

MATERIAL ADOPTED IN THE HI-STAR 190 SAR

MATERIAL ADOPTED IN THE HI-STAR 190 SAR

HI-STAR 190 Chapter 2 Supporting Material

Table 2.2.1

DESIGN PRESSURES

Pressure Location	Condition	Pressure (psig)
MPC Internal Pressure	Normal	100
	Off-Normal/Short-Term	120
	Accident	200
MPC External Pressure	Normal	(0) Ambient
	Off-Normal/Short-Term	(0) Ambient
	Accident	55
HI-TRAC Water Jacket Internal Pressure	Accident	65
Overpack External Pressure	Normal	(0) Ambient
	Off-Normal/Short-Term	(0) Ambient
	Accident	See Paragraph 3.1.2.1.d

Table 2.2.3

DESIGN TEMPERATURES

HI-STORM FW Component	Normal Condition Design Temperature Limits (°F)	Off-Normal and Accident Condition Temperature Limits [†] (°F)
MPC shell	600	800
MPC basket	752	932
MPC basket shims	752	932
MPC lid	600	800
MPC closure ring	500	800
MPC baseplate	400	800
HI-TRAC VW inner shell	500	700
HI-TRAC VW bottom lid	350	700
HI-TRAC VW top flange	400	650
HI-TRAC VW bottom lid seals	350	N/A
HI-TRAC VW bottom lid bolts	350	800
HI-TRAC VW bottom flange	350	700
HI-TRAC VW radial neutron shield	311	N/A
HI-TRAC VW radial lead gamma shield	350	600
Fuel Cladding	752 (Storage) 752 or 1058 (Short Term Operations) ^{††}	1058 (Off-Normal and Accident Conditions)
Overpack concrete	300	350
Overpack Lid Top and Bottom Plate	450	700
Remainder of overpack steel structure	350	700

[†] For accident conditions that involve heating of the steel structures and no mechanical loading (such as the blocked air duct accident), the permissible metal temperature of the steel parts is defined by Table 1A of ASME Section II (Part D) for Section III, Class 3 materials as 700°F. For the fire event, the structure is required to remain physically stable (no specific temperature limits apply)

^{††} Short term operations include MPC drying and onsite transport. The 1058°F temperature limit applies to MPCs containing all moderate burnup fuel. The limit for MPCs containing one or more high burnup fuel assemblies is 752°F.

During a MPC reflood event, water is introduced to the MPC cavity through the lid drain line to cool down the MPC internals and support fuel unloading. This quenching operation induces thermal stresses and strains in the fuel rod cladding, which are maximum at the boundary interface between the rising water and the dry (gaseous) cavity. The following analysis demonstrates that the maximum total strain in the fuel cladding due to the reflood event is well below the failure strain limit of the material. Thus, the fuel rod cladding will not be breached due to the MPC reflood event.

The analysis is carried out using the finite element code ANSYS [3.4.1]. The model, which is shown in Figure 3.4.37, is constructed using 4-node plastic large strain elements (SHELL43) based on the cladding dimensions of the PWR reference fuel type. The overall length of the model is equal to 30 times the outside diameter of the fuel cladding. As seen in Figure 3.4.37, the mesh size is reduced at the boundary between the wetted fuel rod and the dry fuel rod, where the highest stresses and strains occur. To account for the gas pressure inside the fuel rod, the top end of the fuel rod is fixed in the vertical direction, and an equivalent axial force is applied at the bottom end. A radial pressure is also applied to the inside surface of the fuel cladding (see Figure 3.4.38). The fuel cladding material is modeled as a bi-linear isotropic hardening material with temperature dependent properties. The key input data used to develop the finite element model are summarized in Table 3.4.14.

The MPC reflood pressure, which is restricted to below the normal condition pressure limit, is too low to have an adverse effect on the fuel cladding, the reflood water pressure acts to produce compressive hoop stresses which help reduce the tensile hoop stress (albeit by a small amount) from the internal gas pressure in the rods. Therefore, the MPC flooding pressure has no harmful consequence to the fuel cladding and is neglected in the analysis.

