for Saturated Steam Specific Heat11-63
Table 11-9	Liquid Density Constants11-64
Table 11-10	Constant Pressure Specific Heat Constants
Table 11-11	Liquid Viscosity Constants
Table 11-12	Liquid Thermal Conductivity Constants11-66
Table 11-13	Constants for Specific Heat of Air
Table 11-14	Specific Heat of Zircaloy-411-66
Table 11-15	Chemical Composition of ZIRLO [®] and Zircaloy-4 Alloys11-67
Table 11-16	Specific Heat of ZIRLO [®] Alloy
	VOLUME 2
Table 12.2-1	Range of Geometrical Configurations 12-4
Table 12.2-2	Break Configuration 12-4
Table 12.2-3	Range of Physical Conditions Upstream of Discharge 12-4
Table 12.4-1	Selected Dataset and Input Variables 12-7
Table 12.4-2	Additional Dataset for Non-condensable Gas Model Validation and Input Variables
Table 12.4-3	Critical Flow Data Considered for Model Evaluation 12-8
Table 12.4-4	Marviken Test Nozzles (from pp. 51, MXC-101, EPRI/NP-2370) 12-29
Table 12.5-1	Critical Flow Data Comparison for WCOBRA/TRAC Critical Flow Model 12-46
Table 12.7.5-1	Summary of Test Parameters for Two-Phase Flow Loop Offtake Tests 12-79
Table 13.4.1-1	Comparison of Test Conditions with Typical PWR Conditions 13-4
Table 13.4.2-1	ORNL-THTF Test Simulation Matrix
Table 13.4.3-1	Comparison of PWR Rod and G-1 Test Rod Bundle
Table 13.4.3-2	G-1 Core Uncovery Test Matrix
Table 13.4.3-3	G-1 Simulation Results Summary at Model Nominal YDRAG

Table 13.4.3-4	YDRAG Values to Match G-1 Level Swell Data
Table 13.4.4-1	Comparison of 17x17-XL PWR Rod and Test Rod Bundle
Table 13.4.4-2	G2 Loop Core Uncovery Test Vessel Flow Areas
Table 13.4.4-3	G-2 Core Uncovery Test Matrix
Table 13.4.4-4	G-2 Simulation Results Summary at Model Nominal YDRAG 13-69
Table 13.4.4-5	YDRAG Values to Match G-2 Level Swell Data
Table 13.4.5-1	JAERI-TPTF Rod Bundle Uncovery Test Matrix 13-86
Table 13.4.5-2	TPTF Simulation Results Summary
Table 13.4.5-3	TPTF Simulation YDRAG Sensitivity Study Results
Table 14.1-1	SPV Heat Transfer Test Conditions
Table 14.1-2	Typical Conditions in a PWR During SPV (Blowdown, Refill, Boiloff/Recovery, Reflood)
Table 14.1-3	DFFB Heat Transfer Test Conditions
Table 14.1-4	Typical Conditions in a PWR During DFFB (Blowdown, Refill) 14-8
Table 14.1-5	Typical Conditions in a PWR During Reflood14-8
Table 14.1-6	Reflood Heat Transfer Test Conditions
Table 14.2.2.1-1	ORNL-THTF Steady-State DFFB Initial Test Condition
Table 14.2.2.1-2	ORNL-THTF Initial Test Conditions for WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Simulation 14-13
Table 14.2.2.2-1	Comparison of PWR Rod and G-1 Test Rod Bundle14-22
Table 14.2.2.2-2	G-1 Initial Test Conditions
Table 14.2.2.3-1	Comparison of 17x17 PWR Fuel Rod and G-2 Test Rod 14-28
Table 14.2.2.3-2	G-2 Refill Initial Test Conditions
Table 14.2.3.1-1	Test Conditions for FLECHT-SEASET Tests
Table 14.2.3.2-1	Test Conditions for FLECHT Low Flooding Rate Tests
Table 14.2.3.3-1	Test Conditions for FLECHT Top-Skewed Power Tests 14-44
Table 14.2.3.4-1	Test Conditions for FLECHT Supplemental Test 14-48
Table 14.2.3.5-1	G-2 Reflood Tests and Conditions
Table 14.2.3.6-1	Conditions for FEBA Tests 14-55
Table 15.5.2.1-1	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Calculated Fluid Conditions at Rod 1 PCT Time and Locations

l

xxvi

LIST OF TABLES (cont.)

Table 15.5.2.1-2	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 PCT Comparisons	. 15-26
Table 15.5.2.3-1	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Cladding Temperature Comparison with the Means of the G-2 Refill Experimental Data	. 15-72
Table 15.5.2.3-2	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 PCT Comparison with the Means of the G-2 Refill Experimental Data.	. 15-74
Table 15.6.6-1	Range of Reflood Heat Transfer Test Conditions	15-310
Table 15.9-1	Reflood Facilities Major Design Features	15-319
Table 15.9.3-1	FLECHT SEASET Sub-cooling Test Series – Test Data	15-355
Table 15.9.3-2	FLECHT SEASET Predicted Sub-cooling Sensitivity Study Results	15-355
Táble 15.9.3-3	Average PCT – Based on Data for Six-foot Thermocouples	15-355
Table 15.9.3-4	FLECHT Low Flooding Rate Sub-cooling Test Series – Test Data	15-355
Table 15.9.3-5	FLECHT Low Flooding Rate Inlet Sub-cooling Sensitivity Using <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2	15-356
Table 16-1	Selected TPTF Test Data from Kawaji et al. (1987)	16-11
Table 16-2	[] ^{a,c}	. 16-13
Table 17-1	Westinghouse COSI Test Data Average Heat Loss and Uncertainty	. 17-20
Table 17-2	Westinghouse Vertical COSI Tests Data	. 17-21
Table 17-3	Westinghouse Horizontal COSI Tests Data	. 17-23
Table 17-4	Framatome Test Data Average Heat Loss and Uncertainty	. 17-24
Table 17-5	Selected Framatome COSI Tests Data and Calculation for Qcond	. 17-25
Table 17-6	Comparison of Facilities for Cold Leg Condensation Assessment	. 17-26
Table 17-7	ROSA SB-CL-05 SI Condensation Test Data for SETs	. 17 - 27
Table 19.3-1	[] ^{a,c}	. 19-43
Table 19.3-2	[] ^{a,c}	. 19-44
Table 19.3-3	[] ^{a,c}	. 19-44
Table 19.3-4	[] ^{a,c}	. 19-44
Table 19.3-5	[] ^{a,c}	. 19-45
Table 19.3-6	[] ^{a,c}	. 19-45

WCAP-16996-NP

C

Table 19.3-7	[] ^{a,c}
Table 19.3-8	[] ^{a,c}
Table 19.3-9	
] ^{a,c}
Table 19.3-10	[] ^{a,c} 19-47
Table 19.3-11	[] ^{a,c} 19-47
Table 19.3-12	Steam Mass Flows in UPTF Test 6 (all Values are in kg/sec) 19-48
Table 19.3-13	Selected Test Conditions from UPTF Test 6 (Single-Phase Steam Portion) 19-48
Table 19.3-14	Calculated Parameters for UPTF Test 6 19-49
Table 19.3-15	Calculated Cold Leg Nozzle K, $U_{DC} = 0$
Table 19.3-16	UPTF Test 8 Phase A Conditions
Table 19.3-17	[] ^{a,c} 19-50
Table 19.3-18	[] ^{a,c} 19-51
Table 19.3-19	[] ^{a,c} 19-51
Table 19.6-1	[] ^{a,c}
Table 19.6-2	[] ^{a,c}
Table 19.6-3	[] ^{a,c}
Table 19.6-4	[] ^{a,c}
Table 19.6-5	[] ^{a,c} 19-252
Table 21.1-1	Selected ROSA-IV Test Series Description and Related Technical Reports 21-44
Table 21.2-1	Major Design Characteristics of LSTF and PWR
Table 21.2-2	Standard Operational Setpoints of the ROSA-IV Large Scale Test Facility 21-47
Table 21.4-1	Steady-State Parameter Checklist (Initial Conditions) for the SB-CL-18 Test 21-48
Table 21.4-2	Decay Heat Power Curve Used in the SB-CL-18 Test Simulation 21-49
Table 21.5-1	[] ^{a,c} 21-50
Table 21.5-2	[] ^{a,c}
Table 21.6-1	[] ^{a,c} 21-52

WCAP-16996-NP

Table 21.6-2	[
] ^{a,c}		
Table 21.6-3	[
	J ^{u, v}		
Table 21.7-1	JAERI (Full Conserv	vative) Decay Heat Curve	
Table 21.9-1	Initialization of the S	SB-CL-02 Natural Circulation Test Simulation	
Table 22-1	Comparison of LOF	Γ and PWR	
Table 22-2	Differences among I	OFT Experiments	
Table 22-3	LOFT/PWR Axial N	oding Ratio Comparison	22-25
Table 22-4	LOFT L2-5 Hot Ass	embly Fuel Initial Conditions	22-25
Table 22-5	LOFT Large Break	Tests WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Steady State Sim	ulation
	Results	······	
Table 22-6	[] ^{a,c}	22-27
Table 22-7	[] ^{a,c}	
Table 22-8	[] ^{a,c}	
Table 22-9	[] ^{a,c}	
Table 22-10	LOFT L3-1 Steady S	state Comparison	22-29
Table 22-11	[] ^{a,c}	22-29
Table 22-12	LOFT L5-1 Steady S	State Comparison	
Table 22-13	[·] ^{a,c}	22-30
Table 23.1.1-1	Summary of Test Pa Tests	rameters for Small Blowdown Vessel Steam B	lowdown 23-5
Table 23.1.1-2	Characterization of Y	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Results Versus Test Da	ita 23-5
Table 23.1.2-1	Initial Conditions and ECC Requirements S-07-10D Test		
Table 23.1.2-2	Sequence of Operational Procedures for Test S-07-10D		
Table 23.1.2-3	Sequence of Events	Sequence of Events for Test S-07-10D	
Table 24.2-1	V&V Matrix for Lar SETs & IETs	ge Break LOCA Processes, Blowdown Phase	
Table 24.2-2	V&V Matrix for Lar SETs & IETs	ge Break LOCA Processes, Refill/Reflood Pha	ase 24-3

Table 24.2-3	V&V Matrix for Small Break LOCA Processes, Separate Effect Tests	24-4
Table 24.2-4	V&V Matrix for Small Break LOCA Processes, Integral Effect Tests	24-5
Table 24.6.2-1	Bundle Exit Temperatures for ORNL Tests	24-26
Table 24.4.6.3-1	G-1 Blowdown Test Conditions	24-32

VOLUME 3

Table 25.2-1	Hot Assembly Rod Power Census Summary
Table 25.2-2	Peaking Factor Uncertainties
Table 25.2-3	Typical Westinghouse Plant Operation Parameters
Table 25-1	Condensed EOPs for Indian Point Unit 2, Short-Term Portion 25-54
Table 26.1-1	Core Section Axial Cell Lengths
Table 26.1-2	Hot Leg Noding Comparison
Table 26.1-3	Steam Generator Noding Comparison
Table 26.1-4	Crossover Leg Noding
Table 26.1-5	Cold Leg Noding
Table 26.2-1	Key LOCA Parameters and Scoping Study Values for V. C. Summer
Table 26.3-1	Key LOCA Parameters and Scoping Study Values for Beaver Valley Unit 1 26-43
Table 26.4-1	Criteria for an Acceptable Steady-State
Table 28.1.3-1	DTMAX Values used in LBLOCA Timestep Sensitivity
Table 28.1.3-2	PCT Results When Varying DTMAX, CGE LBLOCA Sensitivity 28-33
Table 28.1.3-3	PCT Results When Varying DTMAX, DLW LBLOCA Sensitivity
Table 28.1.4-1	Scenarios for Break Path Resistance Sensitivity Study
Table 28.2.11-1	Extent of Loop Seal Clearance Predicted for Plant Cases
Table 28.2.12-1	Flow Regime Flags
Table 29-1	Uncertainty Elements – Break Location, Type and Area Sampling Methodology
Table 29-2	Uncertainty Elements – Thermal-Hydraulic Models
Table 29-3a	Uncertainty Elements – Local Models [] ^{a,c}
Table 29-3b	Burst Strain for [] ^{a,c}
Table 29-4	Uncertainty Elements – Power-Related Parameters Defined in Section 29.4.1

Table 29-5	Initial and Boundary Conditions Considered in Uncertainty Methodology Defined in Section 29.3.2
Table 29.1.2-1	Nozzle Loss Coefficient Assessment Data Base
Table 29.1.11-1	Extent of Loop Seal Clearance Predicted for 3-inch SBLOCA Plant Cases in HS_SLUG Study
Table 29.3.2-1	Comparison of Measured and Calculated Accumulator Line Resistances
Table 29.4-1	Packing Fractions Using Various Measurements
Table 29.4-2a	Zircaloy Rate Constants (Total Oxygen)
Table 29.4-2b	[] ^{a,c}
Table 29.4-3	Predictions Using Equation 29.4-2 and Cathcart-Pawel
Table 29.4.3-1	[
] ^{a,c}
Table 29.4.3-2	[] ^{a,c}
Table 30-1	
ر. ب	J ^{4,*}
Table 30-2	[
	ла,с 20.11
] ′
Table 30-3	Generic Rod Power Census Used for Core-Wide Oxidation Assessment
Table 30-3 Table 31.1-1	Generic Rod Power Census Used for Core-Wide Oxidation Assessment
Table 30-3 Table 31.1-1 Table 31.1-2a	Generic Rod Power Census Used for Core-Wide Oxidation Assessment
Table 30-3 Table 31.1-1 Table 31.1-2a Table 31.1-2b	Generic Rod Power Census Used for Core-Wide Oxidation Assessment
Table 30-3 Table 31.1-1 Table 31.1-2a Table 31.1-2b Table 31.2-1a	Generic Rod Power Census Used for Core-Wide Oxidation Assessment
Table 30-3 Table 31.1-1 Table 31.1-2a Table 31.1-2b Table 31.2-1a Table 31.2-1b	Generic Rod Power Census Used for Core-Wide Oxidation Assessment
Table 30-3 Table 31.1-1 Table 31.1-2a Table 31.1-2b Table 31.2-1a Table 31.2-1b Table 31.2-1c	Generic Rod Power Census Used for Core-Wide Oxidation Assessment
Table 30-3 Table 31.1-1 Table 31.1-2a Table 31.1-2b Table 31.2-1a Table 31.2-1b Table 31.2-1c Table 31.2-1d	Generic Rod Power Census Used for Core-Wide Oxidation Assessment
Table 30-3 Table 31.1-1 Table 31.1-2a Table 31.1-2b Table 31.2-1a Table 31.2-1b Table 31.2-1c Table 31.2-1d Table 31.2-2a	J30-11Generic Rod Power Census Used for Core-Wide Oxidation Assessment
Table 30-3 Table 31.1-1 Table 31.1-2a Table 31.1-2b Table 31.2-1a Table 31.2-1b Table 31.2-1c Table 31.2-1d Table 31.2-2a Table 31.2-2b	J30-11Generic Rod Power Census Used for Core-Wide Oxidation Assessment
Table 30-3 Table 31.1-1 Table 31.1-2a Table 31.1-2b Table 31.2-1a Table 31.2-1b Table 31.2-1c Table 31.2-1d Table 31.2-2a Table 31.2-2b Table 31.2-2b Table 31.2-2b Table 31.2-2b Table 31.2-2c	Generic Rod Power Census Used for Core-Wide Oxidation Assessment
Table 30-3 Table 31.1-1 Table 31.1-2a Table 31.1-2b Table 31.2-1a Table 31.2-1b Table 31.2-1c Table 31.2-1d Table 31.2-2a Table 31.2-2c Table 31.2-2d	$j^{a,c}$ 31-11 Generic Rod Power Census Used for Core-Wide Oxidation Assessment
Table 30-3 Table 31.1-1 Table 31.1-2a Table 31.1-2b Table 31.2-1a Table 31.2-1b Table 31.2-1c Table 31.2-1d Table 31.2-2a Table 31.2-2a Table 31.2-2a Table 31.2-2b Table 31.2-2c Table 31.2-2d Table 31.2-2d	Generic Rod Power Census Used for Core-Wide Oxidation Assessment



November 2010 Revision 0

Table 31.3-1b	Results for [
Table 31.3-2a	Uncertainty Attributes [] ^{a,c}	
Table 31.3-2b	Results [] ^{a,c}]	31-20
Table 31.4-1a	Uncertainty Attributes [] ^{a,c}	
Table 31.4-1b	Results [] ^{a,c}		
Table 31.5-1	[] ^{a,c} 31-57
Table 32-1	Summary of Assessment Res PIRT Ranked Phenomena	ults and Uncertainty	Treatment for	High

WCAP-16996-NP

LIST OF FIGURES

VOLUME 1

Figure 1-1	Evaluation Model Development and Assessment Process (EMDAP) – High Level Flow Chart (RG 1.203)
Figure 2-1	EMDAP Element 1 Process
Figure 2-3	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Code Development Process
Figure 2-4	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 2-5	EMDAP Element 2
Figure 3-1	Control Volume for Cartesian Coordinates
Figure 3-2	Basic Mesh Cell
Figure 3-3	Variable Mesh Cell
Figure 3-4	Mesh Cell for Vertical Velocities
Figure 3-5	Mesh Cell for Transverse Velocities
Figure 3-6	One-Dimensional Computational Cell Structure
Figure 3-7	A Simple TRAC-PF1 Network
Figure 3-8	Transient Calculation Flow Diagram
Figure 3-9	Outer Calculation Flow Diagram
Figure 3-10	Numerical Solution Routines
Figure 3-11	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Pre-pass Calculation Routines
Figure 3-12	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Outer Iteration Routines
Figure 3-13	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Routines for Post-Pass Calculations
Figure 3-14	Effect of Numerical Damping on Transient Value of y 3-97
Figure 4-1	Vessel Component Normal Wall Flow Regimes
Figure 4-2	Vessel Component Normal Wall Flow Regime Selection Logic 4-45
Figure 4-3	Effect of Scale on Vertical Upflow Regime Transitions Predicted by Taitel, Barnea, and Dukler (1980)
Figure 4-4	Effect of Scale on Vertical Upflow Regime Transitions (Chow, 1989) 4-47
Figure 4-5	Small to Large Bubble Regime – Formation of Large Bubbles
Figure 4-6	Vessel Component Hot Wall Flow Regimes
Figure 4-7	Hot Wall Flow Regime Selection Logic
Figure 4-8	One-Dimensional Component Flow Regime Map 4-51

LIST OF FIGURES (cont.)

Figure 4-9	One-dimensional Horizontal Stratified Flow
Figure 4-10	Taitel-Dukler Transition Criteria as a Function of Pressure
Figure 4-11	Taitel-Dukler Transition Criteria as a Function of Pipe Diameter
Figure 4-12	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 4-13	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 4-14	The Hybrid Horizontal Stratification Criterion
Figure 4-15	Cross Section of Horizontal Stratified Flow
Figure 4-16	Transition Boundary for Various Tests (Continuous Line is Transition Deduced from Data, While Dashed Line is Prediction of Modified Taitel-Dukler Criterion). Note, the Ridge of Taitel-Dukler Boundary of the 0.18 m and 7.3 MPa at Low Jg* Represents a Singularity Point at Zero Relative Velocity
Figure 4-17	Horizontal Stratified Flow Regime Transition and Relevant Data 4-58
Figure 4-18	Comparison between Hybrid Horizontal Stratification Criterion and Viscous Kelvin Helmholtz Models at Various Pressures and Pipe Diameters 4-59
Figure 4-19	Horizontal Flow Regime Map Including Wavy-Dispersed Regime
Figure 4-20	Illustration of Calculation of Entrainment Fraction in Wavy-Dispersed Regime. Example for Pressure 12 MPa and Diameter 0.18 m. Note, Flow Regime Map Is Simplified to Emphasize the Entrainment in Wavy-Dispersed Flow
Figure 4-21	Schematic View of Wavy-Dispersed Flow in Cross Section
Figure 5-1	One-Dimensional Vessel Channel with Area Change
Figure 5-2	Bubble Drag Coefficients (Ishii and Chawla, 1979)5-146
Figure 5-3	Effect of Ramps on Interfacial Friction Factor. (a) Small Bubble Regime, (b) Large Bubble Regime
Figure 5-4	Interfacial Friction Factor for Smooth Films (Wallis, 1969) 5-148
Figure 5-5	Hanstock and Hanratty (1976) Film Flow Interfacial Shear 5-149
Figure 5-6a	Comparison of Droplet Data Range and Droplet Size Limits in <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 at 40 psia
Figure 5-6b	Comparison of Droplet Data Range and Droplet Size Limits in <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 at 20 psia
Figure 5-7	Impingement of a Droplet on a Grid Spacer

WCAP-16996-NP

LIST OF FIGURES (cont.)

Figure 5-7c	Leading Edge of a Wetted Grid; Effect of Vapor Velocity	5-153
Figure 5-8	The Relationship of Droplet Diameter Ratio versus Droplet Weber Number	5-154
Figure 5-9	Comparison of Equation 5-185 with Data from Whalley (1973)	5-155
Figure 5-10	Core to Film Momentum Balance in Annular Film Flow	5-156
Figure 5-11	Comparison of the Wall Friction Factors from the Churchill Model and the Blasius Model (Wall Roughness 5.0E-5 m, Pipe Diameter 0.7 m)	5-157
Figure 5-12	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 1D Noding	5-158
Figure 5-13	Abrupt Expansion in 1D Component	5-159
Figure 5-14	Abrupt Contraction in 1D Component	5-160
Figure 5-15	Sharp-Edged Thin-Plate Orifice	5-161
Figure 5-16	Horizontal 1D Component Connected to a PWR Downcomer Channel	5-162
Figure 5-17	Broken Cold Leg Nozzle Junction to Vessel	5-163
Figure 5-18	Horizontal 1D Component Connected to a PWR Upper Plenum Hot Leg Nozzle	5-164
Figure 5-19	TRAC-PF1/MOD1 Sub-models of the Choked Flow Models	5-165
Figure 5-20	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Two-phase Choked Flow Model Matrix A	5-166
Figure 5-21	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Two-phase Choked Flow Model Matrix B	5-167
Figure 5-22	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Sub-models with Homogeneous Relaxation Non-equilibrium Model Option	5-168
Figure 5-23	Area Ratio in Homogeneous Non-equilibrium Relaxation Model	5-169
Figure 5-24	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Choked Critical Flow Model	5-170
Figure 5-25	Possible Offtake Geometries	5-171
Figure 5-26	Determination of Actual Characteristic Height, h	5-172
Figure 6-1	Large Void Fraction Gradient Ramp for Subcooled Liquid Interfacial Area	. 6-68
Figure 6-2	Suppression Factor at Various Liquid Side Heat Transfer Coefficients at 0.1 MPa and 1.0 MPa using the Revised Young-Bajorek Model	. 6-69
Figure 6-3	Illustration of Condensation Ramp Model, Variable PCONT1 Represents ΔP_{cont}	. 6-70
Figure 6-4	Illustration of the Selection Logic for Condensation, Evaporation, and Flashing for 1D Components	. 6-71
Figure 6-5	Interfacial Mass Transfer Map for 1D Components	. 6-72

LIST OF FIGURES (cont.)

Figure 6-6	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Basic Flow Regime Map for 1D Components	6-73
Figure 6-7	Liquid Side Heat Transfer Coefficient Model During Condensation in Bubbly Slug Flow for 1D Components	6-74
Figure 6-8	Schematic of Flow Pattern in Annular-mist Flow	6-75
Figure 6-9	Transition from Annular-mist to Mist Fflow as a Function of Pressure for Saturated Water	6-76
Figure 6-10	Calculated Stanton Numbers for Liquid-film Flow using Saturated Water Properties	6-77
Figure 6-11	Small Break LOCA Pressure Response (DLW SBLOCA Reference Transient)	6-78
Figure 6-12	Schematic of Flow Regime and Condensation in COSI Experiments	6-79
Figure 6-13	Cross Section of Cold Leg Near the Safety Injection	6-80
Figure 6-14	Temperature Profile of the Bulk Water in the Cold Leg Measured in Westinghouse COSI Test (Test No. 010, Point 5)	6-81
Figure 6-15	Comparison between the Measured Nusselt number and Calculated Nusselt Number from the Cold Leg Condensation Correlation	6-82
Figure 6-16	Comparison of Measured Condensation Heat Transfer Rates under Different Cold Leg Water Level Cases	6-83
Figure 7.2-1	Boiling Curve	7-49
Figure 7.2-2	Heat Transfer Regime Selection Logic for Vessel Component	7-50
Figure 7.2-3	Heat Transfer Regime Map for Vessel Component	7-51
Figure 7.2-4	Chen Correlation Convective Multiplier F _{CHEN}	7-52
Figure 7.2-5	Chen Boiling Suppression Factor S _{CHEN}	7-53
Figure 7.2-6	Droplet Contact Effectiveness (as coded) at Atmospheric Pressure	7-54
Figure 7.2-7	Droplet Contact Effectiveness (as coded) at High Pressure	7-55
Figure 7.2-8	Transition Boiling (Model 2) Ramp F _{FILM}	7-56
Figure 7.2-9	Film Boiling Model Components	7-57
Figure 7.2-10	Effect of Spacer Grids on Convective Heat Transfer (from Chiou, et al., 1986)	7-58
Figure 7.2-11	Enhancement of Convective Heat Transfer Due to Droplets	7-59
Figure 7.2-12	Heat Flux Paths for Nucleate Boiling	7-60
Figure 7.2-13	Heat Flux Paths for Transition Boiling and Dispersed Flow Film Boiling	7-61
J

Figure 7.2-14	Heat Flux Paths for Film Boiling	7-62
Figure 7.3-1	One-Dimensional Component Heat Transfer Regime Selection	7-90
Figure 7.3-2	Biasi CHF Correlation Switch Over Quality (from Liles, D. R., et al., 1988)	7-91
Figure 7.3-3	One-Dimensional Component Heat Transfer Regime Selection Process at High Void and Quality	7-92
Figure 8-1	Nuclear Fuel Rod Geometry	8-68
Figure 8-2	Heater Rod Geometry	8-68
Figure 8-3	Tube and Wall Conductor Geometries	8-69
Figure 8-4	Control Volume for Heat Balance	8-69
Figure 8-5	Noding for Fuel Rod Conduction Model	8-70
Figure 8-6	Conductance Between Nodes	8-70
Figure 8-7	Steady-State Temperature Distribution in a Flat Plate with No Internal Heat Generation	8-71
Figure 8-8	Steady-State Temperature Distribution in a Hollow Cylinder with No Internal Heat Generation	8-71
Figure 8-9	Typical Heat Transfer Noding Scheme	8-72
Figure 8-10	Examples of Heat Transfer Node Insertion	8-73
Figure 8-11	Cladding Temperature Profile with Fine Mesh Renoding	8-74
Figure 8-12	Surface Heat Flux Profile with Fine Mesh Renoding	8-74
Figure 8-13	Temperature Jump Distances for an Ideal Gap	8-75
Figure 8-14	Instantaneous Creep Rates for Westinghouse Zircaloy-4 Cladding	8-76
Figure 8-15	Instantaneous Creep Rates for Westinghouse ZIRLO® Cladding	8-77
Figure 8-16	Instantaneous Creep Rates for Sandvik (NRU) Cladding	8-78
Figure 8-17	Heatup Rate Scenarios	8-79
Figure 8-18	Circumferential Strain Following Rupture – Zircaloy-4 Cladding	8-80
Figure 8-19	Burst Temperature Correlation – Westinghouse ZIRLO® Cladding	8-81
Figure 8-20	$Circumferential\ Strain\ Following\ Rupture-We stinghouse\ ZIRLO^{\textcircled{B}}\ Cladding\ldots$	8-82
Figure 8-21	Rod Strain at Burst Elevation	8-83
Figure 8-22	Flow Area Reduction Due to Blockage – Zircaloy-4 Cladding	8-84
Figure 8-23	Flow Area Reduction Due to Blockage – ZIRLO [®] Cladding	8-85

٦

Figure 8-24	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 8-25	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
] ^{a,c} 8-87
Figure 8-26	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 8-27	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 8-28	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 8-29	Volumetric Increase in Fuel for Corresponding Clad Volume Increase Derived from PBF Tests (Broughton, 1981)
Figure 8-30	[
] ^{a,c}
Figure 8-31	[
] ^{a,c} 8-91
Figure 8-32	[] ^{8,C} 8.02
Figure 8-33	[
	[^{a,c}
Figure 8-34	Geometry for One-Dimensional Component Conductor
Figure 8-35	Geometry for HTSTR Component Conductor
Figure 8-36	Node Located at the Interface between Two Dissimilar Materials
Figure 9-1	U-235 Fission Fraction
Figure 9-2	Pu-239 Fission Fraction
Figure 9-3	U-238 Fission Fraction
Figure 9-4	Calculated Normalized Macroscopic Cross Sections versus Core Average Water Density
Figure 9-5	$\overline{\beta}$ vs. Burnup at Various Enrichments
Figure 9-6	Prompt Neutron Lifetime
Figure 9-7	Prompt Energy Release
Figure 9-8	Total Energy Release

,

Figure 9-9	Delayed Group I Lambda
Figure 9-10	Delayed Group II Lambda
Figure 9-11	Delayed Group III Lambda
Figure 9-12	Delayed Group IV Lambda
Figure 9-13	Delayed Group V Lambda
Figure 9-14	Delayed Group VI Lambda
Figure 9-15	U-238 Capture/Fission Ratio as a Function of Initial Enrichment and Burnup 9-55
Figure 9-16	15x15 Material Composition Assignment Layout
Figure 9-17	15x15 Core Balance Fixed Source Distribution
Figure 9-18	15x15 Hot Assembly Fixed Source Distribution
Figure 9-19	15x15 Hot Rod Fixed Source Distribution
Figure 9-20	Gamma Kerma Cross Section Energy Dependence
Figure 9-21	Typical Heat Flux Deposition Fractions versus Coolant Density
Figure 9-22	Typical Heat Flux Deposition Fractions versus Coolant Density
Figure 9-23	Percent Fit Deviations for U-235 ANSI/ANS 5.1 – 1979 Plus Two Sigma
Figure 9-24	Percent Fit Deviations for Pu-239 ANSI/ANS 5.1 – 1979 Plus Two Sigma
Figure 9-25	Percent Fit Deviations for U-238 ANSI/ANS 5.1 – 1979 Plus Two Sigma
Figure 9-26	U-235 ANSI/ANS 5.1 – 1979 Decay Heat Standard vs. Fitted Results
Figure 9-27	Pu-239 ANSI/ANS 5.1 – 1979 Decay Heat Standard vs. Fitted Results
Figure 9-28	U-238 ANSI/ANS 5.1 – 1979 Decay Heat Standard vs. Fitted Results
Figure 9-29	Time Dependent Reactor Period for $+ 0.003 \Delta K$ Reactivity Insertion versus Time After Insertion
Figure 9-30	Time Dependent Reactor Period for + 0.0015 ΔK Reactivity Insertion versus Time After Insertion
Figure 9-31	Time Dependent Reactor Period for $-0.030 \Delta K$ Reactivity Insertion versus Time After Insertion
Figure 9-32	Total Actinide Decay Power versus Burnup and Initial Enrichment
Figure 9-33	Actinide Decay Power versus Burnup and Initial Enrichment
Figure 9-34	Capture Correction versus Burnup and Initial Enrichment
Figure 9-35	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Calculation Block Diagram

1

Figure 10-1	PIPE Component Noding
Figure 10-2	TEE Component Noding 10-28
Figure 10-3	PUMP Noding Diagram
Figure 10-4	93A Pump Single-Phase Homologous Head Curves 10-30
Figure 10-5	93A Pump Two-Phase Homologous Head Curves 10-31
Figure 10-6	93A Pump Single-Phase Homologous Torque Curves 10-32
Figure 10-7	93A Pump Two-Phase Homologous Torque Curves 10-33
Figure 10-8	Steam Generator Noding Diagram
Figure 10-9	Pressurizer (PRIZER) Component Noding
Figure 10-10	VALVE Component Noding
Figure 10-11	Geometry Configurations for VALVE Flow Area Calculation 10-37
Figure 10-12	Accumulator Noding Diagram
Figure 10-13	Pressure Boundary Condition Using BREAK Component 10-39
Figure 10-14	Velocity Boundary Condition Using FILL Component 10-40
Figure 10-15	ROD or SLAB Geometry HTSTR-Component with Hydraulic Cell Coupling on both the Inner and Outer Surface
Figure 11-1	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Vessel Component Saturated Liquid Enthalpy Function
Figure 11-2	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Vessel Component Saturated Vapor Enthalpy Function
Figure 11-3	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Vessel Component Saturation Temperature
Figure 11-4	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Vessel Component Saturated Liquid Density11-71
Figure 11-5	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Vessel Component Saturated Vapor Density11-72
Figure 11-6	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Vessel Component Saturated Liquid Viscosity11-73
Figure 11-7	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Vessel Component Saturated Vapor Viscosity11-74
Figure 11-8	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Vessel Component Saturated Liquid and Vapor Thermal Conductivity
Figure 11-9	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Vessel Component Saturated Liquid Specific Heat11-76
Figure 11-10	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Vessel Component Saturated Vapor Enthalpy11-77
Figure 11-11	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Vessel Component Saturated Liquid Surface Tension

Figure 11-12	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Vessel Component Superheated Vapor Enthalpy
Figure 11-13	$\underline{W}COBRA/TRAC-TF2 \ Vessel \ Component \ Superheated \ Vapor \ Temperature \11-80$
Figure 11-14	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Vessel Component Superheated Vapor Density
Figure 11-15	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Vessel Component Superheated Vapor Thermal Conductivity
Figure 11-16	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Vessel Component Superheated Vapor Viscosity11-83
Figure 11-17	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 1D Component Saturation Pressure11-84
Figure 11-18	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 1D Component Saturated Vapor Density11-85
Figure 11-19	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 1D Component Saturated Liquid Density
Figure 11-20	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 1D Component Saturated Vapor Enthalpy11-87
Figure 11-21	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 1D Component Saturated Liquid Enthalpy11-88
Figure 11-22	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 1D Component Saturated Vapor Specific Heat11-89
Figure 11-23	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 1D Component Saturated Liquid Specific Heat11-90
Figure 11-24	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 1D Component Saturated Vapor Viscosity11-91
Figure 11-25	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 1D Component Saturated Liquid Viscosity11-92
Figure 11-26	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 1D Component Saturated Vapor Thermal Conductivity
Figure 11-27	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 1D Component Saturated Liquid Thermal Conductivity
Figure 11-28	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 1D Component Surface Tension
Figure 11-29	MATPRO-9 and Modified NFI Thermal Conductivity for fuel density of 95% TD, for fresh fuel11-96
Figure 11-30	Modified NFI Thermal Conductivity for fuel density of 95% TD as a function of Burnup
Figure 11-31	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 UO ₂ Specific Heat Model
Figure 11-32	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Zircaloy-4 Thermal Conductivity Model11-99
Figure 11-33	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Zircaloy-4 Specific Heat Model11-100
Figure 11-34	[] ^{a,c} 11-101
Figure 11-35	[
] ^{a,c} 11-102
Figure 11-36	[] ^{a,c} 11-103

WCAP-16996-NP

Figure 11-37 [

]^{a,c}.....11-104

	VOLUME 2
Figure 12.2-1	Upstream P-T in Small and Large Break LOCAs 12-5
Figure 12.2-2	Upstream Quality in Small and Large Break LOCAs 12-5
Figure 12.4-1a	Upstream P-T in Ardron-Ackerman
Figure 12.4-1b	Upstream Quality in Ardron-Ackerman
Figure 12.4-2a	Upstream P-T in Boivin 12-15
Figure 12.4-2b	Upstream Quality in Boivin
Figure 12.4-3a	Upstream P-T in Fincke-Collins 12-17
Figure 12.4-3b	Upstream Quality in Fincke-Collins 12-17
Figure 12.4-4a	Upstream P-T in Jeandey 12-19
Figure 12.4-4b	Upstream Quality in Jeandey
Figure 12.4-5a	Upstream P-T in Neusen 12-21
Figure 12.4-5b	Upstream Quality in Neusen 12-21
Figure 12.4-6a	Upstream P-T in Reocreux
Figure 12.4-6b	Upstream Quality in Reocruex
Figure 12.4-7a	Upstream P-T in Seynhaeve 12-25
Figure 12.4-7b	Upstream Quality in Seynhaeve
Figure 12.4-8a	Upstream P-T in Sozzi-Sutherland 12-27
Figure 12.4-8b	Upstream Quality in Sozzi-Sutherland 12-27
Figure 12.4-9a	Upstream P-T in Marviken Tests 1 through 27 12-30
Figure 12.4-9b	Upstream Quality in Marviken Tests 1 through 27 12-30
Figure 12.4-10a	Upstream P-T in Amos-Schrock 12-32
Figure 12.4-10b	Upstream Quality in Amos-Schrock 12-32
Figure 12.4-11a	Upstream P-T in TPFL
Figure 12.4-11b	Upstream Quality in TPFL 12-34
Figure 12.4-12a	Stagnation (P,DTsub)in Celata (1988) data
Figure 12.4-12b	Critical Mass Fluxin Celata's data
Figure 12.4-12c	Upstream P-T in Celata
Figure 12.4-12d	Upstream Quality in Celata

xli

Figure 12.4-13a	Upstream Condition in Test Matrix
Figure 12.4-13b	Upstream Condition in Test Matrix
Figure 12-5-1	Pressure Profile along the Break Path 12-43
Figure 12.5-2	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Critical Flows 12-49
Figure 12.5-3a	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Critical Mass Flux with Non-condensable Gas
Figure 12.5-3b	Comparison of Predicted and Measured effect of Non-condensable Gas on Critical Mass Flux
Figure 12.5-4	Prediction Trend in Pressure Variation
Figure 12.5-5a	Prediction Trend in Quality Variation
Figure 12.5-5b	Prediction Trend Quality Variation
Figure 12.5-6a	Prediction Trend in Channel Length Variation in Linear Scale 12-59
Figure 12.5-6b	Prediction Trend in Channel Length Variation in Log Scale 12-60
Figure 12.5-7a	Prediction Trend in Channel Diameter in Linear Scale 12-62
Figure 12.5-7b	Prediction Trend in Channel Diameter in Log Scale 12-63
Figure 12.5-8a	Prediction Trend in Channel L/D Variation – Linear Scale 12-65
Figure 12.5-8b	Prediction Trend in Channel L/D Variation – Log Scale 12-66
Figure 12.5-9	Test 6 Noding Scheme
Figure 12.5-10	Test 6 Prediction of WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 vs. Stand-Alone Model 12-68
Figure 12.5-11a	P(t) BC Comparison
Figure 12.5-11b	T(t) BC Comparison
Figure 12.5-12a	Impact of CD on Predicted Flow 12-71
Figure 12.5-12b	Observed Effective Multiplier
Figure 12.5-12c	Nozzle Upstream Pressure
Figure 12.7.2-1	Vapor Pull Through Mechanisms
Figure 12.7.2-2	Liquid Entrainment Mechanism
Figure 12.7.5-1	Diagram of the Two-Phase Flow Loop Facility
Figure 12.7.5-2	Schematic View of the Two-Phase Flow Loop Test Section 12-83
Figure 12.7.5-3	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Noding Diagram of the Two-Phase Flow Loop 12-84

)

Figure 12.7.5-5 Branchline Quality Versus Mainline Liquid Level for Downward-Vertical Configuration 12-86 Figure 12.7.6-1 Branchline Quality Versus Mainline Liquid Level for Upward-Vertical Configuration 12-87 Figure 12.7.6-2 [$]^{a.c}$ 12-88 Figure 12.7.6-2 [$]^{a.c}$ 12-88 Figure 13.4.2-1 Cross Section of the ORNL-THTF Test Bundle 13-10 Figure 13.4.2-2 Axial View of the ORNL-THTF Test Bundle 13-11 Figure 13.4.2-3 WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Model of the ORNL-THTF. 13-12 Figure 13.4.2-4 [$]^{a.c}$ 13-13 Figure 13.4.2-5 [$]^{a.c}$ 13-14 Figure 13.4.2-6 [$]^{a.c}$ 13-16 Figure 13.4.2-7 [$]^{a.c}$ 13-16 Figure 13.4.2-8 [$]^{a.c}$ 13-16 Figure 13.4.2-8 [$]^{a.c}$ 13-16 Figure 13.4.2-9 [$]^{a.c}$ 13-17
Figure 12.7.6-1 Branchline Quality Versus Mainline Liquid Level for Upward-Vertical Configuration 12-87 Figure 12.7.6-2 [$]^{a.c}$ 12-88 Figure 13.4.2-1 Cross Section of the ORNL-THTF Test Bundle 13-10 Figure 13.4.2-2 Axial View of the ORNL-THTF Test Bundle 13-10 Figure 13.4.2-3 WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Model of the ORNL-THTF 13-12 Figure 13.4.2-4 [$]^{a.c}$ 13-13 Figure 13.4.2-5 [$]^{a.c}$ 13-14 Figure 13.4.2-6 [$]^{a.c}$ 13-15 Figure 13.4.2-7 [$]^{a.c}$ 13-16 Figure 13.4.2-8 [$]^{a.c}$ 13-16 Figure 13.4.2-8 [$]^{a.c}$ 13-16 Figure 13.4.2-8 [$]^{a.c}$ 13-16 Figure 13.4.2-9 [$]^{a.c}$ 13-17
Figure 12.7.6-2 [$]^{a.c.}$ 12-88 Figure 13.4.2-1 Cross Section of the ORNL-THTF Test Bundle 13-10 Figure 13.4.2-2 Axial View of the ORNL-THTF Test Bundle 13-11 Figure 13.4.2-3 WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Model of the ORNL-THTF. 13-12 Figure 13.4.2-4 [$]^{a.c.}$ 13-13 Figure 13.4.2-5 [$]^{a.c.}$ 13-14 Figure 13.4.2-6 [$]^{a.c.}$ 13-15 Figure 13.4.2-7 [$]^{a.c.}$ 13-16 Figure 13.4.2-8 [$]^{a.c.}$ 13-16 Figure 13.4.2-9 [$]^{a.c.}$ 13-17
Figure 13.4.2-1 Cross Section of the ORNL-THTF Test Bundle 13-10 Figure 13.4.2-2 Axial View of the ORNL-THTF Test Bundle 13-11 Figure 13.4.2-3 WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Model of the ORNL-THTF 13-12 Figure 13.4.2-4 [$]^{a,c}$ 13-13 Figure 13.4.2-5 [$]^{a,c}$ 13-14 Figure 13.4.2-6 [$]^{a,c}$ 13-15 Figure 13.4.2-7 [$]^{a,c}$ 13-16 Figure 13.4.2-8 [$]^{a,c}$ 13-16 Figure 13.4.2-9 [$]^{a,c}$ 13-16
Figure 13.4.2-2 Axial View of the ORNL-THTF Test Bundle 13-11 Figure 13.4.2-3 WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Model of the ORNL-THTF 13-12 Figure 13.4.2-4 [$]^{a,c}$ 13-13 Figure 13.4.2-5 [$]^{a,c}$ 13-14 Figure 13.4.2-6 [$]^{a,c}$ 13-15 Figure 13.4.2-7 [$]^{a,c}$ 13-16 Figure 13.4.2-8 [$]^{a,c}$ 13-16 Figure 13.4.2-9 [$]^{a,c}$ 13-17
Figure 13.4.2-3 WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Model of the ORNL-THTF. 13-12 Figure 13.4.2-4 [$]^{a,c}$ 13-13 Figure 13.4.2-5 [$]^{a,c}$ 13-14 Figure 13.4.2-6 [$]^{a,c}$ 13-15 Figure 13.4.2-7 [$]^{a,c}$ 13-16 Figure 13.4.2-8 [$]^{a,c}$ 13-16 Figure 13.4.2-9 [$]^{a,c}$ 13-17
Figure 13.4.2-4 [$]^{a,c}$
Figure 13.4.2-5 [$]^{a,c}$
Figure 13.4.2-6 [$]^{a,c}$
Figure 13.4.2-7 [J ^{a,c}
Figure 13.4.2-8 [] ^{a,c} 13-17 Figure 13.4.2-9 [
Figure 13.4.2-9 [
j ^{***}
Figure 13.4.2-10 [] ^{a,c}
Figure 13.4.2-11 [] ^{a,c}
Figure 13.4.2-12 [] ^{a,c}
Figure 13.4.2-13 [.] ^{a,c}
Figure 13.4.2-14 [] ^{a,c}
Figure 13.4.2-15 [] ^{a,c}



Figure 13.4.2-16	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Profiles for YDRAG Sensitivity Study, ORNL – THTF Test 3.09.10I	5
Figure 13.4.2-17	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Profiles for YDRAG Sensitivity Study, ORNL – THTF Test 3.09.10J	5
Figure 13.4.2-18	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Profiles for YDRAG Sensitivity Study, ORNL – THTF Test 3.09.10K	7
Figure 13.4.2-19	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Profiles for YDRAG Sensitivity Study, ORNL – THTF Test 3.09.10L	3
Figure 13.4.2-20	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Profiles for YDRAG Sensitivity Study, ORNL – THTF Test 3.09.10M	9
Figure 13.4.2-21	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Profiles for YDRAG Sensitivity Study, ORNL – THTF Test 3.09.10N)
Figure 13.4.2-22	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Profiles for YDRAG Sensitivity Study, ORNL – THTF Test 3.09.10AA	1
Figure 13.4.2-23	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Profiles for YDRAG Sensitivity Study, ORNL – THTF Test 3.09.10BB	2
Figure 13.4.2-24	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Profiles for YDRAG Sensitivity Study, ORNL – THTF Test 3.09.10CC	3
Figure 13.4.2-25	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Profiles for YDRAG Sensitivity Study, ORNL – THTF Test 3.09.10DD	1
Figure 13.4.2-26	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Profiles for YDRAG Sensitivity Study, ORNL – THTF Test 3.09.10EE	5
Figure 13.4.2-27	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Profiles for YDRAG Sensitivity Study, ORNL – THTF Test 3.09.10FF	5
Figure 13.4.3-1	Westinghouse ECCS High Pressure Test Facility (G-1 Loop) 13-48	3
Figure 13.4.3-2	G-1 Test Vessel and Test Section)
Figure 13.4.3-3A	G-1 Uncovery Test Heater Rod Bundle Cross-Section)
Figure 13.4.3-3B	G-1 Uncovery Test Heater Rod Bundle Cross-Section	l
Figure 13.4.3-4	G-1 Facility Heater Rod	2
Figure 13.4.3-5	G-1 Axial Power Profile	3
Figure 13.4.3-6	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Model of the G-1 Test Bundle	1
Figure 13.4.3-7	Collapsed Liquid Level and Predicted Cladding Temperatures at the 8- and 10- Foot Elevations, G-1 Test 62	5



Figure 13.4.3-8	Void Fraction and Predicted Cladding Temperature at the 10- Foot Elevation, G-1 Test 62
Figure 13.4.3-9	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Mixture Level Swell for G-1 Bundle Uncovery Tests at Model Nominal YDRAG
Figure 13.4.3-10	Required YDRAG to Recover Data Versus Bundle Power
Figure 13.4.3-11	Required YDRAG to Recover Data Versus Pressure
Figure 13.4.3-12	Required YDRAG to Recover Data Versus Bundle Elevation
Figure 13.4.4-1	G-2 Test Facility Flow Schematic
Figure 13.4.4-2	G-2 Test Vessel and Test Section
Figure 13.4.4-3	G-2 Rod Bundle, Baffle Cross Section, and Bundle Instrumentation 13-73
Figure 13.4.4-4	G-2 Facility Heater Rod
Figure 13.4.4-5	G-2 Facility Axial Power Profile
Figure 13.4.4-6	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Model of the G-2 Test Bundle
Figure 13.4.4-7	Collapsed Liquid Level and Predicted Cladding Temperatures at the 8- and 10- Foot Elevations, G-2 Test 716
Figure 13.4.4-8	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Mixture Level Swell for G-2 Bundle Uncovery Tests at Model Nominal YDRAG
Figure 13.4.4-9	Required YDRAG to Recover Data Versus Peak Linear Heat Rate 13-79
Figure 13.4.4-10	Required YDRAG to Recover Data Versus Pressure
Figure 13.4.4-11	Required YDRAG to Recover Data Versus Bundle Elevation
Figure 13.4.5-1	Cross Section of the JAERI-TPTF Test Bundle
Figure 13.4.5-2	Flow Diagram of the JAERI-TPTF
Figure 13.4.5-3	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Model of the JAERI-TPTF
Figure 13.4.5-4	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Predicted Void Fraction Profile, TPTF Test 330 13-91
Figure 13.4.5-5	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Predicted Clad Temperature Profile, TPTF Test 330
Figure 13.4.5-6	Predicted Versus Measured Critical Heat Flux Elevation
Figure 13.4.5-7	Predicted Over Measured Critical Heat Flux Elevation Versus Pressure
Figure 13.4.5-8	Predicted Over Measured Critical Heat Flux Elevation Versus Linear Heat Rate
Figure 13.4.5-9	Predicted Over Measured Critical Heat Flux Elevation Versus Mass Flux 13-96

•

Figure 14.1-1	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Heat Transfer Regime Map (from Figure 7.2-3) 14-10
Figure 14.2.2.1-1	Inlet Mass Flow Rate Forcing Function Normalized to Initial Condition, Test 3.03.6AR
Figure 14.2.2.1-2	Outlet Pressure Forcing Function Normalized to Initial Condition, Test 3.03.6AR
Figure 14.2.2.1-3	Test Section Bundle Power Forcing Function Normalized to Initial Condition, Test 3.03.6AR
Figure 14.2.2.1-4	Inlet Mass Flow Rate Forcing Function Normalized to Initial Condition, Test 3.08.6C
Figure 14.2.2.1-5	Outlet Pressure Forcing Function Normalized to Initial Condition, Test 3.08.6C
Figure 14.2.2.1-6	Test Section Bundle Power Forcing Function Normalized to Initial Condition, Test 3.08.6C
Figure 14.2.2.2-1	Diagram of G-1 Facility (from Cunningham, et al., 1974) 14-23
Figure 14.2.2.2-2	G-1 Test Vessel (from Cunningham, et al., 1974)
Figure 14.2.2.2-3	G-1 Heater Rod (from Cunningham, et al., 1974)
Figure 14.2.2.2-4	G-1 Heater Rod Axial Power Profile (from Cunningham, et al., 1974) 14-25
Figure 14.2.2.2-5	G-1 Bundle Cross Section and Instrumentation (from Cunningham, et al., 1974)
Figure 14.2.2.3-1	G-2 Test Facility Flow Schematic (from Cunningham, et al., 1975) 14-29
Figure 14.2.2.3-2	G-2 Loop Heater Rod (from Cunningham, et al., 1975)
Figure 14.2.2.3-3	G-2 Loop Heater Rod Axial Power Profile (from Cunningham, et al., 1975)
Figure 14.2.2.3-4	Test Rod Bundle, Cross Section and Instrumentation (from Cunningham, et al., 1975)
Figure 14.2.2.3-5	G-2 Loop Ground Plate (from Cunningham, et al., 1975)14-32
Figure 14.2.2.3-6	Low Pressure UHI Refill Test Sequence of Events (from Hochreiter, et al., 1976)
Figure 14.2.3.1-1	FLECHT-SEASET Rod Bundle Cross Section (from Loftus, et al., 1981) 14-37
Figure 14.2.3.1-2	FLECHT-SEASET Axial Power Shape Profile and Grid Locations
Figure 14.2.3.2-1	FLECHT Rod Bundle Cross Section (from Rosal, et al., 1975) 14-41
Figure 14.2.3.2-2	FLECHT Cosine Axial Power Shape Profile and Grid Locations
Figure 14.2.3.3-1	FLECHT Top-Skewed Power Shape Test Bundle (from Rosal, et al., 1977) 14-45

xlvii

Figure 14.2.3.3-2	FLECHT Top-Skewed Axial Power Shape 14-	46
Figure 14.2.3.4-1	FLECHT Rod Bundle Cross Section (from Cadek et al., 1972) 14-	49
Figure 14.2.3.4-2	FLECHT Heater Rod Schematic Diagram 14-	50
Figure 14.2.3.4-3	FLECHT Axial Power Shape Profile and Grid Locations 14-	51
Figure 14.2.3.6-1	FEBA Test Bundle Cross Section (from Ihle and Rust, 1984) 14-	56
Figure 14.2.3.6-2	FEBA Power Shape and Grid Elevation (from Ihle and Rust, 1984) 14-	57
Figure 15.1-1	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Vessel Component Heat Transfer Regime Map (from Figure 7.2-3)	5-2
Figure 15.2-1	COBRAHT-TF2 Calculation Procedure	5-5
Figure 15.3-1	Predicted Versus Measured Critical Heat Flux Elevation from JAERI-TPTF Tests (from Figure 13.4.5-6)	5-7
Figure 15.4.1-1a	Heat Transfer Coefficient Comparison for ORNL-THTF Uncovered Bundle Tests (from COBRAHT-TF2)15	5-9
Figure 15.4.1-1b	Ratio of Measured to Predicted Heat Transfer Coefficient vs. Vapor Film Reynolds Number for ORNL-THTF Uncovered Bundle Tests (from COBRAHT-TF2)	5-9
Figure 15.4.1-2	Cladding Temperature Profile Comparison for ORNL-THTF Uncovered Bundle Test I	10
Figure 15.4.1-3	Cladding Temperature Profile Comparison for ORNL-THTF Uncovered Bundle Test J	10
Figure 15.4.1-4	Cladding Temperature Profile Comparison for ORNL-THTF Uncovered Bundle Test K15-	11
Figure 15.4.1-5	Cladding Temperature Profile Comparison for ORNL-THTF Uncovered Bundle Test L15-	-11
Figure 15.4.1-6	Cladding Temperature Profile Comparison for ORNL-THTF Uncovered Bundle Test M	12
Figure 15.4.1-7	Cladding Temperature Profile Comparison for ORNL-THTF Uncovered Bundle Test N15-	12
Figure 15.4.1-8	Comparison of Predicted vs. Measured Cladding Temperatures for ORNL-THTF Uncovered Bundle Tests	13
Figure 15.4.1-9	Vapor Temperature Profile Comparison for ORNL-THTF Uncovered Bundle Test I	14
Figure 15.4.1-10	Vapor Temperature Profile Comparison for ORNL-THTF Uncovered Bundle Test J15-	14

Figure 15.4.1-11	Vapor Temperature Profile Comparison for ORNL-THTF Uncovered Bundle Test K
Figure 15.4.1-12	Vapor Temperature Profile Comparison for ORNL-THTF Uncovered Bundle Test L
Figure 15.4.1-13	Vapor Temperature Profile Comparison for ORNL-THTF Uncovered Bundle Test M
Figure 15.4.1-14	Vapor Temperature Profile Comparison for ORNL-THTF Uncovered Bundle Test N
Figure 15.4.1-15	Conduction Node and Cell Vapor Temperature Profile Comparison for ORNL-THTF Uncovered Bundle Test I
Figure 15.4.2-1	Heat Transfer Coefficient Comparison for FLECHT SPV Tests (from COBRAHT-TF2)
Figure 15.4.2-2	Ratio of Predicted to Measured Heat Transfer Coefficient vs. Vapor Film Reynolds Number for FLECHT SPV Tests (from COBRAHT-TF2)
Figure 15.5.1-1	Heat Transfer Coefficient Comparison for all Thermocouples at [] ^{a,c} in ORNL Steady-State Film Boiling Tests (from COBRAHT-TF2) 15-21
Figure 15.5.1-2	Ratio of Measured to Predicted Heat Transfer Coefficient vs. Vapor Film Reynolds Number for all Thermocouples at [] ^{a,c} in ORNL Steady-State Film Boiling Tests (from COBRAHT-TF2)15-21
Figure 15.5.2.1-1	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Model for the ORNL-THTF Simulations
Figure 15.5.2.1-2	ORNL-THTF 3.07.9B Axial Heater Rod Temperature Profile at 20 s of Transient
Figure 15.5.2.1-3	ORNL-THTF 3.03.6AR Axial Heater Rod Temperature Profile at 10 s of Transient
Figure 15.5.2.1-4	ORNL-THTF 3.03.6AR Transient Heater Rod Temperature at 96 in
Figure 15.5.2.1-5	ORNL-THTF 3.03.6AR Transient Heater Rod Temperature at 118 in
Figure 15.5.2.1-6	ORNL-THTF 3.03.6AR Transient Heater Rod Temperature at 143 in
Figure 15.5.2.1-7	ORNL-THTF 3.08.6C Axial Heater Rod Temperature Profile at 21 s of Transient
Figure 15.5.2.1-8	ORNL-THTF 3.08.6C Transient Heater Rod Temperature at 95 in

.

xlix

LIST OF FIGURES (cont.)

