

# BWROG / NRC ECCS-Suction Strainer Meeting

#### March 28, 2012 Rockwell, MD



# Agenda - morning

<u>Time</u>	Topic	Lead
9:00 a.m.	Introductions and Opening Remarks	NRC/BWROG
9:15 a.m.	Overall Project Schedule Update	BWROG
9:45 a.m.	Discussion of Reduction of Insulation Damage Pressure Issue	NRC/BWROG
10:15 a.m.	Break	
10:30 a.m.	Discussion of Staff Feedback on ECCS Suction Strainers Bypass Test Plan	NRC/BWROG
11:50 a.m.	Opportunity for Public Comment	NRC
12:00 p.m.	Lunch	

# Agenda - afternoon

Time	Topic	Lead
1:00 p.m.	Discussion of Staff Feedback on ECCS Suction Strainers Bypass Test Plan	NRC/BWROG
2:00 p.m.	Discussion of Staff Feedback on ECCS Suction Strainers Chemical Effects Strategy Outline	NRC/BWROG
2:45 p.m.	Break	
3:00 p.m.	Discussion of Staff Feedback on ECCS Suction Strainers Chemical Effects Strategy Outline	NRC/BWROG
4:40 p.m.	Wrap Up	NRC/BWROG
4:50 p.m.	Opportunity for Public Comment	NRC
5:00 p.m.	Adjourn	



### Introductions / Opening Remarks





#### Ted Schiffley - BWROG Chairman





#### Steve Scammon (Energy NW) – Committee Chairman



Staff agrees that BWRs do not need to take a 40% correction factor reduction to the URG air jet test insulation damage pressures

BWROG agrees that there is limited URG air test data from which to predict the exact damage pressure for some insulation materials

The BWROG has reviewed the NRC staff proposal to add margin to the damage pressures for some materials and recommends that these damage pressures not be changed

- BWR and PWR ZOI methods are different
- URG methods have many conservatisms
- Impact is negligible to plant safety
- Change to damage pressures would unnecessarily delay issue resolution without commensurate improvement in safety

#### Nukon:

- Change in BWR damage pressure would increase generated fines by less than 2% (NRC SER on NEI 04-07, Appendix II)
- Small increase in fines would have insignificant effect on strainer head loss
- Requires most BWRs to revise existing design basis debris generation calculations

#### **Diamond Power Mirror with standard latches:**

- Damage at 4 psi >99.9% is large size Mirror (> 6.0 in2) and is not transportable
- Damage at 2 psi >99.9% cassettes remain intact
- Metallic insulation headloss is typically small

Calcium Silicate - jacketed:

- The Ontario Power tests jacketing was not representative of BWR configuration
- BWR ZOI is already larger than PWR ZOI (6.4 D vs 5.5 D)

#### Min-K - unjacketed:

- The ZOI at 4 psi is 11.7D so a change to 2.4 psi (12.8D) would only apply to Min-K that is very distant from the break, which is likely shielded by intermediate structures
- Only 7 BWRs have Min-K and all have less than 100 lbs (4 have less than 20 lbs)

Knauf - unjacketed:

- No damage at 6 psi
- Insufficient air jet test data to determine exact damage pressures
- Change in BWR damage pressure would increase generated fines
- Small increase in fines would have insignificant effect on strainer head loss similar to Nukon

Koolphen - unjacketed:

- Closed cell phenolic insulation and will float
- Insufficient air jet test data to determine exact damage pressures
- Koolphen not widely used in BWRS (only 2 plants)
- Like Armaflex, Koolphen does not contribute to headloss

Newly recommended damage pressures would only result in small increases in debris generation

Recognized conservatisms in URG methods envelope any minor increases in debris generation

The need to revise plant-specific debris generation calculations with changed damage pressures would divert resources and delay generic source term definition without a significant improvement in safety

> BWROG recommends that URG damage pressures not be changed



## ECCS Suction Strainer Bypass Test Plan

#### Brad Tyers (Exelon) – Vice Chair, DSE-C



# Agenda for Discussion

- Questions were broken down into three categories
  - Critical Discussion Items
  - Clarification Discussion Items
  - Typos and "other"
- Focus of discussion will be items committee feel have critical importance

# **Critical Discussion Items**

Review of the Staff questions on the plan revealed common concerns

- Testing Methodology
  - Termination Criteria Is Bypass at Steady State
    - Questions 8, 22, 31
- Fiber Concentration
  - Incremental Batch Addition
    - Questions 13, 28, 29, 36, 41
  - Fiber Size Classification
    - Question 44
- Proto-typical Nature of Strainer Design
  - Testing with Fiber Only
    - Question 1
  - Approach Velocities
    - Questions 4, 9, 10, 11, 42
  - Debris Bed Coverage
    - Question 7

# **Clarification Discussion Items**

Various questions identified minor areas for clarification

- Test Water Chemistry
- Control Filter Purpose and Filter Replacement Methodology
- Assumed Sacrificial Area on Strainer for Velocities
- Turbulence
- Data Collection Methodology
- Repeatability
- Agitation

# Typos and "Other"

Third category of comments from the Staff addressed typographical errors and physical testing execution







ECCS Suction Strainer Chemical Effects Strategy Outline

# Jim Furman – Alion Science and Technology





- Strategy document submitted to NRC for review November 2011
- Staff provided formal comments February 2012
- Phone call to discuss comments with Staff, March 2012
- Additional informal comments received March 2012
- Present answers to formal comments March 2012

# Next Steps

- Schedule 2Q2012 phone call with NRC to discuss informal comments
- Generate Material Dissolution Test Plan submit to NRC for review 3Q2012
- Receive / address NRC comments 4Q2012
- Begin Material Dissolution testing 2013