At $t = 0$ sec, the uniform temperature throughout the entire fuel rod is set at 752°F (400°C), which equals the fuel cladding temperature limit under normal operating conditions. At $t = 0.1$ sec, the temperature assigned to the lower half of the fuel rod model is suddenly reduced to 80°F to simulate the water quenching (see Figure 3.4.39). The resulting stress and strain distributions in the fuel rod are shown in Figures 3.4.40 and 3.4.41, respectively. The maximum stress and strain values are summarized in Table 3.4.15. The maximum total strain in the fuel rod is well below the failure strain limit of 1.7% for the cladding material per [3.4.20]. In fact, the maximum stress and strain in the fuel rod remain in the elastic range.

The analysis described above makes a number of assumptions that significantly overstate the computed thru-wall strain in the fuel cladding. The major assumptions are:

1. Even though the peak cladding temperature occurs at a localized location, the fuel rod is modeled as a pressurized tube with closed ends at a uniform temperature that is greater than the maximum peak cladding temperature value reported in Chapter 4 when the MPC is in the HI-TRAC under the Design Basis heat load condition.
2. The rapid thermal straining of the pressurized tube (fuel rod) due to the quenching effect of water is simulated as a step transient wherein the temperature of the quenched portion of the

tube is assumed to drop down to the injected water temperature (assumed to be 80°F) causing a step change in the cladding wall temperature in the longitudinal direction at its interface with the “dry” portion of the tube. This assumption is extremely conservative because in actuality the immersed portion of the fuel rod is blanketed by vapor which acts to retard the severity of the thermal transient.

3. Even though, as the rod is gradually immersed in water, the axial heat conduction will tend to cool the un-immersed portion of the tube thus reducing the ΔT at the quenched/dry interface, no credit for axial conduction is taken.
4. The cooling of the fuel rod by gradual immersion in the water has the beneficial effect of reducing the internal pressure (per the ideal gas law) and thus the magnitude of pressure induced stress in the fuel cladding. As the peak cladding temperature in the MPC is reached in the upper half of the fuel rods (see Chapter 4), a substantial amount of rod is cooled by water (as its level gradually rises inside the MPC) before the vulnerable zone (where the peak cladding temperature exists) is subjected to the thermal transient from quenching. No credit for this amelioration of the pressure stresses due to the gradual cooling of the rod is taken in the analysis.

In summary, even though the analysis presented above is highly conservative, the maximum stress and strain in the fuel rod remain elastic. Moreover, the maximum strain is less than the failure strain limit by a factor of 6. Thus, the MPC reflood event will not cause a breach of the fuel rod cladding.

3.4.5 Cold

A discussion of the resistance to failure due to brittle fracture is provided in Subsection 3.1.2.

The value of the ambient temperature has two principal effects on the HI-STORM FW system, namely:

- i. The steady-state temperature of all material points in the cask system will go up or down by the amount of change in the ambient temperature.
- ii. As the ambient temperature drops, the absolute temperature of the contained helium will drop accordingly, producing a proportional reduction in the internal pressure in accordance with the Ideal Gas Law.

In other words, the temperature gradients in the system under steady-state conditions will remain the same regardless of the value of the ambient temperature. The internal pressure, on the other hand, will decline with the lowering of the ambient temperature. Since the stresses under normal storage condition arise principally from pressure and thermal gradients, it follows that the stress field in the MPC under -40 degree F ambient would be smaller than the "heat" condition of storage, treated in the preceding subsection. Additionally, the allowable stress limits tend to increase as the component temperatures decrease.

shielding as a result of the non-mechanistic tipover event. The complete details of the lid tipover analysis are provided in [3.4.13].