Figure 15.5.2.1-9	ORNL-THTF 3.08.6C Transient Heater Rod
	Temperature at 118 in
Figure 15.5.2.1-10	ORNL-THTF 3.08.6C Transient Heater Rod Temperature at 143 in 15-32
Figure 15.5.2.1-11	ORNL-THTF Predicted versus Measured Peak Cladding Temperature 15-33
Figure 15.5.2.2-1	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Model of the G-1 Blowdown Test Simulations 15-37
Figure 15.5.2.2-2	G-1 Blowdown Test 143 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (24-inch Elevation)
Figure 15.5.2.2-3	G-1 Blowdown Test 143 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (48-inch Elevation)
Figure 15.5.2.2-4	G-1 Blowdown Test 143 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (72-inch Elevation)
Figure 15.5.2.2-5	G-1 Blowdown Test 143 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (96-inch Elevation)
Figure 15.5.2.2-6	G-1 Blowdown Test 143 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (120-inch Elevation)
Figure 15.5.2.2-7	G-1 Blowdown Test 143 Axial Cladding Temperature Comparison (Time = 6 Seconds
Figure 15.5.2.2-8	G-1 Blowdown Test 143 Axial Cladding Temperature Comparison (Time = 10 Seconds, PCT Time)
Figure 15.5.2.2-9	G-1 Blowdown Test 143 Axial Cladding Temperature Comparison (Time = 15 Seconds)
Figure 15.5.2.2-10	G-1 Blowdown Test 143 Axial Cladding Temperature Comparison (Time = 20 Seconds)
Figure 15.5.2.2-11	G-1 Blowdown Test 143 Axial Cladding Temperature Comparison (Time = 30 Seconds)
Figure 15.5.2.2-12	G-1 Blowdown Test 148 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (24-inch Elevation)
Figure 15.5.2.2-13	G-1 Blowdown Test 148 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (48-inch Elevation)
Figure 15.5.2.2-14	G-1 Blowdown Test 148 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (72-inch Elevation)
Figure 15.5.2.2-15	G-1 Blowdown Test 148 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (96-inch Elevation)
Figure 15.5.2.2-16	G-1 Blowdown Test 148 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (120-inch Elevation)

WCAP-16996-NP

Figure 15.5.2.2-17	G-1 Blowdown Test 148 Axial Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (Time = 6 Seconds)	15-45
Figure 15.5.2.2-18	G-1 Blowdown Test 148 Axial Cladding Temperature Comparison (Time = 10 Seconds, PCT Time)	15-46
Figure 15.5.2.2-19	G-1 Bolwdown Test 148 Axial Cladding Temperature Comparison (Time = 15 Seconds)	15-46
Figure 15.5.2.2-20	G-1 Blowdown Test 148 Axial Cladding Temperature Comparison (Time = 20 Seconds)	15-47
Figure 15.5.2.2-21	G-1 Blowdown Test 148 Axial Cladding Temperature Comparison (Time = 30 Seconds)	15-47
Figure 15.5.2.2-22	G-1 Blowdown Test 152 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (24-inch Elevation)	15-48
Figure 15.5.2.2-23	G-1 Blowdown Test 152 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (48 inch Elevation)	15-48
Figure 15.5.2.2-24	G-1 Blowdown Test 152 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (72-inch Elevation)	15-49
Figure 15.5.2.2-25	G-1 Blowdown Test 152 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (96-inch Elevation	15-49
Figure 15.5.2.2-26	G-1 Blowdown Test 152 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (120-inch Elevation)	15-50
Figure 15.5.2.2-27	G-1 Blowdown Test 152 Axial Cladding Temperature Comparison (Time = 6 Seconds)	15-50
Figure 15.5.2.2-28	G-1 Blowdown Test 152 Axial Cladding Temperature Comparison (Time = 10 Seconds, PCT Time)	15-51
Figure 15.5.2.2-29	G-1 Blowdown Test 152 Axial Cladding Temperture Comparison (Time = 15 Seconds)	15-51
Figure 15.5.2.2-30	G-1 Blowdown Test 152 Axial Cladding Temperature Comparison (Time = 20 Seconds)	15-52
Figure 15.5.2.2-31	G-1 Blowdown Test 152 Axial Cladding Temperature Comparison (Time = 30 Seconds)	15-52
Figure 15.5.2.2-32	G-1 Blowdown Test 146 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (24-inch Elevation)	15-53
Figure 15.5.2.2-33	G-1 Blowdown Test 146 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (48-inch Elevation)	15-53

l

Figure 15.5.2.2-34	G-1 Blowdown Test 146 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (72-inch Elevation)
Figure 15.5.2.2-35	Blowdown Test 146 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (96-inch Elevation)
Figure 15.5.2.2-36	G-1 Blowdown Test 146 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (120-inch Elevation)
Figure 15.5.2.2-37	G-1 Blowdown Test 146 Axial Cladding Temperature Comparison (Time = 6 Seconds)
Figure 15.5.2.2-38	G-1 Blowdown Test 146 Axial Cladding Temperature Comparison (Time = 10 Seconds, PCT Time)
Figure 15.5.2.2-39	G-1 Blowdown Test 146 Axial Cladding Temperature Comparison (Time = 15 Seconds)
Figure 15.5.2.2-40	G-1 Blowdown Test 146 Axial Cladding Temperature Comparison (Time = 20 Seconds)
Figure 15.5.2.2-41	G-1 Blowdown Test 146 Axial Cladding Temperature Comparison (Time = 30 Seconds)
Figure 15.5.2.2-42	G-1 Blowdown Test 153 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (24-inch Elevation)
Figure 15.5.2.2-43	G-1 Blowdown Test 153 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (48-inch Elevation)
Figure 15.5.2.2-44	G-1 Blowdown Test 153 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (72-inch Elevation)
Figure 15.5.2.2-45	G-1 Blowdown Test 153 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (96-inch Elevation)
Figure 15.5.2.2-46	G-1 Blowdown Test 153 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (120-inch Elevation)
Figure 15.5.2.2-47	G-1 Blowdown Test 153 Axial Cladding Temperature Comparison (Time = 6 Seconds)
Figure 15.5.2.2-48	G-1 Blowdown Test 153 Axial Cladding Temperature Comparison (Time = 10 Seconds, PCT Time)
Figure 15.5.2.2-49	G-1 Blowdown Test 153 Axial Cladding Temperature Comparison (Time = 15 Seconds)
Figure 15.5.2.2-50	G-1 Blowdown Test 153 Axial Cladding Temperature Comparison (Time = 20 Seconds)

Figure 15.5.2.2-51	G-1 Blowdown Test 153 Axial Cladding Temperature Comparison (Time = 30 Seconds)
Figure 15.5.2.2-52	G-1 Blowdown Test 154 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (24-inch Elevation)
Figure 15.5.2.2-53	G-1 Blowdown Test 154 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (48-inch Elevation)
Figure 15.5.2.2-54	G-1 Blowdown Test 154 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (72-inch Elevation)
Figure 15.5.2.2-55	G-1 Blowdown Test 154 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (96-inch Elevation)
Figure 15.5.2.2-56	G-1 Blowdown Test 154 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (120-inch Elevation)
Figure 15.5.2.2-57	G-1 Blowdown Test 154 Axial Cladding Temperature Comparison (Time = 6 Seconds)
Figure 15.5.2.2-58	G-1 Blowdown Test 154 Axial Cladding Temperature Comparison (Time = 10 Seconds, PCT Time)
Figure 15.5.2.2-59	G-1 Blowdown Test 154 Axial Cladding Temperature Comparison (Time = 15 Seconds)
Figure 15.5.2.2-60	G-1 Blowdown Test 154 Axial Cladding Temperature Comparison (Time = 20 Seconds)
Figure 15.5.2.2-61	G-1 Blowdown Test 154 Axial Cladding Temperature Comparison (Time = 30 Seconds)
Figure 15.5.2.2-62	Measured Thermocouple Data from (Cunningham, J. P., 1974) 15-68
Figure 15.5.2.3-1	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Model for the G-2 Refill Test Simulations 15-75
Figure 15.5.2.3-2	G-2 Refill Test 743 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (12.3-inch Elevation)
Figure 15.5.2.3-3	G-2 Refill Test 743 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (28.7-inch Elevation)
Figure 15.5.2.3-4	G-2 Refill Test 743 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (45.1-inch Elevation)
Figure 15.5.2.3-5	G-2 Refill Test 743 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (82.0-inch Elevation)
Figure 15.5.2.3-6	G-2 Refill Test 743 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (118.9-inch Elevation)

WCAP-16996-NP

November 2010 Revision 0

Figure 15.5.2.3-7	G-2 Refill Test 743 Axial Cladding Temperature at 60 s	15-78
Figure 15.5.2.3-8	G-2 Refill Test 750 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (12.3-inch Elevation)	
Figure 15.5.2.3-9	G-2 Refill Test 750 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (28.7-inch Elevation)	15-79
Figure 15.5.2.3-10	G-2 Refill Test 750 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (45.1-inch Elevation)	15-80
Figure 15.5.2.3-11	G-2 Refill Test 750 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (82.0-inch Elevation)	15-80
Figure 15.5.2.3-12	G-2 Refill Test 750 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (118.9-inch Elevation)	15-81
Figure 15.5.2.3-13	G-2 Refill Test 750 Axial Cladding Temperature at 60 s	15-81
Figure 15.5.2.3-14	G-2 Refill Test 760 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (12.3-inch Elevation)	15-82
Figure 15.5.2.3-15	G-2 Refill Test 760 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (28.7-inch Elevation)	15-82
Figure 15.5.2.3-16	G-2 Refill Test 760 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (45.1-inch Elevation)	15-83
Figure 15.5.2.3-17	G-2 Refill Test 760 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (82.0-inch Elevation)	15-83
Figure 15.5.2.3-18	G-2 Refill Test 760 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (118.9-inch Elevation)	15-84
Figure 15.5.2.3-19	G-2 Refill Test 760 Axial Cladding Temperature at 50 s	15-84
Figure 15.5.2.3-20	G-2 Refill Test 761 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (12.3-inch Elevation)	15-85
Figure 15.5.2.3-21	G-2 Refill Test 761 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (28.7-inch Elevation)	15-85
Figure 15.5.2.3-22	G-2 Refill Test 761 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (45.1-inch Elevation)	15-86
Figure 15.5.2.3-23	G-2 Refill Test 761 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (82.0-inch Elevation)	15-86
Figure 15.5.2.3-24	G-2 Refill Test 761 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (118.9-inch Elevation)	

Figure 15.5.2.3-25	G-2 Refill Test 761 Axial Cladding Temperature at 50 s 15-87
Figure 15.5.2.3-26	G-2 Refill Test 762 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (12.3-inch Elevation)
Figure 15.5.2.3-27	G-2 Refill Test 762 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (28.7-inch Elevation)
Figure 15.5.2.3-28	G-2 Refill Test 762 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (45.1-inch Elevation)
Figure 15.5.2.3-29	G-2 Refill Test 762 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (82.0-inch Elevation)
Figure 15.5.2.3-30	G-2 Refill Test 762 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (118.9-inch Elevation)
Figure 15.5.2.3-31	G-2 Refill Test 762 Axial Cladding Temperature at 50 s 15-90
Figure 15.5.2.3-32	G-2 Refill Test 767 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (12.3-inch Elevation)
Figure 15.5.2.3-33	G-2 Refill Test 767 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (28.7-inch Elevation)
Figure 15.5.2.3-34	G-2 Refill Test 767 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (45.1-inch Elevation)
Figure 15.5.2.3-35	G-2 Refill Test 767 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (82.0-inch Elevation)
Figure 15.5.2.3-36	G-2 Refill Test 767 Cladding Temperature Time History Comparison (118.9-inch Elevation)
Figure 15.5.2.3-37	G-2 Refill Test 767 Axial Cladding Temperature at 60 s 15-93
Figure 15.5.2.3-38	Comparison of G-2 Refill Test Predicted vs. Measured Peak Cladding Temperature
Figure 15.6.1-1	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Transverse Noding for FLECHT-SEASET 15-102
Figure 15.6.1-2	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Axial Noding for FLECHT-SEASET 15-103
Figure 15.6.1-3	FLECHT-SEASET Axial Power Shape Profile
Figure 15.6.1-4	FLECHT-SEASET 31805 Rod Temperatures at 24-inch Elevation 15-105
Figure 15.6.1-5	FLECHT-SEASET 31805 Rod Temperatures at 48-inch Elevation 15-105
Figure 15.6.1-6	FLECHT-SEASET 31805 Rod Temperatures at 72-inch Elevation 15-106
Figure 15.6.1-7	FLECHT-SEASET 31805 Rod Temperatures at 78-inch Elevation 15-106
Figure 15.6.1-8	FLECHT-SEASET 31805 Rod Temperatures at 84-inch Elevation 15-107

Figure 15.6.1-9	FLECHT-SEASET 31805 Rod Temperatures at 96-inch Elevation
Figure 15.6.1-10	FLECHT-SEASET 31805 Rod Temperatures at 120-inch Elevation 15-108
Figure 15.6.1-11	Comparison of Predicted and Estimated Quench Front Elevations for FLECHT-SEASET 31805
Figure 15.6.1-12	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Axial Temperature Profile for FLECHT-SEASET 31805 at 100 Seconds
Figure 15.6.1-13	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Axial Temperature Profile for FLECHT-SEASET 31805 at 200 Seconds
Figure 15.6.1-14	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Maximum Cladding Temperatures at all Thermocouple Elevations for FLECHT-SEASET 3180515-110
Figure 15.6.1-15	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Turn-Around Times for FLECHT-SEASET 31805
Figure 15.6.1-16	FLECHT-SEASET 31805 Bundle Lower Half ΔP
Figure 15.6.1-17	FLECHT-SEASET 31805 Bundle Upper Half ΔP 15-111
Figure 15.6.1-18	FLECHT-SEASET 31805 Overall ΔP15-112
Figure 15.6.1-19	FLECHT-SEASET 31805 Vapor Temperatures at 48-inch Elevation15-112
Figure 15.6.1-20	FLECHT-SEASET 31805 Vapor Temperatures near 72-inch Elevation15-113
Figure 15.6.1-21	FLECHT-SEASET 31805 Vapor Temperatures near 90-inch Elevation15-113
Figure 15.6.1-22	FLECHT-SEASET 31805 Vapor Temperatures near 120-inch Elevation15-114
Figure 15.6.1-23	FLECHT-SEASET 31805 Vapor Temperatures near 138-inch Elevation15-114
Figure 15.6.1-24	FLECHT-SEASET 31504 Rod Temperatures at 24-inch Elevation15-115
Figure 15.6.1-25	FLECHT-SEASET 31504 Rod Temperatures at 48-inch Elevation15-115
Figure 15.6.1-26	FLECHT-SEASET 31504 Rod Temperatures at 72-inch Elevation15-116
Figure 15.6.1-27	FLECHT-SEASET 31504 Rod Temperatures at 78-inch Elevation15-116
Figure 15.6.1-28	FLECHT-SEASET 31504 Rod Temperatures at 84-inch Elevation15-117
Figure 15.6.1-29	FLECHT-SEASET 31504 Rod Temperatures at 96-inch Elevation15-117
Figure 15.6.1-30	FLECHT-SEASET 31504 Rod Temperatures at 120-inch Elevation15-118
Figure 15.6.1-31	Comparison of Predicted and Estimated Quench Front Elevations for FLECHT-SEASET 31504
Figure 15.6.1-32	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Axial Temperature Profile for FLECHT-SEASET 31504 at 50 Seconds15-119



Figure 15.6.1-33	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Axial Temperature Profile for FLECHT-SEASET 31504 at 100 Seconds
Figure 15.6.1-34	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Maximum Cladding Temperatures at all Thermocouple Elevations for FLECHT-SEASET 3150415-120
Figure 15.6.1-35	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Turn-Around Times for FLECHT-SEASET 31504
Figure 15.6.1-36	FLECHT-SEASET 31504 Bundle Lower Half ΔP
Figure 15.6.1-37	FLECHT-SEASET 31504 Bundle Upper Half ΔP 15-121
Figure 15.6.1-38	FLECHT-SEASET 31504 Overall ΔP
Figure 15.6.1-39	FLECHT-SEASET 31504 Vapor Temperatures at 48-inch Elevation 15-122
Figure 15.6.1-40	FLECHT-SEASET 31504 Vapor Temperatures near 72-inch Elevation 15-123
Figure 15.6.1-41	FLECHT-SEASET 31504 Vapor Temperatures near 90-inch Elevation 15-123
Figure 15.6.1-42	FLECHT-SEASET 31504 Vapor Temperatures at 120-inch Elevation 15-124
Figure 15.6.1-43	FLECHT-SEASET 31504 Vapor Temperatures at 138-inch Elevation 15-124
Figure 15.6.1-44	FLECHT-SEASET 32013 Rod Temperatures at 24-inch Elevation 15-125
Figure 15.6.1-45	FLECHT-SEASET 32013 Rod Temperatures at 48-inch Elevation 15-125
Figure 15.6.1-46	FLECHT-SEASET 32013 Rod Temperatures at 72-inch Elevation 15-126
Figure 15.6.1-47	FLECHT-SEASET 32013 Rod Temperatures at 78-inch Elevation 15-126
Figure 15.6.1-48	FLECHT-SEASET 32013 Rod Temperatures at 84-inch Elevation 15-127
Figure 15.6.1-49	FLECHT-SEASET 32013 Rod Temperatures at 96-inch Elevation 15-127
Figure 15.6.1-50	FLECHT-SEASET 32013 Rod Temperatures at 120-inch Elevation 15-128
Figure 15.6.1-51	Comparison of Predicted and Estimated Quench Front Elevations for FLECHT-SEASET 32013
Figure 15.6.1-52	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Axial Temperature Profile for FLECHT-SEASET 32013 at 50 Seconds
Figure 15.6.1-53	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Axial Temperature Profile for FLECHT-SEASET 32013 at 100 Seconds
Figure 15.6.1-54	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Maximum Cladding Temperatures at all Thermocouple Elevations for FLECHT-SEASET 32013
Figure 15.6.1-55	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Turn-Around Times for FLECHT-SEASET 32013
Figure 15.6.1-56	FLECHT-SEASET 32013 Bundle Lower Half ΔP

Figure 15.6.1-57	FLECHT-SEASET 32013 Bundle Upper Half ΔP 15-131
Figure 15.6.1-58	FLECHT-SEASET 32013 Overall ΔP
Figure 15.6.1-59	FLECHT-SEASET 32013 Vapor Temperatures at 48-inch Elevation 15-132
Figure 15.6.1-60	FLECHT-SEASET 32013 Vapor Temperatures near 72-inch Elevation 15-133
Figure 15.6.1-61	FLECHT-SEASET 32013 Vapor Temperatures near 90-inch Elevation 15-133
Figure 15.6.1-62	FLECHT-SEASET 32013 Vapor Temperatures at 120-inch Elevation 15-134
Figure 15.6.1-63	FLECHT-SEASET 32013 Vapor Temperatures at 138-inch Elevation 15-134
Figure 15.6.1-64	FLECHT-SEASET 31203 Rod Temperatures at 24-inch Elevation 15-135
Figure 15.6.1-65	FLECHT-SEASET 31203 Rod Temperatures at 48-inch Elevation 15-135
Figure 15.6.1-66	FLECHT-SEASET 31203 Rod Temperatures at 72-inch Elevation 15-136
Figure 15.6.1-67	FLECHT-SEASET 31203 Rod Temperatures at 78-inch Elevation 15-136
Figure 15.6.1-68	FLECHT-SEASET 31203 Rod Temperatures at 84-inch Elevation 15-137
Figure [,] 15.6.1-69	FLECHT-SEASET 31203 Rod Temperatures at 96-inch Elevation 15-137
Figure 15.6.1-70	FLECHT-SEASET 31203 Rod Temperatures at 120-inch Elevation 15-138
Figure 15.6.1-71	Comparison of Predicted and Estimated Quench Front Elevations for FLECHT-SEASET 31203
Figure 15.6.1-72	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Axial Temperature Profile for FLECHT-SEASET 31203 at 50 Seconds
Figure 15.6.1-73	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Axial Temperature Profile for FLECHT-SEASET 31203 at 100 Seconds
Figure 15.6.1-74	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Maximum Cladding Temperatures at all Thermocouple Elevations for FLECHT-SEASET 3120315-140
Figure 15.6.1-75	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Turn-Around Times for FLECHT-SEASET 3120315-140
Figure 15.6.1-76 [•]	FLECHT-SEASET 31203 Bundle Lower Half ΔP 15-141
Figure 15.6.1-77	FLECHT-SEASET 31203 Bundle Upper Half ΔP 15-141
Figure 15.6.1-78	FLECHT-SEASET 31203 Overall ΔP
Figure 15.6.1-79	FLECHT-SEASET 31203 Vapor Temperatures at 48-inch Elevation 15-142
Figure 15.6.1-80	FLECHT-SEASET 31203 Vapor Temperatures near 72-inch Elevation
Figure 15.6.1-81	FLECHT-SEASET 31203 Vapor Temperatures near 90-inch Elevation
Figure 15.6.1-82	FLECHT-SEASET 31203 Vapor Temperatures at 120-inch Elevation 15-144

Figure 15.6.1-83	FLECHT-SEASET 31203 Vapor Temperatures at 138-inch Elevation
Figure 15.6.1-84	FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Rod Temperatures at 24-inch Elevation 15-145
Figure 15.6.1-85	FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Rod Temperatures at 48-inch Elevation 15-145
Figure 15.6.1-86	FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Rod Temperatures at 72-inch Elevation 15-146
Figure 15.6.1-87	FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Rod Temperatures at 78-inch Elevation 15-146
Figure 15.6.1-88	FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Rod Temperatures at 84-inch Elevation 15-147
Figure 15.6.1-89	FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Rod Temperatures at 96-inch Elevation 15-147
Figure 15.6.1-90	FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Rod Temperatures at 120-inch Elevation 15-148
Figure 15.6.1-91	Comparison of Predicted and Estimated Quench Front Elevations for FLECHT-SEASET 31701
Figure 15.6.1-92	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Axial Temperature Profile for FLECHT-SEASET 31701 at 10 Seconds
Figure 15.6.1-93	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Axial Temperature Profile for FLECHT-SEASET 31701 at 30 Seconds
Figure 15.6.1-94	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Maximum Cladding Temperatures at all Thermocouple Elevations for FLECHT-SEASET 31701
Figure 15.6.1-95	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Turn-Around Times for FLECHT-SEASET 31701
Figure 15.6.1-96	
	FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Bundle Lower Half ΔP
Figure 15.6.1-97	FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Bundle Lower Half ΔP 15-151FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Bundle Upper Half ΔP 15-151
Figure 15.6.1-97 Figure 15.6.1-98	FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Bundle Lower Half ΔP 15-151FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Bundle Upper Half ΔP 15-151FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Overall ΔP 15-152
Figure 15.6.1-97 Figure 15.6.1-98 Figure 15.6.1-99	FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Bundle Lower Half ΔP 15-151FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Bundle Upper Half ΔP 15-151FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Overall ΔP 15-152FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Vapor Temperatures at 48-inch Elevation15-152
Figure 15.6.1-97 Figure 15.6.1-98 Figure 15.6.1-99 Figure 15.6.1-100	FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Bundle Lower Half ΔP 15-151FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Bundle Upper Half ΔP 15-151FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Overall ΔP 15-152FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Vapor Temperatures at 48-inch Elevation15-152FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Vapor Temperatures near 72-inch Elevation15-153
Figure 15.6.1-97 Figure 15.6.1-98 Figure 15.6.1-99 Figure 15.6.1-100 Figure 15.6.1-101	FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Bundle Lower Half ΔP 15-151FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Bundle Upper Half ΔP 15-151FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Overall ΔP 15-152FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Vapor Temperatures at 48-inch Elevation15-152FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Vapor Temperatures near 72-inch Elevation15-153FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Vapor Temperatures near 90-inch Elevation15-153
Figure 15.6.1-97 Figure 15.6.1-98 Figure 15.6.1-99 Figure 15.6.1-100 Figure 15.6.1-101 Figure 15.6.1-102	FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Bundle Lower Half ΔP15-151FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Bundle Upper Half ΔP15-151FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Overall ΔP15-152FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Vapor Temperatures at 48-inch Elevation15-152FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Vapor Temperatures near 72-inch Elevation15-153FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Vapor Temperatures near 90-inch Elevation15-153FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Vapor Temperatures at 120-inch Elevation15-154
Figure 15.6.1-97 Figure 15.6.1-98 Figure 15.6.1-99 Figure 15.6.1-100 Figure 15.6.1-101 Figure 15.6.1-102 Figure 15.6.1-103	FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Bundle Lower Half ΔP 15-151FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Bundle Upper Half ΔP 15-151FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Overall ΔP 15-152FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Vapor Temperatures at 48-inch Elevation15-152FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Vapor Temperatures near 72-inch Elevation15-153FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Vapor Temperatures near 90-inch Elevation15-153FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Vapor Temperatures at 120-inch Elevation15-154FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Vapor Temperatures at 138-inch Elevation15-154
Figure 15.6.1-97 Figure 15.6.1-98 Figure 15.6.1-99 Figure 15.6.1-100 Figure 15.6.1-101 Figure 15.6.1-102 Figure 15.6.1-103 Figure 15.6.1-104	FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Bundle Lower Half ΔP15-151FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Bundle Upper Half ΔP15-151FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Overall ΔP15-152FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Vapor Temperatures at 48-inch Elevation15-152FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Vapor Temperatures near 72-inch Elevation15-153FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Vapor Temperatures near 90-inch Elevation15-153FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Vapor Temperatures at 120-inch Elevation15-154FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Vapor Temperatures at 138-inch Elevation15-154Comparison of Predicted and Measured Maximum Temperatures for15-155
Figure 15.6.1-97 Figure 15.6.1-98 Figure 15.6.1-99 Figure 15.6.1-100 Figure 15.6.1-101 Figure 15.6.1-102 Figure 15.6.1-103 Figure 15.6.1-104	FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Bundle Lower Half ΔP15-151FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Bundle Upper Half ΔP15-151FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Overall ΔP15-152FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Vapor Temperatures at 48-inch Elevation15-152FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Vapor Temperatures near 72-inch Elevation15-153FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Vapor Temperatures near 90-inch Elevation15-154FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Vapor Temperatures at 120-inch Elevation15-154FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Vapor Temperatures at 138-inch Elevation15-154Comparison of Predicted and Measured Maximum Temperatures for15-155WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Transverse Noding for FLECHT-LFR15-161
Figure 15.6.1-97 Figure 15.6.1-98 Figure 15.6.1-99 Figure 15.6.1-100 Figure 15.6.1-101 Figure 15.6.1-103 Figure 15.6.1-104 Figure 15.6.2-1 Figure 15.6.2-2	FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Bundle Lower Half ΔP15-151FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Bundle Upper Half ΔP15-151FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Overall ΔP15-152FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Vapor Temperatures at 48-inch Elevation15-152FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Vapor Temperatures near 72-inch Elevation15-153FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Vapor Temperatures near 90-inch Elevation15-153FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Vapor Temperatures at 120-inch Elevation15-154FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Vapor Temperatures at 138-inch Elevation15-154FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Vapor Temperatures at 138-inch Elevation15-154FLECHT-SEASET 31701 Vapor Temperatures at 138-inch Elevation15-154Comparison of Predicted and Measured Maximum Temperatures for FLECHT-SEASET Simulations15-155WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Transverse Noding for FLECHT-LFR15-161WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Axial Noding for FLECHT-LFR15-162

.

Figure 15.6.2-4	FLECHT 05029 Rod Temperatures at 24-inch Elevation 15-164
Figure 15.6.2-5	FLECHT 05029 Rod Temperatures at 48-inch Elevation 15-164
Figure 15.6.2-6	FLECHT 05029 Rod Temperatures at 72-inch Elevation 15-165
Figure 15.6.2-7	FLECHT 05029 Rod Temperatures at 78-inch Elevation 15-165
Figure 15.6.2-8	FLECHT 05029 Rod Temperatures at 84-inch Elevation 15-166
Figure 15.6.2-9	FLECHT 05029 Rod Temperatures at 96-inch Elevation 15-166
Figure 15.6.2-10	FLECHT 05029 Rod Temperatures at 120-inch Elevation 15-167
Figure 15.6.2-11	Comparison of Predicted and Estimated Quench Front Elevations for FLECHT 0502915-167
Figure 15.6.2-12	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Axial Temperature Profile for FLECHT 05029 at 50 Seconds
Figure 15.6.2-13	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Axial Temperature Profile for FLECHT 05029 at 100 Seconds
Figure 15.6.2-14	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Maximum Cladding Temperatures at all Code Uncertainty Elevations for FLECHT 05029
Figure 15.6.2-15	FLECHT 05029 Bundle Lower Half ΔP 15-170
Figure 15.6.2-16	FLECHT 05029 Bundle Upper Half ΔP 15-170
Figure 15.6.2-17	FLECHT 05029 Overall ΔP
Figure 15.6.2-18	FLECHT 05029 Vapor Temperatures at 84-inch Elevation 15-171
Figure 15.6.2-19	FLECHT 05029 Vapor Temperatures near 120-inch Elevation 15-172
Figure 15.6.2-20	FLECHT 05029 Vapor Temperatures near Bundle Exit 15-172
Figure 15.6.2-21	FLECHT 05132 Rod Temperatures at 24-inch Elevation 15-173
Figure 15.6.2-22	FLECHT 05132 Rod Temperatures at 48-inch Elevation 15-173
Figure 15.6.2-23	FLECHT 05132 Rod Temperatures at 72-inch Elevation 15-174
Figure 15.6.2-24	FLECHT 05132 Rod Temperatures at 78-inch Elevation 15-174
Figure 15.6.2-25	FLECHT 05132 Rod Temperatures at 84-inch Elevation 15-175
Figure 15.6.2-26	FLECHT 05132 Rod Temperatures at 96-inch Elevation 15-175
Figure 15.6.2-27	FLECHT 05132 Rod Temperatures at 120-inch Elevation 15-176
Figure 15.6.2-28	Comparison of Predicted and Estimated Quench Front Elevations for FLECHT 05132

Figure 15.6.2-29	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Axial Temperature Profile for FLECHT 05132 at 50 Seconds	15-177
Figure 15.6.2-30	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Axial Temperature Profile for FLECHT 05132 at 100 Seconds	15-177
Figure 15.6.2-31	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Maximum Cladding Temperatures at all Code Uncertainty Elevations for FLECHT 05132	15-178
Figure 15.6.2-32	FLECHT 05132 Bundle Lower Half ΔP	15-179
Figure 15.6.2-33	FLECHT 05132 Bundle Upper Half ΔP	15-179
Figure 15.6.2-34	FLECHT 05132 Overall ΔP	15-180
Figure 15.6.2-35	FLECHT 05132 Vapor Temperatures at 84-inch Elevation	15-180
Figure 15.6.2-36	FLECHT 05132 Vapor Temperatures near 120-inch Elevation	15-181
Figure 15.6.2-37	FLECHT 05132 Vapor Temperatures near Bundle Exit	15-181
Figure 15.6.2-38	FLECHT 04641 Rod Temperatures at 24-inch Elevation	15-182
Figure 15.6.2-39	FLECHT 04641 Rod Temperatures at 48-inch Elevation	15-182
Figure 15.6.2-40	FLECHT 04641 Rod Temperatures at 72-inch Elevation	15-183
Figure 15.6.2-41	FLECHT 04641 Rod Temperatures at 78-inch Elevation	15-183
Figure 15.6.2-42	FLECHT 04641 Rod Temperatures at 84-inch Elevation	15-184
Figure 15.6.2-43	FLECHT 04641 Rod Temperatures at 96-inch Elevation	15-184
Figure 15.6.2-44	FLECHT 04641 Rod Temperatures at 120-inch Elevation	15-185
Figure 15.6.2-45	Comparison of Predicted and Estimated Quench Front Elevations for FLECHT 04641	15-185
Figure 15.6.2-46	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Axial Temperature Profile for FLECHT 04641 at 50 Seconds	15-186
Figure 15.6.2-47	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Axial Temperature Profile for FLECHT 04641 at 100 Seconds	15-186
Figure 15.6.2-48	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Maximum Cladding Temperatures at all Code Uncertainty Elevations for FLECHT 04641	15-187
Figure 15.6.2-49	FLECHT 04641 Bundle Lower Half ΔP	15-188
Figure 15.6.2-50	FLECHT 04641 Bundle Upper Half ΔP	15-188
Figure 15.6.2-51	FLECHT 04641 Overall ΔP	15-189
Figure 15.6.2-52	FLECHT 04641 Vapor Temperatures at 84-inch Elevation	15-189
Figure 15.6.2-53	FLECHT 04641 Vapor Temperatures near 120-inch Elevation	15-190

WCAP-16996-NP

Figure 15.6.2-54	FLECHT 04641 Vapor Temperatures near Bundle Exit 15-190
Figure 15.6.2-55	FLECHT 0791 Cladding Temperature at 24 inches 15-191
Figure 15.6.2-56	FLECHT 0791 Cladding Temperature at 48 inches 15-191
Figure 15.6.2-57	FLECHT 0791 Cladding Temperature at 72 inches 15-192
Figure 15.6.2-58	FLECHT 0791 Cladding Temperature at 96 inches 15-192
Figure 15.6.2-59	FLECHT 0791 Cladding Temperature at 120 inches 15-193
Figure 15.6.2-60	FLECHT 0791 Quench Front Progression
Figure 15.6.2-61	Maximum Cladding Temperature Comparison
Figure 15.6.2-62	FLECHT 0791 Differential Pressure 0-2 ft 15-194
Figure 15.6.2-63	FLECHT 0791 Differential Pressure 0-4 ft 15-195
Figure 15.6.2-64	FLECHT 0791 Differential Pressure 0-6 ft 15-195
Figure 15.6.2-65	FLECHT 0791 Differential Pressure 0-8 ft 15-196
Figure 15.6.2-66	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Clad Temperatures for FLECHT Low Flooding Rate Simulations
Figure 15.6.3-1	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Transverse Noding for FLECHT Top-Skewed Test Bundle
Figure 15.6.3-2	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Axial Noding for FLECHT Top-Skewed Test Bundle
Figure 15.6.3-3	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Axial Power Shape for FLECHT Top-Skewed Test Bundle
Figure 15.6.3-4	FLECHT 15305 Rod Temperatures at 24-inch Elevation
Figure 15.6.3-5	FLECHT 15305 Rod Temperatures at 48-inch Elevation
Figure 15.6.3-6	FLECHT 15305 Rod Temperatures at 72-inch Elevation
Figure 15.6.3-7	FLECHT 15305 Rod Temperatures at 96-inch Elevation
Figure 15.6.3-8	FLECHT 15305 Rod Temperatures at 120-inch Elevation
Figure 15.6.3-9	FLECHT 15305 Rod Temperatures at 126-inch Elevation
Figure 15.6.3-10	FLECHT 15305 Rod Temperatures at 132-inch Elevation
Figure 15.6.3-11	Comparison of Predicted and Estimated Quench Front Elevations for FLECHT 15305
Figure 15.6.3-12	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Axial Temperature Profile for FLECHT 15305 at 100 Seconds

Figure 15.6.3-13	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Axial Temperature Profile for FLECHT 15305 at 300 Seconds	15-210
Figure 15.6.3-14	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Maximum Cladding Temperatures at all Code Uncertainty Elevations for FLECHT 15305	15-211
Figure 15.6.3-15	FLECHT 15305 Bundle Lower Half ΔP	15-212
Figure 15.6.3-16	FLECHT 15305 Bundle Upper Half ΔP	15-212
Figure 15.6.3-17	FLECHT 15305 Overall ΔP	15-213
Figure 15.6.3-18	FLECHT 15305 Vapor Temperatures at 84-inch Elevation	15-213
Figure 15.6.3-19	FLECHT 15305 Vapor Temperatures at 120-inch Elevation	15-214
Figure 15.6.3-20	FLECHT 15305 Vapor Temperatures at 132-inch Elevation	15-214
Figure 15.6.3-21	FLECHT 13812 Rod Temperatures at 24-inch Elevation	15-215
Figure 15.6.3-22	FLECHT 13812 Rod Temperatures at 48-inch Elevation	15-215
Figure 15.6.3-23	FLECHT 13812 Rod Temperatures at 72-inch Elevation	15-216
Figure 15.6.3-24	FLECHT 13812 Rod Temperatures at 96-inch Elevation	15-216
Figure 15.6.3-25	FLECHT 13812 Rod Temperatures at 120-inch Elevation	15-217
Figure 15.6.3-26	FLECHT 13812 Rod Temperatures at 126-inch Elevation	15-217
Figure 15.6.3-27	FLECHT 13812 Rod Temperatures at 132-inch Elevation	15-218
Figure 15.6.3-28	Comparison of Predicted and Estimated Quench Front Elevations for FLECHT 13812	15-218
Figure 15.6.3-29	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Axial Temperature Profile for FLECHT 13812 at 100 Seconds	15-219
Figure 15.6.3-30	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Axial Temperature Profile for FLECHT 13812 at 300 Seconds	15-219
Figure 15.6.3-31	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Maximum Cladding Temperatures at all Code Uncertainty Elevations for FLECHT 13812	15-220
Figure 15.6.3-32	FLECHT 13812 Bundle Lower Half ΔP	15-221
Figure 15.6.3-33	FLECHT 13812 Bundle Upper Half ΔP	15-221
Figure 15.6.3-34	FLECHT 13812 Overall ΔP	15-222
Figure 15.6.3-35	FLECHT 13812 Vapor Temperatures at 84-inch Elevation	15-222
Figure 15.6.3-36	FLECHT 13812 Vapor Temperatures near 120-inch Elevation	5-223
Figure 15.6.3-37	FLECHT 13812 Vapor Temperatures at 132-inch Elevation	15-223

WCAP-16996-NP

<

1

Figure 15.6.3-38	FLECHT 15713 Rod Temperatures at 24-inch Elevation	15-224
Figure 15.6.3-39	FLECHT 15713 Rod Temperatures at 48-inch Elevation	15-224
Figure 15.6.3-40	FLECHT 15713 Rod Temperatures at 72-inch Elevation	15-225
Figure 15.6.3-41	FLECHT 15713 Rod Temperatures at 96-inch Elevation	15-225
Figure 15.6.3-42	FLECHT 15713 Rod Temperatures at 120-inch Elevation	15-226
Figure 15.6.3-43	FLECHT 15713 Rod Temperatures at 126-inch Elevation	15-226
Figure 15.6.3-44	FLECHT 15713 Rod Temperatures at 132-inch Elevation	15-227
Figure 15.6.3-45	Comparison of Predicted and Estimated Quench Front Elevations for FLECHT 15713	15-227
Figure 15.6.3-46	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Axial Temperature Profile for FLECHT 15713 at 100 Seconds	15-228
Figure 15.6.3-47	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Axial Temperature Profile for FLECHT 15713 at 300 Seconds	15-228
Figure 15.6.3-48	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Maximum Cladding Temperatures at all Code Uncertainty Elevations for FLECHT 15713	15-229
Figure 15.6.3-49	FLECHT 15713 Bundle Lower Half ΔP	15-230
Figure 15.6.3-50	FLECHT 15713 Bundle Upper Half ΔP	15-230
Figure 15.6.3-51	FLECHT 15713 Overall ΔP	15-231
Figure 15.6.3-52	FLECHT: 15713 Vapor Temperatures at 84-inch Elevation	15-231
Figure 15.6.3-53	FLECHT 15713 Vapor Temperatures near 120-inch Elevation	15-232
Figure 15.6.3-54	FLECHT 15713 Vapor Temperatures at 132-inch Elevation	15-232
Figure 15.6.3-55	FLECHT 13914 Rod Temperatures at 24-inch Elevation	15-233
Figure 15.6.3-56	FLECHT 13914 Rod Temperatures at 48-inch Elevation	15-233
Figure 15.6.3-57	FLECHT 13914 Rod Temperatures at 72-inch Elevation	15-234
Figure 15.6.3-58	FLECHT 13914 Rod Temperatures at 96-inch Elevation	15-234
Figure 15.6.3-59	FLECHT 13914 Rod Temperatures at 120-inch Elevation	15-235
Figure 15.6.3-60	FLECHT 13914 Rod Temperatures at 126-inch Elevation	15-235
Figure 15.6.3-61	FLECHT 13914 Rod Temperatures at 132-inch Elevation	15-236
Figure 15.6.3-62	Comparison of Predicted and Estimated Quench Front Elevations for FLECHT 13914	15-236



Figure 15.6.3-63	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Axial Temperature Profile for FLECHT 13914 at 100 Seconds	37
Figure 15.6.3-64	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Axial Temperature Profile for FLECHT 13914 at 300 Seconds	37
Figure 15.6.3-65	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Maximum Cladding Temperatures at all Code Uncertainty Elevations for FLECHT 13914	38
Figure 15.6.3-66	FLECHT 13914 Bundle Lower Half ΔP 15-2	39
Figure 15.6.3-67	FLECHT 13914 Bundle Upper Half ΔP 15-2	39 -
Figure 15.6.3-68	FLECHT 13914 Overall ΔP	40
Figure 15.6.3-69	FLECHT 13914 Vapor Temperatures at 84-inch Elevation 15-2	40
Figure 15.6.3-70	FLECHT 13914 Vapor Temperatures at 120-inch Elevation	41
Figure 15.6.3-71	FLECHT 13914 Vapor Temperatures at 132-inch Elevation	41
Figure 15.6.3-72	FLECHT 13609 Rod Temperatures at 24-inch Elevation	42
Figure 15.6.3-73	FLECHT 13609 Rod Temperatures at 48-inch Elevation	42
Figure 15.6.3-74	FLECHT 13609 Rod Temperatures at 72-inch Elevation	43
Figure 15.6.3-75	FLECHT 13609 Rod Temperatures at 96-inch Elevation	43
Figure 15.6.3-76	FLECHT 13609 Rod Temperatures at 120-inch Elevation	44
Figure 15.6.3-77	FLECHT 13609 Rod Temperatures at 126-inch Elevation	44
Figure 15.6.3-78	FLECHT 13609 Rod Temperatures at 132-inch Elevation	45
Figure 15.6.3-79	Comparison of Predicted and Estimated Quench Front Elevations for FLECHT 1360915-2	45
Figure 15.6.3-80	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Axial Temperature Profile for FLECHT 13609 at 100 Seconds	46
Figure 15.6.3-81	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Axial Temperature Profile for FLECHT 13609 at 300 Seconds	46
Figure 15.6.3-82	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Maximum Cladding Temperatures at all Code Uncertainty Elevations for FLECHT 13609	47
Figure 15.6.3-83	FLECHT 13609 Bundle Lower Half ΔP	48
Figure 15.6.3-84	FLECHT 13609 Bundle Upper Half ΔP	48
Figure 15.6.3-85	FLECHT 13609 Overall ΔP	49
Figure 15.6.3-86	FLECHT 13609 Vapor Temperatures at 84-inch Elevation	49
Figure 15.6.3-87	FLECHT 13609 Vapor Temperatures at 120-inch Elevation	50



Figure 15.6.3-88	FLECHT 13609 Vapor Temperatures at 132-inch Elevation 15-250
Figure 15.6.3-89	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Maximum Clad Temperatures for FLECHT Top-Skewed Power Test Simulations
Figure 15.6.4-1	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Axial Noding for G-2 Reflood Simulations 15-256
Figure 15.6.4-2	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Transverse Noding for G-2 Reflood Simulations 15-257
Figure 15.6.4-3	G-2 Bundle Cross Section
Figure 15.6.4-4	G-2 Reflood Test 550 Rod Temperatures at 29-inch Elevation 15-259
Figure 15.6.4-5	G-2 Reflood Test 550 Rod Temperatures at 45-inch Elevation 15-259
Figure 15.6.4-6	G-2 Reflood Test 550 Rod Temperatures at 70-inch Elevation 15-260
Figure 15.6.4-7	G-2 Reflood Test 550 Rod Temperatures at 82-inch Elevation 15-260
Figure 15.6.4-8	G-2 Reflood Test 550 Rod Temperatures at 94-inch Elevation 15-261
Figure 15.6.4-9	G-2 Reflood Test 550 Rod Temperatures at 111-inch Elevation 15-261
Figure 15.6.4-10	G-2 Reflood Test 550 Rod Temperatures at 135-inch Elevation 15-262
Figure 15.6.4-11	Axial Temperature Profile for G-2 Reflood Test 550 at 57 Seconds 15-262
Figure 15.6.4-12	Axial Temperature Profile for G-2 Reflood Test 550 at 87 Seconds 15-263
Figure 15.6.4-13	Axial Temperature Profile for G-2 Reflood Test 550 at 137 Seconds 15-263
Figure 15.6.4-14	G-2 Reflood Test 550 Bundle Lower Half ΔP 15-264
Figure 15.6.4-15	G-2 Reflood Test 550 Bundle Upper Half ΔP 15-264
Figure 15.6.4-16	G-2 Reflood Test 550 Overall ΔP 15-265
Figure 15.6.4-17	G-2 Reflood Test 550 Vapor Temperatures near 109-inch Elevation 15-265
Figure 15.6.4-18	G-2 Reflood Test 550 Vapor Temperatures at 137-inch Elevation 15-266
Figure 15.6.4-19	Maximum Cladding Temperatures for G-2 Reflood Test 550 15-266
Figure 15.6.4-20	G-2 Reflood Test 562 Rod Temperatures at 29-inch Elevation 15-267
Figure 15.6.4-21	G-2 Reflood Test 562 Rod Temperatures at 45-inch Elevation 15-267
Figure 15.6.4-22	G-2 Reflood Test 562 Rod Temperatures at 70-inch Elevation 15-268
Figure 15.6.4-23	G-2 Reflood Test 562 Rod Temperatures at 82-inch Elevation 15-268
Figure 15.6.4-24	G-2 Reflood Test 562 Rod Temperatures at 94-inch Elevation 15-269
Figure 15.6.4-25	G-2 Reflood Test 562 Rod Temperatures at 111-inch Elevation 15-269
Figure 15.6.4-26	G-2 Reflood Test 562 Rod Temperatures at 135-inch Elevation 15-270
Figure 15.6.4-27	Axial Temperature Profile for G-2 Reflood Test 562 at 34 Seconds 15-270

WCAP-16996-NP

)

lxv

Figure 15.6.4-28	Axial Temperature Profile for G-2 Reflood Test 562 at 64 Seconds 15-271
Figure 15.6.4-29	Axial Temperature Profile for G-2 Reflood Test 562 at 114 Seconds 15-271
Figure 15.6.4-30	G-2 Reflood Test 562 Bundle Lower Half ΔP
Figure 15.6.4-31	G-2 Reflood Test 562 Bundle Upper Half ΔP 15-272
Figure 15.6.4-32	G-2 Reflood Test 562 Overall ΔP
Figure 15.6.4-33	G-2 Reflood Test 562 Vapor Temperatures near 109-inch Elevation 15-273
Figure 15.6.4-34	G-2 Reflood Test 562 Vapor Temperatures at 137-inch Elevation 15-274
Figure 15.6.4-35	Maximum Cladding Temperatures for G-2 Reflood Test 562 15-274
Figure 15.6.4-36	G-2 Reflood Test 568 Rod Temperatures at 29-inch Elevation 15-275
Figure 15.6.4-37	G-2 Reflood Test 568 Rod Temperatures at 45-inch Elevation 15-275
Figure 15.6.4-38	G-2 Reflood Test 568 Rod Temperatures at 70-inch Elevation 15-276
Figure 15.6.4-39	G-2 Reflood Test 568 Rod Temperatures at 82-inch Elevation 15-276
Figure 15.6.4-40	G-2 Reflood Test 568 Rod Temperatures at 94-inch Elevation 15-277
Figure 15.6.4-41	G-2 Reflood Test 568 Rod Temperatures at 111-inch Elevation
Figure 15.6.4-42	G-2 Reflood Test 568 Rod Temperatures at 135-inch Elevation 15-278
Figure 15.6.4-43	Axial Temperature Profile for G-2 Reflood Test 568 at 49 Seconds 15-278
Figure 15.6.4-44	Axial Temperature Profile for G-2 Reflood Test 568 at 79 Seconds 15-279
Figure 15.6.4-45	Axial Temperature Profile for G-2 Reflood Test 568 at 129 Seconds 15-279
Figure 15.6.4-46	G-2 Reflood Test 568 Bundle Lower Half ΔP 15-280
Figure 15.6.4-47	G-2 Reflood Test 568 Bundle Upper Half ΔP 15-280
Figure 15.6.4-48	G-2 Reflood Test 568 Overall ΔP15-281
Figure 15.6.4-49	G-2 Reflood Test 568 Vapor Temperatures near 109-inch Elevation 15-281
Figure 15.6.4-50	G-2 Reflood Test 568 Vapor Temperatures at 137-inch Elevation 15-282
Figure 15.6.4-51	Maximum Cladding Temperatures for G-2 Reflood Test 568 15-282
Figure 15.6.4-52	Predicted and Measured Maximum Cladding Temperatures for G-2 Reflood Test Simulations
Figure 15.6.5-1	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Transverse Noding for FEBA 15-287
Figure 15.6.5-2	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Axial Noding for FEBA
Figure 15.6.5-3	Rod Temperatures for FEBA Test 223 at 2770 mm Reference Elevation 15-289
Figure 15.6.5-4	Rod Temperatures for FEBA Test 223 at 2225 mm Reference Elevation 15-289

