· ·	· 3 03/	30/18
REGL	LATORY INFORMATION DISTRIBU	TION SYSTEM (RIDS)
DISIKIBULI	ON FOR INCOMING MATERIAL	20-302
REC: CASE E G NRC	ORG: JAMES E W WI PUB SVC	DOCDATE: 03/21/78 DATE RCVD: 03/29/78
DOCTYPE: LETTER SUBJECT: RESPONSE TO NRC L INJECTION EFFECTS	NOTARIZED: NO TR DTD 12/16/77FURNISHIN S - ECCS MODEL DEVELOPMENT PI	COPIES RECEIVED LTR 1 ENCL 1 G DESCRIPTION OF THE UPPER PLENUM ROGRAMW/ENCL.
PLANT NAME: KEWAUNEE		REVIEWER INITIAL: XJM DISTRIBUTOR INITIAL: M
****	DISTRIBUTION OF THIS MATER	IAL IS AS FOLLOWS *********************
1. SEND 4 COPIES 2. LAWRENCE(OELD) GENERAL DISTRI (DISTRIBUTION	OF ALL MATERIAL TO I&E - 1 COPY ALL MATERIAL BUTION FOR AFTER ISSUANCE OF CODE A001>	F OPERATING LICENSE.
FOR ACTION:	BR CHIEF SCHWENCER**W/7 E	NCL
INTERNAL :	REG FILE**W/ENCL I & E**W/2 ENCL HANAUER**W/ENCL EISENHUT**W/ENCL BAER**W/ENCL GRIMES**W/ENCL J. MCGOUGH**W/ENCL	NRC PDR**W/ENCL OELD**LTR ONLY CHECK**W/ENCL SHAO**W/ENCL BUTLER**W/ENCL J COLLINS**W/ENCL
EXTERNAL	LPDR'S KEWAUNEE, WI**W/ENCL TIC**W/ENCL NSIC**W/ENCL ACRS CAT B**W/16 ENCL	

DISTRIBUTION: LTR 40 ENCL 39 SIZE: 1P+3P

CONTROL NBR: 780890007

۱.

\*\*\*\*

.

WISCONSIN PUBLIC SERVICE CORPORATION



P.O. Box 1200, Green Bay, Wisconsin 54305



March 21, 1978

Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D. C. 20555

HATARY BUSKET FILE COPY Attention Mr. Edson Case, Acting Director  $d \overline{\Lambda}$ 

Gentlemen:

Docket 50-305 Operating License DPR-43 Upper Plenum Injection Letter from Mr. Edson Case to Wisconsin Public Service dated December 16, 1977

The referenced letter requested that we identify a permanent resolution to the Upper Plenum Injection modeling concerns of the NRC staff and a schedule for that resolution.

Please find attached a description of the Upper Plenum Injection Effects Model Development Program which has been discussed with members of your staff and is being submitted as documented description of our resolution program.

Very truly yours,

E. W. Jame

Senior Vie-President Power Supply & Engineering

sna

Attach.

780890007

## UPPER PLENUM INJECTION EFFECTS-ECCS MODEL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

A new ECCS evaluation model is to be developed in an effort to address the Safety Evaluation Report <sup>(1)</sup>(SER) issued by the NRC, December 1977. This SER requested explicit accounting of upper plenum injected (UPI) water to be simulated during a loss-of-coolant accident. The previous ECCS analyses had assumed that the UPI water adds directly to the bottom reflooding with no account of steam-water interaction. It has been our position that such a model is indeed conservative since no credit was taken for steam condensation and fuel rod cooling as the UPI water penetrates the core. However, in an effort to be responsive to the SER, we are embarking on a work scope which will include steam-water interaction due to upper plenum injection during the reflood portion of the accident. The work is segregated into three phases: development of model, generic sensitivity study and individual plant analysis.

The development of the new model will assume as a starting point the <u>W</u> evaluation codes WREFLOOD <sup>(2)</sup> and LOCTA<sup>(3)</sup>. Added to these appropriate codes will be an average model approach for simulating the UPI water and its interaction with the system. The approach for handling the UPI water interaction is similar to the approach used by the NRC in its SER. The simulation of the UPI water will be accounted for during the reflood portion of the transient and no blowdown effect will be considered.

The basis for eliminating modelling of the UPI water during the blowdown portion of the transient is based upon two generic 2-loop sensitivity studies  $^{(4,5)}$ . These studies showed that for all postulated breaks from 3 ft<sup>2</sup> split break to the full double ended cold leg guillotine (DECLG) (C<sub>p</sub> = 1.0, .8, .6, .4) safety injection does not occur during blowdown.

Upper Plenum Injection Effects-ECCS Model Development Program Description (Continued)

Therefore, requiring no modification to the SATAN-VI code during the blowdown portion. The DECLG breaks have been shown to be the most limiting breaks. For small breaks, the results show that for breaks less than 8" the core pressure is above the shutoff head of the low head safety injection pumps (UPI). Therefore, no UPI will occur and need not be modelled. For breaks between 8" and 3 ft<sup>2</sup> splits, UPI will occur during the blowdown portion of the transient. However, for such breaks the core recovers very quickly (>1 ft/sec) due to accumulator injection. Assuming the steam-water interaction model yields about the same flooding rate decrease as for the large breaks ( $\pm$  0.2 in/sec), the relative effect is much smaller for these breaks than the limiting breaks. As indicated in our January submittal, there is little effect in peak clad temperatures on the limiting breaks. Therefore, the small breaks have 500-700°F margin to the limiting breaks; no modification will be made to either WFLASH or SATAN-VI to run break sizes between 8" and 3 ft<sup>2</sup> breaks.

In the new models the following effects will be considered: metal heat in the upper plenum, top quench frame propagation, vaporization of UPI water, horizontal and vertical entrainment, decay heat in the fuel and the integration with the existing WREFLOOD code to get the overall system and feedback effects. Upon completion of the development phase, generic sensitivity studies will be performed including large break spectrum for double-ended cold leg guillotines ( $C_D = 1.0, .8, .6, .4$ ). Single failure criteria will be examined assuming loss of offsite power and no pumped SI during blowdown. Upper Plenum Injection Effects-ECCS Model Development Program Description (Continued)

Upon completion of the sensitivity studies, a one worst break individual plant analysis will be performed for the limiting conditions determined by the generic sensitivity study.

For the work scope described above the following delineation of estimated calendar time is:

Development5-6 monthsSensitivity2 monthsPlant Analysis1 monthReport1 month9-10 months

The above schedule is an estimate of the time required to accomplish the basic scope of work and does not include any allowance for NRC staff review or time required to respond to requests for additional information.

## References:

2.16

- 1. Case, E. G. letter, dated December 16, 1977, "Safety Evaluation Report on ECCS Evaluation Model for Westinghouse Two-Loop Plants".
- 2. Collier, G., etal., "Calculational Model for Core Reflooding After Loss of Coolant Accident (WREFLOOD Code)".
- 3. Bondeler, etal., "LOCTA-IV Program: Loss of Coolant Transient Analysis", WCAP-8301-June 1974.
- 4. Delsignore, etal., "Westinghouse ECCS Two-Loop Plant Sensitivity Studies (14 x 14)", WCAP-8854-A, May 1977.
- 5. "Westinghouse Emergency Core Cooling System-Plant Sensitivity Studies", WCAP-8340, July 1974.