Finally, to evaluate the potential for crack propagation and growth for the MPC fuel baskets under the non-mechanistic tipover event, a conservative crack propagation analysis is carried out for both MPC-37 and MPC-89 fuel baskets using the same methodology utilized in Attachment D of [1.2.6] to evaluate the HI-STAR 180 F-37 fuel basket in support of the HI-STAR 180 SAR [3.1.10]. The crack propagation analysis is bounding since the maximum tensile strength of the basket material (28.2 ksi) documented in Table 1.2.8 is conservatively considered as the maximum tensile stress experienced by the Metamic fuel baskets in the tip-over accident and used as input to the following crack propagation analysis.

Per [1.2.6] the critical stress intensity factor of Metamic-HT panels is estimated to be

$$K_{IC} = 30\text{ksi}\sqrt{\text{in}}$$

based on Charpy V-notch absorbed energy (CVE) correlations for steels. The estimated value is consistent with the range for aluminum alloys, which is 20 to 50 $\text{MPa}\sqrt{\text{m}}$ or 18.2 to 45 $\text{ksi}\sqrt{\text{in}}$ per Table 3 of [3.4.19]. Next the minimum crack size, a_{\min} , for crack propagation to occur is calculated below using the formula for a through-thickness edge crack given in [3.1.5]. Although the formula is derived for a straight-edge specimen, the use of the maximum tensile strength of the fuel basket material as the maximum tensile stress experienced by the basket well compensates for the geometric difference between the basket panel and the specimen. Moreover, the maximum size of a pre-existing crack (1/16") in the fuel basket panel is less than 1/9th of the basket panel thickness (0.59"). Thus, the assumption of a through-thickness edge crack is very conservative. The result is

$$a_{\min} = \frac{\left(\frac{K_{IC}}{1.12\sigma_{\max}}\right)^2}{\pi} = \frac{\left[\frac{30\text{ksi}\sqrt{\text{in}}}{1.12(28.2\text{ksi})}\right]^2}{\pi} = 0.287\text{in}$$

And the safety factor against crack propagation (based on a 1/16" minimum detectable flaw size) is

$$SF = \frac{a_{\min}}{a_{\text{det}}} = \frac{0.287\text{in}}{0.0625\text{in}} = 4.595$$

The calculated minimum crack size is about 4.6 times the maximum possible pre-existing crack size in the fuel basket (based on 100% surface inspection of each panel). The large safety factor ensures that crack propagation in the HI-STORM FW fuel baskets will not occur due to the non-mechanistic tipover event.

3.4.4.1.5 Load Case 5: Design Internal Pressure

The MPC Enclosure Vessel, which is designed to meet the stress intensity limits of ASME Subsection NB [3.4.4], is analyzed for design internal pressure (Table 2.2.1) using the ANSYS finite element code [3.4.1]. Except for the applied loads and the boundary conditions, the finite element model of the MPC Enclosure Vessel used for this load case is identical to the model described in Subsections 3.1.3.2 and 3.4.3.2 for the MPC lifting analysis.

The only load applied to the finite element model for this load case is the MPC design internal pressure for normal conditions (Table 2.2.1). All internal surfaces of the MPC storage cavity are subjected to the design pressure. The center node on the top surface of the MPC upper lid is fixed against translation in all directions. Symmetric boundary conditions are applied to the two vertical symmetry planes. This set of boundary conditions allows the MPC Enclosure Vessel to deform freely under the applied pressure load. Figure 3.4.31 graphically depicts the applied pressure load and the boundary conditions for Load Case 5.

The stress intensity distribution in the MPC Enclosure Vessel under design internal pressure is shown in Figure 3.4.23. Figures 3.4.32 and 3.4.33 plot the thru-thickness variation of the stress intensity at the baseplate center and at the baseplate-to-shell juncture, respectively. The maximum primary and secondary stress intensities in the MPC Enclosure Vessel are compared with the applicable stress intensity limits from Subsection NB of the ASME Code. The allowable stress intensities are taken at 450°F for the MPC shell and MPC lids, 300°F for the baseplate, and 250°F at the baseplate-to-shell juncture. The maximum calculated stress intensities in the MPC Enclosure Vessel, and their corresponding allowable limits, are summarized in Table 3.4.7 for Load Case 5.