WCAP-16996-NP

Figure 15.6.5-5	Rod Temperatures for FEBA Test 223 at 2125 mm Reference Elevation 15-290
Figure 15.6.5-6	Rod Temperatures for FEBA Test 223 at 2025 mm Reference Elevation 15-290
Figure 15.6.5-7	Rod Temperatures for FEBA Test 223 at 1925 mm Reference Elevation 15-291
Figure 15.6.5-8	Rod Temperatures for FEBA Test 223 at 1625 mm Reference Elevation 15-291
Figure 15.6.5-9	Rod Temperatures for FEBA Test 223 at 1135 mm Reference Elevation 15-292
Figure 15.6.5-10	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Axial Temperature Profiles for FEBA Test 223 at 75 Seconds
Figure 15.6.5-11	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Axial Temperature Profiles for FEBA Test 223 at 150 Seconds
Figure 15.6.5-12	Rod Temperatures for FEBA Test 234 at 2770 mm Reference Elevation 15-294
Figure 15.6.5-13	Rod Temperatures for FEBA Test 234 at 2225 mm Reference Elevation 15-294
Figure 15.6.5-14	Rod Temperatures for FEBA Test 234 at 2125 mm Reference Elevation 15-295
Figure 15.6.5-15	Rod Temperatures for FEBA Test 234 at 2025 mm Reference Elevation 15-295
Figure 15.6.5-16	Rod Temperatures for FEBA Test 234 at 1925 mm Reference Elevation 15-296
Figure 15.6.5-17	Rod Temperatures for FEBA Test 234 at 1625 mm Reference Elevation 15-296
Figure 15.6.5-18	Rod Temperatures for FEBA Test 234 at 1135 mm Reference Elevation 15-297
Figure 15.6.5-19	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Axial Temperature Profiles for FEBA Test 234 at 75 Seconds
Figure 15.6.5-20	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Axial Temperature Profiles for FEBA Test 234 at 150 Seconds
Figure 15.6.5-21	Rod Temperatures for FEBA Test 216 at 2770 mm Reference Elevation 15-299
Figure 15.6.5-22	Rod Temperatures for FEBA Test 216 at 2225 mm Reference Elevation 15-299
Figure 15.6.5-23	Rod Temperatures for FEBA Test 216 at 2125 mm Reference Elevation 15-300
Figure 15.6.5-24	Rod Temperatures for FEBA Test 216 at 2025 mm Reference Elevation 15-300
Figure 15.6.5-25	Rod Temperatures for FEBA Test 216 at 1925 mm Reference Elevation 15-301
Figure 15.6.5-26	Rod Temperatures for FEBA Test 216 at 1625 mm Reference Elevation 15-301
Figure 15.6.5-27	Rod Temperatures for FEBA Test 216 at 1135 mm Reference Elevation 15-302
Figure 15.6.5-28	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Axial Temperature Profiles for FEBA Test 216 at 75 Seconds
Figure 15.6.5-29	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Axial Temperature Profiles for FEBA Test 216 at 150 Seconds

Figure 15.6.5-30	Rod Temperatures for FEBA Test 229 at 2770 mm Reference Elevation 15-304
Figure 15.6.5-31	Rod Temperatures for FEBA Test 229 at 2225 mm Reference Elevation 15-304
Figure 15.6.5-32	Rod Temperatures for FEBA Test 229 at 2125 mm Reference Elevation 15-305
Figure 15.6.5-33	Rod Temperatures for FEBA Test 229 at 2025 mm Reference Elevation 15-305
Figure 15.6.5-34	Rod Temperatures for FEBA Test 229 at 1925 mm Reference Elevation 15-306
Figure 15.6.5-35	Rod Temperatures for FEBA Test 229 at 1625 mm Reference Elevation 15-306
Figure 15.6.5-36	Rod Temperatures for FEBA Test 229 at 1135 mm Reference Elevation 15-307
Figure 15.6.5-37	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Axial Temperature Profiles for FEBA Test 229 at 75 Seconds
Figure 15.6.5-38	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Axial Temperature Profiles for FEBA Test 229 at 150 Seconds
Figure 15.6.5-39	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Maximum Clad Temperatures for FEBA Simulations
Figure 15.7-1	Temperature Profile Near a Spacer Grid from FEBA 223 15-313
Figure 15.7-2	Temperature Profile Near a Spacer Grid from ORNL Test M 15-313
Figure 15.7-3	Temperature Profile Near a Spacer Grid from ORNL Test N 15-314
Figure 15.8-1	Peak Cladding Temperature Comparison for FLECHT Test 31701 15-316
Figure 15.8-2	Quench Front Progression Comparison for FLECHT Test 31701 15-316
Figure 15.8-3	Peak Cladding Temperature Comparison for FLECHT Test 31805 15-317
Figure 15.8-4	Quench Front Progression Comparison for FLECHT Test 31805 15-317
Figure 15.9.1-1	Blowdown Cooling Rates for the G-1 Blowdown Heat Transfer Tests
Figure 15.9.1-2	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Quench Times in the G-1 Blowdown Heat Transfer Tests
Figure 15.9.1-3	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Clad Temperatures for the G-2 Refill Tests
Figure 15.9.1-4	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Maximum Clad Temperatures for all Reflood Separate Effects Tests Simulated
Figure 15.9.1-5	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Quench Times for the FLECHT SEASET Reflood Separate Effects Tests Simulated
Figure 15.9.1-6	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Quench Times for the FLECHT Low Flooding Rate Reflood Separate Effects Tests Simulated

Figure 15.9.1-7	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Quench Times for the FLECHT Skewed Reflood Separate Effects Tests Simulated
Figure 15.9.1-8	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Turn-Around Times for Each Reflood Separate Effects Tests Simulated
Figure 15.9.1-9	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Time above 1600°F for the FLECHT Reflood Separate Effects Tests Simulated
Figure 15.9.2-1	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Film Boiling Model Components 15-333
Figure 15.9.2-2	Calculated Mass Flows as a Function of Elevation for G-1 Test 154 at 10 Seconds into the Test
Figure 15.9.2-3	Calculated Phase Velocities as a Function of Elevation for G-1 Test 154 at 10 Seconds into the Test
Figure 15.9.2-4	Calculated Volume Fraction as a Function of Elevation for G-1 Test 154 at 10 Seconds into the Test
Figure 15.9.2-5	Calculated Droplet Size as a Function of Elevation for G-1 Test 154 at 10 Seconds into the Test
Figure 15.9.2-6	Calculated Droplet (Entrained Phase) Interfacial Surface Area as a Function of Elevation for G-1 Test 154 at 10 Seconds into the Test
Figure 15.9.2-7	Calculated Heater Rod Surface Temperature, Spacer Grid Temperature, and Vapor Temperature as a Function of Elevation for G-1 Test 154 at 10 Seconds into the Test
Figure 15.9.2-8	Calculated Heater Rod Surface Heat Flux and Heat Transfer Mode as a Function of Elevation for G-1 Test 154 at 10 Seconds into the Test 15-337
Figure 15.9.2-9	Calculated Mass Flowrates as a Function of Elevation for ORNL Test 3.08.6C at 59.5 Seconds into the Test
Figure 15.9.2-10	Calculated Phase Velocities as a Function of Elevation for ORNL Test 3.08.6C at 59.5 Seconds into the Test
Figure 15.9.2-11	Calculated Phase Volume Fraction as a Function of Elevation for ORNL Test 3.08.6C at 59.5 Seconds into the Test
Figure 15.9.2-12	Calculated Droplet Diameter as a Function of Elevation for ORNL Test 3.08.6C at 59.5 Seconds into the Test
Figure 15.9.2-13	Calculated Droplet Interfacial Area as a Function of Elevation for ORNL Test 3.08.6C at 59.5 Seconds into the Test
Figure 15.9.2-14	Calculated Heater Rod Surface Temperature, Spacer Grid Temperature, and Vapor Temperature as a Function of Elevation for ORNL Test 3.08.6C at 59.5 Seconds into the Test

Figure 15.9.2-15	Calculated Heater Rod Surface Heat Flux and Heat Transfer Mode as a Function of Elevation for ORNL Test 3.08.6C at 59.5 Seconds into the Test 15-340
Figure 15.9.2-16	Calculated Mass Flowrate of Each Phase as a Function of Elevation for FLECHT SEASET Test 31701 at 10 Seconds into the Test
Figure 15.9.2-17	Calculated Vapor and Entrained (Droplet) Velocities as a Function of Elevation for FLECHT SEASET Test 31701 at 10 Seconds into the Test 15-341
Figure 15.9.2-18	Calculated Phase Volume Fractions as a Function of Elevation for FLECHT SEASET Test 31701 at 10 Seconds into the Test
Figure 15.9.2-19	Calculated Heater Rod Surface Temperature, Spacer Grid Temperature, and Vapor Temperature as a Function of Elevation for FLECHT SEASET Test 31701 at 10 Seconds into the Test
Figure 15.9.2-20	Calculated Heater Rod Heat Flux as a Function of Elevation for FLECHT SEASET Test 31701 at 10 Seconds into the Test
Figure 15.9.2-21	Calculated Net Vapor Generation Rate as a Function of Elevation for FLECHT SEASET Test 31701 at 10 Seconds into the Test
Figure 15.9.2-22	Comparison of Calculated Droplet Size and Drop Velocity at the Three-Foot Elevation with FLECHT SEASET Test Data for Test 31701 (1 - 10 s)
Figure 15.9.2-23	Comparison of Calculated Droplet Size and Drop Velocity at the Nine-Foot Elevation with FLECHT SEASET Test Data for Test 31701 (1 - 10 s)
Figure 15.9.2-24	Calculated Droplet Diameter as a Function of Elevation for FLECHT SEASET Test 31701 at 10 Seconds into the Transient
Figure 15.9.2-25	Calculated Droplet Interfacial Area/Volume as a Function of Elevation for FLECHT SEASET Test 31701 at 10 Seconds into the Test
Figure 15.9.2-26	Comparison of Calculated Droplet Size Frequency for FLECHT SEASET Test 31701 (Results are from the 9-foot Elevation for 1 to 8 Seconds 15-346
Figure 15.9.2-27	Calculated Mass Flow for Each Phase as a Function of Elevation for FLECHT SEASET Test 31805 at 100 Seconds into the Test
Figure 15.9.2-28	Calculated Phase Velocities as a Function of Elevation for FLECHT SEASET Test 31805 at 100 Seconds into the Test
Figure 15.9.2-29	Calculated Phase Void Fractions for Each Phase as a Function of Elevation for FLECHT SEASET Test 31805 at 100 Seconds into the Transient
Figure 15.9.2-30	Calculated Net Vapor Generation as a Function of Elevation for FLECHT SEASET Test 31805 at 100 Seconds into the Transient

Figure 15.9.2-31	Calculated Heater Rod Surface Temperature, Spacer Grid Temperature, and Vapor Temperature as a Function of Elevation for FLECHT SEASET Test 31805 at 100 Seconds into the Test
Figure 15.9.2-32	Calculated Heater Rod Surface Heat Flux as a Function of Elevation for FLECHT SEASET Test 31805 at 100 Seconds into the Test
Figure 15.9.2-33	Calculated Droplet Diameter as a Function of Elevation for FLECHT SEASET Test 31805 at 100 Seconds into the Test
Figure 15.9.2-34	Calculated Droplet Interfacial Surface Area/Volume as a Function of Elevation for FLECHT SEASET Test 31805 at 100 Seconds into the Test 15-350
Figure 15.9.2-35	Comparison of Calculated Drop Size and Velocities with FLECHT SEASET Test Data for Test 31805 at 6 ft (30 – 40 s)
Figure 15.9.3-1	Effect of Flooding Rate on Heat Transfer Coefficient as Determined from Experimental Data (Lee et al., 1982)
Figure 15.9.3-2	Predicted Effect of Flooding Rate on Heat Transfer Coefficient 15-357
Figure 15.9.3-3	Effect of Flooding Rate on Clad Temperature at the 72-inch Elevation as Determined from Experimental Data (Lee et al., 1982)
Figure 15.9.3-4	Predicted Effect of Flooding Rate on Clad Temperature at the 72-inch Elevation
Figure 15.9.3-5	Effect of Flooding Rate on Quench Front Advance as Determined from Experimental Data (Lee et al., 1982)
Figure 15.9.3-6	Predicted Effect of Flooding Rate on Quench Front Advance 15-359
Figure 15.9.3-7	Effect of Pressure on Heat Transfer Coefficient as Determined from Experimental Data (Lee et al., 1982)
Figure 15.9.3-8	Predicted Effect of Pressure on Heat Transfer Coefficient
Figure 15.9.3-9	Predicted Effect of Pressure on Heat Transfer Coefficient (FLECHT Low Flooding Rate)
Figure 15.9.3-10	Effect of Pressure on Clad Temperature at the 72-inch Elevation as Determined from Experimental Data (Lee et al., 1982)
Figure 15.9.3-11	Predicted Effect of Pressure on Clad Temperature at the 72-inch Elevation (FLECHT SEASET)
Figure 15.9.3-12	Predicted Effect of Pressure on Clad Temperature at the 72-inch Elevation (FLECHT Low Flooding Rate)
Figure 15.9.3-13	Effect of Pressure on Quench Front Advance as Determined from Experimental Data (Lee et al., 1982)
Figure 15.9.3-14	Predicted Effect of Pressure on Quench Front Advance (FLECHT SEASET)
-------------------	--
Figure 15.9.3-1'5	Effect of Pressure on Quench Front Advance (FLECHT Low Flooding Rate)
Figure 15.9.3-16	Effect of Subcooling on Temperature Rise and Quench Time as Determined from Experimental Data (Lee et al., 1982)
Figure 15.9.3-17	Comparison of Clad Temperatures at 6-ft. and <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u> Prediction of Sensitivity to Inlet Subcooling in FLECHT SEASET 15-367
Figure 15.9.3-18	Comparison of Quench Times at 6-ft. and <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 Prediction of Sensitivity to Inlet Subcooling in FLECHT SEASET 15-367
Figure 15.9.3-19	Comparison of Clad Temperatures at 6-ft. and <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u> Prediction of Sensitivity to Inlet Subcooling in FLECHT LFR Facility
Figure 15.9.3-20	Comparison of Quench Times at 6-ft. and <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u> Prediction of Sensitivity to Inlet Subcooling in FLECHT LFR Facility
Figure 15.9.3-21	Comparison of Clad Temperatures at 10-ft. and WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Prediction of Sensitivity to Inlet Subcooling in FLECHT Skewed Power Facility
Figure 15.9.3-22	Comparison of Quench Times at 10-ft. and <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 Prediction of Sensitivity to Inlet Subcooling in FLECHT Skewed Power Facility
Figure 16-1	The Schematic Plot of the TPTF Facility (Nakamura et al., 1983) 16-15
Figure 16-2	T Shaped Mixers used in TPTF (Anoda et al., 1989) 16-16
Figure 16-3	Test Section and Measurement Instruments (Kawaji et al., 1987) 16-17
Figure 16-4	TPTF Test Data on WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Flow Regime Map 16-18
Figure 16-5	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Input Models for TPTF. The Fill Component Corresponds to the Location of L/D=17 in the TPTF Facility
Figure 16-6	Comparison Between Measured Void Fraction in TPTF Run 722 and Predicted Void Fraction
Figure 16-7	Comparison Between Measured Void Fraction in TPTF Run 845 and Predicted Void Fraction
Figure 16-8	[

] ^{a,c}	. 16-22
Figure 17-1	COSI Facility Arrangement	. 17-28

WCAP-16996-NP

 \mathbf{b}

LIST OF FIGURES (cont.)

.

Figure 17-2	Westinghouse COSI Test Section Arrangement	. 17-29
Figure 17-3	Depiction of Flow Patterns in the Test Section as Deduced from Data	. 17-30
Figure 17-4	Illustration of Condensation in COSI Test Section	. 17-31
Figure 17-5		
•] ^{a,c}	. 17-32
Figure 17-6	Comparison of Westinghouse Test Section and Framatome Test Section in Cross Section of Cold Leg	. 17-33
Figure 17-7	General Structure of Cold Leg from Crossover Leg to Downcomer in the ROSA Facility	. 17-34
Figure 17-8	Schematics of ECCS Configuration in ROSA IV SB-CL-05	. 17-35
Figure 17-9	<u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 Single TEE Noding Diagram for Westinghouse Vertical COSI, Framatome COSI, and ROSA IV SB-CL-05; for Westinghouse Vertical COSI, the Inclination angle of SI Line is 45°	. 17-36
Figure 17-10	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Two-TEE Noding Diagram for Framatome Inverse COSI Tests	. 17-37
Figure 17-11a	Comparison between Measured Westinghouse COSI Condensation Heat Transfer Rate and <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 Predicted Condensation Heat Transfer Rate	. 17-38
Figure 17-11b	Predicted Heat Transfer Rate for Westinghouse COSI (TEE junction cell is number 4)	. 17-39
Figure 17-12	Comparison between Measured Framatome COSI Condensation Heat Transfer Rate and <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 Predicted Condensation Heat Transfer Rate. Data in Circles Are Tests with High SI Temperature (~80C)	. 17-40
Figure 17-13	Comparison between Measured ROSA SB-CL-05 SI Condensation Heat Transfer Rate and <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 Predicted Condensation Heat Transfer Rate	. 17-41
Figure 17-14	Steam Temperature Profile in Cold Leg in ROSA Test No. 1	. 17-42
Figure 17-15	Steam Temperature Profile in Cold Leg in ROSA Test No. 2	. 17-43
Figure 17-16	Steam Temperature Profile in Cold Leg in ROSA Test No. 3	. 17-44
Figure 17-17	Steam Temperature Profile in Cold Leg in ROSA Test No. 4	. 17-45
Figure 17-18	Comparison between Measured Condensation Heat Transfer Rate and <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 Predicted Condensation Heat Transfer Rate for All Validation Cases.	. 17-46
Figure 17-19	Cold Leg Piping Region of UPTF Test Facility	. 17-47

WCAP-16996-NP

Figure 17-20	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Single TEE Model for UPTF-8 A 17-48
Figure 17-21	Comparison between Measured Fluid Temperature and <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 Predicted Water Temperature at Pump Exit
Figure 17-22	Comparison between Measured Fluid Temperature and <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u> Predicted Water Temperature near Injection Point 17-50
Figure 17-23	Comparison between Measured Fluid Temperature and <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u> Predicted Water Temperature at Downstream of Injection Point
Figure 17-24	Comparison between Measured Fluid Temperature and <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u> Predicted Water Temperature at Outlet of Cold Leg 17-52
Figure 17-25	Comparison between the Predicted Water Temperatures at Injection Cell of Cold Leg in ECC Injection Angel Sensitivity Study
Figure 17-26	Comparison between the Predicted Water Temperatures at Downstream Cell of Cold Leg in ECC Injection Angel Sensitivity Study
Figure 17-27	Comparison between the Predicted Water Temperatures at Outlet of Cold Leg in ECC Injection Angel Sensitivity Study
Figure 17-28	Comparison between the Predicted Water Temperatures at Injection Cell of Cold Leg in Cold Leg Noding Sensitivity Study
Figure 17-29	Comparison between the Predicted Water Temperatures at Downstream of Injection Cell in Cold Leg in Cold Leg Noding Sensitivity Study 17-57
Figure 17-30	Comparison between the Predicted Water Temperatures at Outlet of Cold leg in Cold Leg Noding Sensitivity Study
Figure 17-31	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 17-32	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 17-33	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 17-34	[] ^{a,c} 17-62
Figure 17-35	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 17-36	[
] ^{a,c}

.

LIST OF FIGURES (cont.)

Figure 17-37

] ^{a,c}
Figure 17-38	[
] ^{a,c} 17-6
Figure 18.1-1	Loop Seal Clearing and Refilling
Figure 18.1-2	Loop Seal Clearing Process
Figure 18.2.1-1a	Measured Pressure Drop in Broken Loop of ROSA 5% Break (Kumamaru, et al., 1989)
Figure 18.2.1-1b	Measured Pressure Drop in Broken Loop of ROSA 10% Break (Koizumi and Tasaka, 1988)
Figure 18.2.2-1	PWS 2.3 U-Tube Test Facility
Figure 18.2.2-2	Taitel-Dukler Flow Regime Map, Comparing 1/3-Scale Pipe at 14.7 psia and Full-Scale Pipe at 1000 psia
Figure 18.2.2-3	PWS 2.3 U-Tube Residual Liquid Level Remaining After Test as a Function of Test Gas Flow rate
Figure 18.2.2-4	PWS 2.3 U-Tube Horizontal and Vertical Leg Average Void Fractions During Test
Figure 18.2.2-5	PWS 2.3 U-Tube Horizontal Average Void Fraction During Test Compared with Average Void Fraction after Test
Figure 18.2.2-6	Pressure Difference Across the PWS 2.3 U-Tube
Figure 18.2.2-7	PWS 2.3 U-Tube Normalized Level and Limit Lines
Figure 18.2.2-8	PWS 2.3 U-Tube Flow Regimes Observed Under the Limit Line
Figure 18.2.2-9	Hysteresis in Loop Seal Limit Line
Figure 18.2.2-10	Effect of Increased Geometric Scale on Limit Lines
Figure 18.2.2-11	Effect of Increased Pressure and Scale on Limit Lines
Figure 18.2.2-12	IVO Full-Scale Final Void Fraction and Limit Lines
Figure 18.2.3-1	UPTF Facility and Single Loop Seal (Liebert and Emmerling, 1998) 18-20
Figure 18.2.3-2	Lines of Constant Gas Velocity Compared to UPTF Data for 3-Bar and 15-Bar Loop Seal Tests
Figure 18.2.3-3	UPTF and PWS 2.3 Compared to the Ishii Correlation and Data Base 18-28
Figure 18.3-1	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Model of the UPTF Separate Effects Loop Seal Clearing Tests

Figure 18.3-2	Comparison of <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 Calculations and UPTF Data for the 3-Bar Tests	-32
Figure 18.3-3	Comparison of <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 Calculations Total System Mass for UPTF 3-bar and 15-bar $j_g^* \approx 0.1$ Cases	-32
Figure 18.3-4	Comparison of WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Calculations and UPTF Data for the 15-Bar Tests	-33
Figure 18.3-5	Comparison of Calculated vs. Measured Residual Liquid Levels	-33
Figure 18.3-6	Calculated Residual Liquid Levels and CCFL Limit (Ku = 3.2) for 1000 psia	-34
Figure 18.3-7a	Measured Pressure Drop for UPTF 3-Bar and 15-Bar Loop Seal Tests (from Liebert and Emmerling, 1998)	-35
Figure 18.3-7b	Calculated Loop Seal Pressure Drop for 3-Bar, 15-Bar, and 1000 psia	-35
Figure 18.3-8a	Calculated Pressure Drop for 15-Bar and $j_g^* \approx 0.07$	-36
Figure 18.3-8b	Calculated Pressure Drop for 15-Bar and $j_g^* \approx 0.18$	-36
Figure 18.3-8c	Calculated Pressure Drop for 15-Bar and $j_g^* \approx 0.32$	-37
Figure 18.3-9a	Comparison of Pressure Drop in Bends for $j_g^* \approx 0.05$ 3-bar Case	-38
Figure 18.3-9b	Comparison of Pressure Dropin Bends for $j_g^* \approx 0.05$ 15-bar Case	-38
Figure 18.3-9c	Comparison of Pressure Dropin Bends for $j_g^* \approx 0.22$ 3-bar Case	-39
Figure 18.3-9d	Comparison of Pressure Dropin Bends for $j_g^* \approx 0.22$ 15-bar Case	-39
Figure 19.3-1	UPTF Plan View	-52
Figure 19.3-2	UPTF Test Vessel and Primary Loop	-53
Figure 19.3-3	UPTF Reactor Vessel	-54
Figure 19.3-4	UPTF Upper Plenum Structures	-55
Figure 19.3-5	Dummy Fuel Assembly and End Box with Flow Restrictor (A) or Spider (B)	-56
Figure 19.3-6	UPTF Core Simulator Injection Assembly	-57
Figure 19.3-7	UPTF Steam Generator Simulators and Water Separators	-58
Figure 19.3-8	UPTF System Configuration for Test 6 (MPR-1163) 19-	-59
Figure 19.3-9	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 VESSEL Component Axial View for UPTF Bypass Tests	-60

Figure 19.3-10	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 VESSEL Component Sections 1 and 2 for UPTF Bypass Tests	. 19-61
Figure 19.3-11	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 VESSEL Component Sections 3 and 4 for UPTF Bypass Tests	. 19-62
Figure 19.3-12	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 VESSEL Component Sections 5 and 6 for UPTF Bypass Tests	. 19-63
Figure 19.3-13	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 VESSEL Component Sections 7 and 8 for UPTF Bypass Tests	. 19-64
Figure 19.3-14	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 One-Dimensional Component Model for UPTF Test 6	. 19-65
Figure 19.3-15	Total Core Steam Injection, UPTF Test 6 – Run 131	. 19-66
Figure 19.3-16	Steam Generator Simulator Steam Injection, UPTF Test 6 - Run 131	. 19-67
Figure 19.3-17	Intact Loop ECC Injection, UPTF Test 6 – Run 131	. 19-68
Figure 19.3-18	Measured Absolute Pressures in the Upper Plenum and Downcomer, UPTF Test 6 – Run 131	. 19-69
Figure 19.3-19	Predicted Absolute Pressures in the Upper Plenum and Downcomer, UPTF Test 6 – Run 131	. 19-69
Figure 19.3-20	Measured Downcomer Fluid Temperature at Level 21, UPTF Test 6 – Run 131	. 19-70
Figure 19.3-21	Predicted Downcomer Fluid Temperature at Level 21, UPTF Test 6 – Run 131	. 19-70
Figure 19.3-22	Measured Downcomer Fluid Temperature at Level 01, UPTF Test 6 – Run 131	. 19-71
Figure 19.3-23	Predicted Downcomer Fluid Temperature at Level 01, UPTF Test 6 – Run 131	19-71
Figure 19.3-24	Predicted Liquid Flow at Bottom of the Downcomer in Intact Side, UPTFTest 6 – Run 131	19-72
Figure 19.3-25	Predicted Liquid Flow at Bottom of the Downcomer in Broken Side, UPTF Test 6 – Run 131	19-72
Figure 19.3-26	Measured Axial Differential Pressures in Downcomer, UPTF Test 6 – Run 131	. 19-73
Figure 19.3-27	Predicted Axial Differential Pressures in Downcomer, UPTF Test 6 – Run 131	19-73
Figure 19.3-28	Measured Azimuthal Differential Pressures in Downcomer at Level 06, UPTF Test 6 – Run 131	. 19-74

Figure 19.3-29	Predicted Azimuthal Differential Pressures in Downcomer at Level 06, UPTF Test 6 – Run 131	19-74
Figure 19.3-30	Measured Azimuthal Differential Pressures in Downcomer at Level 22, UPTF Test 6 – Run 131	19-75
Figure 19.3-31	Predicted Azimuthal Differential Pressures in Downcomer at Level 22, UPTF Test 6 – Run 131	19-75
Figure 19.3-32	Comparison on Differential Pressure in Lower Plenum, UPTF Test 6 – Run 131	19-76
Figure 19.3-33	Total Core Steam Injection, UPTF Test 6 – Run 132	19-77
Figure 19.3-34	Steam Generator Simulator Steam Injection, UPTF Test 6 – Run 132	19-78
Figure 19.3-35	Intact Loop ECC Injection, UPTF Test 6 – Run 132	19-79
Figure 19.3-36	Measured Absolute Pressures in the Upper Plenum and Downcomer, UPTF Test 6 – Run 132	19-80
Figure 19.3-37	Predicted Absolute Pressures in the Upper Plenum and Downcomer, UPTF Test 6 – Run 132	19-80
Figure 19.3-38	Measured Downcomer Fluid Temperature at Level 21, UPTF Test 6 – Run 132	19-81
Figure 19.3-39	Predicted Downcomer Fluid Temperature at Level 21, UPTF Test 6 – Run 132	19-81
Figure 19.3-40	Measured Downcomer Fluid Temperature at Level 01, UPTF Test 6 – Run 132	19-82
Figure 19.3-41	Predicted Downcomer Fluid Temperature at Level 01, UPTF Test 6 – Run 132	19-82
Figure 19.3-42	Predicted Liquid Flow at Bottom of the Downcomer in Intact Side, UPTF Test 6 – Run 132	19-83
Figure 19.3-43	Predicted Liquid Flow at Bottom of the Downcomer in Broken Side, UPTF Test 6 – Run 132	19-83
Figure 19.3-44	Measured Axial Differential Pressures in Downcomer, UPTF Test 6 – Run 132	19-84
Figure 19.3-45	Predicted Axial Differential Pressures in Downcomer, UPTF Test 6 – Run 132	19-84
Figure 19.3-46	Measured Azimuthal Differential Pressures in Downcomer at Level 06, UPTF Test 6 – Run 132	19-85
Figure 19.3-47	Predicted Azimuthal Differential Pressures in Downcomer at Level 06, UPTF Test 6 – Run 132	19-85

Figure 19.3-48	Measured Azimuthal Differential Pressures in Downcomer at Level 22, UPTF Test 6 – Run 132	6
Figure 19.3-49	Predicted Azimuthal Differential Pressures in Downcomer at Level 22, UPTF Test 6 – Run 132	6
Figure 19.3-50	Comparison on Differential Pressure in Lower Plenum, UPTF Test 6 – Run 132	7
Figure 19.3-51	Total Core Steam Injection, UPTF Test 6 – Run 133 19-8	8
Figure 19.3-52	Steam Generator Simulator Steam Injection, UPTF Test 6 - Run 133 19-8	9
Figure 19.3-53	Intact Loop ECC Injection, UPTF Test 6 – Run 133 19-9	0
Figure 19.3-54	Measured Absolute Pressures in the Upper Plenum and Downcomer, UPTF Test 6 – Run 133	1
Figure 19.3-55	Predicted Absolute Pressures in the Upper Plenum and Downcomer, UPTF Test 6 – Run 133	1
Figure 19.3-56	Measured Downcomer Fluid Temperature at Level 21, UPTF Test 6 – Run 133	2
Figure 19.3-57	Predicted Downcomer Fluid Temperature at Level 21, UPTF Test 6 – Run 133	2
Figure 19.3-58	Measured Downcomer Fluid Temperature at Level 01, UPTF Test 6 – Run 133	3
Figure 19.3-59	Predicted Downcomer Fluid Temperature at Level 01, UPTF Test 6 – Run 133	3
Figure 19.3-60	Predicted Liquid Flow at Bottom of the Downcomer in Intact Side, UPTF Test 6 – Run 133	4
Figure 19.3-61	Predicted Liquid Flow at Bottom of the Downcomer in Broken Side, UPTF Test 6 – Run 133	4
Figure 19.3-62	Measured Axial Differential Pressures in Downcomer, UPTF Test 6 – Run 133	5
Figure 19.3-63	Predicted Axial Differential Pressures in Downcomer, UPTF Test 6 – Run 133	5
Figure 19.3-64	Measured Azimuthal Differential Pressures in Downcomer at Level 06, UPTF Test 6 – Run 133	6
Figure 19.3-65	Predicted Azimuthal Differential Pressures in Downcomer at Level 06, UPTF Test 6 – Run 133	6
Figure 19.3-66	Measured Azimuthal Differential Pressures in Downcomer at Level 22, UPTF Test 6 – Run 133	7

Figure 19.3-67	Predicted Azimuthal Differential Pressures in Downcomer at Level 22, UPTF Test 6 – Run 133	7
Figure 19.3-68	Comparison on Differential Pressure in Lower Plenum, UPTF Test 6 – Run 133	8
Figure 19.3-69	Total Core Steam Injection, UPTF Test 6 – Run 135	9
Figure 19.3-70	Steam Generator Simulator Steam Injection, UPTF Test 6 - Run 135 19-100	0
Figure 19.3-71	Intact Loop ECC Injection, UPTF Test 6 – Run 135 19-10	1
Figure 19.3-72	Measured Absolute Pressures in the Upper Plenum and Downcomer, UPTF Test 6 – Run 135	2
Figure 19.3-73	Predicted Absolute Pressures in the Upper Plenum and Downcomer, UPTF Test 6 – Run 135	2
Figure 19.3-74	Measured Downcomer Fluid Temperature at Level 21, UPTF Test 6 – Run 135	3
Figure 19.3-75	Predicted Downcomer Fluid Temperature at Level 21, UPTF Test 6 – Run 135	3
Figure 19.3-76	Measured Downcomer Fluid Temperature at Level 01, UPTF Test 6 – Run 135	4
Figure 19.3-77	Predicted Downcomer Fluid Temperature at Level 01, UPTF Test 6 – Run 135	4
Figure 19.3-78	Predicted Liquid Flow at Bottom of the Downcomer in Intact Side, UPTF Test 6 – Run 135	5
Figure 19.3-79	Predicted Liquid Flow at Bottom of the Downcomer in Broken Side, UPTF Test 6 – Run 135	5
Figure 19.3-80	Measured Axial Differential Pressures in Downcomer, UPTF Test 6 – Run 135	5
Figure 19.3-81	Predicted Axial Differential Pressures in Downcomer, UPTF Test 6 – Run 135	5
Figure 19.3-82	Measured Azimuthal Differential Pressures in Downcomer at Level 06, UPTF Test 6 – Run 135	7
Figure 19.3-83	Predicted Azimuthal Differential Pressures in Downcomer at Level 06, UPTF Test 6 – Run 135	7
Figure 19.3-84	Measured Azimuthal Differential Pressures in Downcomer at Level 22, UPTF Test 6 – Run 135	3
Figure 19.3-85	Predicted Azimuthal Differential Pressures in Downcomer at Level 22, UPTF Test 6 – Run 135	3

WCAP-16996-NP

.

Figure 19.3-86	Comparison on Differential Pressure in Lower Plenum, UPTF Test 6 – Run 135	19-109
Figure 19.3-87	Total Core Steam Injection, UPTF Test 6 – Run 136	19-110
Figure 19.3-88	Intact Loop ECC Injection, UPTF Test 6 – Run 136	19-111
Figure 19.3-89	Measured Absolute Pressures in the Upper Plenum and Downcomer, UPTF Test 6 – Run 136	19-112
Figure 19.3-90	Predicted Absolute Pressures in the Upper Plenum and Downcomer, UPTF Test 6 – Run 136	19-112
Figure 19.3-91	Measured Downcomer Fluid Temperature at Level 21, UPTF Test 6 – Run 136	19-113
Figure 19.3-92	Predicted Downcomer Fluid Temperature at Level 21, UPTF Test 6 – Run 136	19-113
Figure 19.3-93	Measured Downcomer Fluid Temperature at Level 01, UPTF Test 6 – Run 136	19-114
Figure 19.3-94	Predicted Downcomer Fluid Temperature at Level 01, UPTF Test 6 – Run 136	
Figure 19.3-95	Predicted Liquid Flow at Bottom of the Downcomer in Intact Side, UPTF Test 6 – Run 136	19-115
Figure 19.3-96	Predicted Liquid Flow at Bottom of the Downcomer in Broken Side, UPTF Test 6 – Run 136	19-115
Figure 19.3-97	Measured Axial Differential Pressures in Downcomer, UPTF Test 6 – Run 136	19-116
Figure 19.3-98	Predicted Axial Differential Pressures in Downcomer, UPTF Test 6 – Run 136	19-116
Figure 19.3-99	Measured Azimuthal Differential Pressures in Downcomer at Level 06, UPTF Test 6 – Run 136	19-117
Figure 19.3-100	Predicted Azimuthal Differential Pressures in Downcomer at Level 06, UPTF Test 6 – Run 136	19-117
Figure 19.3-101	Measured Azimuthal Differential Pressures in Downcomer at Level 22, UPTF Test 6 – Run 136	19-118
Figure 19.3-102	Predicted Azimuthal Differential Pressures in Downcomer at Level 22, UPTF Test 6 – Run 136	19-118
Figure 19.3-103	Comparison on Differential Pressure in Lower Plenum, UPTF Test 6 – Run 136	19-119
Figure 19.3-104	Lower Plenum Fluid Inventory, UPTF Test 6 – Run 131	19-120

Figure 19.3-105	Lower Plenum Fluid Inventory, UPTF Test 6 – Run 132 19-121
Figure 19.3-106	Lower Plenum Fluid Inventory, UPTF Test 6 – Run 133 19-122
Figure 19.3-107	Lower Plenum Fluid Inventory, UPTF Test 6 – Run 135 19-123
Figure 19.3-108	Lower Plenum Fluid Inventory, UPTF Test 6 – Run 136 19-124
Figure 19.3-109	Comparison between Measured and Predicted Penetration Rates in UPTF Test 6
Figure 19.3-110	Comparison between Measured and Predicted Refill Periods versus Nominal Steam Flow Rate for Lower Plenum in UPTF Test 6
Figure 19.3-111	Downcomer CCFL Behavior for UPTF Test 6
Figure 19.3-112	Estimated Mass Distribution, UPTF Test 6 – Run 131 19-128
Figure 19.3-113	Predicted Mass Distribution, UPTF Test 6 – Run 131 19-128
Figure 19.3-114	Estimated Mass Distribution, UPTF Test 6 – Run 132 19-129
Figure 19.3-115	Predicted Mass Distribution, UPTF Test 6 – Run 132 19-129
Figure 19.3-116	Estimated Mass Distribution, UPTF Test 6 – Run 133 19-130
Figure 19.3-117	Predicted Mass Distribution, UPTF Test 6 – Run 133 19-130
Figure 19.3-118	Estimated Mass Distribution, UPTF Test 6 - Run 135 19-131
Figure 19.3-119	Predicted Mass Distribution, UPTF Test 6 – Run 135 19-131
Figure 19.3-120	Estimated Mass Distribution, UPTF Test 6 – Run 136 19-132
Figure 19.3-121	Predicted Mass Distribution, UPTF Test 6 – Run 136 19-132
Figure 19.3-122	Vessel Condensation Efficiency, UPTF Test 6 – Run 131 19-133
Figure 19.3-123	Vessel Condensation Efficiency, UPTF Test 6 – Run 132 19-134
Figure 19.3-124	Vessel Condensation Efficiency, UPTF Test 6 – Run 133 19-135
Figure 19.3-125	Vessel Condensation Efficiency, UPTF Test 6 – Run 135 19-136
Figure 19.3-126	Vessel Condensation Efficiency, UPTF Test 6 – Run 136 19-137
Figure 19.3-127	Comparison of Vessel Condensation Efficiency versus Nominal Steam Flow Rate, UPTF Test 6; Experimental Condensation Efficiency is Estimated by MPR (MPR-1163, 1990); Predicted Condensation Efficiency is Evaluated Using Steam Flow Rate at Break
Figure 19.3-128	Comparison of Vessel Condensation Efficiency versus Nominal Steam Flow Rate with Various DC Condensation Multipliers, UPTF Test 6; Predicted Condensation Efficiency is Evaluated Using Steam Flow Rate at Inlet of Broken Cold Leg

WCAP-16996-NP

Figure 19.3-129	Comparison of Filling Period from Start of ECC Injection to End of Lower Plenum Filling with Various DC Condensation Multipliers versus Nominal Steam Flow Rate, UPTF Test 6. Note, Run 132 did not Fill the Lower Plenum at the End of the Calculation.	19-140
Figure 19.3-130	Comparison of Length of Refill Period from Start of ECC Injection to End of Lower Plenum Filling versus Nominal Steam Flow Rate with Various DTMAX, UPTF Test 6	19-141
Figure 19.3-131	Location of Fluid Thermocouples, Differential and Absolute Pressure Measurements in Broken Cold Leg of Loop 04	19-142
Figure 19.3-132	Moody Diagram	19-143
Figure 19.3-133	Cold Leg Steam Flow Rate (Top) and Downcomer Pressure (Bottom) for Test Run 131	19-144
Figure 19.3-134	Cold Leg Fluid Temperature (Top) and Cold Leg to Downcomer Pressure Drop (Bottom) for Test Run 131	19-145
Figure 19.3-135	Cold Leg Steam Flow Rate (Top) and Downcomer Pressure (Bottom) for Test Run 132	19-146
Figure 19.3-136	Cold Leg Fluid Temperature (Top) and Cold Leg to Downcomer Pressure Drop (Bottom) for Test Run 132	19-147
Figure 19.3-137	Cold Leg Steam Flow rate (Top) and Downcomer Pressure (Bottom) for Test Run 133	19-148
Figure 19.3-138	Cold Leg Fluid Temperature (Top) and Cold Leg to Downcomer Pressure Drop (Bottom) for Test Run 133	19-149
Figure 19.3-139	Cold Leg Steam Flow rate (Top) and Downcomer Pressure (Bottom) for Test Run 135	19-150
Figure 19.3-140	Cold Leg Fluid Temperature (Top) and Cold Leg to Downcomer Pressure Drop (Bottom) for Test Run 135	19-151
Figure 19.3-141	Cold Leg Steam Flow Rate (Top) and Downcomer Pressure (Bottom) for Test Run 136	19-152
Figure 19.3-142	Cold Leg Fluid Temperature (Top) and Cold Leg to Downcomer Pressure Drop (Bottom) for Test Run 136	19-153
Figure 19.3-143	An Illustration of Downcomer and Broken Cold Leg Nozzle Noding	19-154
Figure 19.3-144	Comparison between Measured Pressure Loss and Predicted Pressure Loss across Broken Cold Leg Nozzle for UPTF 6-131	19-155
Figure 19.3-145	Comparison between Measured Pressure Loss and Predicted Pressure Loss across Broken Cold Leg Nozzle for UPTF 6-132	19-156

Figure 19.3-146	Comparison between Measured Pressure Loss and Predicted Pressure Loss across Broken Cold Leg Nozzle for UPTF 6-133 19-157
Figure 19.3-147	Comparison between Measured Pressure Loss and Predicted Pressure Loss across Broken Cold Leg Nozzle for UPTF 6-135
Figure 19.3-148	Comparison between Measured Pressure Loss and Predicted Pressure Loss across Broken Cold Leg Nozzle for UPTF 6-136
Figure 19.3-149	Cold Leg Piping Region of UPTF Facility and Cold Leg Noding 19-160
Figure 19.3-150	System Configuration for UPTF-8A
Figure 19.3-151	Observation on Temperature Distribution in UPTF-8 Experiments (MPR Associates, 1992) and Comparison with Predictions from <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2
Figure 19.3-152	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Vessel Model for UPTF Test 8A 19-163
Figure 19.3-153	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Loop Model for UPTF-8 A 19-164
Figure 19.3-154	Comparison between the Measured Steam Flow Rates and the <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 Predicted Steam Flow Rates in the Cold Leg of the Loop 2
Figure 19.3-155	ECC Injection Flow Rate to Cold Leg in Loop 2 19-166
Figure 19.3-156	Comparison between Measured Fluid Temperature and <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u> Predicted Water Temperature at Pump Exit 19-167
Figure 19.3-157	Comparison between Measured Fluid Temperature and <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u> Predicted Water Temperature near Injection Point 19-168
Figure 19.3-158	Comparison between Measured Fluid Temperature and <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u> Predicted Water Temperature at Downstream of Injection Point
Figure 19.3-159	Comparison between Measured Fluid Temperature and <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 Predicted Water Temperature at Outlet of Cold Leg 19-170
Figure 19.3-160	Predicted Flow Regime Number of Cell Face 4 of Cold Leg 19-171
Figure 19.3-161	Predicted Flow Regime Number of Cell Face 5 of Cold Leg 19-172
Figure 19.3-162	Predicted Flow Regime Number of Cell Face 6 of Cold Leg 19-173
Figure 19.3-163	Predicted Flow Regime Number of Cell Face 7 of Cold Leg 19-174
Figure 19.3-164	System Configuration for UPTF Test 25, Phase A (Run 242) and Phase B (Run 241)
Figure 19.3-165	Steam Flow Rate for UPTF Test 25, Phase A (Run 242) 19-176
Figure 19.3-166	ECC Flow Rate for UPTF Test 25, Phase A (Run 242) 19-177

Figure 19.3-167	Drainage Flow Rate for UPTF Test 25, Phase A (Run 242) 19-1	78
Figure 19.3-168	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Loop Model for UPTF Test 25A 19-1	79
Figure 19.3-169	Absolute Pressure in the Upper Plenum and Downcomer for UPTF Test 25A	80
Figure 19.3-170	Measured Downcomer Fluid Temperature at Level 28 for UPTF Test 25A	81
Figure 19.3-171	Predicted Downcomer Fluid (Vapor) Temperature at Level 28 for UPTF Test 25A	82
Figure 19.3-172	Measured Downcomer Fluid Temperature at Level 24 for UPTF Test 25A	83
Figure 19.3-173	Predicted Downcomer Fluid (Liquid) Temperature at Level 24 for UPTF Test 25A	.83
Figure 19.3-174	Differential Pressure between Upper Plenum and Downcomer for UPTF Test 25A	84
Figure 19.3-175	Axial Differential Pressure in Downcomer for UPTF Test 25A 19-1	85
Figure 19.3-176	Axial Differential Pressures in Downcomer for UPTF Test 25A; Curve 2 is in Broken Quadrant and Curves 1, 3 and 4 are in Intact Quadrants	.86
Figure 19.3-177	Broken Loop Steam Flow Rate for UPTF Test 25A	87
Figure 19.3-178	Broken Loop Liquid Flow Rate for UPTF Test 25A	88
Figure 19.3-179	Void Height versus Steam Flow Rate for UPTF Test 25A	89
Figure 19.3-180	Cold Leg Temperature near ECC Injection for UPTF Test 25A 19-1	90
Figure 19.3-181	Cold Leg Temperature Downstream of ECC Injection for UPTF Test 25A 19-1	91
Figure 19.3-182	Cold Leg Temperature at Exit of Cold Leg for UPTF Test 25A 19-1	92
Figure 19.3-183	Cold Leg Temperature near ECC Injection for UPTF Test 25A with KCOSI=0.4	93
Figure 19.3-184	Cold Leg Temperature Downstream of ECC Injection for UPTF Test 25A with KCOSI=0.4	94
Figure 19.3-185	Cold Leg Temperature at Exit of Cold Leg for UPTF Test 25A with KCOSI=0.4	95
Figure 19.3-186	Axial Differential Pressures in Downcomer for UPTF Test 25A with KCOSI=0.4	96
Figure 19.3-187	Broken Loop Steam Flow Rate for UPTF Test 25A with KCOSI=0.4 19-1	97

Figure 19.3-188	Broken Loop Liquid Flow Rate for UPTF Test 25A with KCOSI=0.4 19-198
Figure 19.3-189	Differential Pressure between Upper Plenum and Downcomer for UPTF Test 25A with XC=0.4
Figure 19.3-190	Axial Differential Pressure in Downcomer for UPTF Test 25A with XC=0.4
Figure 19.3-191	Axial Differential Pressures in Downcomer for UPTF Test 25A with XC=0.4
Figure 19.3-192	Void Height versus Steam Flow Rate for UPTF Test 25A with XC=0.4 19-202
Figure 19.3-193	System Configuration for UPTF, Test 29 Phase B (Run 212) (MPR-1213, 1990)
Figure 19.3-194	Injection Rates into Core Simulator, UPTF 29B 19-204
Figure 19.3-195	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Vessel Component for UPTF Test 29B 19-205
Figure 19.3-196	Illustration of Jet Channel and Global Channel in Upper Plenum 19-206
Figure 19.3-197	Section 5 of Upper Plenum Noding Model for UPTF Test 29B 19-207
Figure 19.3-198	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Loop Model for UPTF Upper Plenum Test 19-208
Figure 19.3-199	Quasi-Steady State Upper Plenum Mass for Phase I of UPTF Test 29B 19-209
Figure 19.3-200	Quasi-Steady State Upper Plenum Mass for Phase II of UPTF Test 29B 19-210
Figure 19.3-201	Quasi-Steady State Upper Plenum Mass for Phase III of UPTF Test 29B19-211
Figure 19.3-202	Quasi-Steady State Upper Plenum Mass for Phase IV of UPTF Test 29B 19-212
Figure 19.3-203	Quasi-Steady State Upper Plenum Mass for Phase V of UPTF Test 29B 19-213
Figure 19.3-204	Quasi-Steady State Upper Plenum Mass for Phase VI of UPTF Test 29B 19-214
Figure 19.4-1	Flooding Model for a Perforated Plate
Figure 19.4-2	Flooding Velocities for the Nitrogen/Water System at [] ^{a,c} Compared with the Air/Water Test (Hsieh, 1980) and Northwestern Flooding Limit
Figure 19.4-3	Flooding Velocities for Saturated Liquid and Vapor at [] ^{a,c} Compared with Northwestern Flooding Limit (<u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u>) 19-223
Figure 19.4-4	Flooding Velocities for Saturated Liquid and Vapor at [] ^{a,c} Compared with Northwestern Flooding Limit (<u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u>) 19-224
Figure 19.4-5	Liquid Mass Flow Rates through Perforated Plate at [] ^{a,c} (WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2)
Figure 19.4-6	Vapor/Liquid Mass Flow Rates through Perforated Plate at [] ^{a,c} (<u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2)

Figure 19.4-7	Liquid Mass Flow rates through Perforated Plate at [] ^{a,c} (<u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2)	19-227
Figure 19.4-8	Vapor/Liquid Mass Flow rates through Perforated Plate at [] ^{a,c} (<u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2)	19-228
Figure 19.5-1	Mass Inventory Measurements in the FLECHT Facilities	19-232
Figure 19.5-2	Predicted and Measured Carryover Fraction, FLECHT-SEASET Test 31805	19-233
Figure 19.5-3	Predicted and Measured Carryover Fraction, FLECHT-SEASET Test 31701	19-234
Figure 19.5-4	Predicted and Measured Carryover Fraction, FLECHT-SEASET Test 31203	19-235
Figure 19.5-5	Predicted and Measured Carryover Fraction, FLECHT Test 04641	19-236
Figure 19.5-6	Predicted and Measured Carryover Fraction, FLECHT Test 05029	19-237
Figure 19.5-7	Predicted and Measured Carryover Fraction, FLECHT Top Skewed Test 15305	19-238
Figure 19.5-8	Predicted and Measured Carryover Fraction, FLECHT Top Skewed Test 13609	19-239
Figure 19.5-9	Predicted and Measured Carryover Fraction, FLECHT Top Skewed Test 13812	19-240
Figure 19.6-1	Top View of Primary Loop Piping	19-253
Figure 19.6-2	Diagram of CCTF Pressure Vessel	19-254
Figure 19.6-3	CCTF Cross Sections (a) Pressure Vessel (b) Upper Plenum Internals	19-255
Figure 19.6-4	Axial Power Profile of Heated Rods in CCTF	19-256
Figure 19.6-5	CCTF Test Sequence for Run 62	19-257
Figure 19.6-6	CCTF Vessel Noding Diagram	19-258
Figure 19.6-7	CCTF Section 1 Noding	19-259
Figure 19.6-8	CCTF Section 2 Noding	19-260
Figure 19.6-9	CCTF Section 3 Noding.	19-261
Figure 19.6-10	CCTF Section 4 Noding	19-262
Figure 19.6-11	CCTF Section 5 Noding	19-263
Figure 19.6-12	CCTF Section 6 Noding	19-264
Figure 19.6-13	CCTF Section 7 Noding	19-265

Figure 19.6-14	CCTF Loop Component Diagram	6
Figure 19.6-15	Dimensions of Hot Leg in CCTF Facility	7
Figure 19.6-16	Noding Diagram of Hot Leg	7
Figure 19.6-17	Dimension of Crossover Leg, Pump Simulator, Cold Leg, and ECC Port in CCTF Facility	58
Figure 19.6-18	Noding Diagram of Crossover Leg, Pump Simulator, Cold Leg, and ECC Port in Loop 1; Other Intact Loops are Identical to Loop 1	68
Figure 19.6-19	Steam Generator Component Diagram	9
Figure 19.6-20	CCTF Run 62 Cladding Temperature at 6.0 ft for Channel 9 (Rod 6) 19-27	0
Figure 19.6-21	CCTF Run 62 Cladding Temperature at 8.0 ft for Channel 9 (Rod 6) 19-27	1
Figure 19.6-22	CCTF Run 62 Cladding Temperature at 10.0 ft for Channel 9 (Rod 6) 19-27	2
Figure 19.6-23	CCTF Run 62 Vapor Temperature at 6.0 ft for Channel 9 19-27	3
Figure 19.6-24	CCTF Run 62 Liquid Level in Core 19-27	4
Figure 19.6-25	CCTF Run 62 Liquid Level in Upper Plenum 19-27	5
Figure 19.6-26	CCTF Run 62 Pressure Difference from Lower Plenum to Upper Plenum 19-27	6
Figure 19.6-27	CCTF Run 62 Pressure Difference from Lower Plenum to Top of Downcomer	7
Figure 19.6-28	CCTF Run 62 Pressure Difference across Intact Loop 19-27	8
Figure 19.6-29	CCTF Run 62 Pressure Difference across Broken Loop 19-27	9
Figure 19.6-30	CCTF Run 62 Pressure Difference across Steam Generators; Averaged for 3 Intact Loops	0
Figure 19.6-31	CCTF Run 62 Temperature Rise across Steam Generator of Loop 1 19-28	1
Figure 19.6-32	CCTF Run 62 Temperature Rise across Steam Generator of Loop 2 19-28	2
Figure 19.6-33	CCTF Run 62 Temperature Rise across Steam Generator of Loop 3 19-28	3
Figure 19.6-34	CCTF Run 62 Total (Liquid and Vapor) Mass Flow Rate in Intact Loop Hot Leg	4
Figure 19.6-35	CCTF Run 62 Total (Liquid and Vapor) Mass Flow Rate in Broken Loop Hot Leg	5
Figure 19.6-36		
	CCTF Run 62 Core Inlet Mass Flow Rate	6

Figure 19.6-38	CCTF Run 62 Time Step Sensitivity Study: Cladding Temperature at 8.0 ft
Figure 19.6-39	CCTF Run 62 Time Step Sensitivity Study: Cladding Temperature at 10.0 ft
Figure 19.6-40	CCTF Run 62 Time Step Sensitivity Study: Collapsed Liquid Level in Core
Figure 19.6-41	CCTF Run 62 Time Step Sensitivity Study: Collapsed Liquid Level in Upper Plenum
Figure 19.6-42	CCTF Run 62 Time Step Sensitivity Study: Pressure Difference from Lower Plenum to Upper Plenum
Figure 19.6-43	CCTF Run 62 Time Step Sensitivity Study: Pressure Difference from Cold Leg Nozzle to Upper Plenum
Figure 20.1-1	IPP Loop #2 Accumulator Line Schematic
Figure 20.1-2	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Model of Accumulator and SI Line in IPP and Callaway Test Models
Figure 20.1-3	Predicted Accumulator Pressure (Solid Line) Compared with Measured Test Data (Dashed Line)
Figure 20.1-4	Predicted Accumulator Flow Rate
Figure 20.1-5	Predicted Gas Temperature at Top of Accumulator 20-15
Figure 20.1-6	Comparison of CALLAWAY Accumulator Blowdown Test Data and <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 Prediction of Accumulator Pressure
Figure 20.1-7	Comparison of CALLAWAY Accumulator Blowdown Test Data and <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 Prediction of Accumulator Gas Volume
Figure 20.1-8	Comparison of CALLAWAY Accumulator Blowdown Test Data and <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 Prediction of Accumulator Gas Temperature
Figure 20.1-9	Best-fit Calculation of Polytropic Exponent from CALLAWAY Accumulator Blowdown <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 Prediction
Figure 20.1-10	Accumulator Liquid Level for LOFT Test L2-5 (Bayless et al., 1982) 20-20
Figure 20.1-11	Accumulator Pressure for LOFT Test L2-5 (Bayless et al., 1982) 20-21
Figure 20.1-12	Intact Loop Cold Leg Density for LOFT Test L2-5 (Bayless et al., 1982) 20-22
Figure 20.1-13	 (a) Core Liquid Level Plots for LOFT Test L2-5 (Bayless et al., 1982) (b) Fuel Rod Clad Temperatures (Bayless et al., 1982)
Figure 20.1-14	Fluid Density and Clad Temperature in Core at a) 27 inches, b) 44 inches Above Bottom of Core (Mackley and Birchley, 1985)

)

۰.