Since the stress intensity distribution in the MPC Enclosure Vessel is a linear function of the internal pressure, and the stress intensity limits for normal and off-normal conditions are the same (Table 3.1.7), the minimum calculated safety factor from Table 3.4.7 is used to establish the internal pressure limit for off-normal conditions (Table 2.2.1).

3.4.4.1.6 Load Case 6: Maximum Internal Pressure Under Accident Conditions

The maximum pressure in the MPC Enclosure Vessel under accident conditions is specified in Table 2.2.1. The stress analysis under this pressure condition uses the same model as the one described in the preceding subsection. The only change is the magnitude of the applied pressure. Figure 3.4.34 graphically depicts the applied pressure load and the boundary conditions for Load Case 6.

The stress intensity distribution in the MPC Enclosure Vessel under accident internal pressure is shown in Figure 3.4.24. The maximum primary stress intensities in the MPC Enclosure Vessel are compared with the applicable stress intensity limits from Subsection NB of the ASME Code [3.4.4]. The allowable stress intensities are taken at 450°F for the MPC shell and MPC lids, 300°F for the baseplate, and 250°F at the baseplate-to-shell juncture. These temperatures bound the calculated temperatures under normal operating conditions for the respective MPC components based on the thermal evaluations in Chapter 4. The allowable stress intensities are determined based on normal operating temperatures since the MPC accident internal pressure is dictated by the 100% fuel rod rupture accident, which does not cause any significant rise in MPC temperatures. In fact, the

temperatures inside the MPC tend to decrease as a result of the 100% fuel rod rupture accident due to the increase in the density and internal pressure of the circulating gas. The maximum calculated stress intensities in the MPC Enclosure Vessel, and their corresponding allowable limits, are summarized in Table 3.4.8 for Load Case 6.

3.4.4.1.7 Load Case 7: Accident External Pressure

The only affected component for this load case is the MPC Enclosure Vessel. The accident external pressure (Table 2.2.1) is selected sufficiently high to envelop hydraulic-pressure in the case of flood or explosion-induced pressure at all ISFSI Sites.

The main effect of an external pressure on the MPC is to cause compressive stress in the MPC shell. Therefore, the potential of buckling must be investigated. The methodology used for this investigation is from ASME Code Case N-284-2 (Metal Containment Shell Buckling Design Methods, Section III, Division 1, Class MC (1/07)). This Code Case has been previously used by Holtec in [3.1.4] and accepted by the NRC as a valid method for evaluation of stability in vessels.

The detailed evaluation of the MPC shell under accident external pressure is provided in Appendix 3.C. It is concluded that positive safety margins exist so that elastic or plastic instability of the maximum height MPC shell does not occur under the applied pressure.

3.4.4.1.8 Load Case 8: Non-Mechanistic Heat-Up of the HI-TRAC VW Water Jacket

Even though the analyses presented in Chapter 4 indicate that the temperature of water in the water jacket shall not reach boiling and the rupture disks will not open, it is (non-mechanistically) assumed that the hydraulic pressure in the water jacket reaches the relief devices' set point. The object of this analysis is to demonstrate that the stresses in the water jacket and its welds shall be below the limits set down in an appropriate reference ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code (Section II Class 3) for the Level D service condition. The accident pressure inside the water jacket is given in Table 2.2.1.

The HI-TRAC VW water jacket is analyzed using classical strength-of-materials. Specifically, the unsupported span of the water jacket shell between radial ribs is treated as a curved beam, with clamped ends, under a uniformly distributed radial pressure. The force and moment reactions at the ends of the curved beam for this type of loading are calculated using the formula for Case 5j of Table 18 in [3.4.16]. The primary membrane plus bending stress is then calculated using the formula for Case 1 of Table 16 in [3.4.16]. Figure 3.4.35 depicts the curved beam model that is used to analyze the water jacket shell and defines the key input variables. The input values that are used in the calculations are provided in Table 3.4.12.