Figure 20.1-15	Suppression Tank Pressure for LOFT Test L2-5 (Bayless et al., 1982) 20-25
Figure 20.1-16	[] ^{18,C} 20.2 <i>C</i>
•]
Figure 20.1-17	[] ^{a,c} 20-27
Figure 20.1-18	[] ^{a,c} 20-28
Figure 20.1-19	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 20.1-20	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 20.1-21	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 20.1-22	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 20.1-23	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 20.1-24	ACHILLES Rig Configured for Best-Estimate Transients
Figure 20.1-25	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Model of ACHILLES Test
Figure 20.1-26	Cross Section of ACHILLES Cluster
Figure 20.1-27	Measured and Predicted Accumulator Pressure
Figure 20.1-28	Measured and Predicted Accumulator Discharge Line Mass Flow Rate
Figure 20.1-29	Measured and Predicted Pressure at Top of Downcomer
Figure 20.1-30	Measured and Predicted Pressure Loss from Top of Downcomer to Break 20-40
Figure 20.1-31	Measured and Predicted Gas Flow Rate from Top of Downcomer to Break 20-41
Figure 20.1-32	Measured and Predicted Downcomer Liquid Level
Figure 20.1-33	Measured and Predicted Test Section Liquid Level
Figure 20.1-34	Measured and Predicted Cladding Temperature at 1.08m (3.54 ft) 20-44
Figure 20.1-35	Measured and Predicted Cladding Temperature at 2.01m (6.59 ft) 20-45
Figure 20.1-36	Measured and Predicted Cladding Temperature at 2.65m (8.69 ft) 20-46
Figure 20.1-37	Measured and Predicted Accumulator Pressure (Broken Pipe Pressure Loss Sensitivity Study)
Figure 20.1-38	Measured and Predicted Accumulator Discharge Line Mass Flow Rate (Broken Pipe Pressure Loss Sensitivity Study)



Figure 20.1-39	Measured and Predicted Pressure at Top of Downcomer (Broken Pipe Pressure Loss Sensitivity Study)
Figure 20.1-40	Measured and Predicted Downcomer Liquid Level (Broken Pipe Pressure Loss Sensitivity Study)
Figure 20.1-41	Measured and Predicted Test Section Liquid Level (Broken Pipe Pressure Loss Sensitivity Study)
Figure 20.1-42	Measured and Predicted Cladding Temperature at 1.08m (3.54 ft) (Broken Pipe Pressure Loss Sensitivity Study)
Figure 20.1-43	Measured and Predicted Cladding Temperature at 2.01m (6.59 ft) (Broken Pipe Pressure Loss Sensitivity Study)
Figure 20.1-44	Measured and Predicted Cladding Temperature at 2.65m (8.69 ft) (Broken Pipe Pressure Loss Sensitivity Study)
Figure 20.2-1	Cross-Sectional View of the Westinghouse Scale Model Pump 20-60
Figure 20.2-2	Scale Model Homologous Head Single-Phase Data in the Pumping Mode, Forward and Reverse Flow
Figure 20.2-3	Scale Model Homologous Head Single-Phase Data in the Dissipation Mode, Forward Flow
Figure 20.2-4	Data Scatter for Dissipative Mode 1/3-Scale Pump Data (Cudlin, 1977) 20-63
Figure 20.2-5	Schematic of the Air/Water Test Facility
Figure 20.2-6	Homologous Head Curves and Westinghouse Air/Water Data
Figure 20.2-7	Single-Phase and Fully Degraded Pump Head Curves Compared With Two-Phase Data
Figure 20.2-8	Pump Single-Phase and Fully Degraded Torque Curves, Compared With Two-Phase Data
Figure 20.2-9	Two-Phase Multiplier and Pumping Mode Data
Figure 20.2-10	Two-Phase Multiplier and All Two-Phase Data
Figure 20.2-11	$M(\alpha)$ for Pump Torque (Referred to as $N(\alpha)$ in Equation 10-9) 20-70
Figure 20.2-12	Westinghouse Pump Head Curves Compared With LOFT Pump Head Curves
Figure 20.3-1	Scenario and Noding Diagram for 1D/3D Mass and Energy Test 20-73
Figure 20.3-2	Mass Conservation for 1D/3D Mass and Energy Test
Figure 20.3-3	Energy Conservation for 1D/3D Mass and Energy Test 20-75
Figure 21.2-1	Schematic Diagram of LSTF

WCAP-16996-NP

Figure 21.3-1	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Model of LSTF Pressure Vessel	21-58
Figure 21.3-2	LSTF Pressure Vessel Sections 1 and 2	21-59
Figure 21.3-3	LSTF Pressure Vessel Sections 3 and 4	21-60
Figure 21.3-4	LSTF Pressure Vessel Sections 5 and 6	21-61
Figure 21.3-5	LSTF Pressure Vessel Sections 7 and 8	21-62
Figure 21.3-6	LSTF Pressure Vessel Sections 9 and 10	21-63
Figure 21.3-7	ROSA-IV LSTF Core Simulator Map	21-64
Figure 21.3-8	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Loop Noding Diagram of LSTF	21-65
Figure 21.3-9	Hot Leg (Including Pressurizer), Steam Generator and Cross-Over Leg Noding	21-66
Figure 21.4-1	Pressurizer Pressure	21-67
Figure 21.4-2	Break Flows	21-68
Figure 21.4-3	Cross-Over Leg A Differential Pressures	21-69
Figure 21.4-4	Cross-Over Leg B Differential Pressures	21-70
Figure 21.4-5	Inner Vessel Differential Pressures	21-71
Figure 21.4-6	Calculated and Measured Peak Cladding Temperatures	21-72
Figure 21.4-7	SG-A U-tube Upflow Side Differential Pressures	21-73
Figure 21.4-8	SG-B U-tube Upflow Side Differential Pressures	21-74
Figure 21.4-9	SG-A U-tube Downflow Side Differential Pressures	21-75
Figure 21.4-10	SG-B U-tube Downflow Side Differential Pressures	21-76
Figure 21.4-11	SG-A Inlet-to-Outlet Differential Pressures	21-77
Figure 21.4-12	SG-B Inlet-to-Outlet Differential Pressures	21-78
Figure 21.4-13	SG-A Inlet Plenum Collapsed Liquid Levels	21-79
Figure 21.4-14	SG-B Inlet Plenum Collapsed Liquid Levels	21-80
Figure 21.4-15	Upper Plenum to SG-A Inlet Differential Pressures	21-81
Figure 21.4-16	Upper Plenum to SG-B Inlet Differential Pressures	21-82
Figure 21.4-17	Upper Plenum Differential Pressures	21-83
Figure 21.4-18	Downcomer Differentail Pressures	21-84
Figure 21.4-19	Comparison of Calculated and Measured Accumulator Injection Flows Loop A	21-85

Figure 21.4-20	Comparison of Calculated and Measured Accumulator Injection Flows Loop
Figure 21.5-1	Core Power
Figure 21.5-2	Pump Speed
Figure 21.5-3	Loop Flow Rates
Figure 21.5-4	Break Flows
Figure 21.5-5	Calculated Break Spool Void Fraction
Figure 21.5-6	Pressurizer Pressures
Figure 21.5-7	Steam Generator Secondary Side Pressures
Figure 21.5-8	Steam Generator SGA U-tube Differential Pressures
Figure 21.5-9	Steam Generator SGB U-tube Differential Pressures
Figure 21.5-10	Cross-Over Leg A Differential Pressures
Figure 21.5-11	Cross-Over Leg B Differential Pressures
Figure 21.5-12	Upper Plenum Differential Pressures
Figure 21.5-13	Upper Plenum to SGA Inlet Differential Pressures
Figure 21.5-14	Upper Plenum to SGB Inlet Differential Pressures
Figure 21.5-15	Downcomer Differential Pressures
Figure 21.5-16	Core Differential Pressures
Figure 21.5-17	Core Differential Pressures for SB-CL-05 and SB-CL-18
Figure 21.5-18	Cold Leg A Pumped ECCS Injection Flows (CLA)
Figure 21.5-19	Total Pumped ECCS Injection Flows (CLA plus CLB)
Figure 21.5-20	Accumulator Hot (ACH) Liquid Level
Figure 21.5-21	Calculated and Measured Peak Cladding Temperatures
Figure 21.6-1	Loop-A Pump Speed Comparison
Figure 21.6-2	Loop-B Pump Speed Comparison
Figure 21.6-3	Comparison of Loop-A Flow Rates21-110
Figure 21.6-4	Comparison of Loop-B Flow Rates
Figure 21.6-5	Comparison of Break Flows
Figure 21.6-6	Comparison of Fluid Density in the Break Spool
Figure 21.6-7	Comparison of Loop-B Cross-Over Leg Differential Pressures

WCAP-16996-NP

Figure 21.6-8	Comparison of System Pressures	115
Figure 21.6-9	Comparison of SG-A U-tube Inlet-to-top Differential Pressures21-	116
Figure 21.6-10	Comparison of SG-B U-tube Inlet-to-top Differential Pressures21-	117
Figure 21.6-11	Comparison of SG-A U-tube Outlet-to-top Differential Pressures21-	118
Figure 21.6-12	Comparison of SG-B U-tube Outlet-to-top Differential Pressures21-	119
Figure 21.6-13	Comparison of SG_A Inlet Plenum Draining	120
Figure 21.6-14	Comparison of Core Collapsed Liquid Levels	121
Figure 21.6-15	Calculated Accumulator Injection Flows	122
Figure 21.6-16	High Power Rod (Rod 1) Cladding Temperature	123
Figure 21.7-1	Break Unit Configuration used in 2.5% Cold Leg Break Tests, SB-CL-01, 02, and 03 (Koizumi, et al., 1987)	124
Figure 21.7-2	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Nodalization of LSTF Break Unit	125
Figure 21.7-3	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Primary System Pressure (ROSA-IV 2.5-Percent Cold Leg Break)	126
Figure 21.7-4	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Break Flow rates (ROSA-IV 2.5-Percent Cold Leg Break)	127
Figure 21.7-5	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Mixture Levels in Broken Cold Leg (ROSA-IV 2.5-Percent Cold Leg Break Runs)	128
Figure 21.7-6	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Core Collapsed Liquid Levels (ROSA-IV 2.5-Percent Cold Leg Break Runs)	129
Figure 21.7-7	Cladding Temperature of B-20 Rod at Position 7 (8.67-ft Elevation) for Side, Bottom, and Top Break Experiments	130
Figure 21.7-8	Predicted and Measured Differential Pressures in SGA Uphill Side	131
Figure 21.7-9	Predicted and Measured Differential Pressures in SGB Uphill Side 21-	132
Figure 21.7-10	Calculated Accumulator Injection Flows	133
Figure 21.7-11	Break Unit Configuration used in the 0.5% Break Tests, SB-CL-12, -15, and -16	134
Figure 21.7-12	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Broken Cold Leg Liquid Levels, ROSA 0.5-Percent Cold Leg Break Runs	135
Figure 21.7-13	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Core Collapsed Liquid Levels, ROSA 0.5-Percent Cold Leg Break Runs	136

.

LIST OF FIGURES (cont.)

Figure 21.7-14	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Integrated Break Flows, ROSA 0.5-Percent Cold Leg Break Runs	7
Figure 21.8-1	Break Flow Comparison	3
Figure 21.8-2	System Pressure Comparison)
Figure 21.8-3(a)	Cross-over Leg A Vapor Flows)
Figure 21.8-3(b)	Cross-over Leg B Vapor Flows	l
Figure 21.8-4	Core Collapsed Levels	2
Figure 21.8-5(a)	Steam Generator A U-tubes Upflow Differential Pressures	3
Figure 21.8-5(b)	Steam Generator B U-tubes Upflow Differential Pressures	1
Figure 21.9-1	ST-NC-02 Primary Pressure and Loop Flow Rate (Figure taken from Reference 9) (Y. Kikuta, et.al., "Nonuniform Steam Generator U-Tube Flow Distribution During Natural Circulation Tests in ROSA-IV Large Scale Test Facility," 1988.)	5
Figure 21.9-2	Primary Side Circulation Flow as a Function of Primary Side Inventory 21-140	5
Figure 21.9-3	ST-NC-02 Primary and Secondary System Pressures	7
Figure 21.9-4	Steam Generator U-tube Upflow Side Differential Pressures	3
Figure 21.9-5	Core Differential Pressure)
Figure 21.9-6	Upper Plenum Differential Pressure)
Figure 21.9-7	Downcomer Differential Pressure	l
Figure 21.9-8	Downcomer-to-Upper Plenum Differential Pressure	2
Figure 21.9-9	SG Primary-to-Secondary Side Heat Transfer Coefficients	3
Figure 21.9-10	Steam Generator Primary-to-Secondary Side Temperature Difference	1
Figure 21.9-11	Steam Generator SGA U-tube Uphill Void Fraction	5
Figure 21.9-12	Steam Generator SGA U-tube Downhill Void Fraction	5
Figure 21.9-13	Steam Generator SGB U-tube Uphill Void Fraction	7
Figure 21.9-14	Steam Generator SGB U-tube Downhill Void Fraction	3
Figure 21.10.1-1	Calculated Counter-current Flow at the Inlet of Steam Generator U-tubes (Simulation of 10% Break Test SB-CL-14))
Figure 21.10.1-2	Calculated Counter-current Flow at the Inlet of Steam Generator U-tubes (Simulation of 5% Break Test SB-CL-18))
Figure 21.10.1-3	Calculated Counter-current Flow at the Inlet of Steam Generator U-tubes (Simulation of 2.5% Break Test SB-CL-01)	L

WCAP-16996-NP

Figure 21.10.1-4	Calculated Counter-current Flow at the Inlet of Steam Generator U-tubes (Simulation of 0.5% Break Test SB-CL-12)	21-162
Figure 21.10.1-5	Calculated Counter-current Flow at the Inlet of Steam Generator U-tubes (Simulation of the Natural Circulation Test SB-CL-12)	21-163
Figure 21.10.2-1	Calculated Counter-current Flow at the Hot Leg Elbows and SG Inlets (Simulation of 10% Break Test SB-CL-14)	21-164
Figure 21.10.2-2	Calculated Counter-current Flow at the Hot Leg Elbows and SG Inlets (Simulation of 5% Break Test SB-CL-18)	21-165
Figure 21.10.2-3	Calculated Counter-current Flow at the Hot Leg Elbows and SG Inlets (Simulation of 2.5% Break Test SB-CL-01)	21-166
Figure 21.10.2-4	Calculated Counter-current Flow at the Hot Leg Elbows and SG Inlets Simulation of 0.5% Break Test SB-CL-12)	21-167
Figure 21.10.3-1	Calculated Counter-current Flow Conditions at the Top of the Peripheral CCFL Channel 72	21-168
Figure 21.10.3-2	Calculated Counter-current Flow Conditions at the Top of the Inner Average CCFL Channel 14	21-169
Figure 21.10.3-3	Calculated Counter-current Flow Conditions at the Top of the Inner Hot CCFL Channel 11	21-170
Figure 21.10.3-4	Calculated UCP Counter-current Flow Conditions (10% Break Test SB-CL-14).	21-171
Figure 21.10.3-5	Calculated UCP Counter-current Flow Conditions (2.5% Break Test SB-CL-01)	21-172
Figure 21.10.3-6	Calculated UCP Counter-current Flow Conditions (0.5% Break Test SB-CL-12)	21-173
Figure 21.10.4-1	Counter-current Flow Periods in Relation to the Steam Generator A Uphill Side Differential Pressure	21-174
Figure 21.10.4-2	Counter-current Flow Periods in Relation to the Steam Generator A Inlet Plenum Collapsed Level	21-175
Figure 21.10.4-3	Counter-current Flow Periods in Relation to the Steam Generator B Uphill Side Differential Pressure	21-176
Figure 21.10.4-4	Counter-current Flow Periods in Relation to the Steam Generator B Inlet Plenum Collapsed Level	21-177
Figure 21.10.4-5	Calculated Velocities at Upper Core Plate Outer Jet Channel 73 (top of peripheral CCFL Channel 72)	21-178

Figure 21.10.4-6	Calculated Velocities at Upper Core Plate Average Jet Channel 20 (top of CCFL Channel 14)	21-179
Figure 21.10.4-7	Calculated Velocities at Upper Core Plate Hot Jet Channel 19 (top of CCFL Channel 14)	21-180
Figure 21.10.4-8	Counter-current Flow Periods in Relation to the Liquid Pool Level above UCP	21-181
Figure 21.10.4-9	Counter-current Flow Periods in Relation to the Inner Vessel Level	21-182
Figure 21.10.4-10	Calculated Hot Leg Flow Rates	21-183
Figure 21.10.4-11	Calculated CCFL at UCP Outer Jet Channel 73	21-184
Figure 21.10.4-12	Calculated and Measured Cladding Temperatures of Low Power Rods at 7.33-ft Elevation	21-185
Figure 21.10.4-12	Calculated and Measured Cladding Temperatures of Low Power Rods at 7.33-ft Elevation	21-186
Figure 21.10.4-13	Calculated and Measured Cladding Temperatures of High Power Rods at 7.33-ft Elevation	21-187
Figure 21.10.4-13	Calculated and Measured Cladding Temperatures of High Power Rods at 7.33-ft Elevation	21-188
Figure 21.10.4-14	Calculated and Measured Cladding Temperatures of Average Power Rods at 7.33-ft Elevation	21-189
Figure 21.10.4-14	Calculated and Measured Cladding Temperatures of Average Power Rods at 7.33-ft Elevation	21-190
Figure 21.11.1-1	SB-CL-18 Cross-Over Leg A Differential Pressures	21-191
Figure 21.11.1-2	SB-CL-18 Cross-Over Leg B Differential Pressures	21-192
Figure 21.11.1-3	Inner Vessel Differential Pressures (LP+Core+UCP)	21-193
Figure 21.11.1-4	Downcomer Differential Pressures	21-194
Figure 21.11.1-5	Lower Plenum Differential Pressures	21-195
Figure 21.11.1-6	Upper Plenum Differential Pressures	21-196
Figure 21.11.1-7	Peak Cladding Temperatures	21-197
Figure 21.11.2-1	SB-CL-18 Cross-Over Leg A Differential Pressures	21-198
Figure 21.11.2-2	SB-CL-18 Cross-Over Leg B Differential Pressures	21-199
Figure 21.11.2-3	Inner Vessel Differential Pressures (LP+Core+UCP)	21-200
Figure 21.11.2-4	Downcomer Differential Pressures	21-201

E: 01.11.0 5		21 202
Figure 21.11.2-5	Lower Plenum Differential Pressures	
Figure 21.11.2-6	Upper Plenum Differential Pressures	21-203
Figure 21.11.2-7	Peak Cladding Temperatures	21-204
Figure 21.11.3-1	SB-CL-18 Cross-Over Leg A Differential Pressures	21-205
Figure 21.11.3-2	SB-CL-18 Cross-Over Leg B Differential Pressures	21-206
Figure 21.11.3-3	Inner Vessel Differential Pressures (LP+Core+UCP)	
Figure 21.11.3-4	Downcomer Differential Pressures	21-208
Figure 21.11.3-5	Lower Plenum Differential Pressures	21-209
Figure 21.11.3-6	Upper Plenum Differential Pressures	21-210
Figure 21.11.3-7	Peak Cladding Temperatures	21-211
Figure 21.12-1	Break Flows	21-212
Figure 21.12-2	Calculated Break Void Fraction	21-213
Figure 21.12-3	Cross-Over Leg A Differential Pressures	21-214
Figure 21.12-4	Cross-Over Leg B Differential Pressures	21-215
Figure 21.12-5	Pressurizer Pressures	21-216
Figure 21.12-6	SGA U-tubes Inlet-to-Top Differential Pressure	21-217
Figure 21.12-7	SGB U-tubes Inlet-to-Top Differential Pressures	21-218
Figure 21.12-8	SGA U-tubes Outlet-to-Top Differential Pressures	
Figure 21.12-9	SGB U-tube Outlet-to-Top Differential Pressures	21-220
Figure 21.12-10	SGA Inlet Plenum Collapsed Liquid Levels	21-221
Figure 21.12-11	SGB Inlet Plenum Collapsed Liquid Levels	21-222
Figure 21.12-12	Upper Plenum to SGA Inlet Differential Pressures	21-223
Figure 21.12-13	Upper Plenum to SGB Inlet Differential Pressures	21-224
Figure 21.12-14	Downcomer Differential Pressures	21-225
Figure 21.12-15	Upper Plenum Differential Pressures	21-226
Figure 21.12-16	Inner Vessel (LP+Core+UP) Differential Pressures	21-227
Figure 21.12-17	Lower Plenum Differential Pressures	21-228
Figure 21.12-18	Peak Cladding Temperatures	21-229
Figure 21.12-19	Accumulator A Injection Flows	21-230

Figure 21.13-1	Break Flows	-231
Figure 21.13-2	Calculated Break Void Fraction	-232
Figure 21.13-3	Cross-Over Leg A Differential Pressures	-233
Figure 21.13-4	Cross-Over Leg B Differential Pressures	-234
Figure 21.13-5	Pressurizer Pressures	-235
Figure 21.13-6	SGA U-tubes Inlet-to-Top Differential Pressure	-236
Figure 21.13-7	SGB U-tubes Inlet-to-Top Differential Pressures	-237
Figure 21.13-8	SGA U-tubes Outlet-to-Top Differential Pressures	-238
Figure 21.13-9	SGB U-tube Outlet-to-Top Differential Pressures	-239
Figure 21.13-10	SGA Inlet Plenum Collapsed Liquid Levels	-240
Figure 21.13-11	SGB Inlet Plenum Collapsed Liquid Levels	-241
Figure 21.13-12	Upper Plenum to SGA Inlet Differential Pressures	-242
Figure 21.13-13	Upper Plenum to SGB Inlet Differential Pressures	-243
Figure 21.13-14	Downcomer Differential Pressures	-244
Figure 21.13-15	Upper Plenum Differential Pressures	-245
Figure 21.13-16	Inner Vessel (LP+Core+UP) Differential Pressures	-246
Figure 21.13-17	Lower Plenum Differential Pressures	-247
Figure 21.13-18	Peak Cladding Temperatures	-248
Figure 21.13-19	Accumulator A Injection Flows	-249
Figure 21.14-1	Pump A Differential Pressures	-250
Figure 21.14-2	SB-CL-18 Cross-Over Leg A Differential Pressures	-251
Figure 21.14-3	SB-CL-18 Cross-Over Leg B Differential Pressures	-252
Figure 21.14-4	Inner Vessel Differential Pressures (LP+Core+UCP)	-253
Figure 21.14-5	Downcomer Differential Pressures	-254
Figure 21.14-6	Lower Plenum Differential Pressures	-255
Figure 21.14-7	Upper Plenum Differential Pressures	-256
Figure 21.14-8	Hot Leg A Differential Pressures	-257
Figure 21.14-9	Hot Leg B Differential Pressures	-258
Figure 21.14-10	Peak Cladding Temperatures	-259

Figure 21.15-1	SB-CL-18 Cross-Over Leg A Differential Pressures
Figure 21.15-2	SB-CL-18 Cross-Over Leg B Differential Pressures
Figure 21.15-3	Inner Vessel Differential Pressures (LP+Core+UCP)
Figure 21.15-4	Upper Plenum Differential Pressures
Figure 21.15-5	Downcomer Differential Pressures
Figure 21.15-6	Peak Cladding Temperatures
Figure 21.16.1-1	Calculated Break Flow Rates
Figure 21.16.1-2	Calculated Pressurizer and Steam Generator Secondary Pressures 21-267
Figure 21.16.1-3	Calculated Steam Generator U-tube Uphill Side Differential Pressures
Figure 21.16.1-4	Calculated Cross-Over Leg A Differential Pressures
Figure 21.16.1-5	Calculated Cross-Over Leg B Differential Pressures
Figure 21.16.1-6	Calculated Downcomer Differential Pressures
Figure 21.16.1-7	Calculated Upper Plenum Differential Pressures
Figure 21.16.1-8	Calculated Hot Leg Differential Pressures
Figure 21.16.1-9	Calculated Core Differential Pressures
Figure 21.16.1-10	Calculated Peak Cladding Temperatures
Figure 21.16.2-1	Calculated Break Flow Rates
Figure 21.16.2-2	Calculated Pressurizer and Steam Generator Secondary Pressures 21-275
Figure 21.16.2-3	Calculated Steam Generator U-tube Uphill Side Differential Pressures
Figure 21.16.2-4	Calculated Cross-Over Leg A Differential Pressures
Figure 21.16.2-5	Calculated Cross-Over Leg B Differential Pressures
Figure 21.16.2-6	Calculated Downcomer Differential Pressures
Figure 21.16.2-7	Calculated Upper Plenum Differential Pressures
Figure 21.16.2-8	Calculated Hot Leg Differential Pressures
Figure 21.16.2-9	Calculated Core Differential Pressures
Figure 21.16.2-10	Calculated Peak Cladding Temperatures
Figure 21.16.3-1	Calculated Break Flow Rates
Figure 21.16.3-2	Calculated Pressurizer and Steam Generator Secondary Pressures
Figure 21.16.3-3	Calculated Steam Generator U-tube Uphill Side Differential Pressures

с

Figure 21.16.3-4	Calculated Cross-Over Leg A Differential Pressures
Figure 21.16.3-5	Calculated Cross-Over Leg B Differential Pressures
Figure 21.16.3-6	Calculated Downcomer Differential Pressures
Figure 21.16.3-7	Calculated Upper Plenum Differential Pressures
Figure 21.16.3-8	Calculated Hot Leg Differential Pressures
Figure 21.16.3-9	Calculated Core Differential Pressures
Figure 21.16.3-10	Calculated Peak Cladding Temperatures
Figure 21.17-1	Cold Leg Void Fractions at the SI Injection Nodes
Figure 21.17-2	Mixture Flow at the Broken Cold Leg Nozzle (interface with the vessel) 21-291
Figure 21.17-3	Total SI Condensation Heat Rate at Cold Leg Injection Node in CLA 21-292
Figure 21.17-4	Cold Leg Fluid Temperatures at SI Injection Nodes
Figure 21.17-5	Cold Leg Pressures at SI Injection Nodes
Figure 21.17-6	Accumulator Injection Flows
Figure 21.17-7	Broken Cold Leg Void at Break Off-take Node
Figure 21.17-8	Break Void Fractions
Figure 21.17-9	Fluid Temperatures at the Break
Figure 21.17-10	Break Flow Rates
Figure 21.17-11	Integrated Break Flows
Figure 21.17-12	Integrated Break Flow Difference (KCOSI_low-KCOSI_high)
Figure 21.18-1	Calculated Primary and Steam Generator Secondary Pressures
Figure 21.18-2	Calculated Break Flows
Figure 21.18-3	Calculated Draining of Steam Generator U-tubes Uphill Side 21-301
Figure 21.18-4	Calculated Upper Plenum Differential Pressures
Figure 21.18-5	Calculated Upper Plenum to Steam Generator Inlet Differential Pressures 21-303
Figure 21.18-6	Calculated Cross-Over Leg Differential Pressures (Bottom-to-Pump Inlet) 21-304
Figure 21.18-7	Calculated Loop Flow Rates
Figure 21.18-8	Calculated Core Differential Pressures
Figure 21.18-9	Calculated Peak Cladding Temperatures
Figure 22-1	Schematic of LOFT Facility

Figure 22-2	LOFT Reactor Vessel Diagram with Flow Paths	22-32
Figure 22-3	LOFT Reactor Core and Arrangement of Incore Instrumentation	22-33
Figure 22-4	LOFT <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 Vessel Model	22-34
Figure 22-5	Section Views of LOFT <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 Vessel Model	22-35
Figure 22-6	Section Views of LOFT WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Vessel Model	22-36
Figure 22-7	Section Views of LOFT WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Vessel Model	22-37
Figure 22-8	Arrangement of WCOBRA/TRAC Core Channels	22-38
Figure 22-9	LOFT Intact Loop <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 Model	22-39
Figure 22-10	LOFT Active Loop Steam Generator WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Model	22-40
Figure 22-11(a)	Inactive (Broken) Loop Break Orifice and Cold Leg Modeling – LOFT Large Break	22-41
Figure 22-11(b)	Inactive (Broken) Loop Break Orifice and Cold Leg Modeling – LOFT Small Break	22-42
Figure 22-11c)	Inactive (Broken) Loop Break Orifice (Gillas and Carpenter, 1980) and Cold Leg Modeling – LOFT Intermediate Break	22-43
Figure 22-12	LOFT Inactive (Broken) Loop Hot Leg WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Model	22-44
Figure 22-13	Typical Time History of Cladding Temperature during a LOFT Large break Test Transient	22-45
Figure 22-14	Predicted (Component 500) and Measured (PE-PC-005) Pressure, Test L2-2	22-46
Figure 22-15	Predicted (Component 500) and Measured (PE-PC-005) Pressure, Test L2-3	22- 47.
Figure 22-16	Predicted (Component 500) and Measured (PE-PC-005) Pressure, Test L2-5	22-48
Figure 22-17	Predicted (Component 500) and Measured (PE-PC-005) Pressure, Test LB-1	22-49
Figure 22-18	Predicted (Component 900) and Measured (FR-BL-216) Mass Flow Rate in Broken Hot Leg, Test L2-2	22-50
Figure 22-19	Predicted (Component 900) and Measured (FR-BL-116) Mass Flow Rate in Broken Hot Leg, Test L2-3	22-51
Figure 22-20	Predicted (Component 900) and Measured (FR-BL-002) Mass Flow Rate in Broken Hot Leg, Test L2-5	22-52

WCAP-16996-NP

١

Figure 22-21	Predicted (Component 900) and Measured (FR-BL-205) Mass Flow Rate in Broken Hot Leg, Test LB-1	22-53
Figure 22-22	Predicted (Component 96) and Measured (FR-BL-116) Mass Flow Rate in Broken Cold Leg, Test L2-2	22-54
Figure 22-23	Predicted (Component 96) and Measured (FR-BL-216) Mass Flow Rate in Broken Cold Leg, Test L2-3	22-55
Figure 22-24	Predicted (Component 96) and Measured (FR-BL-001) Mass Flow Rate in Broken Cold Leg, Test L2-5	22-56
Figure 22-25	Predicted (Component 96) and Measured (FR-BL-105) Mass Flow Rate in Broken Cold Leg, Test LB-1	22-57
Figure 22-26	Predicted (Component 300) and Measured (FT-P139-27) Mass Flow Rate in Intact Hot Leg, Test L2-2	22-58
Figure 22-27	Predicted (Component 300) and Measured (Figures 69, 78, Prassinos, et. al, 1979) Mass Flow Rate in Intact Hot Leg, Test L2-3	22-59
Figure 22-28	Predicted (Component 300) and Measured (FR-PC-201) Mass Flow Rate in Intact Hot Leg, Test L2-5	22-60
Figure 22-29	Predicted (Component 810) and Measured (FR-PC-105) Mass Flow Rate in Intact Cold Leg, Test LB-1	22-61
Figure 22-30a	Predicted (Component 840) and Measured (FT-P120-36) Volumetric Flow Rate and Predicted (Component 840) Void Fraction from Accumulator, Test L2-2	22-62
Figure 22-30b	Predicted (Component 850) and Measured (LIT-P120-087) Liquid Level in Accumulator, Test L2-2	22-63
Figure 22-30c	Measured Liquid Levels in Downcomer and Core Regions, Test L2-2	22-64
Figure 22-30d	Predicted Liquid Levels in Downcomer and Core Region, Test L2-2	22-65
Figure 22-30e	Predicted and Measured Liquid Levels in Core Regions, Test L2-2	22-66
Figure 22-31a	Predicted (Component 840) and Measured (FT-P120-36) Volumetric Flow Rate and Predicted (Component 840) Void Fraction from Accumulator, Test L2-3	22-67
Figure 22-31b	Predicted (Component 850) and Measured (LIT-P120-084) Liquid Level in Accumulator, Test L2-3	22-68
Figure 22-31c	Measured Liquid Levels in Downcomer and Core Regions, Test L2-3	22-69
Figure 22-31d	Predicted Liquid Levels in Downcomer and Vessel Core Regions, Test L2-3	22-70

)

Figure 22-31e	Predicted Liquid Levels in Downcomer and Vessel Core Regions, Test L2-3	. 22-71
Figure 22-32a	Predicted (Component 850) Accumulator Volumetric Flow Rate and Void Fraction, Test L2-5	. 22-72
Figure 22-32b	Predicted (Component 850) and Measured Accumulator Water Level, Test L2-5	. 22-73
Figure 22-32c	Measured Liquid Levels in Downcomer and Core Regions, Test L2-5	. 22-74
Figure 22-32d	Predicted Liquid Levels in Downcomer and Vessel Core Regions, Test L2-5	. 22-75
Figure 22-32e	Predicted and Measured Liquid Levels in Vessel Core Regions, Test L2-5	. 22-76
Figure 22-33a	Predicted (Component 840) and Measured (FT-P120-36-1) Volumetric Flow Rate and Predicted (Component 840) Void Fraction from Accumulator, Test LB-1	. 22-77
Figure 22-33b	Predicted (Component 850) and Measured (LIT-P120-044, LIT-P120-087) Accumulator Water Level, Test LB-1	. 22-78
Figure 22-33c	Predicted Liquid Levels in Downcomer and Vessel Core Regions, Test LB-1	. 22-79
Figure 22-33e	Predicted Liquid Level in Vessel Core Regions and Measured Vessel LowerPlenum Fluid Temperature, Test LB-1	. 22-80
Figure 22-34	Predicted (2.72 ft) and Measured Cladding Temperature in the Hot Channel, Test L2-2	. 22-81
Figure 22-35	Predicted (2.79 ft) and Measured Cladding Temperature in the Hot Channel, Test L2-3	. 22-82
Figure 22-36	Predicted (1.54 ft) and Measured Cladding Temperature in the Hot Channel, Test L2-5	. 22-83
Figure 22-37	Predicted (2.79 ft) and Measured Cladding Temperature in Hot Channel, Test LB-1	. 22-84
Figure 22-38	Impact of Critical Flow Model Uncertainties on PCS Pressure, Test L2-3	. 22-85
Figure 22-39	Impact of Critical Flow Model Uncertainties on Cold Leg Break Flow, Test L2-3	. 22-86
Figure 22-40	Impact of Critical Flow Model Uncertainties on Cladding Temperature, Test L2-3	. 22-87
Figure 22-41	Predicted (Component 810) and Measured Fluid Temperatures in Intact Cold Leg, Test L2-5	. 22-88

Figure 22-42	Predicted and Measured Inlet and Outlet Fluid Temperature in Intact Loop Steam Generator, Test L2-5
Figure 22-43	Predicted (Component 600) Pressure Difference Across Intact Loop Pump, Test L2-5
Figure 22-44	Predicted (Rod 1 at 2.18 ft.) and Measured Centerline Fuel Temperature, Test LB-1
Figure 22-45	Predicted and Measured Core Power, Test L2-5
Figure 22-46	Predicted and Measured Primary System Pressure, Test L3-1 22-93
Figure 22-47	Predicted and Measured Steam Generator Secondary Side Pressure, Test L3-1
Figure 22-48	Predicted and Measured Cold Leg Break Flow and Void Fraction Before the Break, Test L3-1
Figure 22-49	Predicted and Measured Accumulator Liquid Level, Test L3-1 22-96
Figure 22-50	Predicted and Measured Accumulator Pressure, Test L3-1
Figure 22-51	Measured Primary and SG Secondary Pressure, Test L3-1
Figure 22-52	Impact of SG Secondary Side Pressure on Primary Pressure, Test L3-1 22-99
Figure 22-53	Impact of Critical Flow Model Uncertainties on Primary Pressure, Test L3-1
Figure 22-54	Impact of Critical Flow Model Uncertainties on Break Flow, Test L3-1 22-101
Figure 22-55	Predicted and Measured Primary System Pressure, Test L5-1 22-102
Figure 22-56	Predicted and Measured Cold Leg Break Flow and Break Upstream Void Fraction, Test L5-1
Figure 22-57	Predicted and Measured Primary and Steam Generator Secondary Side Pressure, Test L5-1
Figure 22-58	Predicted and Measured Hot Assembly Cladding Temperature, Test L5-1
Figure 22-59	Predicted and Measured Accumulator Liquid Level, Test L5-1 22-106
Figure 22-60	Impact of Critical Flow Model Uncertainties on Primary Pressure, Test L5-1
Figure 22-61	Impact of Critical Flow Model Uncertainties on Break Flow, Test L5-1 22-108
Figure 22-62	Impact of Critical Flow Model Uncertainties on Cladding Temperature, Test L5-1

Figure 22-63	Impact of Horizontal Stratification in the Intact Hot Leg on Cladding Temperature, Test L5-1
Figure 22-64	Impact of Horizontal Stratification in the Intact Hot Leg on Break Flow, Test L5-1
Figure 22-65	Impact of Horizontal Stratification in the Intact Hot Leg on Cladding Temperature, Test L5-1
Figure 22-66	Measured Liquid Levels in Reactor Vessel Core Region, Test L5-122-113
Figure 22-67	Predicted Liquid Levels in Upper Plenum and Vessel Core Regions (Base Case), Test L5-1
Figure 22-68	Predicted Liquid Levels in Upper Plenum and Vessel Core Regions (with HS_SLUG=0.1) for Test L5-1
Figure 22-69	Predicted Flow Regime and Liquid Flow Rate in the Hot Leg for both the Base case and Sensitivity case (with HS_LUG=0.1) for Test L5-1
Figure 23.1.1-1	Small Blowdown Vessel
Figure 23.1.1-2	Small Blowdown Vessel Instrumentation
Figure 23.1.1-3	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Model of the GE Vessel Blowdown Facility 23-8
Figure 23.1.1-4	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Fraction at Level 1, Test 8-21-1
Figure 23.1.1-5	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Fraction at Level 2, Test 8-21-1
Figure 23.1.1-6	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Fraction at Level 3, Test 8-21-1
Figure 23.1.1-7	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Fraction at Level 4, Test 8-21-1
Figure 23.1.1-8	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Fraction at Level 5, Test 8-21-1
Figure 23.1.1-9	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Fraction at Level 6, Test 8-21-1
Figure 23.1.1-10	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Fraction at Level 1, Test 8-25-1
Figure 23.1.1-11	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Fraction at Level 2, Test 8-25-1
Figure 23.1.1-12	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Fraction at Level 3, Test 8-25-1

Figure 23.1.1-13	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Fraction at Level 4, Test 8-25-1	23-18
Figure 23.1.1-14	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Fraction at Level 5, Test 8-25-1	23-19
Figure 23.1.1-15	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Fraction at Level 6, Test 8-25-1	23-20
Figure 23.1.1-16	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Fraction at Level 1, Test 8-28-1	23-21
Figure 23.1.1-17	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Fraction at Level 2, Test 8-28-1	23-22
Figure 23.1.1-18	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Fraction at Level 3, Test 8-28-1	23-23
Figure 23.1.1-19	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Fraction at Level 4, Test 8-28-1	23-24
Figure 23.1.1-20	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Fraction at Level 5, Test 8-28-1	23-25
Figure 23.1.1-21	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Fraction at Level 6, Test 8-28-1	23-26
Figure 23.1.1-22	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Fraction at Level 1, Test 9-1-1	23-27
Figure 23.1.1-23	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Fraction at Level 2, Test 9-1-1	23-28
Figure 23.1.1-24	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Fraction at Level 3, Test 9-1-1	23-29
Figure 23.1.1-25	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Fraction at Level 4, Test 9-1-1	23-30
Figure 23.1.1-26	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Fraction at Level 5, Test 9-1-1	23-31
Figure 23.1.1-27	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Fraction at Level 6, Test 9-1-1	23-32
Figure 23.1.1-28	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Fraction at Level 1, Test 9-15-1	23-33
Figure 23.1.1-29	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Fraction at Level 2, Test 9-15-1	23-34


Figure 23.1.1-30	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Fraction at Level 3, Test 9-15-1	
Figure 23.1.1-31	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Fraction at Level 4, Test 9-15-1	
Figure 23.1.1-32	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Fraction at Level 5, Test 9-15-1	23-37
Figure 23.1.1-33	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Fraction at Level 6, Test 9-15-1	
Figure 23.1.1-34	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Fraction at Level 1, Test 1004-3	
Figure 23.1.1-35	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Fraction at Level 2, Test 1004-3	
Figure 23.1.1-36	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Fraction at Level 3, Test 1004-3	
Figure 23.1.1-37	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Fraction at Level 4, Test 1004-3	
Figure 23.1.1-38	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Fraction at Level 5, Test 1004-3	23-43
Figure 23.1.1-39	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Fraction at Level 6, Test 1004-3	23-44
Figure 23.1.1-40	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Fraction at Level 1, Test 1004-2	
Figure 23.1.1-41	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Fraction at Level 2, Test 1004-2	23-46
Figure 23.1.1-42	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Fraction at Level 3, Test 1004-2	
Figure 23.1.1-43	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Fraction at Level 4, Test 1004-2	
Figure 23.1.1-44	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Fraction at Level 5, Test 1004-2	
Figure 23.1.1-45	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Fraction at Level 6, Test 1004-2	23-50
Figure 23.1.2-1	Semiscale Mod-3 Facility Overview	23-59
Figure 23.1.2-2	Plan View of Semiscale Mod-3 Core for S-07-10D Test	

Figure 23.1.2-3	Semiscale S-07-10D Test Axial Power Profile in Relation to Vessel Instrumentation	23-61
Figure 23.1.2-4	Semiscale Mod-3 Pressure Vessel and Downcomer – Cross Section Showing Instrumentation	23-62
Figure 23.1.2-5	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Semiscale Mod 3 Vessel Model	23-63
Figure 23.1.2-6	Semiscale S-07-10D Test Upper Plenum Pressure (Hot Leg Backpressure)	23-64
Figure 23.1.2-7	Semiscale S-07-10D Test Lower Plenum Fluid Temperature	23-65
Figure 23.1.2-8	Semiscale S-07-10D Test Core Power Decay	23-66
Figure 23.1.2-9	Semiscale S-07-10D Test Core Collapsed Liquid Level	23-67
Figure 23.1.2-10	Density Measurement Recorded During Semiscale S-07-10D Test	23-68
Figure 23.1.2-11	Semiscale S-07-10D Clad Temperature at Elevation = 354 cm (from the Bottom of the Core)	23-69
Figure 23.1.2-12	Semiscale S-07-10D Clad Temperature at Elevation = 322 cm (from the Bottom of the Core)	23-70
Figure 23.1.2-13	Semiscale S-07-10D Clad Temperature at Elevation = 277 cm (from the Bottom of the Core)	23-71
Figure 23.1.2-14	Semiscale S-07-10D Clad Temperature at Elevation = 254 cm (from the Bottom of the Core)	23-72
Figure 23.1.2-15	Semiscale S-07-10D Clad Temperature at Elevation = 226 cm (from the Bottom of the Core)	23-73
Figure 23.1.2-16	Semiscale S-07-10D Clad Temperature at Elevation = 208 cm (from the Bottom of the Core)	23-74
Figure 23.1.2-17	Semiscale S-07-10D Clad Temperature at Elevation = 190 cm (from the Bottom of the Core)	23-75
Figure 23.1.2-18	Semiscale S-07-10D Clad Temperature at Elevation = 181 cm (from the Bottom of the Core)	23-76
Figure 23.1.2-19	Semiscale S-07-10D Clad Temperature at Elevation = 167 cm (from the Bottom of the Core)	23-77
Figure 23.1.2-20	Semiscale S-07-10D Clad Temperature Elevation = 135 cm (from the Bottom of the Core)	23-78
Figure 23.1.2-21	Semiscale S-07-10D Clad Temperature at Elevation = 112 cm (from the Bottom of the Core)	23-79

1

Figure 23.1.2-22	Semiscale S-07-10D Clad Temperature at Elevation = 71 cm (from the Bottom of the Core)
Figure 23.1.2-23	Semiscale S-07-10D Clad Temperature at Elevation = 48 cm (from the Bottom of the Core)
Figure 23.1.2-24	Semiscale S-07-10D Clad Temperature at Elevation = 7 cm (from the Bottom of the Core)
Figure 23.1.2-25	Semiscale S-07-10D Collapsed Liquid Level
Figure 23.1.2-26	Semiscale S-07-10D Void Fraction at Inlet of the Core (502 cm below CL Centerline)
Figure 23.1.2-27	Semiscale S-07-10D Void Fraction at 483 cm below CL Centerline
Figure 23.1.2-28	Semiscale S-07-10D Void Fraction at 323 cm below CL Centerline
Figure 23.1.2-29	Semiscale S-07-10D Void Fraction at 313 cm below CL Centerline 23-87
Figure 23.1.2-30	Semiscale S-07-10D Void Fraction at 243 cm below CL Centerline
Figure 23.1.2-31	Semiscale S-07-10D Void Fraction at 164 cm below CL Centerline 23-89
Figure 23.1.2-32	Semiscale S-07-10D Void Fraction at Core Outlet (11 cm below CL Centerline)
Figure 23.1.2-33	Semiscale S-07-10D Mixture Level
Figure 23.2.1-1	Schematic and Nodalization Diagram for the Oscillating Manometer (note that Nodes 1 and 20 are each Connected to a PIPE Component not Depicted in the Diagram)
Figure 23.2.1-2	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Results for Liquid Velocity at the Bottom of the Tube
Figure 23.2.1-3	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Results for Liquid Velocity at the Bottom of the Tube
Figure 23.2.2-1	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Model of the Manometer Test Problem using the VESSEL Component
Figure 23.2.2-2	Velocity at the Bottom Gap of the 3D Manometer
Figure 23.2.2-3	Collapsed Liquid Levels and Total System Mass in the 3D Manometer
Figure 23.2.3-1	Nodalization and Schematic for Steam Expulsion Test using 1D Pipe 23-105
Figure 23.2.3-2	Pressure Profile in the 1D Pipe for the Steam Expulsion Test, Superheated Steam Case
Figure 23.2.3-3	Pressure Profile in the 1D Pipe for the Steam Expulsion Test, Superheated Steam Case

сх

Figure 23.2.3-4	Void Fraction Profile in the 1D Pipe for the Steam Expulsion Test, Superheated Steam Case	. 23-108
Figure 23.2.3-5	Liquid Velocity Profile in the 1D Pipe for the Steam Expulsion Test, Superheated Steam Case	. 23-109
Figure 23.2.3-6	Steam Velocity Profile in the 1D Pipe for the Steam Expulsion Test, Superheated Steam Case	23-110
Figure 23.2.3-7	Liquid Temperature Profile in the 1D Pipe for the Steam Expulsion Test, Superheated Steam Case	23-111
Figure 23.2.3-8	Vapor Temperature Profile in the 1D Pipe for the Steam Expulsion Test, Superheated Steam Case	23-112
Figure 23.2.3-9	Pressure Profile in the 1D Pipe for the Steam Expulsion Test, Saturated Steam Case	23-113
Figure 23.2.3-10	Void Fraction Profile in the 1D Pipe for the Steam Expulsion Test, Saturated Steam Case	.23-114
Figure 23.2.3-11	Liquid Velocity Profile in the 1D Pipe for the Steam Expulsion Test, Saturated Steam Case	.23-115
Figure 23.2.3-12	Steam Velocity Profile in the 1D Pipe for the Steam Expulsion Test, Saturated Steam Case	23-116
Figure 23.2.3-13	Liquid Temperature Profile in the 1D Pipe for the Steam Expulsion Test, Saturated Steam Case	.23-117
Figure 23.2.3-14	Vapor Temperature Profile in the 1D Pipe for the Steam Expulsion Test, Saturated Steam Case	.23-118
Figure 23.2.4-1	Steam Expulsion Test using 3D Vessel	23-121
Figure 23.2.4-2	Collapsed Liquid Level in the Vessel for the Steam Expulsion Test, Superheated Steam Case	23-122
Figure 23.2.4-3	Pressure Profile in the 3D Vessel for Steam Expulsion Test, Superheated Steam Case	23-123
Figure 23.2.4-4	Void Fraction Profile in the 3D Vessel for the Steam Expulsion Test, Superheated Steam Case	23-124
Figure 23.2.4-5	Liquid Temperature Profile in the 3D Pipe for the Steam Expulsion Test, Superheated Steam Case	23-125
Figure 23.2.4-6	Vapor Temperature Profile in the 3D Vessel for the Steam Expulsion Test, Superheated Steam Case	23-126
Figure 23.2.4-7	Liquid Velocity Profile in the 3D Vessel for the Steam Expulsion Test, Superheated Steam Case	23-127

Figure 23.2.4-8	Vapor Velocity Profile in the 3D Vessel for the Steam Expulsion Test, Superheated Steam Case, Superheated Steam Case	28
Figure 23.2.4-9	Collapsed Liquid Level in the Vessel for the Steam Expulsion Test, Saturated Steam Case	29
Figure 23.2.4-10	Pressure Profile in the 3D Vessel for the Steam Expulsion Test, Saturated Steam Case	30
Figure 23.2.4-11	Void Fraction Profile in the 3D Vessel for the Steam Expulsion Test, Saturated Steam Case	31
Figure 23.2.4-12	Liquid Temperature Profile in the 3D Pipe for the Steam Expulsion Test, Saturated Steam Case	32
Figure 23.2.4-13	Vapor Temperature Profile in the 3D Vessel for the Steam Expulsion Test, Saturated Steam Case	33
Figure 23.2.4-14	Liquid Velocity Profile in the 3D Vessel for the Steam Expulsion Test, Saturated Steam Case	34
Figure 23.2.4-15	Vapor Velocity Profile in the 3D Vessel for the Steam Expulsion Test, Saturated Steam Case	35
Figure 23.2.5-1	Fill and Drain Model using 1D Pipe	38
Figure 23.2.5-2	Predicted Void Fraction between 10 s and 20 s in the 1D Fill and Drain Problem without Steam Injection	39
Figure 23.2.5-3	Predicted Pressure between 10 s and 20 s in the 1D Fill and Drain Problem without Steam Injection	40
Figure 23.2.5-4	Predicted Void Fraction between 10 s and 20 s in the 1D Fill and Drain Problem with Steam Injection	4 1
Figure 23.2.5-5	Predicted Pressure between 10 s and 20 s in the 1D Fill and Drain Problem without Steam Injection	1 2
Figure 23.2.6-1	Fill and Drain Model using 3D Vessel	15
Figure 23.2.6-2	Predicted Collapsed Liquid Level in the 3D Fill and Drain Problem without Steam Injection	1 6
Figure 23.2.6-3	Predicted Void Fraction between 10 s and 20 s in the 3D Fill and Drain Problem without Steam Injection	17
Figure 23.2.6-4	Predicted Pressure between 10 s and 20 s in the 3D Fill and Drain Problem without Steam Injection	48
Figure 23.2.6-5	Predicted Pressure between 10 s and 20 s in the 3D Fill and Drain Problem without Steam Injection	1 9

Figure 23.2.6-6	Predicted Collapsed Liquid Level in the 3D Fill and Drain Problem with Steam Injection	150
Figure 23.2:6-7	Predicted Void Fraction between 10 s and 20 s in the 3D Fill and Drain Problem with Steam Injection	151
Figure 23.2.6-8	Predicted Pressure between 10 s and 20 s in the 3D Fill and Drain Problem with Steam Injection	52
Figure 23.2.7-1	3D Vessel Model used in the Condensation Test Problem	55
Figure 23.2.7-2	Void Fraction in the Condensation Test Problem, Vapor only Case 23-1	56
Figure 23.2.7-3	Flow Regime in the Condensation Test Problem, Vapor Only Case 23-1	57
Figure 23.2.7-4	Heat Transfer to Vapor and Vapor Velocity in the Condensation Test Problem, Vapor Only Case	58
Figure 23.2.7-5	Heat Transfer to Liquid and Liquid Velocity in the Condensation Test Problem, Vapor Only Case	159
Figure 23.2.7-6	Void Fraction and Relative Humidity in the Condensation Test Problem, Vapor and Non-Condensable Gas Case	60
Figure 23.2.7-7	Total, Steam, and Non-Condensable Gas Partial Pressures in the Condensation Test Problem, Vapor and Non-Condensable Gas Case	61
Figure 23.2.7-8	Gas, Liquid, Saturation, and Dew point Temperatures in the Condensation Test Problem, Vapor and Non-Condensable Gas Case	62
Figure 24.5-1	Comparison of Vessel Condensation Efficiency versus Nominal Steam Flow Rate, UPTF Test 6; The Experimental Condensation Efficiency is Estimated by MPR (MPR-1163, 1990)	-14
Figure 24.5-2	ECC Liquid Temperature Comparison near Vessel Inlet	-15
Figure 24.5-3	Downcomer Void Height Comparison in UPTF Test 25A	-16
Figure 24.5-4	Broken Loop Steam Flow Rate in UPTF Test 25A	-17
Figure 24.5-5	Cold Leg Temperature at Exit of Cold Leg for UPTF Test 25A 24-	-18
Figure 24.6.1-1	Heat Transfer Coefficient Comparison for ORNL-THTF	-21
Figure 24.6.1-2	Prediction Error as a Function of Vapor Reynolds Number	-21
Figure 24.6.1-3	Heat Transfer Coefficient Comparison for FLECHT SPV Tests	-22
Figure 24.6.1-4	Ratio of Measured to Predicted Heat Transfer Coefficient vs. Vapor Film Reynolds Number for FLECHT SPV Tests (from COBRAHT-TF2)	-22
Figure 24.6.1-5	Average Heat Transfer Coefficient Comparison for ORNL Steady-State Film Boiling Tests	-23

Einen 24 (1 (Dredicted Heat Elvy Dieg up Dev for ODM Date	24.22
Figure 24.0.1-0	Predicted Heat Flux Blas vs. Rev for OKNL Data	. 24-23
Figure 24.6.1-7	Predicted Heat Flux Bias vs. Void Fraction for DFFB Data	. 24-24
Figure 24.6.2-1	ORNL Test 3.03.36AR – Vapor Temperature and TLIQ (=Tsat) at Bundle Exit Calculated by <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2	. 24-27
Figure 24.6.2-2	ORNL Test 3.08.6C – Vapor Temperature and TLIQ (=Tsat) at Bundle Exit Calculated by <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2	. 24-28
Figure 24.6.3-1	Cladding Temperature During LBLOCA for Three-Loop Plant	. 24-33
Figure 24.6.3-2	Mass Flux at PCT Location During Blowdown (0-30 Seconds)	24-34
Figure 24.6.3-3	Void Fraction at PCT Location During Blowdown (0-30 Seconds)	24-35
Figure 24.6.3-4	Axial Cladding Temperature Distribution at Blowdown PCT Time (7.5 Seconds after Break)	≂. . 24-36
Figure 24.6.3-5	Axial Cladding Temperature Profile at End of Blowdown Cooling Time (11.5 Seconds after Break)	. 24-37
Figure 24.6.3-6	Blowdown Cooling Rates for the G 1 Blowdown Heat Transfer Tests	24-38
Figure 24.6.3-7	Cladding Axial Temperature at Start of Test (6 Seconds), 15, 20, 30 Seconds for Case 1 (Test 148)	. 24-39
Figure 24.6.3-8	Cladding Axial Temperature at Start of Test (6 Seconds), 15, 20, 30 Seconds for Case 2 (Test 143)	. 24-40
Figure 24.6.3-9	Cladding Axial Temperature at Start of Test (6 Seconds), 15, 20, 30 Seconds for Case 3 (Test 152)	. 24-41
Figure 24.6.3-10	Cladding Axial Temperature at Start of Test (6 Seconds), 15, 20, 30 Seconds for Case 4 (Test 146)	. 24-42
Figure 24.6.3-11	Cladding Axial Temperature at Start of Test (6 Seconds), 15, 20, 30 Seconds for Case 5 (Test 154)	, 24-43
Figure 24.6.3-12	Cladding Axial Temperature at Start of Test (6 Seconds), 15, 20, 30 Seconds for Case 6 (Test 153)	24-44
Figure 24.6.3-13	WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Heat Transfer Regime Map	24-45
Figure 24.6.3-14	Vapor Fraction at 72-inch Elevation for G-1 Test 148 (Case 1)	24-46
Figure 24.6.3-15	Heat Flux to Vapor at 72-inch Elevation for G-1 Test 148 (Case 1)	24-47
Figure 24.6.3-16	Heat Flux to Liquid at 72-inch Elevation for G-1 Test 148 (Case 1)	24-48
Figure 24.6.3-17	Vapor Fraction at 72-inch Elevation for G-1 Test 146 (Case 4)	24-49
Figure 24.6.3-18	Heat Flux to Vapor at 72-inch Elevation for G-1 Test 146 (Case 4)	24-50
Figure 24.6.3-19	Heat Flux to Liquid at 72-inch Elevation for G-1 Test 146 (Case 4)	24-51

Figure 24.6.3-20	Effect of Reduced T_{min} on Cladding Axial Temperature at 26 Seconds for Case 1 (Test 148)	24-52
Figure 24.6.3-21	Effect of Reduced T _{min} on Axial Vapor Temperature at 26 Seconds for Case 1 (Test 148)	24-53
Figure 24.6.3-22	Effect of Reduced D _{DROP} on Cladding Axial Temperature at 26 Seconds for Case 1 (Test 148)	24-54
Figure 24.6.3-23	Effect of Reduced D _{DROP} on Axial Vapor Temperature at 26 Seconds for Case 1 (Test 148)	24-55
Figure 24.6.3-24	Effect of Reduced T_{min} on Cladding Axial Temperature at 22 Seconds for Case 4 (Test 146)	24-56
Figure 24.6.3-25	Effect of Reduced T _{min} on Axial Vapor Temperature at 22 Seconds for Case 4 (Test 146)	24-57
Figure 24.6.3-26	Effect of Reduced D _{DROP} on Cladding Axial Temperature at 22 Seconds for Case 4 (Test 146)	24-58
Figure 24.6.3-27	Effect of Reduced D _{DROP} on Axial Vapor Temperature at 22 Seconds for Case 4 (Test 146)	24-59
Figure 24.6.4-1	TCLAD vs. Time at 6 ft for FLECHT-31504	24-62
Figure 24.6.4-2	TCLAD vs. Time at 9.3 ft for FLECHT-31504	24-63
Figure 24.6.4-3	Lower DP vs. Time for FLECHT-31504	24-64
Figure 24.6.4-4	Upper DP vs. Time for FLECHT-31504	24-65
Figure 24.6.4-5	Quench Front Elevation vs. Time for FLECHT-31504	. 24-66
Figure 24.6.4-6a	Vapor Temperature Profile Prediction at 200 Seconds in FLECHT-31504	24-67
Figure 24.6.4-6b	Vapor Temperature Profile Prediction at 260 Seconds Compared against Data taken at 200 Seconds	24-68
Figure 24.6.4-7	Void Fraction Profile Comparison when the Quench Front is at 60 inches (Prediction at 260 and Data at 200 Seconds) in FLECHT-31504	24-69
Figure 24.6.4-8	Drop Velocity vs. Diameter Comparison at ~1ft above Quench Front (Prediction at 260 and Data at 200~206 Seconds) in FLECHT-31504	24-70
Figure 24.6.4-9	Bundle Vapor Flow Comparison (Prediction at 260 and Data at 200 Seconds) in FLECHT-31504	24-71
Figure 24.6.4-10	Heat Transfer to Vapor Comparison (Prediction at 260 and Data at 200 Seconds) in FLECHT-31504	. 24-72
Figure 24.6.4-11	Heat Transfer to Liquid Comparison (Prediction at 260 and Data at 200 Seconds) in FLECHT-31504	. 24-73

Figure 24.6.4-12	Predicted Fraction of Heat Transfer to Liquid in FLECHT-31504	. 24-74
Figure 24.6.4-13	Vapor Reynolds Number Comparison (Prediction at 260 and Data at 200 Seconds) in FLECHT-31504	. 24-75
Figure 24.6.4-14	Vapor Nusselt Number Comparison (Prediction at 260 and Data at 200 Seconds) in FLECHT-31504	. 24-76
Figure 24.6.5-1	Comparison of Measured Void Fraction Distribution Reported for FLECHT-SEASET Tests 31805 and 31701	. 24-79
Figure 24.6.5-2	TCLAD Profile at 100 Seconds in FLECHT-31805	. 24-80
Figure 24.6.5-3	Heat Transfer Coefficient vs. Time at ~6 ft in FLECHT-31805	. 24-81
Figure 24.6.5-4	Axial Comparison of Predicted and Measured HTC in FLECHT-SEASET 31805	. 24-82
Figure 24.6.5-5	Void Fraction Profile in FLECHT-SEASET 31805	. 24-83
Figure 24.6.5-6	Measured Void Fraction near 6 ft in FLECHT-SEASET 31805	. 24-84
Figure 24.6.5-7	Measured Clad Temperature, Void Fraction at 6 ft in FLECHT-SEASET 31805 (Only one Legend is shown but all Available Thermocouples are Plotted)	. 24-85
Figure 24.6.5-8	Measured HTC, Void Fraction at 6 ft in FLECHT-SEASET 31805 (Only one Legend is shown but all Available Thermocouples are Plotted)	. 24-86
Figure 24.6.5-9	Expanded View of Measured Clad Temperature, Void Fraction at 6 ft in FLECHT-SEASET 31805 (Only one Legend is shown but all Available Thermocouples are Plotted)	. 24-87
Figure 24.6.5-10	Expanded View of Measured HTC, Void Fraction at 6 ft in FLECHT-SEASET 31805 (Only one Legend is shown but all Available Thermocouples are Plotted)	. 24-88
Figure 24.6.5-11	Predicted Clad Temperature, Void Fraction at 6 ft in FLECHT-SEASET 31805	. 24-89
Figure 24.6.5-12	Predicted HTC, Void Fraction at 6 ft in FLECHT-SEASET 31805	. 24-90
Figure 24.6.5-13	Void Fraction Comparison at 6 ft in FLECHT-SEASET 31805	. 24-91
Figure 24.6.5-14	Measured Clad Temperature, Void Fraction at 10 ft in FLECHT-31805 (Only one Legend is shown but all Available Thermocouples are Plotted)	. 24-92
Figure 24.6.5-15	Measured HTC, Void Fraction at 10 ft in FLECHT-SEASET 31805 (Only one Legend is shown but all Available Thermocouples are Plotted)	. 24-93
Figure 24.6.5-16	Predicted Clad Temperature, Void Fraction at 10 ft in FLECHT-SEASET 31805	. 24-94

Figure 24.6.5-17	Predicted HTC, Void Fraction at 10 ft in FLECHT-SEASET 31805 24-95
Figure 24.6.5-18	Void Fraction Comparison at 10-11 ft in FLECHT-SEASET 31805 24-96
Figure 24.6.5-19	Void Fraction Axial Profile Comparison [] ^{a,c} in FLECHT-SEASET 31805
Figure 24.6.6-1	Void Fraction Measurement at 5-7 ft for FLECHT-SEASET 31701 24-100
Figure 24.6.6-2	Measured Clad Temperature, Void Fraction for FLECHT-SEASET 31701 24-101
Figure 24.6.6-3	Measured HTC, Void Fraction Relation for FLECHT-SEASET 31701 24-102
Figure 24.6.6-4	Predicted Clad Temperature, Void Fraction Relation at 6 ft for FLECHT-SEASET 31701
Figure 24.6.6-5	Predicted HTC, Void Fraction Relation at 6 ft for FLECHT-SEASET 31701
Figure 24.6.6-6	Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Fraction Relation at 6-7 ft for FLECHT-SEASET 31701
Figure 24.6.6-7	Void Fraction Measurement at 9-11 ft for FLECHT-SEASET 31701 24-106
Figure 24.6.6-8	Measured Clad Temperature, Void Fraction Relation at 10 ft for FLECHT-SEASET 31701
Figure 24.6.6-9	Measured HTC, Void Fraction Relation at 10 ft for FLECHT-SEASET 31701
Figure 24.6.6-10	Predicted Clad Temperature, Void Fraction Relation at 10 ft for FLECHT-SEASET 31701
Figure 24.6.6-11	Predicted HTC, Void Fraction Relation at 10 ft for FLECHT-SEASET 3170124-110
Figure 24.6.6-12	Comparison of Measured and Predicted Void Fraction at 10 ft for FLECHT-SEASET 3170124-111
Figure 24.7.1-1	LOFT Measurement/Prediction Locations
Figure 24.7.1-2	LOFT L2-3 Data vs. Predicted Hot Rod Cladding Temperature24-117
Figure 24.7.1-3	Predicted Vapor Flowrate at Top and Bottom of Hot Assembly
Figure 24.7.1-4	Predicted Entrained Drop Flowrate at Top and Bottom of Hot Assembly24-119
Figure 24.7.1-5	LOFT L2-3 Data vs. Predicted Steam Temperature at Top of Hot Assembly
Figure 24.7.1-6	LOFT L2-3 Data vs. Predicted Steam Temperature at Bottom of Hot Assembly
Figure 24.7.1-7	Predicted Hot Rod Vapor Heat Transfer Coefficient at PCT Elevation 24-122

.

Figure 24.7.1-8	Predicted Hot Rod Liquid Heat Transfer Coefficient at PCT Elevation
Figure 24.7.1-8a	Predicted Hot Rod Liquid Heat Transfer Coefficient at PCT Elevation (Expanded Scale)
Figure 24.7.1-9	Measured and Predicted Intact Loop Pressure
Figure 24.7.1-10	Predicted Downcomer Collapsed Liquid Level (1- Intact, 2-Broken Side) 24-126
Figure 24.7.1-11	Predicted and Measured Core Collapsed Liquid Level (Line 5-Estimated from the Liquid Detector)
Figure 24.7.1-12	Predicted Upper Plenum Collapsed Liquid Level 24-128
Figure 24.7.1-13	Measured and Predicted Intact Loop Hot Leg Flowrate
Figure 24.7.1-14	Measured and Predicted Intact Loop Hot Leg Mixture Density
Figure 24.7.1-15	Measured and Predicted Intact Loop Hot Leg Mixture Velocity 24-131
Figure 24.7.1-15a	Measured and Predicted Intact Loop Pressure Comparison
Figure 24.7.1-16	Measured and Predicted Intact Loop Cold Leg Flowrate 24-133
Figure 24.7.1-17	Measured and Predicted Intact Loop Cold Leg Flowrate 24-134
Figure 24.7.1-18	Measured and Predicted Intact Loop Cold Leg Mixture Density 24-135
Figure 24.7.1-19	Measured and Predicted Intact Loop Cold Leg Mixture Density 24-136
Figure 24.7.1-20	Measured and Predicted Intact Loop Cold Leg Mixture Velocity
Figure 24.7.1-21	Measured and Predicted Intact Loop Cold Leg Mixture Velocity 24-138
Figure 24.7.1-22	Measured and Predicted Hot Leg Break Flowrate
Figure 24.7.1-23	Measured and Predicted Broken Loop Hot Leg Mixture Density
Figure 24.7.1-24	Measured and Predicted Broken Loop Hot Leg Mixture Velocity
Figure 24.7.1-25	Predicted Void Fraction in Upper Plenum at Loop Level
Figure 24.7.1-26	Predicted Void Fraction in Upper Plenum above Upper Core Plate 24-143
Figure 24.7.1-27	Measured and Predicted Cold Leg Break Flowrate 24-144
Figure 24.7.1-28	Measured and Predicted Broken Cold Leg Mixture Density
Figure 24.7.1-29	Measured and Predicted Broken Cold Leg Mixture Velocity 24-146
Figure 24.7.1-30	Mid-Elevation Cladding Temperature Comparison in Sensitivity Run with CD2=1.05
Figure 24.7.1-31	Predicted Vapor Flowrate at Top and Bottom of Hot Assembly in Sensitivity Run with CD2=1.05

Figure 24.7.1-32	Predicted Entrained Drop Flowrate at Top and Bottom of Hot Assembly in Sensitivity Run with CD2=1.05
Figure 24.7.1-33	Predicted Hot Rod Liquid Heat Transfer Coefficient at PCT Elevation in Sensitivity Run with CD2=1.05
Figure 24.7.2-1	Measured vs. Predicted Hot Rod Cladding Temperature
Figure 24.7.2-2	Predicted Vapor Flowrate at Top and Bottom of Hot Assembly
Figure 24.7.2-3	Predicted Entrained Drop Flowrate at Top and Bottom of Hot Assembly 24-157
Figure 24.7.2-4	LOFT L2-5 Data vs. Predicted Steam Temperature at Top of Hot Assembly
Figure 24.7.2-5	LOFT L2-5 Data vs. Predicted Steam Temperature at Bottom of Hot Assembly
Figure 24.7.2-6	Predicted Hot Rod Vapor Heat Transfer Coefficient at PCT Elevation
Figure 24.7.2-7	Predicted Hot Rod Liquid Heat Transfer Coefficient at PCT Elevation
Figure 24.7.2-7a	Predicted Hot Rod Liquid Heat Transfer Coefficient at PCT Elevation (with Expanded Scale)
Figure 24.7.2-8	Measured and Predicted Intact Loop Pressure
Figure 24.7.2-9	Predicted Downcomer Collapsed Liquid Level (1- Intact, 2-Broken side) 24-164
Figure 24.7.2-10	Predicted and Measured Core Collapsed Liquid Level (Line 2-Estimated from the Liquid Detector)
Figure 24.7.2-11	Predicted Upper Plenum Collapsed Liquid Level
Figure 24.7.2-12	Measured and Predicted Intact Loop Hot Leg Flowrate
Figure 24.7.2-13	Measured and Predicted Intact Loop Hot Leg Mixture Density
Figure 24.7.2-14	Measured and Predicted Intact Loop Hot Leg Mixture Velocity
Figure 24.7.2-15	Measured and Predicted Intact Loop Cold Leg Flowrate
Figure 24.7.2-16	Measured and Predicted Intact Loop Cold Leg Flowrate
Figure 24.7.2-17	Measured and Predicted Intact Loop Cold Leg Mixture Density 24-172
Figure 24.7.2-18	Measured and Predicted Intact Loop Cold Leg Mixture Density 24-173
Figure 24.7.2-19	Measured and Predicted Intact Loop Cold Leg Mixture Velocity 24-174
Figure 24.7.2-20	Measured and Predicted Intact Loop Cold Leg Mixture Velocity 24-175
Figure 24.7.2-21	Measured and Predicted Hot Leg Break Flowrate
Figure 24.7.2-22	Measured and Predicted Hot Leg Mixture Density

١

cxx

Figure 24.7.2-23	Measured and Predicted Broken Loop Hot Leg Mixture Velocity	24-178
Figure 24.7.2-24	Predicted Void Fraction in Upper Plenum at Loop Level	24-179
Figure 24.7.2-25	Predicted Void Fraction in Upper Plenum at Exit of CCFL Region	24-180
Figure 24.7.2-26	Measured and Predicted Cold Leg Break Flowrate	24-181
Figure 24.7.2-27	Measured and Predicted Broken Cold Leg Mixture Density	24-182
Figure 24.7.2-28	Measured and Predicted Broken Cold Leg Mixture Velocity	24-183
Figure 24.7.2-29	Predicted Broken Cold Leg Nozzle DP	24-184
Figure 24.7.2-30	Predicted Broken Cold Leg Pressure Drop to the Break Plane	24-185
Figure 24.7.3-1a	Pressure, Differential Pressure, Liquid Level and Mass Flowrate Instrumentation Location in Pressure Vessel	24-190
Figure 24.7.3-1b	Top View of Primary Loop Piping	24-191
Figure 24.7.3-2	Core Inlet Flow Comparison	24-192
Figure 24.7.3-3	CCTF Run 62 WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 vs. Data – Cladding Temperature Comparison at 3.33 ft	24-193
Figure 24.7.3-4	CCTF Run 62 WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 vs. Data Cladding Temperature Comparison at 6 ft	24-194
Figure 24.7.3-5	CCTF Run 62 WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 vs. Data Cladding Temperature Comparison at 6.68 ft	24-195
Figure 24.7.3-6	CCTF Run 62 WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 vs. Data Cladding Temperature Comparison at 8 ft	24-196
Figure 24.7.3-7	CCTF Run 62 WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 vs. Data Cladding Temperature Comparison at 10 ft	24-197
Figure 24.7.3-8	CCTF Run 62 <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 vs. Data Vapor Temperature Comparison at 6 ft	24-198
Figure 24.7.3-9	CCTF Run 62 <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 vs. Data Vapor Temperature Comparison at 8 ft	24-199
Figure 24.7.3-10	CCTF Run 62 WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 vs. Data Comparison Void Fraction from 2.1 to 2.71 m	24-200
Figure 24.7.3-11	CCTF Run 62 WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 vs. Data Comparison Void Fraction from 2.71 to 3.32 m	24-201
Figure 24.7.3-12	CCTF Run 62 <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 vs. Data Comparison Void Fraction from 3.32 to 3.93 m	24-202



Figure 24.7.3-13	CCTF Run 62 <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 vs. Data Comparison Void Fraction from 3.93 to 4.54 m
Figure 24.7.3-14	CCTF Run 62 <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 vs. Data Comparison Void Fraction from 4.54 to 5.15 m
Figure 24.7.3-15	CCTF Run 62 <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 vs. Data Comparison Void Fraction from 5.15 to 5.76 m
Figure 24.7.3-16	CCTF Run 62 <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 vs. Data Comparison Void Fraction from Top of Upper Core Plate to Bottom of Upper Support Plate 24-206
Figure 24.7.3-17	CCTF Run 62 WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 vs. Data Collapsed Liquid Level in Core
Figure 24.7.3-18	CCTF Run 62 <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 vs. Data Collapsed Liquid Level in Upper Plenum
Figure 24.7.3-19	CCTF Run 62 WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 vs. Data Pressure in Upper Plenum
Figure 24.7.3-20	CCTF Run 62 WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 vs. Data Pressure Difference from Lower Plenum to Upper Plenum
Figure 24.7.3-21	CCTF Run 62 WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 vs. Data Pressure Difference from Lower Plenum to Top of Downcomer
Figure 24.7.3-22	CCTF Run 62 <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 vs. Data Pressure Difference from Upper Plenum to Intact Cold Leg Nozzle (Intact Loop ΔP)
Figure 24.7.3-23	CCTF Run 62 WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 vs. Data Pressure Difference from Upper Plenum to Steam Generator (Intact Loop ΔP)
Figure 24.7.3-24	CCTF Run 62 <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 vs. Data Pressure Difference from Inlet to Outlet Plenum of Steam Generator (Intact Loop ΔP)
Figure 24.7.3-25	CCTF Run 62 WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 vs. Data Pressure Difference across RCP (Intact Loop ΔP)
Figure 24.7.3-26	CCTF Run 62 <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 vs. Data Pressure Difference from RCP to Downcomer (Intact Loop ΔP)
Figure 24.7.3-27	CCTF Run 62 Pressure Difference from UP to SG 24-217
Figure 24.7.3-28	CCTF Run 62 Pressure Difference from UP to PUMP
Figure 24.7.3-29	CCTF Run 62 <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 vs. Data Pressure Difference in Broken Loop Hot Leg (Broken Loop ΔP)
Figure 24.7.3-30	CCTF Run 62 <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 vs. Data Pressure Difference from Upper Plenum to Steam Generator in Broken Loop (Broken Loop ΔP)



Figure 24.7.3-31	CCTF Run 62 <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 vs. Data Pressure Difference from Inlet to Outlet Plenum of Steam Generator in Broken Loop (Broken Loop ΔP)	24-221
Figure 24.7.3-32	CCTF Run 62 <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 vs. Data Pressure Difference across RCP in Broken Loop (Broken Loop ΔP)	24-222
Figure 24.7.3-33	CCTF Run 62 <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 vs. Data Pressure Difference from RCP to CV (Broken Loop ΔP)	24-223
Figure 24.7.3-34	CCTF Run 62 WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 vs. Data Vapor Mass Flowrate in Intact Hot Leg	24-224
Figure 24.7.3-35	CCTF Run 62 <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 vs. Data Vapor Velocity in Intact Hot Leg	24-225
Figure 24.7.3-36	CCTF Run 62 <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 vs. Data Vapor Density in Intact Hot Leg	24-226
Figure 24.7.3-37	CCTF Run 62 <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 vs. Data Liquid Mass Flowrate in Intact Hot Leg	24-227
Figure 24.7.3-38	CCTF Run 62 <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 vs. Data Total Mass Flowrate in Intact Hot Leg	24-228
Figure 24.7.3-39	CCTF Run 62 <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 vs. Data Vapor Mass Flowrate in Intact Cold Leg	24-229
Figure 24.7.3-40	CCTF Run 62 <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 vs. Data Liquid Mass Flowrate in Intact Cold Leg	24-230
Figure 24.7.3-41	CCTF Run 62 <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 vs. Data Total Mass Flowrate in Intact Cold Leg	24-231
Figure 24.7.3-42	CCTF Run 62 <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 vs. Data Liquid Mass Flowrate in Broken Hot Leg	24-232
Figure 24.7.3-43	CCTF Run 62 <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 vs. Data Vapor Mass Flowrate in Broken Hot Leg	24-233
Figure 24.7.3-44-	CCTF Run 62 <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 vs. Data Total Mass Flowrate in Broken Hot Leg	24-234
Figure 24.7.3-45	CCTF Run 62 <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 vs. Data Vapor Mass Flowrate in Broken Cold Leg	24-235
Figure 24.7.3-46	CCTF Run 62 <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 vs. Data Pressure in Upper Plenum in Higher Containment Pressure Case	24-236
Figure 24.7.3-47	CCTF Run 62 <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 vs. Data Cladding Temperature Comparison at 6 ft in Higher Containment Pressure Case	24-237

)

Figure 24.7.3-48	CCTF Run 62 WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 vs. Data Cladding Temperature Comparison at 6.68 ft in Higher Containment Pressure Case
Figure 24.7.3-49	Core Inlet Flow Comparison in Higher Containment Pressure Case
Figure 24.7.3-50	CCTF Run 62 WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 vs. Data Collapsed Liquid Level in Core in Higher Containment Pressure Case
Figure 24.7.3-51	CCTF Run 62 WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 vs. Data Collapsed Liquid Level in Upper Plenum in Higher Containment Pressure Case
Figure 24.8.1-1	Core DP Comparison in SB-CL-18 Simulation
Figure 24.8.1-2	Pump Speed used in Test and in Simulation
Figure 24.8.1-3	SB-CL-18 Core DP Comparison with Core Inlet Liquid Velocity
Figure 24.8.1-4	SB-CL-18 Core DP Comparison with Pump DP in Loop A and B 24-250
Figure 24.8.1-5	Primary Side Circulation Flow as a Function of Primary Side Inventory 24-251
Figure 24.8.1-6	Core DP Comparison with the Void Fraction in Downhill side on Steam Generator and Cross-over Leg
Figure 24.8.1-7	Core DP Comparison with Axial Vapor Velocity at UCP (Curve-3=Inner High Power, Curve-4=Inner Low Power, Curve-5=Outer Low Power)
Figure 24.8.1-8	Core DP Comparison with the Hot Leg Nozzle Liquid Flowrates
Figure 24.8.1-9	DP Comparison from Upper Plenum to Steam Generator Inlet
Figure 24.8.1-10	DP Comparison from Steam Generator Inlet to Outlet Plenum
Figure 24.8.1-11	Core DP Comparison with Void Fraction in Cross-over Leg Piping 24-256
Figure 24.8.1-12	Inner Vessel DP Comparison
Figure 24.8.1-13	Downcomer to Upper Plenum Pressure Difference
Figure 24.8.1-14	Core DP Comparison for SB-CL-01 (2.5%)
Figure 24.8.1-15	Loop-A Loopseal Bottom to Pump DP Comparison for SB-CL-01 (2.5%)
Figure 24.8.1-16	Loop-B Loopseal Bottom to Pump DP Comparison for SB-CL-01 (2.5%)
Figure 24.8.1-17	Downcomer to Upper Plenum Pressure Difference in SB-CL-01 (2.5%)
Figure 24.8.1-18	Core Collapsed Liquid Level Comparison for SB-CL-14 (10%) 24-262
Figure 24.8.1-19	Steam Generator Inlet to Top of Tube DP Comparison for SB-CL-14 (10%)

Figure 24.8.1-20	Comparison of Loop-A Cross-Over Leg Differential Pressures	. 24-264
Figure 24.8.1-21	Comparison of Loop-B Cross-Over Leg Differential Pressures	. 24-265
Figure 24.8.2-1	Comparison of Predicted Mixture Level and Test Data	. 24-266
Figure 24.8.2-2	Comparison of Predicted Mixture Level and Test Data, and YDRAG Sensitivity	. 24-267
Figure 24.8.3-1	Comparison of Predicted Level Swell against Measured	. 24-268
Figure 24.8.3-2	Impact of YDRAG Variation on Predicted Level Swell	. 24-269
	VOLUME 3	
Figure 25.2-1	Typical Assembly Power Map and Assembly Power Distribution, Beginning of Cycle	25-29
Figure 25.2-2	Typical Assembly Power Map and Assembly Power Distribution, End of Cycle	25-30
Figure 25.2-3	Typical Hot Assembly Fuel Rod Power Distribution	25-31
Figure 25.2-4	Hot Assembly Rod Power Census for Typical Westinghouse Fuel Designs	25-32
Figure 25.2-5	Relative Axial Power Distribution at BOL and EOL During Full Power Steady-State Conditions	25-33
Figure 25.2-6	Typical Transient Axial Power Distributions	25-34
Figure 25.2-7	Envelope of Peak Linear Heat Rates as a Function of Core Height for a Typical Westinghouse Core Design	25-35
Figure 25.2-8	Typical Steady-State Peaking Factors Versus Peaking Factor Design Limit	25-36
Figure 25.2-9	Effect of Load Follow Maneuver Period on Decay Heat Equilibrium Fraction for Various Times After Trip	25-37
Figure 25.2-10	Typical Measurement of Enthalpy Rise Hot Channel Factor $F_{\Delta H}$	25-38
Figure 25.2-11	Typical Measurement of Total Peaking Factor F _Q	25-39
Figure 25.2-12	Effect of Burnup on (a) Baseload PLHR, (b) Fuel Average Temperature, (c) Decay Heat Equilibrium Fraction	25-40
Figure 25.2-13	Bottom and Middle Third Integrals for a Typical Low Peaking Factor Core Design	25-41
Figure 25.2-14	Bottom and Middle Third Integrals for a Typical High Peaking Factor Core Design, Relaxed ΔI Bands	25-42
Figure 25.2-15	Effect of Unlimited F_Q and ΔI Bands on Bottom and Middle Third Integrals .	25-43
Figure 25.2-16	Typical <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2 Axial Power Distribution	25-44
Figure 25.6-1	Comparison of Analysis and Experiment for Scale Model Flywheel Tests	25-59

Figure 25.6-2	[] ^{a,c}	. 25-60
Figure 26.2-1	Virgil C. Summer Vessel Profile	. 26-22
Figure 26.2-2	Virgil C. Summer Vessel Component Elevations	. 26-23
Figure 26.2-3	Virgil C. Summer Vessel Model Noding Diagram	. 26-24
Figure 26.2-4	Virgil C. Summer Vessel Sections 1 through 3	. 26-25
Figure 26.2-5	Virgil C. Summer Vessel Sections 4 through 6	. 26-26
Figure 26.2-6	Virgil C. Summer Vessel Sections 7 through 9	. 26-27
Figure 26.2-7	Virgil C. Summer Upper Plenum Structure Map	. 26-28
Figure 26.2-8	Virgil C. Summer Loop Model Noding Diagram	. 26-29
Figure 26.2-9	Virgil C. Summer Steam Generator Component Noding Diagram	. 26-30
Figure 26.2-10	Virgil C. Summer Reference Case Axial Power Distribution	. 26-31
Figure 26.3-1	Beaver Valley Unit 1 Vessel Profile	. 26-44
Figure 26.3-2	Beaver Valley Unit 1 Vessel Component Elevations	. 26-45
Figure 26.3-3	Beaver Valley Unit 1 Vessel Model Noding Diagram	. 26-46
Figure 26.3-4	Beaver Valley Unit 1 Vessel Section 1	. 26-47
Figure 26.3-5	Beaver Valley Unit 1 Vessel Section 2	. 26-48
Figure 26.3-6	Beaver Valley Unit 1 Vessel Section 3	. 26-49
Figure 26.3-7	Beaver Valley Unit 1 Vessel Section 4	. 26-50
Figure 26.3-8	Beaver Valley Unit 1 Vessel Section 5	. 26-51
Figure 26.3-9	Beaver Valley Unit 1 Vessel Section 6	. 26-52
Figure 26.3-10	Beaver Valley Unit 1 Vessel Section 7	. 26-53
Figure 26.3-11	Beaver Valley Unit 1 Vessel Section 8	. 26-54
Figure 26.3-12	Beaver Valley Unit 1 Vessel Section 9	. 26-55
Figure 26.3-13	Beaver Valley Unit 1 Upper Plenum Structure Map	. 26-56
Figure 26.3-14	Beaver Valley Unit 1 Loop Model Noding Diagram	. 26-57
Figure 26.3-15	Beaver Valley Unit 1 Steam Generator Component Noding Diagram	. 26-58
Figure 26.3-16	Beaver Valley Unit 1 Reference Case Axial Power Distribution	. 26-59
Figure 27.1.1.1-1	Rod 1 Peak Cladding Temperature, CGE LBLOCA	27-3
Figure 27.1.1.1-2	Rod 1 Peak Cladding Temperature Location, CGE LBLOCA	27-4

 \cup

LIST OF FIGURES (cont.)

Figure 27.1.1.1-3	Break Flow, CGE LBLOCA	
Figure 27.1.1.1-4	RCS Pressure, CGE LBLOCA	
Figure 27.1.1.1-5	Accumulator Mass Flow Rate, CGE LBLOCA	
Figure 27.1.1.1-6	Vessel Fluid Mass, CGE LBLOCA	
Figure 27.1.1.1-7	Safety Injection Flow Rate, CGE LBLOCA	
Figure 27.1.1.1-8	Containment Pressure, CGE LBLOCA	
Figure 27.1.1.2-1	Rod 1 Peak Cladding Temperature, CGE IBLOCA	
Figure 27.1.1.2-2	Total Break Flow, CGE IBLOCA	
Figure 27.1.1.2-3	RCS Pressure, CGE IBLOCA	
Figure 27.1.1.2-4	Accumulator Mass Flow Rate, CGE IBLOCA	
Figure 27.1.1.2-5	Vessel Fluid Mass, CGE IBLOCA	
Figure 27.1.1.3-1	Break Void Fraction, CGE SBLOCA	
Figure 27.1.1.3-2	RCS Pressure, CGE SBLOCA	
Figure 27.1.1.3-3	Upper Head Collapsed Liquid Level, CGE SBLOCA	
Figure 27.1.1.3-4	Break Flow, CGE SBLOCA	
Figure 27.1.1.3-5	Rod 1 Peak Cladding Temperature, CGE SBLOCA	
Figure 27.1.1.3-6	Loop 1 Loop Seal Differential Pressure, CGE SBLOCA	
Figure 27.1.1.3-7	Loop 2 Loop Seal Differential Pressure, CGE SBLOCA	
Figure 27.1.1.3-8	Loop 3 Loop Seal Differential Pressure, CGE SBLOCA	27-25
Figure 27.1.2.1-1	Rod 1 Peak Cladding Temperature, DLW LBLOCA	27-27
Figure 27.1.2.1-2	Rod 1 Peak Cladding Temperature Location, DLW LBLOCA	
Figure 27.1.2.1-3	Total Break Flow, DLW LBLOCA	
Figure 27.1.2.1-4	RCS Pressure, DLW LBLOCA	27-30
Figure 27.1.2.1-5	Accumulator Mass Flow, DLW LBLOCA	
Figure 27.1.2.1-6	Vessel Fluid Mass, DLW LBLOCA	
Figure 27.1.2.1-7	Intact Loop Safety Injection Flow, DLW LBLOCA	
Figure 27.1.2.1-8	Containment Backpressure, DLW LBLOCA	
Figure 27.1.2.2-1	Rod 1 Peak Cladding Temperatures, DLW IBLOCA	
Figure 27.1.2.2-2	Total Break Flow, DLW IBLOCA	27-37

2

(

Figure 27.1.2.2-3	RCS Pressure, DLW IBLOCA	3
Figure 27.1.2.2-4	Accumulator Mass Flow Rate, DLW IBLOCA)
Figure 27.1.2.2-5	Vessel Fluid Mass, DLW IBLOCA)
Figure 27.1.2.3-1	RCS Pressure, DLW SBLOCA	2
Figure 27.1.2.3-2	Upper Head Collapsed Liquid Level, DLW SBLOCA	3
Figure 27.1.2.3-3	Break Flow Rate, DLW SBLOCA	1
Figure 27.1.2.3-4	Rod 1 Peak Cladding Temperature, DLW SBLOCA 27-4	5
Figure 27.1.2.3-5	Loop 1 Loop Seal Differential Pressure, DLW SBLOCA	5
Figure 27.1.2.3-6	Loop 2 Loop Seal Differential Pressure, DLW SBLOCA	7
Figure 27.1.2.3-7	Loop 3 Loop Seal Differential Pressure, DLW SBLOCA	3
Figure 27.2.1-1	Peak Cladding Temperatures, CGE LBLOCA Reference Transient	L
Figure 27.2.1-2	Rod 1 Peak Cladding Temperature Location, CGE LBLOCA Reference Transient	2
Figure 27.2.1-3	Vessel Side Break Flow, CGE LBLOCA Reference Transient	3
Figure 27.2.1-4	Pump Side Break Flow, CGE LBLOCA Reference Transient	1
Figure 27.2.1-5	Lower Plenum Collapsed Liquid Level, CGE LBLOCA Reference Transient	5
Figure 27.2.1-6	Vapor Mass Flow Rate Near PCT Elevation, CGE LBLOCA Reference Transient	5
Figure 27.2.1-7	RCS Pressure, CGE LBLOCA Reference Transient	7
Figure 27.2.1-8	Accumulator Flow Rate, CGE LBLOCA Reference Transient	3
Figure 27.2.1-9	Containment Pressure, CGE LBLOCA Reference Transient)
Figure 27.2.1-10	Vessel Fluid Mass, CGE LBLOCA Reference Transient)
Figure 27.2.1-11	Core Collapsed Liquid Levels, CGE LBLOCA Reference Transient 27-61	l
Figure 27.2.1-12	Downcomer Collapsed Liquid Level, CGE LBLOCA Reference Transient 27-62	2
Figure 27.2.1-13	Safety Injection Flow, CGE LBLOCA Reference Transient	3
Figure 27.2.2-1	Break Flow, CGE IBLOCA Reference Transient	5
Figure 27.2.2-2	Void Fraction at the Break, CGE IBLOCA Reference Transient	5
Figure 27.2.2-3	RCS Pressure, CGE IBLOCA Reference Transient	7
Figure 27.2.2-4	Core Collapsed Liquid Levels, CGE IBLOCA Reference Transient (2=Hot Assembly, 3=Guide Tube, 4=OH/SC/SM, 5=Low Power)	3



Figure 27.2.2-5	Downcomer Collapsed Liquid Levels, CGE IBLOCA Reference Transient 27-69
Figure 27.2.2-6	Peak Cladding Temperatures, CGE IBLOCA Reference Transient
Figure 27.2.2-7	Vapor Flowrate in the Hot Assembly, CGE IBLOCA Reference Transient
Figure 27.2.2-8	Accumulator Flow Rate, CGE IBLOCA Reference Transient
Figure 27.2.2-9	Vessel Fluid Mass, CGE IBLOCA Reference Transient
Figure 27.2.2-10	Safety Injection Flow, CGE IBLOCA Reference Transient
Figure 27.2.2-11	Safety Injection and Break Flow, CGE IBLOCA Reference Transient
Figure 27.2.3-1	Break Flow Void Fraction, CGE SBLOCA Reference Transient
Figure 27.2.3-2	Safety Injection Flow, CGE SBLOCA Reference Transient
Figure 27.2.3-3	RCS and Steam Generator Secondary Side Pressure, CGE SBLOCA Reference Transient
Figure 27.2.3-4	Upper Head Collapsed Liquid Level, CGE SBLOCA Reference Transient 27-81
Figure 27.2.3-5	Break Flow, CGE SBLOCA Reference Transient
Figure 27.2.3-6	Core Collapsed Liquid Levels, CGE SBLOCA Reference Transient (2=Hot Assembly, 3=Guide Tube, 4=OH/SC/SM, 5=Low Power) 27-83
Figure 27.2.3-7	Rod 1 Cladding Temperature, CGE SBLOCA Reference Transient
Figure 27.2.3-8	Loop 1 Loop Seal Pressure Differential, CGE SBLOCA Reference Transient
Figure 27.2.3-9	Loop 2 Loop Seal Pressure Differential, CGE SBLOCA Reference Transient
Figure 27.2.3-10	Loop 3 Loop Seal Pressure Differential, CGE SBLOCA Reference Transient
Figure 27.2.3-11	Accumulator Flow, CGE SBLOCA Reference Transient
Figure 27.2.3-12	Vessel Fluid Mass, CGE SBLOCA Reference Transient
Figure 27.2.3-13	Safety Injection and Break Flow, CGE SBLOCA Reference Transient 27-90
Figure 27.3.1-1	Peak Cladding Temperatures, DLW LBLOCA Reference Transient
Figure 27.3.1-2	Peak Cladding Temperature Location, DLW LBLOCA Reference Transient 27-94
Figure 27.3.1-3	Vessel Side Break Flow, DLW LBLOCA Reference Transient
Figure 27.3.1-4	Pump Side Break Flow, DLW LBLOCA Reference Transient
Figure 27.3.1-5	Lower Plenum Collapsed Liquid Level, DLW LBLOCA Reference Transient



Figure 27.3.1-6	Vapor Mass Flow in Hot Assembly Near PCT Elevation, DLW LBLOCA Reference Transient
Figure 27.3.1-7	RCS Pressure, DLW LBLOCA Reference Transient
Figure 27.3.1-8	Accumulator Mass Flow Rate, DLW LBLOCA Reference Transient
Figure 27.3.1-9	Containment Pressure, DLW LBLOCA Reference Transient
Figure 27.3.1-10	Vessel Fluid Mass, DLW LBLOCA Reference Transient
Figure 27.3.1-11	Core Collapsed Liquid Levels, DLW LBLOCA Reference Transient
Figure 27.3.1-12	Downcomer Collapsed Liquid Level, DLW LBLOCA Reference Transient 27-104
Figure 27.3.1-13	Safety Injection Flow, DLW LBLOCA Reference Transient
Figure 27.3.2-1	Break Flow, DLW IBLOCA Reference Transient
Figure 27.3.2-2	Void Fraction at the Break, DLW IBLOCA Reference Transient
Figure 27.3.2-3	RCS Pressure, DLW IBLOCA Reference Transient
Figure 27.3.2-4	Core Collapsed Liquid Levels, DLW IBLOCA Reference Transient (2=Hot Assembly, 3=Guide Tube, 4=OH/SC/SM, 5=Low Power)27-110
Figure 27.3.2-5	Downcomer Collapsed Liquid Levels, DLW IBLOCA Reference Transient27-111
Figure 27.3.2-6	Peak Cladding Temperatures, DLW IBLOCA Reference Transient
Figure 27.3.2-7	Vapor Flowrate in Hot Assembly Channel, DLW IBLOCA Reference Transient
Figure 27.3.2-8	Accumulator Flow, DLW IBLOCA Reference Transient
Figure 27.3.2-9	Vessel Fluid Mass, DLW IBLOCA Reference Transient
Figure 27.3.2-10	Safety Injection Flow, DLW IBLOCA Reference Transient
Figure 27.3.2-11	Safety Injection and Break Flow, DLW IBLOCA Reference Transient27-117
Figure 27.3.3-1	Void Fraction at the Break, DLW SBLOCA Reference Transient
Figure 27.3.3-2	Safety Injection Flow, DLW SBLOCA Reference Transient
Figure 27.3.3-3	RCS and Steam Generator Secondary Side Pressure, DLW SBLOCA Reference Transient
Figure 27.3.3-4	Upper Head Collapsed Liquid Level, DLW SBLOCA Reference Transient
Figure 27.3.3-5	Break Flow, DLW SBLOCA Reference Transient
Figure 27.3.3-6	Core Collapsed Liquid Levels, DLW SBLOCA Reference Transient (2=Hot Assembly, 3=Guide Tube, 4=OH/SC/SM, 5=Low Power) 27-125
	$2^{-1}2^{-$

•

Figure 27.3.3-7	Hot Rod Cladding Temperature, DLW SBLOCA Reference Transient	7-126
Figure 27.3.3-8	Loop 1 Loop Seal Differential Pressure, DLW SBLOCA Reference Transient	7-127
Figure 27.3.3-9	Loop 2 Loop Seal Differential Pressure, DLW SBLOCA Reference Transient	7-128
Figure 27.3.3-10	Loop 3 Loop Seal Differential Pressure, DLW SBLOCA Reference Transient	7-129
Figure 27.3.3-11	Accumulator Flow, DLW SBLOCA Reference Transient	7-130
Figure 27.3.3-12	Vessel Fluid Mass, DLW SBLOCA Reference Transient	7-131
Figure 27.3.3-13	Safety Injection Flow and Break Flow, DLW SBLOCA Reference Transient	7-132
Figure 28.1.1-1	Axial Power Distribution, CGE Axial Power Distribution Sensitivity	. 28-5
Figure 28.1.1-2	Rod 1 Peak Cladding Temperatures, CGE Axial Power Distribution Sensitivity	. 28-6
Figure 28.1.1-3	Peak Cladding Temperature Location, CGE Axial Power Distribution Sensitivity	. 28-7
Figure 28.1.1-4	Lower Plenum Collapsed Liquid Level, CGE Axial Power Distribution Sensitivity	. 28-8
Figure 28.1.1-5	Hot Assembly Collapsed Liquid Level, CGE Axial Power Distribution Sensitivity	. 28-9
Figure 28.1.1-6	Vessel Fluid Mass, CGE Axial Power Distribution Sensitivity	28-10
Figure 28.1.1-7	Axial Power Distribution, DLW Axial Power Distribution Sensitivity	28-11
Figure 28.1.1-8	Peak Cladding Temperatures, DLW Axial Power Distribution Sensitivity	28-12
Figure 28.1.1-9	Peak Cladding Temperature Location, DLW Axial Power Distribution Sensitivity	28-13
Figure 28.1.1-10	Lower Plenum Collapsed Liquid Level, DLW Axial Power Distribution Sensitivity	28-14
Figure 28.1.1-11	Hot Assembly Collapsed Liquid Level, DLW Axial Power Distribution Sensitivity	28-15
Figure 28.1.1-12	Vessel Fluid Mass, DLW Axial Power Distribution Sensitivity	28-16
Figure 28.1.2-1	Safety Injection Flow, CGE Offsite Power Availability Sensitivity	28-19
Figure 28.1.2-2	Intact Loop Pump Speed, CGE Offsite Power Availability Sensitivity	28-20
Figure 28.1.2-3	Broken Loop Pump Speed, CGE Offsite Power Availability Sensitivity	28-21

cxxxi

Figure 28.1.2-4	Accumulator and Safety Injection Flow Rates, CGE Offsite Power Availability Sensitivity
Figure 28.1.2-5	Hot Assembly Vapor Mass Flow Rate, CGE Offsite Power Availability Sensitivity
Figure 28.1.2-6	Peak Cladding Temperatures, CGE Offsite Power Availability Sensitivity 28-24
Figure 28.1.2-7	Safety Injection Flow, DLW Offsite Power Availability Study
Figure 28.1.2-8	Intact Loop Pump Speed, DLW Offsite Power Availability Study
Figure 28.1.2-9	Broken Loop Pump Speed, DLW Offsite Power Availability Study 28-27
Figure 28.1.2-10	Peak Cladding Temperature, DLW Offsite Power Availability Study
Figure 28.1.2-11	Hot Assembly Vapor Mass Flow Rate, DLW Offsite Power Availability Study
Figure 28.1.2-12	Lower Plenum Liquid Subcooling, DLW Offsite Power Availability Study 28-30
Figure 28.1.2-13	Lower Plenum Collapsed Liquid Level, DLW Offsite Power Availability Study
Figure 28.1.3-1	Vessel Fluid Mass, run004 of CGE Timestep Sensitivity Study (DTMAX) 28-35
Figure 28.1.3-2	Peak Cladding Temperature, run004 of CGE Timestep Sensitivity Study (DTMAX)
Figure 28.1.3-3	Vessel Fluid Mass, run007 of CGE Timestep Sensitivity Study (DTMAX) 28-37
Figure 28.1.3-4	Peak Cladding Temperature, run007 of CGE Timestep Sensitivity Study (DTMAX)
Figure 28.1.3-5	Vessel Fluid Mass, run001 of DLW Timestep Sensitivity Study (DTMAX) 28-39
Figure 28.1.3-6	Peak Cladding Temperature, run001 of DLW Timestep Sensitivity Study (DTMAX)
Figure 28.1.3-7	Vessel Fluid Mass, run004 of DLW Timestep Sensitivity Study (DTMAX) 28-41
Figure 28.1.3-8	Peak Cladding Temperature, run004 of DLW Timestep Sensitivity Study (DTMAX)
Figure 28.1.4-1	[] ^{a,c} 28-47
Figure 28.1.4-2	[] ^{a,c} 28-48
Figure 28.1.4-3	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.1.4-4	[] ^{a,c}

Figure 28.1.4-5	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.1.4-6	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.1.4-7	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.1.4-8	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.1.4-9	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.1.4-10	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.1.4-11	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.1.4-12	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.1.4-13	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.1.4-14	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.1.4-15	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.1.4-16	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.1.4-17	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.1.4-18	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.1.4-19	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.1.4-20	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.1.4-21	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.1.4-22	[] ^{a,c}

Figure 28.1.4-23	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.1.4-24	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.1.4-25	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.1.4-26	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.1.4-27	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.1.4-28	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.1.4-29	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.1.4-30	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.1.4-31	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.1.4-32	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.1.4-33	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.1.4-34	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.1.4-35	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.1.4-36	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.1.5-1	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.1.5-2	.[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.1.5-3	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.1.5-4	ľ	۲a,c ۵۰ ۵۰
Figure 28.1.5-5	[]

WCAP-16996-NP

cxxxiv

TICOD	ODI	THE CONTENT	n <i>a i</i>	
			n	AANT \
	VP I	LIGUN	E.C.7.1	CONLA
	~~ .	~~~~~	~~ (

/

Figure 28.1.5-6	[] ^{a,c} 28-90
Figure 28.1.5-7	[
] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.1.5-8	[] ^{a,c} 28-92
Figure 28.1.5-9	[] ^{a,c} 28-93
Figure 28.1.6-1	[] ^{a,c} 28-95
Figure 28.1.6-2	[] ^{a,c} 28-96
Figure 28.1.6-3 ·	[] ^{a,c} 28-97
Figure 28.1.6-4	[] ^{á,c}
Figure 28.1.6-5	[] ^{a,c} 28-99
Figure 28.1.6-6	[] ^{a,c} 28-100
Figure 28.1.6-7	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.1-1	Void Fraction at Break, CGE SBLOCA Reference Transient Re-Baseline 28-103
Figure 28.2.1-2	RCS Pressure, CGE SBLOCA Reference Transient Re-Baseline
Figure 28.2.1-3	Upper Head Collapsed Liquid Level, CGE SBLOCA Reference Transient Re-Baseline
Figure 28.2.1-4	Break Flow, CGE SBLOCA Reference Transient Re-Baseline
Figure 28.2.1-5	Intact Loop 1 Loop Seal Differential Pressure, CGE SBLOCA Reference Transient Re-Baseline
Figure 28.2.1-6	Intact Loop 2 Loop Seal Differential Pressure, CGE SBLOCA Reference Transient Re-Baseline
Figure 28.2.1-7	Broken Loop 3 Loop Seal Differential Pressure, CGE SBLOCA Reference Transient Re-Baseline
Figure 28.2.1-8	Peak Cladding Temperature, CGE SBLOCA Reference Transient Re-Baseline
Figure 28.2.2-1	[] ^{a,c} 28-113
Figure 28.2.2-2	[] ^{a,c} 28-114
Figure 28.2.2-3	[] ^{a,c} 28-115
Figure 28.2.2-4	[] ^{a,c}

Figure 28.2.2-5	[] ^{a,c}	
Figure 28.2.2-6	. [] ^{a,c}		
Figure 28.2.2-7	[, ,	a,c	28-119
Figure 28.2.2-8	[]	28-120
Figure 28.2.2-9	[յ	28-121
Figure 28.2.2-10	[] ^{a,c} 28-122
Figure 28.2.2-11	[
	· .] ^{a,c}		
Figure 28.2.2-12	[] ^{a,c}		
Figure 28.2.2-13	[م. a,c	
Figure 28.2.2-14	[] ^{a,c}	-	
Figure 28.2.2-15	[-] ^{a,c}		
Figure 28.2.2-16	[•] ^{a,c}	
Figure 28.2.2-17	[] ^{a,c}	
Figure 28.2.2-18	[] ^{a,c}	
Figure 28.2.3-1	[] ^{a,c}	-	
Figure 28.2.3-2	[] ^{a,c}		
Figure 28.2.3-3	[1] ^{a,c}	
Figure 28.2.3-4	[] ^{a,c}	

WCAP-16996-NP

Figure 28.2.3-5	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.3-6	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.3-7	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.3-8	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.3-9	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.3-10	[¹ ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.3-11	[J ^{a,c} 28-143
Figure 28.2.3-12	· [J ^{a,c} 28-144
Figure 28.2.3-13	[J ^{a,c} 28-145
Figure 28.2.3-14	[J ^{a,c} 28-146
Figure 28.2.3-15	[] ^{a,c} 28-147
Figure 28.2.3-16	[]
Figure 28.2.3-17	[J
Figure 28.2.3-18	[J [*]
Figure 28.2.3-19	[J [*]
Figure 28.2.3-20	[J ^{2,2}
Figure 28.2.3-21	[] ^{۳,۰}
		J ^{*,~}

,

LIST OF FIGURES (cont.) Figure 28.2.3-22 [Figure 28.2.3-23 [Figure 28.2.3-24 [Figure 28.2.4-1 [Figure 28.2.4-2 []^{a,c} 28-160 Figure 28.2.4-3 ſ Figure 28.2.4-4 [Figure 28.2.4-5 []^{a,c}]^{a,c} 28-163 Figure 28.2.4-6 ſ]^{a,c} 28-165 Figure 28.2.5-1 ſ]^{a,c} 28-166 Figure 28.2.5-2 ſ Figure 28.2.5-3 Γ Figure 28.2.6-1 []^{a,c} 28-170 Figure 28.2.6-2 ſ Figure 28.2.6-3 []^{a,c}..... 28-171 Figure 28.2.6-4 []^{a,c}..... 28-172 Figure 28.2.6-5 ſ Figure 28.2.6-6 [Figure 28.2.6-7 Ε]^{a,c}..... 28-175 Figure 28.2.6-8 []^{a,c}..... 28-176 Figure 28.2.6-9 []^{a,c}..... 28-177

WCAP-16996-NP

Figure 28.2.7-1	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.7-2	[
] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.7-3	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.7-4	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.7-5	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.7-6	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.7-7	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.7-8	[
] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.7-9	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.7-10	[] ^{a,c} 28-188
Figure 28.2.7-11	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.7-12	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.7-13	[
] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.7-14	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28 2 7-15	ſ	,
Tiguro zolził io	Ł] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.8-1	[
] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.8-2	[ر. ا ^{a,c} 28-197
T: 28 2 8 2	r]
Figure 28.2.8-3	l] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.8-4	[
-] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.8-5	[1 ^{8,0}
Figure 28 2 8 6	ſ]
inguie 20.2.0-0	L] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.8-7	[] ^{a,c} 28-202
_	-	

.