The bottom flange, which serves as the base of the water jacket, is conservatively analyzed as an annular plate clamped at the water jacket inside diameter and simply supported at the water jacket outside diameter. The maximum bending stress in the bottom flange is calculated using the following formula from [3.4.18, Art. 23]:

bounding value of the dead load of the component being lifted. In all lifting analyses considered in this document, the handling load H is assumed to be 0.15D. In other words, the inertia amplifier during the lifting operation is assumed to be equal to 0.15g. This value is consistent with the guidelines of the Crane Manufacturer's Association of America (CMAA), Specification No. 70, 1988, Section 3.3, which stipulates a dynamic factor equal to 0.15 for slowly executed lifts. Thus, the "apparent dead load" of the component for stress analysis purposes is $D^* = 1.15D$. Unless otherwise stated, all lifting analyses in this FSAR use the "apparent dead load", D^* , as the lifted load.

Unless explicitly stated otherwise, all analyses of lifting operations presented in this FSAR follow the load definition and allowable stress provisions of the foregoing. Consistent with the practice adopted throughout this chapter, results are presented in dimensionless form, as safety factors, defined as

$$\text{Safety Factor, } \beta = \frac{\text{Allowable Stress}}{\text{Computed Stress}}$$

In the following subsections, the lifting device stress analyses performed to demonstrate compliance with regulations are presented. Summary results are presented for each of the analyses.

3.4.3.2 Analysis of Lifting Scenarios

In the following, the safety analyses of the HI-STORM FW components under the following lifting conditions are summarized.

a. MPC Lifts

The governing condition for the MPC lift is when it is being raised or lowered in a radiation shielded space defined by the HI-TRAC VW or HI-STORM FW stack. In this condition, as stated in Section 3.4.3.1, only four tapped holes in the MPC lid (Alloy X material) are credited to carry the weight.

The criteria derived from NUREG-0612, Reg. Guide 3.61, and the ASME Code Level A condition, stated earlier, apply. The stress analysis is carried out in two parts.

- i. Strength analysis of the TALs (connection points) using classical strength-of-materials.
- ii. A finite element analysis of the MPC as a cylindrical vessel with the weight of the fuel and basket applied on its baseplate which along with the weight of the Confinement Boundary metal is equilibrated by the reaction loads at the our lift points.

The primary stress intensities must meet the Level A stress limits for "NB" Class 3 plate and shell structures.

Case (i): Stress Analysis of MPC Threaded Anchor Locations (TALs)

Per Table 3.2.8, the maximum weight of a loaded MPC is

$$D = 116,400 \text{ lb}$$

Per the above, the apparent dead load of the MPC during handling operations is

$$D^* = 1.15 \times D = 133,860 \text{ lb}$$

The MPC lid has 8 TALs as shown on the drawings in Section 1.5, but as stated in Section 3.4.3.1, only four tapped holes in the MPC lid are credited to carry the weight. Therefore, the lifted load per TAL is equal to

$$\frac{D^*}{4} = 33,465 \text{ lb}$$

Per Machinery's Handbook [3.4.12], the shear area of the internal threads (1 3/4" - 5UNC x 3.0" min length.) at each TAL is computed as

$$A = 11.8 \text{ in}^2$$

Finally, the shear stress on the TALs is computed as follows

$$\tau = \frac{D^*}{4A} = 2,836 \text{ psi}$$

The MPC lid is made from Alloy X material, whose mechanical properties are listed in Table 3.3.1. Based on a design temperature of 600°F (Table 2.2.3), and assuming the yield and ultimate strengths in shear to be 60% of the corresponding tensile strengths, the allowable stress in the threads is determined as follows

$$S_a = 0.6 \times \min\left(\frac{S_y}{3}, \frac{S_u}{10}\right) = 3,540 \text{ psi}$$

Therefore, the safety factor against shear failure of the TALs in the MPC lid is

$$SF = \frac{S_a}{\tau} = 1.248$$

Case (ii): Finite Element Analysis of MPC Enclosure Vessel

The stress analysis of the MPC Enclosure Vessel under normal handling conditions is performed using ANSYS [3.4.1]. The finite element model, which is shown in Figure 3.4.1, is 1/4 -symmetric,

and it represents the maximum height MPC as defined by Tables 3.2.1 and 3.2.2. The maximum height MPC is analyzed because it is also the heaviest MPC. The key attributes of the ANSYS finite element model of the MPC Enclosure Vessel are described in Subsection 3.1.3.2.