٠

WCAP-16996-NP

Figure 28.2.8-8	[.] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.8-9	[
] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.8-10	[18.0 20.005
]*
Figure 28.2.8-11	Į] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.8-12	[
•] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.8-13	[1 ^{8,0}
E: 00.0.0.14	ŗ]
Figure 28.2.8-14	l] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.8-15	[] ^{a,c} 28-210
Figure 28.2.8-16	[] ^{a,c} 28-211
Figure 28.2.9-1	1	
0	L] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.9-2	[
] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.9-3	[18.6
]**
Figure 28.2.9-4	l	l ^{a,c} 28-216
Figure 28 2 9-5	r]
1 iguie 20.2.7-5	L] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.9-6	[] ^{a,c} 28-218
Figure 28.2.9-7	ſ] ^{a,c} 28-219
Figure 28.2.9-8	ſ	
0	L] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.9-9	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.10-1	[
] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.10-2	[10.0
		J ^{-,-}

Figure 28.2.10-3	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.10-4	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.10-5	. [] 1ª,c 20.007
Figure 28.2.10-6	[]
Figure 28.2.10-7	[J ^{4,0}
] ^{a,c}	
Figure 28.2.10-8	[] ^{a,c} 28-230
Figure 28.2.10-9	[
			J ^{ac}
Figure 28.2.10-10	[۔ ۱ ^{۹,0} کې کې
Eimira 28 2 10 11	ſ]
Figure 28.2.10-11	L] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.10-12	[
-	-] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.10-13	[•	
] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.10-14	[l ^{a,c} 28-236
Figure 28 2 10-15	ſ]
1 iguie 20.2.10-13	,] ^{a,c}	
Figure 28.2.10-16	[] ^{a,c} 28-238
Figure 28.2.11-1	[
] ^{a,c}	
Figure 28.2.11-2	Ē	-9.0	
_, _, _, ,, ,	_	J ^{a,c}	
Figure 28.2.11-3		J ^{a,c}	28-244
Figure 28 2 11-4	ſ	1] ^{a,c} 28-245
Figure 28 2 11-5	L F		
1 iguic 20.2.11-J	L] ^{a,c}	

WCAP-16996-NP

,

Figure 28.2.11-6	[
] ^{a,c}	
Figure 28.2.11-7	[
- , ·	-] ^{a,c}	
Figure 28.2.11-8	Ϊ.] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.12-1	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.12-2	[[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.12-3	[
		· · ·] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.12-4	[- a.c	
]-,-	
Figure 28.2.12-5	[1ª.º 28-257
Eiran 28 2 12 C	r]
Figure 28.2.12-6	L] ^{a,c}	28-258
Figure 28 2 12-7	г	.	
	L	•] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.12-8	[· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
] ^{a,c}	
Figure 28.2.12-9	[
] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.12-10	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.12-11	[· .] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.12-12	[· .] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.12-13	[ى .] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.12-14	[
] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.12-15	[78.6	
•]","	
Figure 28.2.12-16	[ا ^{ه, د} ۲۶-۲۶۶
Figure 28 2 12 17	r		J
	L] ^{a,c}	
		-	

WCAP-16996-NP

November 2010 Revision 0

Figure 28.2.12-18	[
] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.12-19	[]a,c	28 271
Eiman 28/2 12 20	J	
Figure 28.2.12-20	l] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.12-21	ſ] ^{a,c}
Figure 28.2.12-22] ^{a,c}
Figure 29.1.1-1		-
C C] ^{a,c}	
Figure 29.1.1-2	[
] ^{a,v}	
Figure 29.1.1-3	[] ^{a,c}	29-12
Figure 29 1 1-4		
1 Iguie 27.1.1 4	د] ^{a,c}	
Figure 29.1.1-5	Branchline Quality Versus Mainline Liquid Lev Configuration	vel for Horizontal
Figure 29.1.1-6	Branchline Quality Versus Mainline Liquid Lev Configuration	vel for Downward-Vertical
Figure 29.1.5-1	Predicted Versus Measured Level Swell for the	G1 and G2 Boiloff
	Simulations with [] ^{a,c}
Figure 29.1.5-2	G1 and G2 [] ^{a,c}	
Figure 29.1.5-3	[,
] ^{a,c}	
Figure 29.1.5-4	Predicted Versus Measured Level Swell for the Simulations with [G1 and G2 Boiloff] ^{a,c} 29-28
Figure 29.1.5-5	Differential Pressure in the Test Bundle for [FLECHT-SEASET Test 31504] ^{a,c} ,
Figure 29.1.5-6	Quench Profile for [Test 31504] ^{a,c} , FLECHT-SEASET

Figure 29.1.6-1

[

] ^{a,c}	29-33
Figure 29.1.8-1	Dispersed Flow Cooling	29-37
Figure 29.1.8-2	Inverted Annular Cooling	29-37
Figure 29.1.8-3	Histogram of T_{min} Values Based on G1 and G2 Test Data [
] ^{a,c}	29-38
Figure 29.1.8-4	T _{min} Variation with Re (From Appendix N, Boyack et al., 1989)	29-39
Figure 29.1.8-5	T _{min} Variation with Pressure (From Appendix N, Boyack et al., 1989)	29-39
Figure 29.1.8-6	Method for Determining Quench Temperature [] ^{a,c}	29-40
Figure 29.1.8-7	Predicted vs. Measured Quench Temperatures from G1 Blowdown Simulations	29-40
Figure 29.1.8-8	Predicted vs. Measured Quench Temperatures from FLECHT SEASET Forced Reflood Test Simulations	29-41
Figure 29.1.8-9	Predicted vs. Measured Quench Temperatures from FLECHT Low Flooding Rate Forced Reflood Test Simulations	29-41
Figure 29.1.8-10	Predicted vs. Measured Quench Temperatures from FLECHT Skewed Forced Reflood Test Simulations	29-42
Figure 29.1.11-1	Predicted vs. Measured Residual Liquid Level Comparison for the UPTF Loop Seal HS_SLUG Study	29-46
Figure 29.1.11-2	Pressure Drop across the Loop Seal for UPTF Loop Seal HS_SLUG Study	29-46
Figure 29.2.3-1	LOCA Frequency Evaluation Obtained using Expert Elicitation Presented by R. L. Tregoning, et al. (2007)	29-52
Figure 29.2.4-1	DECLG Break Noding Scheme	29-54
Figure 29.2.4-2	Guillotine Break Noding Used in <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2	29-55
Figure 29.2.5-1	Split Break Noding Scheme	29-57
Figure 29.2.5-2	Split Break Noding Used in <u>W</u> COBRA/TRAC-TF2	29-58
Figure 29.4-1	Effect of Load Follow on F _Q	29-71
Figure 29.4-2	F _Q Histogram for Full Power Points of Load Follow Maneuver; Solid Line Indicates Uniform Range Assumed	29-72


[

] ^{a,c}
Figure 29.4-4	ZIRLO® Cladding Burst Temperature Data and Correlation
Figure 29.4-5	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 29.4-6	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 29.4-7	[] ^{a,c} 29-82
Figure 29.4-8	[
] ^{a,c}
Figure 29.4-9	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 29.4-10	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 29.4-11	
0] ^{a,c}
Figure 29.4-12	[] ^{a,c} 29-87
Figure 29.4-13	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 29.4-14	Distribution of Packing Fraction Data
Figure 29.4-15	L
] ^{a, c}
Figure 29.4-16	[] ^{a,c} 29-96
Figure 29.4-18	Thermal Conductivity of UO ₂
Figure 29.4.3-1	
] ^{a,c}
Figure 29.4.3-2	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 29.4.3-3	[
1 18an 0 201 110 0] ^{a,c}
Figure 29.4.3-4	Heat Transfer Coefficient vs. Time from FLECHT 31805, 6 ft 29-108
Figure 29.4.3-5	Predicted vs. Measured Heat Transfer Coefficients from Forced Reflood Tests at Elevations 6-ft and 10-ft
Figure 29.4.3-6	[
] ^{a,c}

Figure 29.4.3-7	FLECHT 31203 6-ft Elevation Cladding Temperature Comparison for Local and Global Heat Transfer Multiplier of [] ^{a,c}
Figure 29.4.3-8	FLECHT 31203 6-ft Elevation Cladding Temperature Comparison for Local and Global Heat Transfer Multiplier of [] ^{a,c}
Figure 29.4.3-9	FLECHT 31203 8-ft Elevation Cladding Temperature Comparison for Local and Global Heat Transfer Multiplier of [] ^{a,c}
Figure 29.4.3-10	FLECHT 31203 8-ft Elevation Cladding Temperature Comparison for Local and Global Heat Transfer Multiplier of [] ^{a,c}
Figure 29.4.3-11	FLECHT 31203 10-ft Elevation Cladding Temperature Comparison for Local and Global Heat Transfer Multiplier of [] ^{a,c} 29-112
Figure 29.4.3-12	FLECHT 31203 10-ft Elevation Cladding Temperature Comparison for Local and Global Heat Transfer Multiplier of [] ^{a,c}
Figure 29.4.3-13	FLECHT 31504 6-ft Elevation Cladding Temperature Comparison for Local and Global Heat Transfer Multiplier of [] ^{a,c}
Figure 29.4.3-14	FLECHT 31504 6-ft Elevation Cladding Temperature Comparison for Local and Global Heat Transfer Multiplier of [] ^{a,c}
Figure 29.4.3-15	FLECHT 31504 8-ft Elevation Cladding Temperature Comparison for Local and Global Heat Transfer Multiplier of [] ^{a,c} 29-114
Figure 29.4.3-16	FLECHT 31504 8-ft Elevation Cladding Temperature Comparison for Local and Global Heat Transfer Multiplier of [] ^{a,c} 29-114
Figure 29.4.3-17	FLECHT 31504 10-ft Elevation Cladding Temperature Comparison for Local and Global Heat Transfer Multiplier of [] ^{a,c}
Figure 29.4.3-18	FLECHT 31504 10-ft Elevation Cladding Temperature Comparison for Local and Global Heat Transfer Multiplier of [] ^{a,c}
Figure 29.4.3-19	FLECHT 31805 6-ft Elevation Cladding Temperature Comparison for Local and Global Heat Transfer Multiplier of [] ^{a,c} 29-116
Figure 29.4.3-20	FLECHT 31805 6-ft Elevation Cladding Temperature Comparison for Local and Global Heat Transfer Multiplier of [] ^{a,c} 29-116
Figure 29.4.3-21	FLECHT 31805 8-ft Elevation Cladding Temperature Comparison for Local and Global Heat Transfer Multiplier of [] ^{a,c}
Figure 29.4.3-22	FLECHT 31805 8-ft Elevation Cladding Temperature Comparison for Local and Global Heat Transfer Multiplier of [] ^{a,c} 29-117
Figure 29.4.3-23	FLECHT 31805 10-ft Elevation Cladding Temperature Comparison for Local and Global Heat Transfer Multiplier of [] ^{a,c}



Figure 2	9.4.3-24	FLECHT 31805 10-ft Elevation Cladding Temperature Comparison for Local and Global Heat Transfer Multiplier of [] ^{a,c}
Figure 3	1.1-1	Description of Break Area Regions
Figure 3	1.1-2	Noding Diagram for Minimum Break Area Determination
Figure 3	1.1-3	Uncertainty Range of the Demonstration Plant PBOT and PMID
Figure 3	1.3-1	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 3	1.3-2	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 3	1.3-3	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 3	1.3-4	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 3	1.3-5	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 3	1.3-6	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 3	1.3-7	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 3	1.3-8	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 3	1.3-9	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 3	1.3-10	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 3	1.3-11	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 3	1.3-12	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 3	1.3-13	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 3	1.4-1	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 3	1.4-2	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 3	1.4-3	[] ^{a,c} 31-40
Figure 3	1.4-4	[] ^{a,c}
Figure 3	1.4-5	[] ^{a,c}

•			
] ^{a,c} 31-43		[Figure 31.4-6
		[Figure 31.4-7
] ^{a,c}		
		[Figure 31.4-8
	,c ``		
		Г	Figure 31 4-9
] ^{a,c}	L	1 19010 0 11 1 2
		[Figure 31.4-10
	·		- -
	·		
78.0 21.40			Figure 31.4-11
J ^{~,}			
		[Figure 31.4-12
	1,C		
		· [Figure 31.4-13
	.] ^{a,c}	Ľ	5
		[Figure 31.4-14
	c		
		[Figure 31.4-15
] ^{a,c}			
		[Figure 31.4-16
] ^{a,c}		
		r	Figure 31 4.17
	1,C	L	1 igute 51.4-17

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Westinghouse's previously approved best-estimate Large Break loss-of-coolant accident (LBLOCA) methodology (or Evaluation Model (EM)) is described in WCAP-16009-P-A (Nissley et al., 2005). The methodology is referred to as the Automated Statistical Treatment of Uncertainty Method (ASTRUM) and is applicable to Westinghouse designed 3- and 4-loop plants with emergency core cooling system (ECCS) injection into the cold legs, Westinghouse designed 2-loop plants with upper plenum injection (UPI) and Combustion Engineering designs. The ASTRUM EM is based on the use of WCOBRA/TRAC as the system code. The ASTRUM EM was also submitted as part of the AP1000^{TM1} Design Control Document (APP-GW-GL-700, Rev. 17).

The ASTRUM EM addressed Large Break LOCA scenarios with a minimum size of 1.0 ft². In this report the applicability of the Westinghouse best-estimate LOCA EM was extended to consider smaller break size, therefore including what traditionally are defined as Small and Intermediate Break LOCA scenarios. The new realistic LOCA EM is called FULL SPECTRUM^{TM1} LOCA (FSLOCA^{TM1}) methodology. The term 'Full Spectrum' specifies that the new EM is intended to resolve the full spectrum of LOCA scenarios which result from a postulated break in the cold leg of a PWR (While this EM is also applicable for analysis of breaks at other loop locations, such as the hot leg, these breaks are not limiting compared with the cold leg break). The break sizes considered in the Westinghouse FULL SPECTRUM LOCA include any break size in which break flow is beyond the capacity of the normal charging pumps, up to and including a double ended guillotine (DEG) rupture with a break flow area equal to two times the pipe area.

As in previous EMs, the FULL SPECTRUM LOCA methodology was patterned after the Code Scaling, Applicability, and Uncertainty (CSAU) methodology developed under the guidance of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) (Boyack et al., 1989). The development roadmap is consistent with Regulatory Guide 1.203.

For the FULL SPECTRUM LOCA methodology <u>W</u>COBRA/TRAC was modified by replacing the 1D Module (based on TRAC-PD2) with the TRAC-PF1/MOD2 code and adding a few improvements to the 3D module (based on Westinghouse modified COBRA-TF). One of the major changes is the addition of an explicit non-condensable gas transport equation within the 3D module. The replacement of TRAC-PD2 with TRAC-PF1/MOD2 allows the extension of a two-fluid, six-equation formulation of the two-phase flow to the 1D loop components. This new code has been named <u>W</u>COBRA/TRAC-TF2 where "TF2" is an identifier that reflects the use of a three-field (TF) formulation of the 3D module derived by COBRA-TF and a two-fluid (TF) formulation of the 1D module based on TRAC-PF1/MOD2.

With the exception of the additional tracking of a non-condensable gas field, and few minor upgrades needed to address Small Break LOCA scenarios, the Vessel model is equivalent to the Vessel model of the approved version of <u>WCOBRA/TRAC</u>. Requests for additional information (RAIs) identified during the early review of the code that led to the approval of the original CQD (Bajorek et al., 1998) and

 FULL SPECTRUM[™], FSLOCA[™], AP1000[™], and ZIRLO[™] are trademarks or registered trademarks in the United States of Westinghouse Electric Company LLC, its subsidiaries and/or its affiliates. These marks may be used and/or registered in other countries throughout the world. All rights reserved. Unauthorized use is strictly prohibited. Other names may be trademarks of their respective owners.

subsequent ASTRUM EM (Nissley et al., 2005), and associated responses should still be applicable. In a few instances, as in the downcomer region, a more refined noding scheme has been adopted to improve accuracy or provide more consistency across the various test facilities. Such noding choices have been justified by assessing the model against large and full scale experiments.

The FULL SPECTRUM LOCA EM is intended to be applicable to all PWR fuel designs with Zirconium alloy cladding. Most of the data considered in the methodology is based on Zircaloy-4 and ZIRLO^{TM1}.

]^{a,c}

The uncertainty methodology is based on a direct Monte Carlo sampling of the uncertainty attributes. The overall uncertainty is bounded using a non-parametric statistical method similar to the ASTRUM EM. However, sample size is increased to reduce the variability of the estimator. The break size spectrum is divided in two regions. Region-I provides coverage of what typically are defined as Small Break LOCA scenarios and stretch into Intermediate Break LOCA. Region-II starts from Intermediate Break size and include what typically are defined Large Break LOCA scenarios. A 95/95 joint-probability statement is developed for the key parameters that are needed to demonstrate compliance with 10 CFR 50.46 acceptance criteria.

The code models, their assessment, and conclusions on model biases and uncertainties are aimed to be generic and applicable to the same class of plants covered by the ASTRUM EM. When modeling aspects are specific to a particular PWR design, the choice was made to focus attention on the Westinghouse 3-loop PWR with cold leg ECCS injection. Therefore, the demonstration plant analysis is limited to such a design.

 FULL SPECTRUMTM, FSLOCATM, AP1000TM, and ZIRLOTM are trademarks or registered trademarks in the United States of Westinghouse Electric Company LLC, its subsidiaries and/or its affiliates. These marks may be used and/or registered in other countries throughout the world. All rights reserved. Unauthorized use is strictly prohibited. Other names may be trademarks of their respective owners.

12 ASSESSMENT OF BREAK FLOW MODEL

12.1 INTRODUCTION

During a LOCA, the break flow rate determines the depressurization rate as well as the mass inventory of the primary system of a PWR. These parameters in turn influence the timing of various engineered safeguard system responses, such as reactor trip and safety injection, and the degree of core uncovery which is the major parameter determining the subsequent heatup and clad temperature. Although the size, location, and shape of the break are not known for the postulated LOCA, the best-estimate code needs to predict consistent responses given the break size and location over a range of pressure, subcooling, and upstream fluid states expected in LOCA.

In this section, an assessment is made of the critical flow model in the <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u> version described in Section 5.12.2, Volume 1, of this document. This section presents the following assessment results.

12.1.1 Critical Flow in LOCA (Relation to LOCA PIRT)

A fluid system contained in a reactor vessel with a pipe break is in communication with the containment atmosphere, which is at a lower pressure through the break flow path. Under critical flow conditions, the discharge flow rate from the high pressure system becomes independent of the containment conditions, which are at the lower pressure.

Since the break flow rate determines the depressurization and inventory and mass distribution in the vessel, it is easy to justify a high ranking of this phenomenon as discussed in Section 2. For Small Break LOCA, because the Reactor Coolant System (RCS) pressure remains high enough to cause the break flow critical [

Early in a LOCA, the fluid condition upstream of the break location is subcooled. This results in a high discharge flow rate and a fast depressurization. As the pressure drops to the saturation pressure corresponding to the coolant liquid temperature upstream of the break, the discharge becomes two-phase and a relatively low discharge rate and a slow depressurization result. As the system mass depletes and the flow in the main pipe stratifies, the break location begins to uncover. The break quality under the stratified upstream is determined by the offtake phenomena and is the subject of Section 12.7.

WCAP-16996-NP

]^{a,c}

12.1.2 Assessment Objective

In this section, the break flow model in $\underline{W}COBRA/TRAC-TF2$ is assessed relative to the following effects on the break flow in addition to the accuracy relative to data:

- Break path length
- Break flow area variation
- Upstream pressure variation
- Variation in degree of subcooling during liquid discharge
- Upstream void fraction/quality variation
- Break entrance geometry
- Non-condensable gas concentration in the Vapor phase

The critical flow model's bias and uncertainty will be determined by comparing the critical flow model prediction implemented in <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u> with selected data from the qualified break flow dataset. A selection of the model assessment dataset is described in the subsequent section.

12.2 CRITICAL FLOW DATA NEEDS FOR PWR LOCA MODEL VALIDATION

The requirements of a critical flow data base which would be suitable for use in validating critical flow models for the range of conditions occurring during PWR LOCAs is discussed in this section. The range of geometrical, and physical conditions, and the criteria for defining the necessary quality of the data were discussed by Holmes and Allen (1998).

Holmes and Allen (1998) identified the range of parameters, both geometrical and physical, which would cover the perceived need for the analytical model validation used in LOCA analyses as shown in Tables 12.2-1 through 12.2-3.

In LOCA scenarios, the worst break is postulated to occur in the cold leg of the primary coolant system. For bounding purposes, the size of the break is assumed to be as large as the full cross section of the primary loop pipes, and as small as the break size of $\sim 0.5 \text{in}^2$ below which the coolant makeup system is able to maintain the reactor coolant inventory by matching the injection to the leak rate from the break. Thus the scale requirement for the critical flow data for the purpose of PWR LOCA analyses is 0.5 in^2 to ~ 4.15 ft². The data requirement for the break upstream fluid conditions may be determined by examining LOCA experiment measurements/analyses and PWR LOCA simulations. Figures 12.2-1 and 12.2-2 show respectively the predicted temperature-pressure and the quality-pressure trajectories for LBLOCA transients and a 5% small break tests. The blue line shows the predicted trajectory for the largest Double Ended Guillotine Break in a typical 3 loop PWR. The green line shows the predicted trajectory for the smallest (~1 ft² break area) LBLOCA of a 3 loop PWR which could be considered an largest Intermediate Break (IB) LOCA. The red line shows the predicted trajectory of SB-CL-05, a 5% cold leg break simulation performed at ROSA facility. Trajectory for IB and LB LOCA shows a rapid depressurization to saturation from the operating condition to saturation at around 1000~1200 psia where the initially subcooled liquid reaches saturation and the upstream of the break turns two-phase. The predicted SB-CL-05 small break trajectory reaches saturation at around 1200 psia and transitions from all liquid to all vapor due to loop-seal clearing. The upstream quality remains at or near 1.0 until accumulator injection at around 600 psia at which time the break becomes subcritical. The desired critical flow data should cover the range of fluid condition indicated in these figures.

Table 12.2-1 Range of Geometrical Configurations ⁽¹⁾						
Component	Ranges					
Straight Pipe	Diameter ≤ 0.7 m, $1 \leq L/D \leq 10$ (This range of L/D is for large break LOCAs in PWRs, i.e., e. pipe length of 0.5 m-7 m, small break LOCAs will require a correspondingly wider range of L/D)					
Elbows	$45^{\circ}-90^{\circ}$, diameter ≤ 0.7 m, $1 \leq r/d \leq 4$					
Tees	Angle of offtake 45°-90°, diameter ≤ 0.7 m, $0.3 \leq L/D \leq 10$, round/square entry					
Pumps	Pump Specific Geometry					
Valves	All valve data					
Orifices, flow meters, etc.	Where available					
Note: 1. Holmes and Allen, 1998.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					

Table 12.2-2 Break Configuration ⁽¹⁾						
Break Configuration	Ranges					
Guillotine Breaks	Varying degree of off-set					
Holes	$10^{-4} \text{ m}^2 \leq \text{Break Area} \leq 0.1 \text{ m}^2$					
Splits	Horizontal/Circumferential, $\sim 10^{-4} \text{ m}^2 \leq \text{Break Area} \leq 1.0 \text{ m}^2$					
Reactor Coolant Pump seal Geometry	Pump design specific					
Note: 1. Holmes and Allen, 1998.						

Pressure (MPa) Temperature Flow Condition							
0.1 – 20	~ Saturation	Single-phase steam/two-phase					
0.1 – 15	≤ 200K subcooled/saturation	Single-phase liquid/two-phase					
-	-	Single-phase vapor/two-phase with Non-condensable gas					
Note: 1. Holmes and Al	len, 1998.						

12-4



12.3 ASSESSMENT TEST MATRIX AND BASIS FOR SELECTION

The critical flow dataset compiled by V. Illic (1986) was further examined for the purpose of the critical flow model validation and the bias/uncertainty evaluation in a similar screening discussed in Elias and Lellouche (1994), and Holmes and Allen (1998). Data without well defined or stagnation condition or upstream condition were excluded for assessment. Dataset generated by Cruver (1963), Fauske (1962), Henry (1990), Isbin (1957) and Zaloudek (1964) do not report stagnation pressure. Dataset generated by Guizovarn (1975) contains superheated liquid upstream of the nozzle, which is contrary to the description in V. Illic (1986) which states subcooled inlet condition. Dataset generated by Bryers and Hsieh (1966) contains highly subcooled stagnation condition contrary to the description. The dataset generated by Ogasawara (1969) did not contain the reservoir temperature or the quality. Datasets generated by Danforth (1941) and Schrock (1977) are suspect with regard to achieving the critical condition according to Illic. Dataset generated by Morrison (1977) appears to be inconsistent with other similar data.

The dataset mentioned above need to be further investigated for the use in the model bias and uncertainty study since as-reported upstream condition is suspect. These subsections were discarded in much the same reasons as the previous work (pp. 117, Elias and Lellouche, 1994). The database was further expanded by including four additional sources. Marviken (1982) test data were added since this set is the only critical flow data for diameters above 200 mm and can be considered a full scale. While this is a transient experiment, necessary upstream conditions were reported at 1 second interval which could be used to define the inlet condition. The offtake dataset taken at TPFL (Anderson and Benedetti, 1986) was added which contains fluid condition measurements upstream of the break nozzle where the flow was critical. Amos and Schrock's (1983) data covers the pressure and subcooling range comparable to the PWR's operating condition. Celata's (1988) subcooled data were included for the subsequent validation of the non-condensable gas capability. Table 12.4-1 is a summary of all selected datasets for this assessment. The subsection number in the table was assigned prior to the selection process. This is the reason why the dataset number seen in the table is not contiguous. The dataset represents 3199 points from 53 geometries containing data from 13 to 2500 psia. The geometry ranges from 0 < L < 2300 mm, 0.464 mm < D_H < 500 mm.

Additionally, Celata's non-condensable gas data was selected for the validation of non-condensable gas effects as seen in Table 12.4-3.

Table 12.4-3, is the complete list of database in the assessment test matrix used to evaluate the accuracy of the <u>WCOBRA-TRAC-TF2</u> break flow model; it describes in detail all 53 nozzle geometries and orientations. Comment section describes Diameter, D, as a function of axial distance, z.

12-7

Table 12.4-1 Selected Dataset and Input Variables							
Reference	Pressure (psia)	Upstream Condition	No. of Data Points	Length (mm)	Dhyd (mm)		
Ardron (1978)	. 22-55	Subcooled	32	1015	26.3		
Boivin (1979)	200-1500	Subcooled	21	500-1830	12-50		
Fincke (1981)	13-45	Subcooled	92	79.72	18.28		
Jeandey (1981)	100-2100	Subcooled	88	463	20.13		
Neusen (1962)	100-600	Saturated to X=0.23	37	Orifice (1 mm)	6.4-11.125		
Reocreux (1974)	30-50	Subcooled	28	2335	20		
Seynhaeve (1980)	40-150	Subcooled	57	221-306	12.5		
Sozzi & Sutherland(1975)	400-1100	Subcool and Saturated	667	4.7-1822.5	12.7		
Amos (1983)	500-2300	Subcooled	44	63.5	0.464, 0.748		
Anderson (1985)	500-900	Saturated Liquid up to Saturated Vapor	109	54	16.2		
Marviken (1982)	400-750	Subcooled and Saturated	1927	166-1809	200-509		
Celata (1988)	72-218	Subcooled to Saturated,	97	1500	,4.6		
	13-2300	Subcooled Liquid to Saturated Vapor	3199	0-2335	0.418-509		

Table 12.4-2 Additional Dataset for Non-condensable Gas Model Validation and Input Variables							
Reference	Pressure (psia)	Upstream Condition	No. of Data Points	Length (mm)	Dhyd (mm)		
Celata (1988)	72-218	Data-41 with Non-C (Volume %): 0-80.	96	1500	4.6		



Table 12.4-3 Critical Flow Data Considered for Model Evaluation							
Reference	L (mm)	D (mm)	cosθ	N-Data	Comments		
Ardron, K. H. & Ackerman, M. C. (1978)	1015	26.3	0	33	One superheated upstream condition was not used		
Boivin (1979)	500	12	0	10	D=50 (z<0); 0 <z<50 entrance;<br="" rounded="">D=12 (50<z<500); d="12+19(z-500)<br">(500<z<700); (z="" d="50">700 mm)</z<700);></z<500);></z<50>		
Boivin (1979)	1600 (30	0	5	D=150 (z<0); 0 <z<130 entrance;<br="" rounded="">D=30 (130<z<1730); d="30+0.12(z-1730)<br">(1730<z<2305); (z="" d="100">2305 mm)</z<2305);></z<1730);></z<130>		
Boivin (1979)	1700	50	0	6	D=150 (z<0); 0 <z<130 entrance;<br="" rounded="">D=50 (130<z<1830); d="50+0.12(z-1830)<br">(1830<z<2240); (z="" d="100">2240 mm)</z<2240);></z<1830);></z<130>		
Fincke & Collins (1981)	25	18.3	0	92	D=18.28 (54.7 <z<79.7); D=18.28+0.12(z-79.7), (z<215.9 mm)</z<79.7); 		
Jeandey et al. (1981)	463	20	1	15	D=66.7-0.54z (0 <z<86.9); D=20.1 (z>86.9 mm)</z<86.9); 		
Jeandey et al. (1981)	463	20	1	73	see Appendix C.7.1 for (z<100); D=20.13 (100 <z<463); d="20.13+0.12(z-463)<br">(z<900); D=737 (z>900 mm)</z<463);>		
Neusen (1962)	0	11	0	25	D=11.12 mm at throat; D=11.12+0.425z (0 <z<35.91 mm)<="" td=""></z<35.91>		
Neusen (1962)	0	6	0	12	D=16.4 mm at throat; D=6.4+0.425z (0 <z<59.81 mm)<="" td=""></z<59.81>		
Reocreux (1974)	2335	20	1	28	D=20 (0 <z<2335); D=20+0.12(z-2335) (z<2662 mm)</z<2335); 		
Seynhaeve (1980)	306	13	1	26	D=12.5 (0 <z<306); D=12.5+0.245(z-306) (z>541); D=70 (z>541 mm)</z<306); 		
Seynhaeve (1980)	306	13	1	31	D=12.5 (0 <z<221); d="12.5+0.245(z-221)<br">(z>541); D=70 (z>541 mm)</z<221);>		
Sozzi & Sutherland (1975)	45	12.7	0	129	D=43.2 (z=0); rounded convergent (0 <z<44.5); D=12.7+0.105(z-44.5) (z<158.5 mm) (Nozzle 1)</z<44.5); 		
Sozzi & Sutherland (1975)	45	12.7	0	13	D=43.2 (z=0); rounded convergent (0 <z<44.5 (nozzle="" 2)<="" mm)="" td=""></z<44.5>		
Sozzi & Sutherland (1975)	57	12.7	0	47	D=43.2 (z=0); rounded convergent (0 <z<44.5 (nozzle="" 2)<="" mm)="" td=""></z<44.5>		
Sozzi & Sutherland (1975)	362	12.7	0	19	D=43.2 ($z=0$); rounded convergent (0< $z<44.5$ mm) (Nozzle 2)		

WCAP-16996-NP

November 2010 Revision 0

(cont.)					·······
Reference	L (mm)	D (mm)	cosθ	N-Data	Comments
Sozzi & Sutherland (1975)	- 83	12.7	0	17	D=43.2 (z=0); rounded convergent (0 <z<44.5 (nozzle="" 2)<="" mm)="" td=""></z<44.5>
Sozzi & Sutherland (1975)	553	12.7	0	13	D=43.2 (z=0); rounded convergent (0 <z<44.5 (nozzle="" 2)<="" mm)="" td=""></z<44.5>
Sozzi & Sutherland (1975)	108	12.7	0	23	D=43.2 (z=0); rounded convergent (0 <z<44.5 (nozzle="" 2)<="" mm)="" td=""></z<44.5>
Sozzi & Sutherland (1975)	(679	12.7	0	96	D=43.2 (z=0); rounded convergent (0 <z<44.5 (nozzle="" 2)<="" mm)="" td=""></z<44.5>
Sozzi & Sutherland (1975)	159 .	12.7	0	15	D=43.2 (z=0); rounded convergent (0 <z<44.5 (nozzle="" 2)<="" mm)="" td=""></z<44.5>
Sozzi & Sutherland (1975)	1823	. 12.7	0	81	D=43.2 (z=0); rounded convergent (0 <z<44.5 (nozzle="" 2)<="" mm)="" td=""></z<44.5>
Sozzi & Sutherland (1975)	235	12.7	0	12	D=43.2 (z=0); rounded convergent (0 <z<44.5 (nozzle="" 2)<="" mm)="" td=""></z<44.5>
Sozzi & Sutherland (1975)	273	12.7	0	22	D=43.2 (z=0); rounded convergent (0 <z<44.5 (nozzle="" 2)<="" mm)="" td=""></z<44.5>
Sozzi & Sutherland (1975)	5	12.7	0	58	Nozzle No. 3 (Sharp entrance)
Sozzi & Sutherland (1975)	322	12.7	0	24	Nozzle No. 3 (Sharp entrance)
Sozzi & Sutherland (1975)	513	12.7	0	24	Nozzle No. 3 (Sharp entrance)
Sozzi & Sutherland (1975)	640	12.7	0	17	Nozzle No. 3 (Sharp entrance)
Sozzi & Sutherland (1975)	195	12.7	0	23	Nozzle No. 3 (Sharp entrance)
Sozzi & Sutherland (1975)	45	19	0	23	D=43.2 (z=0); rounded convergent (0 <z<44.5 mm)<="" td=""></z<44.5>
Sozzi & Sutherland (1975)	732	54	0	4	D=260-0.39(z-202) (202 <z<732); D=54+0.263(z-732) (z<1112 mm)</z<732);
Sozzi & Sutherland (1975)	696	76	0	3	D=260-0.39(z-223) (223 <z<696); D=54+0.263(z-696) (z<1076 mm)</z<696);
Sozzi & Sutherland (1975)	63	28	0	5	D=72.6 (z=0); rounded elliptical sec. (0 <z<63.5); (z<228.5)<="" d="28+0.246(z-63.5)" td=""></z<63.5);>
Amos & Schrock (1983)	63.5	0.747	-1	18	Rec. Slit 0.381x63.5 mm with known entrance losses



(cont.)								
Reference	L (mm)	D (mm)	cosθ	N-Data	Comments			
Amos & Schrock (1983)	63.5	0.418	-1	26	Rec. Slit 0.254x63.5 mm with known entrance losses			
Anderson & Benedetti (1986)	31.9	16.2	0	109	Rounded entrance (at 500, 640 and 900 psia)			
Marviken Test 1 (1982)	300	300	-1	97	Rounded entrance, Nozzle I, Type III			
Marviken Test 2 (1982)	300	300	-1	91	Rounded entrance, Nozzle II, Type II Exp.			
Marviken Test 3 (1982)	150	500	-1	40	Rounded entrance			
Marviken Test 4 (1982)	150	500	-1	39	Rounded entrance			
Marviken Test 5 (1982)	300	300	-1	43	Rounded entrance			
Marviken Test 6 (1982)	300	300	-1	85	Rounded entrance			
Marviken Test 7 (1982)	150	500	-1	84	Rounded entrance			
Marviken Test 8 (1982)	150	500	-1	. 40	Rounded entrance			
Marviken Test 9 (1982)	150	500	-1	58	Rounded entrance			
Marviken Test 10 (1982)	150	500	-1	57	Rounded entrance			
Marviken Test 11 (1982)	150	500	-1	41	Rounded entrance			
Marviken Test 12 (1982)	150	500	-1	121	Rounded entrance			
Marviken Test 13 (1982)	150	500	-1	139	Rounded entrance			
Marviken Test 14 (1982)	150	500	-1	144	Rounded entrance			
Marviken Test 15 (1982)	1809	500	-1	45	Rounded entrance			
Marviken Test 16 (1982) 590200-1146	1809	500	-1	40	Rounded entrance			
Marviken Test 17 (1982) 590200-1146	1110	300	-1	90	Rounded entrance			
Marviken Test 18 (1982) 590200-1146	1110	300	-1	69	Rounded entrance			
Marviken Test 19 (1982) 590200-1146	1110	300	-1	85	Rounded entrance			
Marviken Test 20 (1982) 590200-1146	730	500	1	50	Rounded entrance			
Marviken Test 21 (1982) 590200-1146	730	500	-1	50	Rounded entrance			
Marviken Test 22 (1982) 590200-1146	730	500	1	37	Rounded entrance			

12-10



Table 12.4-3 Critical F (cont.)	low Data	Conside	red for	Model Eva	luation
Reference	L (mm)	D (mm)	cosθ	N-Data	Comments
Marviken Test 23 (1982)	166	500	· -1	61	Rounded entrance
Marviken Test 24 (1982)	166	500	-1	44	Rounded entrance
Marviken Test 25 (1982) 590200-1146	510	300	-1	84	Rounded entrance
Marviken Test 26 (1982) 590200-1146	510	300	-1	134	Rounded entrance
Marviken Test 27 (1982) 590200-1146	730	500	-1	59 _.	Rounded entrance
Celata (1988)	1500	4.6	-1	97	Entrance loss calibrated using one single-phase flow test.

l

12.4 DESCRIPTION OF DATASETS

The stagnation condition of each dataset such as Pressure/Temperature and Pressure/Quality are shown graphically in the following figures. The Pressure/Temperature trajectories of the primary system of LOFT 2.5% cold leg break and ROSA 5% cold break while the break is choked during small break LOCA experiments along with the saturation line are shown for comparison.

12.4.1 Ardron and Ackerman

Ardron and Ackerman conducted critical flow experiments by discharging subcooled water from a pressure vessel through a horizontal test section. The test section consisted of a straight cylindrical pipe 0.0263 m in diameter and 1.015 m long. Instrumentation included measurement of stagnation pressure and temperature with reported uncertainties of 7.0 kPa and 0.1°C, respectively, mass flux with uncertainty of 200 kg/m²-s, and differential pressure measurements, the roughness of pipe was estimated to be 2.5E-06 m. As seen in Figures 12.4-1a and 12.4-1b, the range of stagnation pressure tested was from 150 to 370 kPa (21.8 to 53.7 psia) with subcooling from 0 to 7°C (quality of 0 to $-6x10^{-6}$). All tests were conducted with de-mineralized and degassed water.



a,c







12.4.2 Boivin

Boivin conducted critical flow experiments by discharging water through long, horizontal nozzles. Three nozzles were tested. Each nozzle had a rounded inlet, a long cylindrical smooth pipe, and a diffuser having a small expanding angle. In the three cases, the L/D ratio is greater than 30 to minimize 2D effects. The first nozzle had a pipe diameter of 0.012 m, 0.45 m long with a diffuser angle of 11 degrees. The second nozzle had a pipe diameter of 0.030 m, 1.6 m long with a 7 degree diffuser. The diameter of the third nozzle was 0.050 m, 1.7 m long with a diffuser of 7.7 degree.

Measurements reported include inlet (stagnation) pressure and temperature, mass flux, and throat pressure. No measurement uncertainties were reported. Stagnation pressure conditions ranged from 1960 to 10100 kPa (284.3 to 1464.9 psia) with inlet water somewhat subcooled.

The upstream conditions in Pressure/Temperature and Pressure/Quality planes, along with (P, T) trajectories observed in LOFT and ROSA small break tests, are shown in Figures 12.4-2a and 12.4-2b.







WCAP-16996-NP

November 2010 Revision 0

a,c

12-15

12.4.3 Fincke and Collins

Fincke and Collins performed critical flow experiments by flowing subcooled water through a loop and test section. Mass flow rate was controlled by a flow control valve upstream of the test section and back pressure was controlled by a valve downstream of the test section. The test section consisted of a 1.8 m long, 0.0444 m diameter Lexan cylindrical tube followed by a convergent-divergent Lexan nozzle with a minimum diameter of 0.01828 m. Degassed water was used for all experiments. Instrumentation included upstream temperature (reported uncertainty of 0.1°C), volumetric flow rate (uncertainty of 0.1 l/s), pressure just upstream of the nozzle (no uncertainty given), and differential pressure measurements along the nozzle (uncertainty ranging from 0.5 to 2.5 kPa). The differential pressure measurements were used to determine the throat pressure that is included in this data base. The upstream pressure ranged from 90 to 300 kPa (13.1 to 43.5 psia), inlet temperatures were 5° to 40°C subcooled (quality of $-3x10^{-6}$ to $-7x10^{-5}$).

The upstream conditions in Pressure/Temperature and Pressure/Quality planes, along with (P, T) trajectories from LOFT and ROSA small break tests are shown in Figures 12.4-3a and 12.4-3b.

(

a,c







12.4.4 Jeandey

Jeandey performed critical flow experiments by flowing subcooled, demineralized and degassed water through a vertical test section. The test section consisted of a smoothly convergent entrance followed by a straight cylindrical pipe 0.02013 m in diameter followed by a diverging section with a divergent angle of 7 degrees. Flow was vertically upward for all the experiments. Stagnation conditions ranged from pressures of 900 to 14000 kPa (130.5 to 2030.5 psia) and temperatures of 148.5 to 324.6 C (quality of 0 to -0.01). The resulting critical mass fluxes ranged from 14500 to 62000 kg/m²-s.

The throat pressure was measured along with many other pressures along the test section. In addition, for 21 of the experiments, axial and radial void fraction profiles were obtained using an X-ray densitometer.

The upstream conditions in Pressure/Temperature and Pressure/Quality planes, along with (P, T) trajectories observed in LOFT and ROSA small break tests, are shown in Figures 12.4-4a and 12.4-4b.



a,c









12.4.5 Neusen

Neusen performed experiments to determine design criteria for convergent-divergent nozzles. Critical flow occurred during these experiments, and the data are included in this data base. Neusen ran the saturated water through two convergent-divergent nozzles with minimum diameters of 0.0064 and 0.011 m. Reported stagnation conditions ranged from pressures of 841 to 6516 kPa (122 to 945 psia) and qualities of 0.0028 and 0.228.

Stagnation conditions for these experiments were determined by measuring subcooled temperature and pressure upstream of a throttling valve. The throttling process was assumed to be isentropic, and pressure was measured downstream of the throttling valve (reported uncertainty of 1%). Reported uncertainties for mass flux and calculated enthalpy were less than 2.5% and 0.5%, respectively.

The upstream conditions in Pressure/Temperature and Pressure/Quality planes, along with (P, T) trajectories observed in LOFT and ROSA small breaks, are shown in Figures 12.4-5a and 12.4-5b.







WCAP-16996-NP

a,c

12-21

12.4.6 Reocreux

Reocreux performed critical flow experiments by flowing subcooled degassed, demineralized water upwards through a vertical test section. The test section consisted of a straight, cylindrical section 2.335 m long and 0.020 m in diameter, followed by a divergent section 0.327 m long. Stagnation pressures ranged from 212 to 340 kPa (30.7 to 49.3 psia), and stagnation temperatures ranged from 115.9 to 121.8 C (quality of $-5x10^{-6}$ to $-3.5x10^{-5}$). Pressures were measured along the test section at many locations, most concentrated near the choking point (at the entrance to the divergent section). The critical or throat pressures were determined from these measurements. In addition, the void fraction at the choking point was measured for most of the tests using X-ray attenuation method.

The upstream conditions in Pressure/Temperature and Pressure/Quality planes, along with (P, T) trajectories observed in LOFT and ROSA small break tests, are shown in Figures 12.4-6a and 12.4-6b.



a,c

Figure 12.4-6a Upstream P-T in Reocreux







12.4.7 Seynhaeve

Seynhaeve performed critical flow experiments by flowing subcooled, demineralized water upwards in vertical test sections. Two test sections were employed. Each section consisted of a straight, cylindrical pipe 0.0125 m in diameter followed by a divergent section. One section had the straight pipe 0.306 m long, and the other 0.221 m long. Stagnation conditions for these experiments range from 280 to 1015 kPa (40.6 to 147.2 psia) in pressure and 111 to 166.8 C in temperature (quality of $-9x10^{-6}$ to $-8.9x10^{-5}$). Critical pressure was measured near the choking plane. Measurement uncertainties are not known.

The upstream conditions in Pressure/Temperature and Pressure/Quality planes, along with (P, T) trajectories observed in LOFT and ROSA small break tests, are shown in Figures 12.4-7a and 12.4-7b.

12-25

a,c

Figure 12.4-7a Upstream P-T in Seynhaeve







12.4.8 Sozzi and Sutherland

Sozzi and Sutherland conducted a series of critical flow experiments with subcooled and low quality water. The water for each experiment was demineralized and degassed. Water from a large vessel was blown down through test nozzles. Data from 21 different nozzle shapes and configurations have been taken with more than 650 individual data points. Stagnation pressure ranged from 3000 to 7000 kPa (435 to 1015.3 psia), and stagnation qualities ranged from approximately -0.006 to 0.01 (based on the specific volume).

The upstream conditions in Pressure/Temperature and Pressure/Quality planes, along with (P, T) trajectories observed in LOFT and ROSA small break tests, are shown in Figures 12.4-8a and 12.4-8b.



a,c

Figure 12.4-8a Upstream P-T in Sozzi-Sutherland



Figure 12.4-8b Upstream Quality in Sozzi-Sutherland

12.4.9 Marviken Tests 1 through 27

Marviken tests provide very large diameter downflow data typically considered full scale. The Marviken facility was used for full-scale critical flow tests between mid-1977 and December 1979. During this time, 27 tests were conducted by a downward discharge of water and steam mixtures from a full-sized reactor vessel through a large diameter vertical discharge pipe that supplied the flow to a test nozzle. There were 9 nozzles tested; all had rounded entrances followed by a nominal 20, 30 and 50 cm constant diameter straight section. Table 12.4-4 shows the characteristic dimensions for the tests. As seen in the table, the entire test series (Tests 1 through 27) were selected for the model validation.

The discharge pipe that connects the vessel to the nozzle is 6283 mm long and is geometrically complex. It is made up of several pieces: nozzle, permanently attached to the vessel with a 752 mm diameter, a 1980 mm long drift tube of the same diameter, a 1778 mm long global valve with a 780 mm diameter and a 1000 mm long with 752 mm diameter section to which the nozzle is attached. Besides these there were two 120 mm long instrument rings inserted on either end of the 1980 mm drift tube. It is quite clear that with this degree of geometric complexity, the question of establishing a consistent set of complete inlet conditions is not simple.

For assessment, only the nozzle is modeled by the critical flow model. Thus the inlet condition to the nozzle was taken from 004M109 for pressure (0.7 m upstream of the nozzle entrance) ranging from 2580 to 5160 kPa (374 to 748 psia) and 003M404 for temperature (2.8 m upstream of the nozzle entrance) ranging from 469 to 535 K (quality of -0.0036 to 0.004).

Probable measurement error is stated as: Pressure -7 kPa, Temperature -0.6°C.

The upstream conditions in Pressure/Temperature and Pressure/Quality planes, along with (P, T) trajectories observed in LOFT and ROSA small break tests, are shown in Figures 12.4-9a and 12.4-9b.

Table 12.4-4 Marviken Test Nozzles (from pp. 51, MXC-101, EPRI/NP-2370)						
Nozzle Number	Diameter (mm)	Length (mḿ)	Used in Tests			
1	-200	590	13, 14			
. 2	300	290	6, 7			
. 3	300	511	25, 26			
4	300	895	1, 2, 12			
5	300	1116	17, 18, 19			
6	500	166	23, 24			
7	500	730	20, 21, 22, 27			
8	500	1809	15, 16			
9	509	1589	3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11			



a,c







WCAP-16996-NP

November 2010 Revision 0
12.4.10 Amos and Schrock

Amos and Schrock's break flow data cover a wide range of pressure from 4000 to 15500 kPa (580 to 2248 psia), and subcooling from 0 to 60° C (quality of 8×10^{-6} to -0.043) which is suited for evaluating a performance of the break model for small break LOCA analyses. The configuration of the break is thin rectangular slit with the nominal width of 0.381 and 0.254 mm. These set of tests are two of larger slit size of the three of their experiments. Although the break flow area is rectangular and small (equivalent hydraulic diameter = 0.748 and 0.464 mm), the data is valuable since the phenomena which governs the critical condition appeared to be the same for breaks of all sizes. This may be why the 1D flow model is sufficiently accurate to describe the break flows.

The upstream conditions in Pressure/Temperature and Pressure/Quality planes, along with (P, T) trajectories observed in LOFT and ROSA small break tests, are shown in Figures 12.4-10a and 12.4-10b.



a,c

Figure 12.4-10a Upstream P-T in Amos-Schrock





WCAP-16996-NP

12.4.11 Anderson and Benedetti (TPFL)

Anderson and Benedetti conducted critical flow tests at the Two Phase Flow Loop (TPFL) located in INEL, for purpose of investigating the entrainment at the break off the stratified upstream flow under saturated condition. A two-phase mixture of known phasic mass flow rate flowed through a branch line pipe of 1.63 m long, 34 mm diameter attached to a simulated cold leg pipe, to the nozzle which is 54 mm long and has a diameter of 16.2 mm. The pressure just upstream of the rounded entrance nozzle as well as the void fraction was measured by a gamma attenuation method. Their experiments are well instrumented critical flow tests with saturated upstream conditions at 900, 640 and 500 psia. The flow qualities in the tests were varied from 0 to 1 at all three pressures.

The upstream conditions in Pressure/Temperature and Pressure/Quality planes, along with (P, T) trajectories observed in LOFT and ROSA small break tests, are shown in Figures 12.4-11a and 12.4-11b.



a,c







WCAP-16996-NP

12.4.12 Celata (1988)

Celata et al. (1988) conducted a set of flow rate critical flow experiments with and without non-condensable using a 1.5 m long 4.6 mm id vertical downward pipe. The experiments were conducted at the pressure of 0.5, 1.0, and 1.5 MPa, and the subcooling of 0, 20, 40, and 60° C (-5.5x10⁻⁵ to -6.3x10⁻⁴). Figure 12.4-12a shows the stagnation pressure and the inlet subcooling of Celata's data. As seen in the figure data were taken at three roughly discrete pressures, namely 0.5 MPa (72.5 psia), 1.0 MPa (145 psia), and 1.5 MPa (217.5 psia). They have reported the un-reliability and a lack of reproducibility associated with the saturated water data. Figure 12.4-12b shows the measured critical mass flux vs. subcooling at all three pressures. It is noted that the critical mass flux data near saturation are higher than that at the higher subcooling condition which is inconsistent and is due to difficulty with this particular set of data as stated by Celata et al. Therefore the validation will use Celata's subcooled dataset (subcooling greater than 10°C). This represents 97 out of 132 test runs.



Figure 12.4-12a Stagnation (P,DTsub) in Celata (1988) data





For each test point, two paired runs were made, i.e., a reference run without non-condensable gas and with non-condensable gas, and following data were recorded,

- Stagnation pressure, P_0 (MPa),
- Temperature, T_0 (°C),
- Inlet subcooling, ΔT_{sub} (°C)
- Outlet critical pressure, P_c (MPa)
- Reference Critical Mass Flux without non-condensable gas, G_{c0} (kg/s-m²)
- Critical Mass Flux with non-condensable gas, G_c (kg/s-m²)
- Air Mass Flux, G_a (kg/s-m²)
- Ratio of Critical Mass Flux with non-condensable gas to the reference Critical Mass Flux, G_c/G_{c0}

In addition to the above data, pressure and temperature were measured at 6 locations in the test section for selected test runs.

12-37







WCAP-16996-NP

12-38

a,c

12.4.13 Overall

The test matrix selected covers from 13 psia to 2300 psia, and quality of -0.0429 to 1.0. The coverage of upstream condition is graphically shown in Figure 12.4-13a and Figure 12.4-13b below. Figures show the upstream fluid condition found in the critical flow database for the validation as well as the predicted trajectories of temperature-pressure and quality-pressure for small and large break LOCAs. It is noted that while more dataset with the two-phase inlet condition and high pressure-high subcooling are desirable, the validation database adequately covers the range of upstream conditions expected during PWR LOCAs.

				<u>a</u> ,
/				
Figure 12.4-13a Upstream Condit	tion in Test	Matrix		

WCAP-16996-NP

ć.

12-41

a,c

Figure 12.4-13b Upstream Condition in Test Matrix

12.5 ASSESSMENT RESULTS

12.5.1 Assessment Method

A stand-alone model of the <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u> critical flow module was used for the prediction-data comparison. The consistency between the stand-alone code results and the <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u> results was confirmed by comparing the prediction for subset of critical flow data points in Section 12.5.4.1.

12.5.1.1 CALCULATION

As described in Section 5.12.2 of this document, the inlet flow is iterated until the exit pressure gradient becomes [$]^{a,c}$. At this point the pressure along the break path becomes what is shown in Figure 12.5-1. The figure shows the pressure along the break path with the measured pressures for Celata's Run 020 data.

]^{a,c} and compared to the measured critical

[mass flux, G_c value.



a,c



Figure 12-5-1 Pressure Profile along the Break Path

WCAP-16996-NP

12.5.2 DATA COMPARISON

The critical mass flux prediction is compared with the measured critical mass flux. This comparison is performed for a total of 3199 data points with no non-condensable gas and 96 data points with non-condensable gas.

12.5.2.1 Bias and Uncertainty Results

A total of 3199 data points from 53 nozzle geometries were used for the determination of bias and uncertainty associated with the critical flow model prediction used in <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u>. The

prediction error was calculated as, $\varepsilon = \frac{G_{\text{meas}} - G_{\text{pred}}}{G_{\text{preds}}}$. This is not a usual definition of the deviation from

the measurement, $\frac{G_{pred} - G_{meas}}{G_{meas}}$, but the one convenient for the purpose of ranging the break flow for

the statistical sampling process since the quantity $(1 + \varepsilon)$ can be used as the multiplier to the model prediction (or C_D, the discharge coefficient) to recover the measured value.

The following results were obtained through the comparison to data. Note that since uncertainty associated with many of the measurement were unknown. Others have the reported uncertainty. The reported uncertainty was much smaller than the prediction error and thus the contribution of measurement error on the prediction error is neglected.

A valid range of the bias and uncertainty estimate given here is based on selected experimental data. A comparison was made for 0 (Orifice) $< L \le 2335$ mm, and $0.418 \le D_H \le 500$ mm.

Overall (-0.0429 \leq Quality \leq 1.0)

Predictions for all selected data are shown in Table 12.5-1. Appendix-A contains all output and the comparison of predicted and measured critical mass flux for all individual test series.

The mean error (or the bias) for the entire dataset,

$$\overline{\epsilon} = \frac{\sum_{i}^{N} \left(\frac{G_{\text{meas}} - G_{\text{pred}}}{G_{\text{preds}}} \right)}{N} \text{ was found to be [}]^{a,c},$$

and the standard deviation,

$$\sigma(\epsilon) = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} (\epsilon_{i} - \overline{\epsilon})}{N-1}}$$
 was found to be []^{a,c}.

The bias and standard deviation based on the upstream fluid state are;

- For Subcooled Liquid Region (-0.043 \leq Quality \leq 0)
 - Bias = [$]^{a,c}$
 - Standard Deviation = [$]^{a,c}$
- For Saturated Flow rate including Single Phase Vapor Region ($0 < \text{Quality} \le 1.0$)
 - Bias = [$]^{a,c}$
 - Standard Deviation = [$]^{a,c}$



D. C.		D			Mean Error ε (%) $(\frac{G_{meas} - G_{calc}}{G})$	
Reference	(mm)	(mm)	cost	N-Data	^o meas	σ(ε) (%)
Andron, K. H. & Ackerman, M. C. (1978)	1015	26.3	0	32		
Boivin (1979)	500	12	0	10		
Boivin (1979)	1600	30	0	5		
Boivin (1979)	1700	50	0	6		
Fincke & Collins (1981)	13	44	0	92		
Jeandey et al. (1981)	463	20	1	15		
Jeandey et al. (1981)	463	20	1	73		
Neusen (1962)	0	11	0	25		
Neusen (1962)	0	6	0 `	12		
Reocreux (1974)	2335	20	1	28		
Seybhaeve (1980)	306	13	1	26		
Seybhaeve (1980)	306	13	1	31		
Sozzi & Sutherland (1975)	45	12.7	0	. 128		
Sozzi & Sutherland (1975)	45	12.7	0	13		
Sozzi & Sutherland (1975)	57	12.7	0	47	· ·	
Sozzi & Sutherland (1975)	362	12.7	0	19		
Sozzi & Sutherland (1975)	83	12.7	0	17		
Sozzi & Sutherland (1975)	553	12.7	0	13		
Sozzi & Sutherland (1975)	108	12.7	0	23		
Sozzi & Sutherland (1975)	679	12.7	0	96		
Sozzi & Sutherland (1975)	159	12.7	0	15		
Sozzi & Sutherland (1975)	1823	· 12.7	0	81		
Sozzi & Sutherland (1975)	. 235	12.7	0	12		
Sozzi & Sutherland (1975)	273	12.7	. 0	22		
Sozzi & Sutherland (1975)	5	12.7	0	58		
Sozzi & Sutherland (1975)	322 ·	12.7	0	24		
Sozzi & Sutherland (1975)	513	12.7	0	24		
Sozzi & Sutherland (1975)	640	12.7	0	17		

12-46

Table 12.5-1 Critical Flow Data Comparison for WCOBRA/TRAC Critical Flow Model

(cont.)	1	1		1	T	1
·					Mean Error ε (%)	
Reference	L (mm)	D (mm)	cos0	N-Data	$\left(\frac{G_{\text{meas}}}{G_{\text{meas}}}\right)$	σ(ε) (%)
Sozzi & Sutherland (1975)	195	12.7	0	23		
Sozzi & Sutherland (1975)	45	19	0	23		
Sozzi & Sutherland (1975)	732	54	0	4		
Sozzi & Sutherland (1975)	696	76	0	3		
Sozzi & Sutherland (1975)	. 63	28	0	5		
Amos & Schrock (1983)	63.5	0.748	-1	18		
Amos & Schrock (1983)	63.5	0.464	-1	26		
Anderson & Benedetti (1985)	31.9	16.2	0	109		
Marviken Test 1 (1982)	895	300	-1	97	- · ·	
Marviken Test 2 (1982)	895	300	-1	91		
Marviken Test 3 (1982)	1589	509	-1	40		
Marviken Test 4 (1982)	1589	509	-1	39		•
Marviken Test 5 (1982)	1589	509	-1	43		
Marviken Test 6 (1982)	300	300	-1	85		
Marviken Test 7 (1982)	300	300	-1	84		
Marviken Test 8 (1982)	1589	509	-1	40	N (
Marviken Test 9 (1982)	1589	509	-1	58		
Marviken Test 10 (1982)	1589	509	-1	·57		
Marviken Test 11 (1982)	1589	509	-1	41		
Marviken Test 12 (1982)	895	300	-1	121		
Marviken Test 13 (1982)	590	200	-1	139		
Marviken Test 14 (1982)	590	200	-1	144		
Marviken Test 15 (1982)	1809	500	-1	45		
Marviken Test 16 (1982) 590 200-1146	1809	500	-1	40		
Marviken Test 17 (1982) 590 200-1146	1110	300	-1	· 90		
Marviken Test 18 (1982) 590 200-1146	1110	300	-1	69		



-	

Reference	L (mm)	D (mm)	cosθ	N-Data	Mean Error ε (%) $(\frac{G_{meas} - G_{calc}}{G_{meas}})$	σ(ε) (%)
Marviken Test 19 (1982) 590 200-1146	1110	300	-1	85		
Marviken Test 20 (1982) 590 200-1146	730	500	-1	50		
Marviken Test 21 (1982) 590 200-1146	730	500	-1	50		
Marviken Test 22 (1982) 590 200-1146	730	500	-1	37		,
Marviken Test 23 (1982)	166	500	-1	61		
Marviken Test 24 (1982)	166	500 -	-1	44		
Marviken Test 25 (1982) 590 200-1146	510	300	-1	84		
Marviken Test 26 (1982) 590 200-1146	510	300	-1	134		
Marviken Test 27 (1982) 590 200-1146	730	500	-1	59		
Celata (1988)	1500	4.6	-1	97		
Total				3199		



a,c

Figure 12.5-2 below shows the comparison of all points in the test matrix with $\pm 1\sigma$ lines above and below the 45° line.

Figure 12.5-2 Comparison of Predicted and Measured Critical Flows

Figure 12.5-3a shows the predicted critical flow mass flux vs. the measured critical flow mass flux for cases with non-condensable gas.

To check for a consistency relative to the effect of non-condensable, the ratio of critical mass flux with non-condensable to with no-non-condensable gas cases was reported from the paired experiment by Celata (1980). The predicted ratios were calculated and compared with the measured values. This ratio as a function of the non-condensable gas concentration was examined. Figure 12.5-3b shows the comparison of measured effect of the non-condensable on the critical flow rate and the predicted effect of the non-condensable gas.

Considering the fact that the thermal equilibrium between the non-condensable gas (air) and the steam/water mixture at the inlet was not well established in the experiment, the agreement between the data and the prediction is considered to be adequate. Although there is a tendency to over-predict the impact of Non-condensable as the fraction of non-condensable increases, the deviation is below the saturated two-phase upstream cases. Thus a separate uncertainty value for the two-phase upstream with non-condensable gas would not be applied. The saturated upstream values [

]^{a,c} will be used for two-phase regardless of the presence of non-condensable.



WCAP-16996-NP

12-51

a,c



Figure 12.5-3b Comparison of Predicted and Measured effect of Non-condensable Gas on Critical Mass Flux

WCAP-16996-NP

12.5.3 PARAMETRIC TREND OF PREDICTION

This section examines the presence of bias in the major parameters such as pressure, quality, break area and break path length. For the purpose of examining the model trend in this subsection, the error is

defined in the usual way, (as the deviation from the measurement), $\frac{G_{pred} - G_{meas}}{G_{meas}}$

12.5.3.1 Trend with Respect to Pressure Variation

In this section, a possible model trend with respect to the upstream pressure is examined. Figure 12.5-4 below shows the error vs. pressure of all data points. The figure does not show global trend relative to the upstream pressure, although it does show that there is a larger spread in the lower pressure points (p < 1000 psia).

	12-3-1
	a -

WCAP-16996-NP

12.5.3.2 Trend with Respect to Quality Variation

]^{a,c}

In this section, a possible model trend with respect to the upstream quality is examined. Figure 12.5-5a below show the error vs. quality of all data points. The figure shows global trend relative to the upstream quality. The model [



WCAP-16996-NP

Figure 12.5-5b Prediction Trend Quality Variation

12-57

a,c

12.5.3.3 Trend with Respect to Channel Length Variation

]^{a,c}

In this section, a possible model trend with respect to the channel length is examined. Figures 12.5-6a and 12.5-6b below show the error vs. channel length of all data points. The figures [

12-59

a,c

Figure 12.5-6a Prediction Trend in Channel Length Variation in Linear Scale



Figure 12.5-6b Prediction Trend in Channel Length Variation in Log Scale

12.5.3.4 Trend with Respect to Hydraulic Diameter Variation

In this section, a possible model trend with respect to the hydraulic diameter is examined. Figure 12.5-7a below shows the error vs. hydraulic diameter of all data points. The figure [

]^{a,c}



a,c

٠.



Figure 12.5-7a Prediction Trend in Channel Diameter in Linear Scale

a,c

Figure 12.5-7b Prediction Trend in Channel Diameter in Log Scale

12-63

12.5.3.5 Trend with Respect to L/D Variation

In this section, a possible model trend with respect to the break path L/D is examined. Figures 12.5-8a and 12.5-8b show the relative errors vs. L/D of the break path in linear and log scale. [

]^{a,c}

· 12-65

a,c

Figure 12.5-8a Prediction Trend in Channel L/D Variation – Linear Scale

2

WCAP-16996-NP

(

12-66

a,c

WCAP-16996-NP
12.5.4 Model Performance as Implemented in WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2

12.5.4.1 Impact of Transient

The assessment presented in the previous section was performed with the stand-alone program extracted from <u>W</u>COBRA/TRAC-TF2. Therefore, the model prediction as an integral part of <u>W</u>COBRA/TRAC-TF2 was examined by repeating Marviken Test 6 to see the impact of coupling. Figure 12.5-9 shows the noding diagram used for Marviken Test 6 simulation. PIPE-26 models the discharge pipe with the HRM modeling the nozzle. The HRM break model is explicitly shown to be attached to the right most cell of PIPE-26. The input parameters for the nozzle, namely nozzle hydraulic diameter (HRMOFD), nozzle length (HRMOFL), the flow multiplier for single phase liquid (HRM1PM) and two-phase/single phase vapor (HRM2PM) are shown below the noding diagram. These parameters will be discussed in detail in Section 29. Figure 12.5-10 shows the Mass Flow comparison with the stand-alone prediction for Marviken Test 6 given in Appendix A.11.6. Predictions are equivalent. The differences are caused by the sparser boundary condition specification used in the <u>W</u>COBRA/TRAC-TF2 model compared to the stand-alone input as seen in Figures 12.5-11a (Pressure) and 12.5-11b (Temperature).

a,c

a,c



Figure 12.5-10 Test 6 Prediction of WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 vs. Stand-Alone Model

WCAP-16996-NP

Pressure Boundary Condition Comparisons CRITFLOW and TF2 CRITFLOW used 004M109, TF2 used Simplified Table PN 26 4 0 CD=1.0 0 COLUMN 00002









]^{a,c}

12.5.4.2 Influence of Mesh Size

The model prediction's sensitivity to a number of axial nodes used within the critical flow module, HRM, was investigated using a subset of the validation test cases. The number of axial nodes is set [

12.5.4.3 Influence of Friction Factor/Entrance Effect

The entrance and friction factors were found to be very important for predicting the low pressure experiments such as those of Ardron and Ackerman (1978). For very low pressure cases such as these, an inaccurate prediction of entrance and pipe friction pressure loss may cause significant mis-prediction of the pressure in the pipe and subsequent mis-prediction of critical flow rates. This is the reason the reported friction factors were used for simulation of Ardron and Ackerman. For higher pressures where the upstream of the break in PWR LOCAs are expected, the entrance loss and friction factors play an insignificant role.

12.5.4.4 Application of Multiplier (or Discharge Coefficient, CD)

Two sensitivity runs with CD=0.8 and 1.2 were performed to validate the method of applying the discharge coefficient. The results show that the discharge coefficient application via <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u> input parameters, HRM1PM and HRM2PM yields desired break flows as seen in Figure 12.5-9. These input parameters will be discussed in detail in Section 29. Figure 12.5-12a shows the impact of CD on the predicted break flows. Figure 12.5-12b shows the effective multiplier observed in this simulation. They are close to 0.8 and 1.2 but because of the feedback of the flow on the nozzle inlet pressure (Figure 12.5-12c), the multipliers are slightly deviated from CD values, which is expected.



a,c

a,c



Figure 12.5-12b Observed Effective Multiplier

WCAP-16996-NP

12-72

a,c

Figure 12.5-12c Nozzle Upstream Pressure

12.6 CRITICAL FLOW ASSESSMENT CONCLUSIONS

The critical flow comparisons showed that the present model predicted both small diameter tests such as Amos and Schrock at 0.0295 inch, and Sozzi and Sutherland at 0.5-inch as well as the large diameter (19.7-inch) data obtained in the Marviken tests (EPRI-NP-2370, 1982) with acceptable accuracy.

12.6.1 Scaling Consideration

An observation relative to the scalability of the model is addressed in this section.

12.6.1.1 Pressure, Subcooling, and Quality

For the subcooled break flow model, a pressure range of 13 to 2300 psia and a quality range of -0.0429 to 1.0 were examined. The results indicated that the model is scalable relative to pressure and subcooling with reasonable accuracy. The results showed that the model adequately accounts for the pressure and the quality variations.

12.6.1.2 Break Flow Area

The break flow comparisons showed that the present model predicted both small diameter tests such as Amos and Schrock for 0.0295 inch (Amos and Schrock, 1983), and Sozzi and Sutherland for 0.5-inch (Sozzi and Sutherland, 1975), as well as the large diameter (19.7-inch) data obtained in the Marviken tests

(EPRI-NP-2370, 1982) with adequate accuracy. The <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u> break model was able to simulate both small and large diameter nozzles adequately.

12.6.2 Break Path Geometry and Application to PWR LOCA

The entrance effects, such as the roundness/sharpness of the orifice are accounted for in the present model when they are known and reported for simulation. However, roughness, and sharpness are not known in the PWR LOCA application [

12.7 OFFTAKE ENTRAINMENT MODEL

]^{a,c}

12.7.1 Introduction

During a small break LOCA, the break flow rate determines the depressurization rate as well as the mass inventory of the primary system of a PWR. These parameters in turn influence the timing of various engineered safeguard system responses, such as reactor trip and safety injection.

Early in a small break LOCA, the fluid condition upstream of the break location is subcooled. This results in a high discharge flow rate and a fast depressurization. As the pressure drops to the saturation pressure corresponding to the coolant liquid temperature upstream of the break, the discharge becomes two-phase and a relatively low discharge rate and a slow depressurization result. The flow in the cold leg is expected to be horizontally stratified. Under those conditions the void fraction upstream of the break changes from primarily liquid to primarily vapor as the liquid level in the main pipe decreases. As the stratified surface lowers in the vicinity of the break, the quality at the break is greatly influenced by the entrainment of vapor/liquid off the stratified surface upstream of the break.

Although the size, location, and shape of the break are not known for the postulated small break LOCA, the best-estimate code needs to predict consistent responses relative to experimental data over a range of pressure, subcooling, and upstream fluid states, as well as the break flow area variations, so that accurate sensitivity to small break LOCA responses can be obtained.

12.7.2 Offtake Phenomenon

The vapor pull through and liquid entrainment phenomenon are especially important in the analysis of the small break LOCA accident. For a portion of the small break LOCA accident, one would envision a stratified flow regime in the broken cold leg, where liquid would flow along the bottom of the pipe and vapor flow at the top of the pipe due to the effect of gravity. If the break in the pipe is located in the side of the pipe below the interface, or at the bottom of the pipe, then the quality of the flow through the break will be low. However, certain conditions will lead to a two-phase break flow as opposed to single phase liquid. This phenomenon is known as vapor pull-through, or also as vapor entrainment.

Vapor pull through can occur in the form of vortex or vortex free flow. Figure 12.7.2-1 contains a diagram of each of these flow mechanisms. Vortices tend to be unstable at low flow conditions, and are unable to form at high flow conditions. Vortex flow will also tend to transition into vortex free flow as the distance from the interface to the break decreases. While it is possible for a vortex to form for a break in the side of the pipe, the effect of the pipe wall tends to stunt vortex formation.

Again considering the condition of stratified flow in a pipe, if the break in the pipe is located in the side of the pipe above the interface, or at the top of the pipe, then the quality of the flow through the break will be high. However, certain conditions will lead to a two-phase break flow as opposed to single phase vapor. This phenomenon is known as liquid entrainment. A diagram of the liquid entrainment mechanism is given in Figure 12.7.2-2. The vapor velocity tends to increase near the break due to the Bernoulli effect. As the vapor velocity increases, waves will tend to form at the stratified interface. Some amount of liquid may be entrained from this surface, and carried into the break by the vapor.

Under certain conditions, the size of the wave formed at the break will increase until the wave reaches the top of the pipe. This behavior will propagate through the pipe, and the flow regime will undergo a transition from stratified flow into slug flow. The quality of the break flow will decrease significantly with a transition from a stratified flow regime into a slug flow regime. This transition to slug flow is observed in the experimental data for an upward break orientation presented later in this section. The offtake model is not applicable once transition to slugging occurs.

Some of the key factors which impact the quality of the break flow are the break orientation, flow regime, distance from the interface to the break (for stratified flow), vapor velocity (for liquid entrainment), liquid velocity (for vapor pull through), and the differential pressure across the break.

12.7.3 Relationship to PIRT

The ability of a code to accurately calculate the break flow quality is very important to the analysis of the small break LOCA accident. [

]^{a,c} Since the break flow rate has a significant effect on the system inventory during a SBLOCA, this process is important throughout the entire SBLOCA transient (except for blowdown where the break flow is primarily single-phase liquid).

12.7.4 Section Objectives

In this section, an assessment is made of the offtake model in the <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u> version described in Section 5.13, Volume 1 of this document. The model was validated against test data from the TPFL facility, as well as other additional data as discussed in Section 12.7.6. A description of all the tests performed at the TPFL is given in EPRI NP-4532 (1986).

12.7.5 Two-Phase Flow Loop Offtake Entrainment Tests

12.7.5.1 TPFL Test Facility Description

[

Γ

[...

ſ

The tee/critical flow experiments were performed in the TPFL at the INEL Thermal Hydraulics Laboratory (Figure 12.7.5-1). [

]^b The schematic view of the facility is shown in Figure 12.7.5-2.

]^b

This facility is the largest scale facility with experimental data which can be used to validate the offtake model within \underline{W} COBRA/TRAC-TF2.

12.7.5.2 Test Matrix for TPFL Offtake Simulations

]^b Table 12.7.5-1 summarizes the tests selected for simulation using <u>W</u>COBRA/TRAC-TF2.

]^{a,c}

12.7.5.3 Test Procedure for TPFL Offtake Simulations

]^b

The intent of the test data was to correlate the flow quality in the branch pipe against the mainline liquid level for different pressures and break orientations.

12.7.5.4 WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Model for TPFL Offtake Tests

12.7.5.5 Simulation of TPFL Offtake Tests

12.7.5.6 Summary and Conclusions

12.7.5.6.1 Comparison of WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Prediction to Horizontal Data

Figure 12.7.5-4 shows the comparison of the <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u> prediction for the branchline quality as a function of the mainline liquid level for the horizontal configuration. [

]^{a,c}

WCAP-16996-NP

[

[

ſ

]^b

12.7.5.6.2 Comparison of WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Prediction to Downward-Vertical Data

Figure 12.7.5-5 shows the comparison of the <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u> prediction and the experimental data of the branchline quality as a function of the mainline liquid level for the downward-vertical configuration. [

]^{a,c}

12.7.6 Additional Offtake Model Validation

The TPFL facility tests address the vertical downward and horizontal break orientations, but provide no data for an upward vertical break. As such, additional validation was performed to ensure that the $\underline{W}COBRA/TRAC-TF2$ code reasonably predicts the offtake phenomenon for an upward oriented break.

Using the TPFL facility geometry, the offtake model was exercised for vertical upward breaks across a range of boundary conditions. The model was exercised at pressures of [

]^{a,c} The code results

are compared to [

]^{a,c} to assess the capability of the model.

12.7.6.1 Comparison of WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Prediction to Upward-Vertical Data

Figure 12.7.6-1 shows the comparison of the <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u> prediction for the branchline quality as a function of the mainline liquid level divided by the critical height for onset of offtake (hereafter referred to as the level ratio) for the upward-vertical configuration versus experimental data. [

 $]^{a,c}$

]^{a,c}

. . . .

WCAP-16996-NP

[

(

		- -
	· · ·	
		┨
	· · ·	1
-		

12-79



Figure 12.7.2-1 Vapor Pull Through Mechanisms

WCAP-16996-NP



Figure 12.7.2-2 Liquid Entrainment Mechanism







12-84



Figure 12.7.5-4 Branchline Quality Versus Mainline Liquid Level for Horizontal Configuration

WCAP-16996-NP

12-85

12-86

a,c

Figure 12.7.5-5 Branchline Quality Versus Mainline Liquid Level for Downward-Vertical Configuration

WCAP-16996-NP



1

12-87



.

Figure 12.7.6-2 [

]^{a,c}

WCAP-16996-NP

November 2010 Revision 0

12-88

12.8 REFERENCES

- 1. Alamgir, M. D. and Lienhard, J. H., 1981, "Correlation of Pressure Undershoot During Hot-Water Depressurization," Trans. ASME, J. Heat Transfer, Vol. 103, pp. 52-55.
- 2. Amos, C. N. and Schrock, V. E., 1983, "Critical Discharge of Initially Subcooled Water Through Slits," NUREG/CR-3475.
- 3. Anderson, J. L. and Benedetti, R. L., 1986, "Critical Flow Through Small Pipe Break," EPRI/NP-4532.
- 4. Ardron, K. H. & Ackerman, M. C., 1978, "Studies of the Critical Flow of Subcooled Water in a Pipe," CEGB Report: RD/B/N4299.
- 5. Ardron, K. H. and Bryce, W. M., 1990, "Assessment of Horizontal Stratification Entrainment Model in RELAP5/MOD2 by Comparison With Separate Effects Experiment," Nuclear Engineering and Design 122, pp. 263-271.
- Bajorek, S. M., et al., 1992, "Westinghouse Code Qualification Document for Best Estimate Loss of Coolant Accident Analysis Volume 1: Models and Correlations," WCAP-12945-P-A, Vol. 1, pp. 4-124.
- 7. Boivin, J. V., 1979, "Two-phase Critical Flow in Long Nozzles," Nuclear Technology, 46, pages 540-545.
- Bryers, R. W., Hsieh, W. W., Hunter, J. A. & Sieder, E. N., 1966, "Study of Two-phase Metastable Flow," U. S. Department of Interior, Office of Saline Water, R&D Progress Report No. 234, November, 1966.
- Celata, G. P., Cumo, M., D'Annibale, F., and Farello, G. E., 1988, "THE INFLUENCE OF NON-CONDENSIBLE GAS ON TWO-PHASE CRITICAL FLOW," International Journal of Multiphase Flow, Volume 14, No. 2, pages 175-187.
- 10. Condie, K. G., 1980, "LOFT LOCE L3-5/L3-5A Results and Analysis." Paper presented at the LOFT Review Group Meeting, Idaho Falls, Idaho.
- 11. Craya, A., 1949, "Experimental Research on the Flow of Non-homogeneous Fluids," LeHouille Blanche, January-February, pp. 56-64.
- 12. Cruver, J. E., "Metastable Critical Flow of Steam Water Mixtures, 1963, "Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Chemical Engineering, University of Washington, (University Microfilms Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan).
- 13. Danforth, J. L., 1941, "Flow of Hot Water Through a Rounded Orifice," M. S. Dissertation, Department of Mechanical Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

15.	Elias, E., and Lellouche, G. S., 1994, "TWO-PHASE CRITICAL," International Journal of Multiphase Flow, Vol. 20, Supplement, pp. 91-168.
16.	EPRI/NP-2370, 1982, "The Marviken Full-Scale Critical Flow Tests," Vol. 1, Summary Report.
17.	Fauske, H. K., 1962, "Contribution to the Theory of Two-phase, One Component Critical Flow," Argonne National Laboratory Report ANL-6633.
18.	Fincke, J. R. & Collins, D. R., "The Correlation of Two-dimension and Non-equilibrium Effects in Subcooled Choked Nozzle Flow," NUREG/CR-1907, EGG-2081.
19.	Guizovarn, L., Pinet, B., Barriere, G. & Pietri, D., 1975, "Etude Expermentale des Debits Critiques en Ecoulement Diphasiques eau Vapeur a Faible Titre Dans un Canal Avec Divergent de 7° a des Transports Thermiques," Note TT No. 501.
20.	Henry, R. E., 1970, "An Experimental Study of Low Quality, Steam-Water Critical Flow at Moderate Pressures," Argonne National Laboratory Report ANL-7740.
21.	Holmes, B. J., and Allen, E. J., 1998, "A REVIEW OF CRITICAL FLOW DATA FOR PRESSURISED WATER REACTOR SAFETY STUDIES," Multiphase Science and Technology, Vol. 10, pp. 141-302.
22.	Illic, V., Banerjee S. and Behling S., 1986, "A Qualified Database for the Critical Flow of Water," EPRI-NP-4556, May.
23.	Jeandey, C., Gros D'Aillon, L., Bourgin, R. & Barriere, G., "Auto Vaporisation d'Ecoulements Eau/Vapeur," Departement des Reacteurs a Eau Service des Transferts Thermiques (Centre D'Etudes Nucleaires de Grenoble) Report T. T. No. 163, 1981.
24.	Jones, O. C., Jr., 1980, "Flashing Inception in Flowing Liquids," Trans. ASME, J. Heat Transfer, Vol. 102, pp. 439-444.
25.	Lubin, B. T. and Springer, G. S., 1967, AThe Formation of a Dip on the Surface of a Liquid Draining from a Tank," Journal of Fluid Mechanics, 29, pp. 385-390.
26.	Maciaszek, T. and Memponteil, A., 1986, "Experimental Study on Phase Separation in a Tee Junction for Steam-Water Stratified Inlet Flow," Paper C2 presented at European Two-phase Flow Group Meeting, Munich, June 10-13.
27.	Moon, Y. M. and No, H. C., 2003, "Offtake and Slug Transition at T-junction of Vertical-up Branch in the Horizontal Pipe," Journal of Nuclear Science and Technology, Vol. 40, No. 5, pp. 317-324.

Doa, L. T. C and Carpenter, J. M., 1980, "Experiment Data Report for LOFT Nuclear

Small-Break Experiment L3-5/L3-5A," NUREG/CR-1695, EGG-2060.

14.

28. Morrison, A. F., 1977, "Blowdown Flow in the BWR BDHT Test Apparatus," GEAP-21656.

- 29. Neusen, K. F., 1969, "Optimizing of Flow Parameters for the Expansion of Very Low-quality Steam," University of California, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, UCRL-6152.
- Ohkawa, K., "ASSESSMENT OF HOMOGENEOUS NON-EQUILIBRIUM RELAXATION CRITICAL FLOW MODEL," 15th International Conference on Nuclear Engineering, ICONE15-10708, Nagoya, Japan, April 22-26, 2007.
- 31. Reocreux, M., 1974, "Contribution a l'Etude des Debits Critiques en Econlement Diphasique Eau-Vapeur," Ph.D. Thesis, Universite Scientifique et Medicale de Grenoble, France.
- 32. Schrock, V. E., et al., 1986, "Small Break Critical Discharge The Roles of Vapor and Liquid Entrainment in a Stratified Two-phase Region Upstream of the Break," NUREG/CR-4761.
- 33. Schrock, V. E., Starkman, E. S. & Brown, R. A., 1977, "Flashing Flow of Initially Subcooled Water in Convergent-divergent Nozzles," Journal of Heat Transfer 99 (2).
- 34. Seynhaeve, J. M., 1980, "Etude Experimentale des Ecoulements Diphasiques Critiques a Faible Titre," Doctoral thesis, Department Thermodynamique et Turbomachines, Universite Catholique de Louvain.
- Seynhaeve, J. M., et al., 1976, "Non-equilibrium Effects on Critical Flow Rates at Low Qualities," Vol. 2, pp. 672-688, Proceedings of the CSNI Specialist Meeting on Transient Two-phase Flow, Toronto, August 3-4.
- 36. Smoglie, C. and Reimann, J., 1986, "Two-phase Flow Through Small Branches in a Horizontal Pipe with Stratified Flow," International Journal of Multi-Phase Flow, pp. 609-626.
- 37. Sozzi, G. L. and Sutherland, W. A., 1975, "Critical Flow of Saturated and Subcooled Water at High Pressure," NEDO-13418.
- Yonomoto, T. and Tasaka, K., 1988, "New Theoretical Model for Two-phase Flow Discharge from Stratified Two-phase Region Through Small Break," Journal of Nuclear Science and Technology, 25[5], pp. 441-455.
- 39. Zaloudek, F. R., 1964, "Steam-Water Critical Flow From High Pressure Systems," HW-80535.
- 40. Zuber, N., 1980, "Problem in Modelling of Small Break LOCA," NUREG-724.
- 41. Anderson, J. L. and Benedetti, R. L., 1985, "Critical Flow Through Small Pipe Break," EPRI NP-4532.



a,c

APPENDIX A RESULTS OF CRITICAL FLOW ASSESSMENT FOR INDIVIDUAL DATASET

In this appendix, the output for each dataset is given, and comparisons of predicted and measured mass flux for individual test subsection are presented graphically.

A.1 ANDRON & ACKERMAN

A.2 BOIVIN

WCAP-16996-NP

November 2010 Revision 0

12-93

A.3 FINCKE & COLLINS

12-94

A.4 JEANDEY

.

WCAP-16996-NP

12-95

A.5 NEUSEN

.

12-96

A.6 REOCREUX

Naumha

WCAP-16996-NP

...

November 2010 Revision 0

12-97

A.7 SEYNHAEVE

12-98

A.8 SOZZI-SUTHERLAND

WCAP-16996-NP

a,c

12-99

AMOS & SHROCK A.9

WCAP-16996-NP

12-100

a,c

November 2010

Revision 0

A.10 TPFL (ANDERSON & BENEDETTI)

12-101

A.11 MARVIKEN

WCAP-16996-NP
A.11.1 MARVIKEN TEST 1

WCAP-16996-NP

November 2010 Revision 0

12-103

1

A.11.2 MARVIKEN TEST 2

WCAP-16996-NP

November 2010 Revision 0

12-104

A.11.3 MARVIKEN TEST 3

WCAP-16996-NP

12-105

A.11.4 MARVIKEN TEST 4

12-106

A.11.5 MARVIKEN TEST 5

_____.

.

WCAP-16996-NP

November 2010 Revision 0

12-107



a,c

A.11.6 MARVIKEN TEST 6

A.11.7 MARVIKEN TEST 7

WCAP-16996-NP

November 2010 Revision 0

12-109

WCAP-16996-NP

November 2010 Revision 0

12-110

November 2010 Revision 0

A.11.9 MARVIKEN TEST 9



A.11.10 MARVIKEN TEST 10

-

· ·

WOAD 1/00/ ND

WCAP-16996-NP

November 2010 Revision 0

12-112

A.11.11 MARVIKEN TEST 11

Υ

WCAP-16996-NP

. .

> November 2010 Revision 0

12-113

A.11.12 MARVIKEN TEST 12

-..

· · · ·

• • •

12-114

A.11.13 MARVIKEN TEST 13

- · · · · ·

Ŋ

6996-NP

November 2010 Revision 0

12-115

a,c

WCAP-16996-NP

A.11.14 MARVIKEN TEST 14

WCAP-16996-NP

A.11.15 MARVIKEN TEST 15

-

WCAP-16996-NP

November 2010 Revision 0

12-117

A.11.16 MARVIKEN TEST 16

WCAP-16996-NP

12-118

a,c

A.11.17 MARVIKEN TEST 17

<u>-</u>

· · ·

. .

· · ·

> November 2010 Revision 0

A.11.18 MARVIKEN TEST 18

WCAP-16996-NP

12-120

A.11.19 MARVIKEN TEST 19

WCAP-16996-NP

· ·

12-12

A.11.20 MARVIKEN TEST 20

WCAP-16996-NP

a,c

November 2010 Revision 0

12-122

A.11.21 MARVIKEN TEST 21

»

WCAP-16996-NP

12-12

A.11.22 MARVIKEN TEST 22

WCAP-16996-NP

November 2010 Revision 0

12-124

A.11.23 MARVIKEN TEST 23

7

- · · ·

. · ·

· ·

. .

.

• •

November 2010 Revision 0

12-125

a,c

WCAP-16996-NP

A.11.24 MARVIKEN TEST 24

WCAP-16996-NP

November 2010 Revision 0

12-126

A.11.25 MARVIKEN TEST 25

WCAP-16996-NP

November 2010 Revision 0

12-



a,c

A.11.26 MARVIKEN TEST 26

WCAP-16996-NP

12-129

a,c

A.11.27 MARVIKEN TEST 27

_

. . .

.

·

November 2010 Revision 0

A.12 CELATA

.

.

.

12-130

a,c

November 2010 Revision 0

13 CORE VOID DISTRIBUTION AND MIXTURE LEVEL SWELL

13.1 INTRODUCTION

Early in a small break LOCA, voids are generated in the primary RCS by flashing and boiling in the core. Because of the small break size, flows in the RCS are primarily gravity-driven. Following the initial rapid depressurization stage of the LOCA, distinct liquid levels are formed at several locations, and most significantly in the core. Below this liquid or two-phase mixture level, the fluid is a low quality two-phase mixture; while above the level, it is primarily single-phase vapor. Liquid levels initially occur in the pressurizer, in the upper head, and in the uphill and downhill steam generator tubing. Eventually, the RCS drains so that the level in the reactor vessel reaches the hot leg. At this point, the rate of system depressurization is low and vapor generation results from boiling in the core, from power produced by decay heat. Because the vapor generation rate resulting from this decay heat can be high, regions in the vessel can achieve a significant void fraction. The two-phase mixture level depends on the interfacial shear exerted by the vapor on the liquid, and as a result, the mixture level can be significantly higher than the collapsed liquid level. The difference between the two-phase mixture level and the collapsed level is a measure of the "mixture level swell," which is defined as:

$$S = \frac{(Z_{2\Phi} - Z_{SAT}) - (Z_{CLL} - Z_{SAT})}{Z_{CLL} - Z_{SAT}}$$
(13-1)

where Z_{CLL} is the collapsed liquid level, $Z_{2\Phi}$ is the two-phase mixture level, and Z_{SAT} is the elevation where the liquid reaches the saturation point. Using this definition, a swell of zero corresponds to a two-phase mixture level which is the same as the collapsed liquid level.

Prediction of the mixture level swell and tracking of the mixture level are important [

.]^{a,c} As more liquid is boiled away, the mixture level can eventually drop into the core. While good cooling can be maintained below the mixture level, dryout occurs above the mixture level. Heat transfer above the mixture level is by convection and thermal radiation to steam. These relatively poor modes of heat transfer cause the cladding temperature above the mixture level to increase rapidly. Thus, prediction of the two-phase mixture level in the active core is vital to an accurate prediction of the cladding behavior in a small break or intermediate break LOCA.

13.2 PHYSICAL PROCESSES

As described in Section 13.1, mixture level swell is the process that determines the vertical position of the two-phase interfaces in the system; above the interface the mixture is essentially single-phase vapor. [

]^{a,c}

]^{a,c}

]^{a,c}

Several experimental tests have been run under small or intermediate break LOCA thermal-hydraulic conditions to measure the effects of various parameters on mixture level swell. [

13.3 WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 DETERMINATION OF THE MIXTURE LEVEL

The models and correlations for wall and interfacial drag are described in Sections 5.2 through 5.4, Volume 1 of this document. Flow regime transitions are described in Section 4, Volume 1 of this document. These models are used to determine the void fraction distribution within a region. The models and correlations used to determine the critical heat flux elevation are detailed in Section 7.2.3, Volume 1, of this document.

13.4 ASSESSMENT OF WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 MIXTURE LEVEL PREDICTIONS

13.4.1 Introduction

]^{a,c}

ſ

ſ

There are several separate effects experimental tests that provide data on the mixture level and sometimes mass inventory distribution in a rod bundle under small break LOCA thermal-hydraulic conditions. Four such experimental facilities were modeled with <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u>, and several experimental tests were simulated to determine the predictive capability of the code. The tests were as follows:

• The ORNL-THTF Uncovered Bundle Tests by Anklam (Anklam, et al., 1982)

• The Westinghouse G-1 Core Uncovery Tests, WCAP-9764 (WCAP-9764, 1980)

• The Westinghouse G-2 Core Uncovery Tests, EPRI NP-1692 (NP-1692, 1981)

• The JAERI-TPTF Critical Heat Flux Bundle Tests by Guo (Guo, et al., 1993)

Each of these tests, [

 $]^{a,c}$ provides information on the cladding heatup elevation; and most provide the mass distribution in a vessel for various thermal-hydraulic conditions. The ORNL-THTF, G-1, and G-2 tests provide mixture level and mass inventories for uncovered rod bundles, and the JAERI-TPTF tests provide critical heat flux elevations for uncovered rod bundles. The following sections discuss each test, the <u>W</u>COBRA/TRAC-TF2 simulation, and the comparisons between the measured and predicted results.

A comparison of the test conditions versus typical conditions expected in a PWR during the period(s) of interest is presented in Table 13.4.1-1.

The General Electric (GE) Vessel Blowdown Tests by Findlay and Sozzi (Findlay and Sozzi, 1981) provide mass inventory data in a vessel during rapid depressurization. These tests were also simulated with <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u>, as described in Section 23.1.1 of this document.

13.4.2 ORNL-THTF Small Break Tests

13.4.2.1 Introduction

A series of experimental tests pertinent to <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u> model validation were performed at the ORNL-THTF. Two types of experiments were conducted in the ORNL-THTF. One series consisted of several uncovered bundle heat transfer tests, and the other series consisted of level swell tests. These two different test series are fundamentally the same. In the bundle uncovery tests, the experiment was continued until a steady-state condition was reached in the uncovered part of the bundle and rods were heated to a high temperature. The second type of tests (level swell tests) either did not have bundle uncovery, or only a relatively short portion of the top of the bundle was uncovered. For these tests, a void profile over the entire axial length was obtained.

Additional information on the ORNL-THTF uncovered bundle heat transfer and two-phase mixture level swell tests is contained in NUREG/CR-2456 (Anklam, et al., 1982).

13.4.2.2 ORNL-THTF Facility Description

The ORNL-THTF is a high pressure rod bundle thermal-hydraulics loop. Flow is pumped through the loop via a main coolant pump. After exiting the pump, the flow passes through a turbine meter and then enters the inlet manifold of the test section. The flow does not pass through a downcomer. The flow proceeds upward through the heated bundle and exits through the bundle outlet spool piece. The measurements taken at this spool piece include pressure, temperature, density, and volumetric flow. After leaving the orifice manifold, the flow passes through a heat exchanger and returns to the pump inlet.

The bundle is full height (12 ft) and contains 64 electrically heated rods with internal dimensions typical of a 17x17 PWR fuel bundle. The hydraulic diameter of the test section is consistent with a typical Westinghouse PWR. Figure 13.4.2-1 shows a cross section of the ORNL-THTF test bundle. Four of the rods were unheated to represent control rod guide tubes in a nuclear fuel assembly. Figure 13.4.2-2 shows an axial profile of the ORNL-THTF bundle. The rods have a flat power profile in both the axial and radial directions. The bundle had a heated length of 12 feet (3.66 m) and contained six spacer grids. Thermocouples were located at 25 different axial elevations.

13.4.2.3 Test Matrix for ORNL-THTF Simulations

Simulations of small break LOCAs in PWRs generally show that there are two periods in which the core can possibly be uncovered. The first occurs during the loop seal clearance period. During this uncovery, the primary system pressure []^{a.c} and the two-phased mixture level can drop below the top of the core. The second uncovery occurs if the break flow exceeds the pumped SI flow during the boiloff period. The system pressure during this uncovery is [

Table 13.4.2-1 lists tests selected for simulation by <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u>. As previously discussed there were two different series of tests which were executed at ORNL; one series referred to as the bundle uncovery tests and one as the level swell tests.

]^{a,c}.

Six of the tests are bundle uncovery tests. Three are at relatively low pressure (580 to 650 psia), and three are at high pressure (1010 to 1090 psia). All six had roughly one-half the bundle uncovered. Six other tests are from the level swell test series. Again, three were at low pressure (520 to 590 psia), and three were at high pressure (1090 to 1170 psia). [

]^{a,c}

13.4.2.4 Test Procedure for ORNL-THTF Simulations

All of the experiments in this test series were run within a 24 hour period, which minimized the amount of time required for preheating the facility, and enabled the use of a single instrumentation calibration. The facility was preheated using the accumulating pump heat in the primary flow circuit. Preheating continued until a stable loop temperature of 350°F to 400°F was obtained.

Once the base temperature and pressure were established, the flow was reduced to the pre-determined amount for each experiment. This was accomplished by closing the inlet flooding line and metering the flow through a 1/2 inch flow line.

After the loop was configured for each specific test, the bundle power was applied. Eventually, the test facility settled into a quasi-steady state condition, with the bundle partially uncovered and the inlet liquid mass flow equal to the exiting steam mass flow. The bundle power was then adjusted to produce a peak heater rod temperature of about 1,400°F, and the loop was again allowed to stabilize. Data acquisition was initiated after the loop stabilized, and then the pressure, flow, and power were adjusted for the next test in the series.

]^{a,c}

13.4.2.5 WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Model of the ORNL-THTF

Figure 13.4.2-3 shows the WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 model of the ORNL-THTF. [

13.4.2.6 Simulation of ORNL-THTF Tests

]^{a,c}

ſ

[

WCAP-16996-NP

November 2010 Revision 0

13.4.2.7 Summary and Conclusions

[--

. · · · · ·

]^{a,c}

WCAP-16996-NP


Table 13.4.2-1	3.4.2-1 ORNL-THTF Test Simulation Matrix							
Test No.	Pressure(psia)	Rod Power (kW/ft)	Dața Mixture Level (ft)	DataCollapsed Liquid Level (ft)				
Bundle uncovery tests								
3.09.10I	650	0.68	8.60	4.39				
3.09.10J	610	0.33	8.10	5.31				
3.09.10K	580	0.10	6.98	5.31				
3.09.10L	1090	0.66	9.02	5.77				
3.09.10M	1010	0.31	8.60	6.20				
3.09.10N	1030	0.14	6.98	6.10				
Level swell tests								
3.09.10AA	590	0.39	11.23	6.56				
3.09.10BB	560	. 0.20	10.85	7.61				
3.09.10CC	520	0.10	11.80	9.45				
3.09.10DD	1170	0.39	10.61	7.84				
3.09.10EE	1120	0.19	11.40	9.35				
3.09.10FF	1090	0.098	10.61	9.51				



Figure 13.4.2-1 Cross Section of the ORNL-THTF Test Bundle

WCAP-16996-NP

ORNL-DWG 81-20288 ETD



Figure 13.4.2-2 Axial View of the ORNL-THTF Test Bundle

WCAP-16996-NP

Figure 13.4.2-3 WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Model of the ORNL-THTF

WCAP-16996-NP

November 2010 Revision 0

13-12



WCAP-16996-NP

13-14

					•
	•				
				•	
-					
		•			
		·	•	,	
1					
· · ·					
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					,

WCAP-16996-NP

Figure 13.4.2-6

[

]^{a,c}



WCAP-16996-NP



WCAP-16996-NP



.

Figure 13.4.2-9 [

]^{a,c}

WCAP-16996-NP

November 2010 Revision 0

<u>13-18</u> a,c



· ·

Figure 13.4.2-10 [

]^{a,c}

WCAP-16996-NP



WCAP-16996-NP

13-21

a,c

Figure 13.4.2-12 [

]^{a,c}

WCAP-16996-NP

a,c

Figure 13.4.2-13 [

]^{a,c}

WCAP-16996-NP

13-23

a,c

Figure 13.4.2-14 [

]^{a,c}

WCAP-16996-NP



Figure 13.4.2-15 [

]^{a,c}

WCAP-16996-NP

Figure 13.4.2-16

WCAP-16996-NP

November 2010 Revision 0

Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Profiles for YDRAG Sensitivity Study, ORNL – THTF Test 3.09.10I

13-25

Figure 13.4.2-17Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Profiles for YDRAG Sensitivity
Study, ORNL – THTF Test 3.09.10J

WCAP-16996-NP

November 2010 Revision 0

13-26

Figure 13.4.2-18

WCAP-16996-NP

November 2010 Revision 0

Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Profiles for YDRAG Sensitivity Study, ORNL – THTF Test 3.09.10K

13-27

Figure 13.4.2-19

.2-19 Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Profiles for YDRAG Sensitivity Study, ORNL – THTF Test 3.09.10L

13-28

Figure 13.4.2-20Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Profiles for YDRAG Sensitivity
Study, ORNL – THTF Test 3.09.10M

13-29

 Figure 13.4.2-21
 Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Profiles for YDRAG Sensitivity

 Study, ORNL – THTF Test 3.09.10N

WCAP-16996-NP

13-30



-3

13-31

Figure 13.4.2-23Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Profiles for YDRAG Sensitivity
Study, ORNL – THTF Test 3.09.10BB

7

WCAP-16996-NP

13-32

 Figure 13.4.2-24
 Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Profiles for YDRAG Sensitivity Study, ORNL – THTF Test 3.09.10CC

WCAP-16996-NP

November 2010 Revision 0

13-33

a,c

.

13-34 a,c Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Profiles for YDRAG Sensitivity Study, ORNL – THTF Test 3.09.10DD Figure 13.4.2-25

WCAP-16996-NP

13-35

a,c

Figure 13.4.2-26Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Profiles for YDRAG Sensitivity
Study, ORNL – THTF Test 3.09.10EE

WCAP-16996-NP



Figure 13.4.2-27 Comparison of Predicted and Measured Void Profiles for YDRAG Sensitivity Study, ORNL – THTF Test 3.09.10FF

WCAP-16996-NP

]^b

13.4.3 Simulation of G-1 Core Uncovery Tests

13.4.3.1 Introduction

A series of core uncovery experiments was conducted in the Westinghouse Emergency Core Cooling System (ECCS) High Pressure Test Facility. These tests are pertinent to the validation of the WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 FULL SPECTRUM LOCA models. [

Additional information on the G-1 Core Uncovery Tests is contained in WCAP-9764 (1980).

13.4.3.2 G-1 Facility Description

[

]^b

13.4.3.3 Test Matrix for G-1 Uncovery Tests

[

[

WCAP-16996-NP

]^b

Jp

13.4.3.4 Test Procedure for G-1 Uncovery Tests

[

. .

13.4.3.5 WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Model of G-1 Test Facility

[

]^{a,c}

13.4.3.6 Simulation of G-1 Core Uncovery Tests

13.4.3.7 Discussion of Results

ч .

. .

]^{a,b,c}

.

· · ·

.

13.4.3.8 Summary and Conclusions

[

]^{a,c}

١,

J^{a,b,c}

Table 13.4.3-1 Comparison of PWR Rod and G-1 Test Rod Bundle					
· · ·					
· · · ·					
		· · ·			
		· · ·			
· · ·					
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
	-				
·					
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					

Table 13.4.3	3-2 G-1 Core Un	covery Test Matrix
		·
		·

WCAP-16996-NP

b

)

Table 13.4.3-3 G-1 Simulation Results Summary at Model Nominal YDRAG <u>a,b</u>,c , ,

13-44
13-45

 	· · · · · ·	•	 		
· · · · ·				<u> </u>	
		······································	 N		

WCAP-16996-NP

.

Table 13.4.3-4	YDRAG Values	to Match G-1 Level Swel	l Data
		:	
	,		
		· .	
		•	
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	,

WCAP-16996-NP

Table 13.4.3-4 YDRAG Values to Match G-1 Level Swell Data (cont.)					
•					
			н		

13-47

<u>a,b,</u>c

13-48

b



WCAP-16996-NP

1



WCAP-16996-NP

November 2010 Revision 0

13-49

Figure 13.4.3-3A G-1 Uncovery Test Heater Rod Bundle Cross-Section

13-50

Figure 13.4.3-3B G-1 Uncovery Test Heater Rod Bundle Cross-Section

13-51



WCAP-16996-NP

12 52
3-7.3
10 00

b

Figure 13.4.3-5 G-1 Axial Power Profile

WCAP-16996-NP

November 2010 Revision 0

Figure 13.4.3-6 WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Model of the G-1 Test Bundle

WCAP-16996-NP

13-54

13-55

a,c

Figure 13.4.3-7Collapsed Liquid Level and Predicted Cladding Temperatures at the 8- and
10- Foot Elevations, G-1 Test 62

WCAP-16996-NP

November 2010 Revision 0

Figure 13.4.3-8

Void Fraction and Predicted Cladding Temperature at the 10- Foot Elevation, G-1 Test 62

r

WCAP-16996-NP

ł

13-56

Figure 13.4.3-9

Comparison of Predicted and Measured Mixture Level Swell for G-1 Bundle Uncovery Tests at Model Nominal YDRAG

WCAP-16996-NP

November 2010 Revision 0

13-57

Figure 13.4.3-10 Required YDRAG to Recover Data Versus Bundle Power WCAP-16996-NP

13-58



Figure 13.4.3-11 Required YDRAG to Recover Data Versus Pressure

WCAP-16996-NP



Figure 13.4.3-12 Required YDRAG to Recover Data Versus Bundle Elevation

WCAP-16996-NP

13.4.4 Simulation of G-2 Core Uncovery Tests

13.4.4.1 Introduction

The G-2 test facility is designed to provide data for downflow film boiling, reflood heat transfer, and core uncovery over a range of power, flow, temperature, and pressure conditions that simulate PWR large break and small break LOCAs. The core uncovery tests conducted at this facility are particularly relevant to the validation of the <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u> mixture level swell prediction; and are therefore the primary topic of this section.

Additional information on the G-2 Core Uncovery Tests is contained in EPRI NP-1692 (1981).

13.4.4.2 G-2 Facility Description

[

WCAP-16996-NP

Jp

]^b

13-62

13.4.4.3 Test Matrix for G-2 Uncovery Tests

]^b

[

[

]^{a,b,c}

]^b

13.4.4.4 Test Procedure for G-2 Uncovery Tests

WCAP-16996-NP

[

ſ

13.4.4.5 WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Model of G-2 Test Facility

]^b

Figure 13.4.4-6 shows the WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 model for the G-2 test bundle. [

13.4.4.6 Simulation of G-2 Uncovery Tests

[

]^{a,b,c}

13.4.4.7 Discussion of Results

[

.

.

WCAP-16996-NP

.

13-66

[

]^{a,c}

13.4.4.8 Summary and Conclusions

,

]^{a,c}

Table 13.4.4-1 Comparison of 17x17-XL PWR Rod and Test Rod Bundle ~``

<u>a,b</u>,c

13-68

b

Table 13.4.4-3	G-2 Core Uncovery Test Matrix				
	· ·				

WCAP-16996-NP

Table 13.4.4-4 G-2 Simulation Results Summary at Model Nominal YDRAG <u>a,b</u>,c

Table 13.4.4-5	.4.4-5 YDRAG Values to Match G-2 Level Sw					
	,					
		·				

13-70

<u>a,b</u>,c

.

Figure 13.4.4-1 G-2 Test Facility Flow Schematic

WCAP-16996-NP

)

13-7T



Figure 13.4.4-2 G-2 Test Vessel and Test Section

WCAP-16996-NP

November 2010 Revision 0



b



WCAP-16996-NP

WCAP-16996-NP

Figure 13.4.4-4 G-2 Facility Heater Rod

13-74

.

. .

Figure 13.4.4-5 G-2 Facility Axial Power Profile

WCAP-16996-NP



WCAP-16996-NP

November 2010 Revision 0

a,c

13-76



Collapsed Liquid Level and Predicted Cladding Temperatures at the 8- and 10- Foot Elevations, G-2 Test 716

WCAP-16996-NP

November 2010 Revision 0

13-77

Figure 13.4.4-8

Comparison of Predicted and Measured Mixture Level Swell for G-2 Bundle Uncovery Tests at Model Nominal YDRAG

WCAP-16996-NP

13-78



Figure 13.4.4-9 Required YDRAG to Recover Data Versus Peak Linear Heat Rate

n,

13-80

a,c

Figure 13.4.4-10 Required YDRAG to Recover Data Versus Pressure

WCAP-16996-NP

November 2010 Revision 0


13-81

13.4.5 JAERI-TPTF Rod Bundle Tests

13.4.5.1 Introduction

The Two-Phase Flow Test Facility (TPTF) is a separate effect test facility built to study small break LOCA thermal-hydraulic behavior. In particular, the heat transfer and critical heat flux (CHF) point in typical SBLOCA conditions. In these tests, the experiment was continued until a steady-state condition was reached in the uncovered part of the bundle and rods were heated to a high temperature. For these tests, the critical heat flux elevation was obtained.

Additional information on the JAERI-TPTF uncovered bundle heat transfer and critical heat flux elevation tests is contained in JAERI-M 93-238 (Guo, et al., 1993).

The JAERI-TPTF rod bundle tests are CHF elevation tests, but cannot be considered level swell tests since no void fraction or collapsed liquid level information is available for these tests. However, the JAERI-TPTF tests are [.

13.4.5.2 JAERI-TPTF Facility Description

The TPTF was a high pressure rod bundle thermal-hydraulics loop. The bundle was approximately full height for a typical PWR, and contained 25 heated rods in a 5x5 array.

Figure 13.4.5-1 contains a cross-section of the TPTF test bundle. The 25 heated rods were arranged in a square lattice with a pitch of 0.636 inches, and a rod outer diameter (OD) of 0.483 inches. The bundle had a heated length of 145.7 inches, which contained six spacer grids. Ninety-nine (99) thermocouples to measure rod surface temperature were located at 11 different axial elevations on 9 rods. Both the axial and lateral power profiles were uniform for the critical heat flux tests.

Figure 13.4.5-2 shows a flow diagram of the TPTF. The steam drum produces high-pressure saturated water and steam. The steam and water are pumped separately into a mixer at the inlet of the test section. The steam and water flow rates are measured using orifice flowmeters located upstream of the mixer. The pressure and temperature of the mixed fluid are measured at the test section inlet. This two-phase mixture flows into the test section, is heated by the rods, and then exits and returns to the steam drum.

13-83

]^{a,c}

13.4.5.3 Test Matrix for JAERI-TPTF Simulations

Eighteen critical heat flux experiments were conducted at the TPTF. These experiments spanned pressures from 464 to 1773 psia, mass fluxes from 3.49 to 19.18 lbm/ft^2 -sec, and peak linear heat rates from 0.38 to 2.12 kW/ft. [

13.4.5.4 Test Procedure for JAERI-TPTF Simulations

These tests were conducted by supplying nearly saturated water to the test section. After a constant flow through the test section was achieved, the power to the bundle was turned on. The system was allowed to reach a quasi steady-state, where the inlet flow into the bundle was equal to the steam mass flow exiting the bundle. The bundle power was selected so that the maximum heater rod surface temperature was no more than 1,200°F.

Data was recorded after the steady-state condition was achieved. The dryout or critical heat flux elevation was defined as the average of the lowest thermocouple elevation where the temperature was 36°F above saturation and the adjacent upstream thermocouple. This exercise was performed for both the 5 instrumented rods in the middle of the assembly, as well as the 4 instrumented rods in the outside of the assembly. An average value for all 9 instrumented rods was also determined.

13.4.5.5 WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Model of the JAERI-TPTF

Figure 13.4.5-3 shows the WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 model of the JAERI-TPTF.

 $]^{a,c}$

]^{a,c}

13.4.5.6 Simulation of JAERI-TPTF Tests

[

13.4.5.7 Summary and Conclusions

.

WCAP-16996-NP

November 2010 Revision 0

]^{a,c}

ſ

.

]^{a,c}

,13-85



Table 13.4.5-1 J	AERI-TPTF Rod Bundle Un	covery Test Matrix
Run No.	Pressure (psia)	Rod Power (kW/ft)
321	496	1.07
330	495	1.39
340	494	1.62
. 30	464	1.72
612	, 1064	0.87
620	1063	1.25
630	1060	1.54
640	1063	1.86
60	1035	2.12
910	1772	0.85
ີ 920	1773	1.25
930	1773	1.52
940	1772	1.82
90	1722	2.00

Table 13.4.5-2 T	PTF Simulation Results Sum	mary	
		``````````````````````````````````````	
· .		•	
	,		

· ·		
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	· · · · · ·	

<u>a,c</u>



Figure 13.4.5-1 Cross Section of the JAERI-TPTF Test Bundle



Figure 13.4.5-2 Flow Diagram of the JAERI-TPTF

November 2010 Revision 0

13-89

13-90

a,c

# Figure 13.4.5-3 WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Model of the JAERI-TPTF

.

Figure 13.4.5-4 WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Predicted Void Fraction Profile, TPTF Test 330

WCAP-16996-NP

13-91

Figure 13.4.5-5 WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Predicted Clad Temperature Profile, TPTF Test 330

WCAP-16996-NP

November 2010 Revision 0

13-92



November 2010 Revision 0

13-93



November 2010 Revision 0

13-94



13-95



I

13-96



[

# 13.5 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

]^{a,c}

# 13.6 **REFERENCES**

- 1. Anklam, T. M., et al., 1982, "Experimental Investigations of Uncovered Bundle Heat Transfer and Two-Phase Mixture Level Swell Under High Pressure Low Heat Flux Conditions," NUREG/CR-2456.
- 2. EPRI NP-1692, January 1981, "Heat Transfer Above the two-Phase Mixture Level Under Core Uncovery Conditions in a 336-Rod Bundle," Volumes 1 and 2.

- 3. Findlay, J. A. and Sozzi, G. L., 1981, "BWR Refill-Reflood Program B Model Qualification Task Plan, NUREG/CR-1899.
- 4. Guo, Z., et al., December 1993, "Critical Heat Flux for Rod Bundle Under High-Pressure Boiloff Conditions," JAERI-M 93-238.
  - WCAP-9764, 1980, "Documentation of the Westinghouse Core Uncovery Tests and the Small Break Evaluation Model Core Mixture Level Model," Proprietary.

5.

# 14 SEPARATE EFFECT TESTS USED TO ASSESS CORE HEAT TRANSFER MODEL

# 14.1 INTRODUCTION

)

Section 7 in Volume 1 of the <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u> Code Qualification Document (CQD) described the VESSEL component heat transfer package. This package consists of a set of heat transfer correlations and selection logic to determine the appropriate correlation based on the local thermal-hydraulic conditions. The heat transfer package in <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u> produces a continuous boiling curve as a function of wall temperature and local fluid conditions. Figure 14.1-1 shows the heat transfer regime map used by the <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u> vessel component.

Heat transfer is modeled in <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u> as a regime dependent, three step process. Specific models and correlations are used for heat transfer from the wall to vapor field, heat transfer from the wall to the liquid fields, and interfacial heat transfer between the phases. Each of these processes is flow regime dependent and is based on the local hydrodynamic conditions in the computational cell. Section 7 described the wall to fluid heat transfer models, and Section 6 described those for interfacial heat transfer.

The same heat transfer package in  $\underline{W}$ COBRA/TRAC-TF2 is used for small, intermediate and large break phenomena. No specific logic is included that would result in a difference in small, intermediate and large break heat transfer models.

This section presents the tests used to assess the <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u> heat transfer package against the high ranked core heat transfer phenomena discussed in Section 2.3, Volume 1 and in Table 2-1. This includes [ $]^{a,c}$ .

Since the core heat transfer package is used for small, intermediate and large break phenomena, the focus of the core heat transfer assessment is heat transfer mode specific, rather than by transient phase. The assessment is broken into three areas: film boiling, single phase vapor and reflood heat transfer. [

]^{a,c} Reflood is considered a special case, which encompasses many of the interactions and entanglements of the core heat transfer PIRT phenomena, and as such will be assessed as a whole.

# Single Phase Vapor (SPV)

SPV is predominant during refill and early reflood conditions of a large break, and boiloff/recovery of a small break. The experiments selected for the validation of the <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u> heat transfer package under SPV conditions were chosen from the following test series:

- 1. Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL) Uncovered Bundle Heat Transfer tests (Anklam et al., 1982).
- 2. Westinghouse/NRC/EPRI FLECHT-SEASET Reflood Tests (Loftus et al., 1978).

These tests provide reasonable verification of the heat transfer package performance in the high pressure single phase vapor regimes. The tests chosen and their conditions are summarized in Table 14.1-1.

The ranges which these tests cover are compared to the typical PWR ranges in Table 14.1-2. [

]^{a,c}

#### **Dispersed Flow Film Boiling (DFFB)**

DFFB is predominant under blowdown and reflood conditions of a large break, and accumulator/safety injection phases of an intermediate break. The experiments selected for the validation of the <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u> heat transfer package under DFFB conditions were chosen from the following test series:

1. Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL) High Pressure Film Boiling Tests (Yoder et al., 1982, Morris et al., 1982, and Mullins et al., 1982).

2. Westinghouse G-1 Intermediate Pressure Blowdown Tests (Cunningham et al., 1974).

3. Westinghouse G-2 Low Pressure Refill Tests (Hochreiter et al., 1976).

]^{a,c} The tests chosen and their conditions are summarized in Table 14.1-3.

### Reflood

ſ

[

The reflood phase of a large break LOCA is characterized by relatively constant, low pressure conditions, with two-phase film boiling and rewet under low flow conditions. As described in Section 2.3.1.2, Volume 1, characteristic features of the reflood transient are the interaction of cold ECCS water with hot fuel rods, and the oscillatory nature of the reflood process. In terms of basic thermal and hydraulic

WCAP-16996-NP

November 2010 Revision 0

]^{a,c}

parameters, the reflood process in a typical fuel assembly takes place within the range of conditions depicted in Table 14.1-5.

Pressure, mass velocity, inlet subcooling and steam quality ranges are typically used to characterize the inlet fluid conditions applied to the test assemblies in experiments. Assembly maximum heat rate characterizes the peak power present in the test or fuel assembly, while the average linear heat rate is a measure of the total assembly power. The assembly maximum temperature, while actually a test or predicted result, is important because it identifies whether the tests were in the appropriate heat transfer regime for a sufficient period of time.

[

( [

 $]^{a,c}$  The experiments selected for the validation of the <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u> heat transfer package under reflood conditions were chosen from the following test series:

1. Westinghouse/NRC/EPRI FLECHT-SEASET Reflood Tests (Loftus et al., 1978).

2. Westinghouse/NRC FLECHT Low Flooding Rate Tests (Rosal et al., 1975).

3. Westinghouse/NRC FLECHT Skewed Power Reflood Tests (Rosal et al., 1977).

4. Westinghouse/Aerojet FLECHT Supplemental Tests (Cadek et al., 1972).

5. Westinghouse G-2 Reflood Tests (Cunningham et al., 1975).

6. FEBA Reflood Tests (Ihle and Rust, 1984).

The three FLECHT series of tests provide the most comprehensive tests available of heat transfer in rod bundles under constant flooding rate conditions. A broad range of possible assembly conditions, including power distribution, was tested, and detailed fluid and thermal data were obtained. The FEBA tests allow the assessment of a different assembly power distribution from those tested in FLECHT, and the important contribution to heat transfer provided by the fuel assembly grids, since there are tests available with and without grids. The G-2 tests provide data in a bundle of different height, with prototypical mixing vane grids similar to those used in a PWR fuel assembly. The tests chosen and their conditions are summarized in Table 14.1-6.

14-4

]^{a,c}

[

. . .

. .

.

. . .

November 2010 Revision 0



Table 14.1-1 SPV	Table 14.1-1   SPV Heat Transfer Test Conditions							
Test Series	Test Number	Pressure psia	Vapor Reynolds Number	Steam Cooling Region ft	Power/Rod kW/ft	Comment		
ORNL	3.09.10I 3.09.10J 3.09.10K 3.09.10L 3.09.10M 3.09.10N	650 620 580 1090 1010 1030	12,200 - 16,600 $5,000 - 6,700$ $1,100 - 1,900$ $13,000 - 17,700$ $5,100 - 6,500$ $1,600 - 3,000$	9.91-11.88 9.91-11.88 7.94-11.88 9.91-11.88 9.91-11.88 7.94-11.88	0.68 0.33 0.10 0.66 0.31 0.14			
FLECHT SEASET (Steam cooling)	32753 36160 36261 36362 36463 36564 36766 36867	40 39 39 39 40 40 40 40 39	18,300 - 20,000 $18,000 - 19,800$ $14,700 - 16,100$ $9,100 - 9,900$ $5,600 - 6,100$ $4.400 - 4,700$ $2,800 - 3,000$ $2,800 - 3,000$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.0-12.0\\ 0.0-12.0\\ 0.0-12.0\\ 0.0-12.0\\ 0.0-12.0\\ 0.0-12.0\\ 0.0-12.0\\ 0.0-12.0\\ 0.0-12.0\\ 0.0-12.0\\ \end{array}$	0.21 0.16 0.13 0.79 0.48 0.04 0.02 0.02	The listed rod powers for this test are the peak rod powers.		

Table 14.1-2	Typical Conditions in a PWR During SPV (Blowdown, Refill, Boiloff/Recovery, Reflood)						
			· · ·				
	•						
			· · ·				

Table 14.1-3 D	FFB Heat Trans	fer Test Conditions				
Test Series	Test Number	Pressure psia	Mass Flux lbm/s-ft ²	Inlet Temperature °F	Peak Power kW/ft	Comment
ORNL	3.03.6AR	2040	467	513	5.6	
	3.07.9B	1849	146	590	8.3	
	3.07.9C	1805	68.4	559	5.1	
	3.07.9D	1847	10.6	577	6.3	
	3.07.9E	1908	121	579	6.5	
	3.07.9K	635	46.2	415	4.0	
	3.07.9L	1203	108	529	7.0	
	3.07.9M	1242	134	543	7.9	
•	3.07.9P	874	107	513	7.4	
	3.07.9Q	947	66.6	502	5.1	
	3.07.9X	872	70.5	514	5.4	
	3.08.6C	1870	214	508	3.4	
	1 .					
ŕ						
			•			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

14-7

b

Table 14.1-5	Typical Conditions in a PWR During Reflood						
	ł						
					•		
· .							



31805 31203	40	0.81	1		
31504 32013	40 40 40 60	1.51 6.1 0.97 1.04	143 141 140 144 143	0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7	COSINE POWER SHAPE 17x17 ROD ARRAY
05029 05132 04641	40 40 20	0.85 1.0 1.0	141 140 139	0.73 0.95 0.95	COSINE POWER SHAPE 15x15 ROD ARRAY
15305 13812 15713 13914 13609	40 41 40 21 21	0.8 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0	140 83 2 5 141	0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7	TOP SKEWED POWER SHAPE 15x15 ROD ARRAY
	05029 05132 04641 15305 13812 15713 13914 13609	32013     00       05029     40       05132     40       04641     20       15305     40       13812     41       15713     40       13914     21       13609     21	32013     00     1.04       05029     40     0.85       05132     40     1.0       04641     20     1.0       15305     40     0.8       13812     41     1.0       15713     40     1.0       13914     21     1.0       13609     21     1.0	32013       00       1.04       143         05029       40       0.85       141         05132       40       1.0       140         04641       20       1.0       139         15305       40       0.8       140         13812       41       1.0       83         15713       40       1.0       2         13914       21       1.0       5         13609       21       1.0       141	32013         00         1.04         143         0.7           05029         40         0.85         141         0.73           05132         40         1.0         140         0.95           04641         20         1.0         139         0.95           15305         40         0.8         140         0.7           13812         41         1.0         83         0.7           15713         40         1.0         2         0.7           13914         21         1.0         5         0.7           13609         21         1.0         141         0.7

November 2010 Revision 0





# **14.2 TEST FACILITIES DESCRIPTION**

# 14.2.1 Test Facilities Used to Assess Single-Phase Vapor (SPV)

# 14.2.1.1 Oak Ridge National Laboratory Thermal Hydraulic Test Facility (ORNL-THTF) Uncovered Bundle Heat Transfer Tests

A series of steady-state experiments investigating small break LOCA phenomena was performed in the ORNL-THTF high pressure rod bundle thermal-hydraulics loop, as reported in NUREG/CR-2456 (Anklam, et al., 1982). The test facility, test procedure and test conditions are described in more detail in Section 13.4.2 of this report. The uncovered bundle tests provided local conditions for pressure, mass flow, quality, and steam temperature, which were used as input to a driver program containing the <u>W</u>COBRA/TRAC-TF2 code heat transfer package for assessment. Table 14.1-1 lists the thermal-hydraulic conditions of the six selected ORNL-THTF uncovered bundle tests used to evaluate the <u>W</u>COBRA/TRAC-TF2 film boiling heat transfer models as part of the heat transfer driver program.

## 14.2.1.2 FLECHT-SEASET Steam Cooling Tests

The FLECHT-SEASET test series was conducted in order to provide an experimental data base at low flooding rates for simulated Westinghouse 17x17 fuel rods as described by Conway et al. (1977). The data from these tests were evaluated by Lee et al. (1982). The tests and experimental facility are described in more detail in Section 14.2.3.1 of this report. Tests 32753, 36160, 36261, 36362, 36463, 36564, 36766, and 36867 were simulated in order to demonstrate the ability of  $\underline{W}$ COBRA/TRAC-TF2 to predict the thermal-hydraulic phenomena observed in each test and to verify the ability of the code to predict the single-phase vapor heat transfer observed in the tests. Table 14.1-1 lists the thermal-hydraulic conditions of the eight selected FLECHT-SEASET steam cooling tests used to evaluate the  $\underline{W}$ COBRA/TRAC-TF2 single-phase vapor heat transfer models.

# 14.2.2 Test Facilities Used to Assess Dispersed Flow Film Boiling (DFFB) Heat Transfer

## 14.2.2.1 ORNL-THTF High Pressure Film Boiling Tests

The ORNL-THTF high pressure film boiling tests are one source of data for validating the heat transfer predictions of <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u> in the DFFB regimes of interest for LOCAs. A series of high-pressure steady-state upward DFFB tests in a rod bundle was performed in the ORNL-THTF and is discussed by Yoder (Yoder, et al., 1982). [

 $]^{a,c}$  The conditions for these tests are listed in Table 14.2.2.1-1. As seen in the table, these tests were conducted for pressures ranging from 23 bar (635 psia) to 132 bar (1908 psia) at flow rates from 226 kg/s-m² (46.2 lbm/s-ft²) to 713 kg/s-m² (146 lbm/s-ft²). These tests provided local conditions for pressure, mass flow, quality, and steam temperature at the tube exit, which were used as input to a driver program containing the <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u> code heat transfer package for assessment.

Additional ORNL-THTF tests were conducted to investigate heat transfer during dispersed flow film boiling (Morris et al., 1982). These tests simulate dryout and film boiling phenomena at high pressure in a

transient condition. The initial conditions for these tests are listed in Table 14.2.2.1-2. To help validate the film boiling heat transfer models of <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u>, two of the dispersed flow film boiling tests were simulated using <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u>, as well as one of the steady-state tests.

# 14.2.2.1.1 Facility Description

The test facility is the same as that described in Section 13.4.2.

## 14.2.2.1.2 Test Procedure

During steady-state operation of the ORNL-THTF, the inlet flow at the bottom of the test section was established and the loop was adjusted to provide the desired inlet fluid temperature and inlet quality. The bundle power was then increased until the dryout (CHF) point was obtained. The steady-state point was assumed to be reached when both pressure and rod surface temperatures stabilized. The results of both rod surface conditions and local equilibrium fluid conditions were then reported as cross-sectional average values for each level. Table 14.2.2.1-1 lists the thermal-hydraulic conditions of the 10 selected ORNL-THTF steady-state film boiling tests used to evaluate the WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 film boiling heat transfer models as part of the heat transfer driver program.

The following describes the tests used for full experiment simulation.

<u>Steady-State Test</u> – In the steady-state experiment (3.07.9B – Yoder et al., 1982), inlet flow at the bottom of the test section was established and adjusted such that the desired flow rate, temperature, and pressure was reached. The bundle power was increased until the dryout point was at the desired position in the bundle. When the operating pressure and rod surface temperature were stabilized, steady-state was assumed. The test conditions are listed in Table 14.2.2.1-2.

<u>Transient Tests</u> – The first step in the transient experiments (3.08.6C and 3.03.6AR - Mullins et al., 1982) was to establish steady-state conditions prior to the initiation of the transients. The initial conditions for the two selected transient tests are also listed in Table 14.2.2.1-2.

Once steady-state conditions were achieved, the transients were initiated by breaking the outlet rupture disk assembly. The outlet break areas were 0.486 square inches and 0.583 square inches for Tests 3.08.6C and 3.03.6AR, respectively. Following the breaking of the outlet rupture disk, bundle power was ramped up from the initial steady-state levels to near maximum power levels, over a period of time to prolong the film boiling. Then the power was ramped down slowly. The pump was turned off at transient initiation for Test 3.03.6AR, while the pump was left on during the first 20 seconds for Test 3.08.6C.

Figures 14.2.2.1-1 through 14.2.2.1-3 provide the inlet mass flow rates, outlet pressure and test section bundle power for Test 3.03.6AR. Figures 14.2.2.1-4 through 14.2.2.1-6 provide the inlet mass flow rates, outlet pressure and test section bundle power for Test 3.08.6C.



.

Table 14.2.2.1-1       ORNL-THTF Steady-State DFFB Initial Test Condition							
Test	Pressure psia	Mass Flux lbm/s-ft ²	Inlet Quality	Inlet Temperature F	Power kW/ft		
3.07.9B	1850	146	-0.107	624.7	8.3		
3.07.9C	1806	68.4	-0.179	621.4	5.2		
3.07.9D	1849	106	-0.154	624.5	6.3		
3.07.9E	1910	121	-0.155	629.0	6.5		
3.07.9K	635	46.3	-0.128	492.3	4.1		
3.07.9L	334	108 .	-0.082	567.4	7.1		
3.07.9M	1243	135	-0.061	571.4	8.1		
3.07.9P	875	107	-0.029	528.4	7.4		
3.07.9Q	947	66.6	-0.067	537.9	5.2		
3.07.9X	. 872	70.5	-0.026	528.0	5.4		

Table 14.2.2.1-2	ORNL-THTF Initial Test Conditions for WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 Simulation							
•								
			·					
	·							

.

a,c



Figure 14.2.2.1-1

Inlet Mass Flow Rate Forcing Function Normalized to Initial Condition, Test 3.03.6AR

November 2010 Revision 0



Figure 14.2.2.1-2

2 Outlet Pressure Forcing Function Normalized to Initial Condition, Test 3.03.6AR

November 2010 Revision 0



TIME (SEC)



BUNDLE PONER

Test Section Bundle Power Forcing Function Normalized to Initial Condition, Test 3.03.6AR



Figure 14.2.2.1-4Inlet Mass Flow Rate Forcing Function Normalized to Initial Condition,<br/>Test 3.08.6C

November 2010 Revision 0

14-17



Figure 14.2.2.1-5 Outlet Pressure Forcing Function Normalized to Initial Condition, Test 3.08.6C


Figure 14.2.2.1-6 Test Section Bundle Power Forcing Function Normalized to Initial Condition, Test 3.08.6C

## 14.2.2.2 G-1 Intermediate Pressure Blowdown Heat Transfer Experiments

These experiments were designed to provide data which could be used to verify heat transfer models applicable to the analysis of heat transfer during the blowdown portion of a large break Loss-of-Coolant Accident (LOCA) in a Pressurized Water Reactor (PWR). They will be used to demonstrate the adequacy of the film boiling models in <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u>.

## 14.2.2.2.1 Facility Description

ſ

[

The G-1 test facility, Figure 14.2.2.2-1, was designed to simulate thermal-hydraulic conditions calculated for a PWR during the blowdown portion of a LOCA. The facility could be operated at pressures up to 2000 psig and temperatures up to 650°F. The test facility's original purpose was to verify the performance of the Upper Head Injection (UHI) ECCS which was installed in some PWRs. The UHI system injected subcooled water into the top of the core during the blowdown phase of the LOCA. During the same time period, two-phase mixture from the upper plenum and reactor coolant loops was expected to flow into the core and provide additional cooling. Both of these processes were simulated in the test facility.

A detailed description of this facility is contained in Section 13.4.3.2 of this topical. However, a brief summary of the facility description is provided below.

Jp

#### 14.2.2.2.2 Test Procedure

WCAP-16996-NP

٦Þ

WCAP-16996-NP

[

]^b

} ·

14-21

2

Fable 14.2.2.2-2 G-1 Initial Test Conditions							
						· · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
		<u>.</u>	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				
		······································					

WCAP-16996-NP

<u>a,b</u>,c

Figure 14.2.2.2-1 Diagram of G-1 Facility (from Cunningham, et al., 1974)

WCAP-16996-NP

b

Figure14.2.2.2-2 G-1 Test Vessel (from Cunningham, et al., 1974)

b



Figure 14.2.2.2-4 G-1 Heater Rod Axial Power Profile (from Cunningham, et al., 1974)

b

Figure 14.2.2.2-5 G-1 Bundle Cross Section and Instrumentation (from Cunningham, et al., 1974)

WCAP-16996-NP

November 2010 Revision 0

### 14.2.2.3 G-2 Low Pressure Refill Heat Transfer Experiments

Low pressure Upper Head Injection (UHI) refill tests conducted at the Westinghouse G-2 test facility were simulated using the <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u> computer code. Comparisons of the <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u> results to the refill test experimental data can be used to help assess the capability of <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u> to accurately predict top-down quench phenomena, low pressure film boiling, and countercurrent film boiling heat transfer.

#### 14.2.2.3.1 Facility Description

[

[

[

A detailed description of this facility is contained in Section 13.4.4.2 of this topical. However, a brief summary of the facility description is provided below.

#### 14.2.2.3.2 Test Procedure

]^b Figure 14.2.2.3-6

Jp

]^b

shows the low pressure UHI refill test sequence of events. Table 14.2.2.3-2 summarizes the test conditions of the tests which were simulated with <u>W</u>COBRA/TRAC-TF2.

Table I	Table 14.2.2.3-2 G-2 Retill Initial Test Conditions						
		•					·
				ŝ			
							1.
		<b>k</b>	• · · · · · ·		•		
	•						

Figure 14.2.2.3-1 G-2 Test Facility Flow Schematic (from Cunningham, et al., 1975)

WCAP-16996-NP

14-29

b

b

Figure 14.2.2.3-2 G-2 Loop Heater Rod (from Cunningham, et al., 1975)

Figure 14.2.2.3-3 G-2 Loop Heater Rod Axial Power Profile (from Cunningham, et al., 1975)

Figure 14.2.2.3-4 Test Rod Bundle, Cross Section and Instrumentation (from Cunningham, et al., 1975)

WCAP-16996-NP

November 2010 Revision 0

14-31

b



Figure 14.2.2.3-6 Low Pressure UHI Refill Test Sequence of Events (from Hochreiter, et al., 1976)

WCAP-16996-NP

14-33

b

## 14.2.3 Test Facilities Used to Assess Reflood Heat Transfer

#### 14.2.3.1 FLECHT-SEASET Reflood Tests

The FLECHT-SEASET test series was conducted in order to provide an experimental data base at low flooding rates for simulated Westinghouse 17x17 fuel rods. The tests and experimental facility are described by Conway et al. (1977) and the data from these tests were evaluated by Lee et al. (1982). Tests 31203, 31504, 31701, 31805, and 32013 were simulated in order to demonstrate the ability of  $\underline{W}COBRA/TRAC-TF2$  to predict the thermal-hydraulic phenomena observed in each test and to verify the ability of the code to predict the parametric trends found in the tests. The test conditions for these experiments are shown in Table 14.2.3.1-1. Each of these tests had a peak rod power of 0.7 kW/ft and a uniform radial power shape.

#### 14.2.3.1.1 Facility Description

A diagram of the FLECHT-SEASET test bundle is shown in Figure 14.2.3.1-1. The test section consisted of 161 electrical heater rods (93 non-instrumented and 68 instrumented) arranged in a square pitch with dimensions comparable to 17x17 PWR fuel rod arrays. The rod diameter was 0.374 inches and the rod pitch was 0.496 inches. The bundle also contained 16 control rod guide tubes of 0.484-inch diameter and eight solid filler rods. The triangular filler rods reduced the excess flow area to within 5 percent of the power/flow area ratio of a PWR fuel assembly. The test section was enclosed by a cylindrical stainless steel housing and was connected to an upper and lower plenum. The housing, with an inside diameter of 7.625 inches, was insulated from the outside air to reduce the heat loss to the environment. The bundle flow area was 24.1 square inches. The upper ends of both the housing and test rods were bolted to the top of the test assembly. The lower ends were allowed to hang free permitting axial movement. Horizontal movement and/or bowing of the heater rods was restricted by grid spacers located at 20.5-inch intervals, starting at the beginning of the heated length.

The electrical heater rods were constructed of a spiral-wound heating element embedded in a boron-nitride insulator. A chopped cosine power profile with a peak/average ratio of 1.66 was approximated by a seven-step power profile. The length of each power step and the peak-to-average power factors are shown in Figure 14.2.3.1-2 along with the location of six grid spacers. (Grids at the top and bottom of the bundle are not shown.)

Type K thermocouples were mounted in 68 of the heater rods and in four of the thimble tubes. Differential pressure cells were located every 12 inches along the test section and provided data used in determining mass balance and the bundle void fraction. Steam probes were placed in the bundle and in the test section outlet. The probes were located in the thimble tubes and were designed to separate moisture from the high temperature steam and then aspirate the steam across a thermocouple.

#### 14.2.3.1.2 Test Procedure

The tests were conducted by first pressurizing the test section to the desired system pressure by valving steam from a boiler into the system and the exhaust line control valve. Water was then injected into the test section lower plenum until it reached the beginning of the heated length of the bundle heater rods. Power was next applied to the bundle and the rods were allowed to heatup. When the temperature of any

two bundle thermocouples exceeded the pre-selected value of  $1600^{\circ}$ F, the bundle was reflooded at a specified rate and power was decreased to match the ANS 1971 + 20 percent decay heat rate.

Table 14.2.3.1-1	able 14.2.3.1-1 Test Conditions for FLECHT-SEASET Tests					
Test No.	Forced Injection Rate in/s Upper Plenum Pressure psia		Injection Water Temperature °F			
31805	0.81	40	124			
31504	0.97	40	123			
32013	1.04	60	150			
31203	1.51	40	126			
31701	6.1	40 ·	127			





#### BUNDLE STATISTICS

194.0 mm (7.625 in.)
5.08 mm (0.200 in.)
9.50 mm (0.374 in.)
12.0 mm (0.474 in.)
12.6 mm (0.496 in.)
15571 mm ² (24.136 in. ² )
18.8 x 8.43 mm (0.741 x 0.332 in.)
<b>— —</b>

Figure 14.2.3.1-1 FLECHT-SEASET Rod Bundle Cross Section (from Loftus, et al., 1981)

WCAP-16996-NP

November 2010 Revision 0



## FLECHT-SEASET AXIAL POWER SHAPE, THERMOCOUPLE AND GRID LOCATIONS

Figure 14.2.3.1-2 FLECHT-SEASET Axial Power Shape Profile and Grid Locations

## 14.2.3.2 FLECHT Low Flooding Rate Tests

The FLECHT Low Flooding Rate Cosine Power Shape Test series was conducted to provide experimental data for Westinghouse 15x15 fuel. The tests and the experimental facility are described by Rosal et al. (1975). Tests 05029, 05132, and 04641 were simulated to demonstrate the ability of WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2 to predict the thermal-hydraulic phenomena observed in these experiments. The test conditions for these tests are shown in Table 14.2.3.2-1. These tests had a cosine axial power shape with a peak to average power ratio of 1.66.

#### 14.2.3.2.1 Facility Description

A diagram of the FLECHT test bundle is shown in Figure 14.2.3.2-1. The test section consisted of 91 electrical heater rods arranged in a square pitch with dimensions comparable to 15x15 PWR fuel rod arrays. The rod diameter was 0.422 inches and the rod pitch was 0.563 inches. The test bundle also contained eight control rod guide tubes and one instrument tube in a 10x10 square array. The test section was enclosed by a square, 0.7-inch thick carbon steel housing, and was connected to upper and lower plenums. The housing had internal dimensions of 5.889 inches x 5.889 inches, and was insulated from the outside air to reduce heat loss to the environment. Horizontal movement and/or bowing of the heater rods was restricted by eight grid spacers located at 20.5-inch intervals, starting at the beginning of the heated length.

The electrical heater rods were constructed of a spiral-wound heating element embedded in a boron-nitride insulator. A chopped cosine power profile with a peak/average ratio of 1.66 was approximated by a seven-step power profile. The length of each power step and the peak to average power factors are shown in Figure 14.2.3.2-2 along with the location of the grid spacers.

The bundle was assembled with 6 heater rods instrumented with 8 thermocouples, 15 rods with 5 thermocouples, 22 rods with 3 thermocouples and 48 un-instrumented rods.

Test section instrumentation also included fluid and wall thermocouples in the upper and lower plenums, differential pressure transducers which measured pressure drops every two feet along the heated length of the rod bundle, and an overall pressure drop across the entire bundle. A static pressure transducer connected to the upper plenum monitored the test section pressure.

#### 14.2.3.2.2 Test Procedure

The tests were conducted by first pressurizing the test section to the desired system pressure by valving steam from a boiler into the system and the exhaust line control valve. Water was then injected into the test section lower plenum until it reached the beginning of the heated length of the bundle heater rods. Power was next applied to the bundle and the rods were allowed to heatup. When the temperature of any two bundle thermocouples exceeded a pre-selected value, the bundle reflood was initiated and power was decreased to match the ANS 1971 + 20 percent decay heat rate.

Table 14.2.3.2-1       Test Conditions for FLECHT Low Flooding Rate Tests							
Test No.	Forced Injection Rate in/s	Upper Plenum Pressure psia	Injection Water Temperature °F	Peak Rod Power kW/ft			
05029 .	0.85	40	126	0.73			
05132	1.0 '	. 40	127	0.95			
04641	1.0	20	89	0.95			



Figure 14.2.3.2-1 FLECHT Rod Bundle Cross Section (from Rosal, et al., 1975)

SPACER GRIDS: G G G G G G THERMOCOUPLES: x x 1.80 1.50 1.20 **Relative Power** 0.90 0.60 0.30 FCOSPS.SPF CQD Vol. II Figure 12-3-0.00 <u>12 24 36 48 60 72 84 96 108120132144</u> Bundle Elevation, in.

# FLECHT COSINE AXIAL POWER SHAPE, THERMOCOUPLE AND GRID LOCATIONS



#### 14.2.3.3 FLECHT Top-Skewed Power Tests

The FLECHT skewed power tests were run to provide experimental data at low flooding rates for simulated Westinghouse 15x15 fuel with a top-skewed axial power shape. These tests are described by Rosal et al. (1977). Tests 15305, 13812, 15713, 13914, and 13609 were simulated to demonstrate the ability of <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u> to predict the thermal-hydraulic phenomena observed in these experiments. Table 14.2.3.3-1 lists the conditions for each of these tests. These tests were simulated in order to demonstrate the ability of <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u> to predict the correct thermal-hydraulic response during reflood in a rod bundle with a top-skewed power shape.

#### 14.2.3.3.1 Facility Description

A diagram of the FLECHT top-skewed power shape test bundle is shown in Figure 14.2.3.3-1. The test section consisted of 105 electrical heater rods arranged to simulate a quarter section of a 15x15 PWR fuel assembly. The rod diameter was 0.422 inches and the rod pitch was 0.563 inches. The test bundle also contained 7 simulated control rod thimble tubes and 12 solid filler rods. The triangular filler rods reduced the excess flow area to within 5 percent of the power/flow area ratio of a PWR fuel assembly. The test section was enclosed by a 0.188-inch thick cylindrical stainless steel housing that was connected to the upper and lower plenums. The housing, with an inside diameter of 7.0 inches, was insulated on the exterior to reduce heat loss to the environment. Horizontal movement and/or bowing of the heater rods was restricted by eight grid spacers located at 20.5-inch intervals starting at the beginning of the heated length.

The electrical heater rods were constructed of a spiral-wound heating element embedded in a boron-nitride insulator. The top-skewed power shape was peaked at 9.75 feet and had a maximum peak-to-average power ratio of 1.35. The power shape profile is shown in Figure 14.2.3.3-2.

Heater rod thermocouples were located at 14 elevations in the bundle including 4 thermocouple elevations downstream at the peak power location. Differential pressure transducers were spaced 12 inches apart along the test section. Steam probes were located in thimble tubes in the bundle and also in the test section outlet.

#### 14.2.3.3.2 Test Procedure

The tests were conducted by first pressurizing the test section to the desired system pressure by valving steam from a boiler into the system and the exhaust line control valve. Water was then injected into the test section lower plenum until it reached the beginning of the heated length of the bundle heater rods. Power was next applied to the bundle and the rods were allowed to heatup. When the temperature of any two bundle thermocouples exceeded the pre-selected value of  $1600^{\circ}$ F, the bundle was reflooded at a specified rate and power was decreased to match the ANS 1971 + 20 percent decay heat rate.

Table 14.2.3.3-1       Test Conditions for FLECHT Top-Skewed Power Tests						
Test No.	Forced Injection Rate in/s	Upper Plenum Pressure psia	Injection Water Temperature °F	Peak Rod Power kW/ft		
15305	0.8	40	127	0.7		
13812	1.0	41	184	0.7		
15713	1.0	40	265	0.7		
13914	1.0	21	223	0.7		
13609	1.0	21	87	0.7		





G G G G G G SPACER GRIDS: THERMOCOUPLES: 1.80 1.50 1.20 **Relative Power** 0.90 0.60 0.30 FSQPPS.SPF CQD Vol. II Figure 12-4-0.00 **- Hamman Andreas Andreas** Bundle Elevation, in. SKEWED POWER AXIAL POWER SHAPE, THERMOCOUPLE AND GRID LOCATIONS



WCAP-16996-NP

14-46

## 14.2.3.4 FLECHT Supplemental Tests

The FLECHT Supplemental Test series was conducted to provide experimental data for Westinghouse 15x15 fuel. The tests and the experimental facility are described by (Cadek et al., 1972). Test 0791 was simulated to demonstrate the ability of <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u> to predict the thermal-hydraulic phenomena observed in this reflood experiment with a very low flooding rate. The test conditions for this test are shown in Table 14.2.3.4-1.

Jp

## 14.2.3.4.1 Facility Description

ſ

## 14.2.3.4.2 Test Procedure

WCAP-16996-NP

]^b

Table 14.2.3.4-1 Test Conditions for FLECHT Supplemental Test					

t

14-49 b Figure 14.2.3.4-1 FLECHT Rod Bundle Cross Section (from Cadek et al., 1972)

,

WCAP-16996-NP

November 2010 Revision 0



b

Jp

]^b

#### 14.2.3.5 G-2 Reflood Experiments

The low pressure, forced reflood tests performed at the Westinghouse G-2 test facility were simulated using the <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u> computer code. Comparisons of the <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u> results to the reflood test data can be used to help assess the capability of <u>WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2</u> to accurately predict rod bundle reflood heat transfer behavior including spacer grid effects on dispersed flow film boiling heat transfer. [

## 14.2.3.5.1 Facility Description

The facility is the same as that described in Section 14.2.2.3.

14.2.3.5.2 Test Procedure

[

Table	Table 14.2.3.5-1   G-2 Reflood Tests and Conditions							
					·			

<u>b</u>

#### 14.2.3.6 FEBA

The FEBA (Flooding Experiments with Blocked Arrays) tests were a series of forced reflood tests conducted by the Karlsruhe Nuclear Research Center in West Germany and reported by Ihle and Rust (1984). The main purpose of these experiments was to investigate the effects of grid spacers and flow blockages on reflood heat transfer. However, FEBA tests also provided many typical results of a reflood transient.

In order to further verify WCOBRA/TRAC-TF2, four FEBA tests were simulated. [

^{a,b,c} Table 14.2.3.6-1

summarizes the conditions for each test.

#### 14.2.3.6.1 Facility Description

The FEBA test facility was originally designed to simulate typical forced reflood conditions in a KWU PWR core. [

#### 14.2.3.6.2 Test Procedure

Jp

[

]^b
 	 		· · ·	
 · ·	· · · · ·	_		
	······································			

WCAP-16996-NP



WCAP-16996-NP

14-56

b

.....

Figure 14.2.3.6-2 FEBA Power Shape and Grid Elevation (from Ihle and Rust, 1984)

WCAP-16996-NP

14-57

b

## 14.3 **REFERENCES**

- Anklam, T. M., et al., 1982, "Experimental Investigations of Uncovered Bundle Heat Transfer and Two-Phase Mixture Level Swell Under High Pressure Low Heat Flux Conditions," NUREG/CR-2456.
- 2. Cadek, F. F., et al., October 1972, "PWR FLECHT Final Report Supplement," WCAP-7931.
- 3. Conway, C. E. et al., 1977, "PWR FLECHT Separate Effects and System Effects Test (SEASET) Program Plan," NRC/EPRI/Westinghouse-1.
- 4. Cunningham, J. P., et al., 1974, "ECCS Heat Transfer Experiments with Upper Head Injection, Volume 1: Test Facility, Procedures and Data," WCAP-8400.
- Cunningham, J. P., Gray, A. D., Mendler, O. J., and Steer, R. W., 1975, "G-2 Facility Forced Flooding Tests with a 17x17 Rod Array – Volume 1: Test Facility, Procedures, and Data," WCAP-8551.
- 6. Hochreiter, L. E., et al., 1976, "G-2, 17x17 Refill Heat Transfer Test and Analysis," WCAP-8793.
- 7. Ihle, P., and Rust, K., 1984, "FEBA Flooding Experiments with Blocked Arrays, Data Report 1, Test Series I through IV," Kernforschungszentrum Karlsruhe.
- Lee, N., Wong, S., Yeh, H. C., and Hochreiter, L. E., 1982, "PWR FLECHT SEASET Unblocked Bundle, Forced and Gravity Reflood Task Data Evaluation and Analysis Report," NUREG/CR-2256, WCAP-9891.
- 9. Loftus, M. J. et al., 1981, "PWR FLECHT-SEASET Unblocked Bundle, Forced and Gravity Reflood Task Data Report," Volumes 1 and 2, NUREG/CR-1532, (WCAP-9699).
- 10. Morris D. G., et al., 1982, "An Analysis of Transient Film Boiling of High-Pressure Water in a Rod Bundle," NUREG/CR-2469.
- Mullins, C. B., et al., 1982, "Thermal-Hydraulic Test Facility Experimental Data Report for Test 3.03.6AR and Test 308.6C – Transient Film Boiling in Upflow," NUREG/CR-2525, Volumes 2 and 5.
- 12. Rosal, E. R., Hochreiter, L. E., McGuire, M. F., and Krepinevich, M. C., 1975, "FLECHT Low Flooding Rate Cosine Test Series Data Report," WCAP-8651.
- 13. Rosal, E. R., Conway, C. E., and Krepinevich, M. C., 1977, "FLECHT Low Flooding Rate Skewed Test Series Data Report," WCAP-9108.
- 14. Yoder, et al., 1982, "Dispersed Flow Film Boiling in Rod Bundle Geometry-Steady State Heat Transfer Data and Correlation Comparisons," NUREG/CR-2435, ORNL-5822.