The loads are statically applied to the finite element model in the following manner. The self weight of the Enclosure Vessel is simulated by applying a constant acceleration of 1.15g in the vertical direction. The apparent dead weight of the stored fuel inside the MPC cavity (which includes a 15% dynamic amplifier) is accounted for by applying a uniformly distributed pressure of 18.8 psi on the top surface of the MPC baseplate. The amplified weight of the fuel basket and the fuel basket shims is applied as a ring load on the MPC baseplate at a radius equal to the half-width of the fuel basket cross section. The magnitude of the ring load is equal to 100.4 lbf/in. All internal surfaces of the MPC storage cavity are also subjected to an internal pressure of 95 psig, which exceeds the normal operating pressure per Table 4.4.5. Finally, the model is constrained by fixing one node on the top surface of the ¼-symmetric MPC lid, which coincides with the TAL. Symmetric boundary conditions are applied to the two vertical symmetry planes. The boundary conditions and the applied loads are graphically depicted in Figure 3.4.28.

The resulting stress intensity distribution in the Enclosure Vessel under the applied handling loads is shown in Figure 3.4.2. Figures 3.4.29 and 3.4.30 plot the thru-thickness variation of the stress intensity at the baseplate center and at the baseplate-to-shell juncture, respectively. The maximum primary and secondary stress intensities in the MPC Enclosure Vessel are compared with the applicable stress intensity limits from Subsection NB of the ASME Code [3.4.4]. The allowable stress intensities are taken at 450°F for the MPC shell and MPC lids, 300°F for the baseplate, and 250°F at the baseplate-to-shell juncture. These temperatures bound the operating temperatures for these parts under normal operating conditions (Table 4.4.3). The maximum calculated stress intensities and the corresponding safety factors are summarized in Table 3.4.1.

The shear stress in the MPC lid-to-shell weld under normal handling conditions is independently calculated, as shown below.

Per Table 3.2.8, the maximum weight of a loaded MPC is

$$W_{MPC} = 116,400 \text{ lb}$$

The diameter and weight of the MPC lid assembly are

$$D = 74.5 \text{ in}$$

$$W_{lid} = 11,500 \text{ lb}$$

From Table 4.4.5, the bounding pressure inside the MPC cavity under normal operating conditions is

$$P = 95 \text{ psig}$$

Thus, the total force acting on the MPC lid-to-shell weld is

$$F = 1.15 \cdot (W_{MPC} - W_{lid}) + P \cdot \left(\frac{\pi \cdot D^2}{4} \right) = 534,755 lb$$

which includes a 15% dynamic amplifier. The MPC lid-to-shell weld is a 3/4" partial groove weld, which has an effective area equal to

$$A = \pi \cdot D \cdot \left(t_w - \frac{1}{8} \text{ in} \right) \cdot 0.8 = 117.0 \text{ in}^2$$

where t_w is the weld size (= 0.75in). The calculated weld area includes a strength reduction factor of 0.8 per ISG-15 [3.4.17]. Thus, the average shear stress in the MPC lid-to-shell weld is

$$\tau = \frac{F}{A} = 4,571 \text{ psi}$$

The MPC Enclosure Vessel is made from Alloy X material, whose mechanical properties are listed in Table 3.3.1. Based on a temperature of 450°F (Table 4.4.3), and assuming that the weld strength is equal to the base metal ultimate strength, the allowable shear stress in the weld under normal conditions is

$$\tau_a = 0.3 \times S_u = 19,170 \text{ psi}$$

Therefore, the safety factor against shear failure of the MPC lid-to-shell weld is

$$SF = \frac{\tau_a}{\tau} = 4.19$$

b. Heaviest Weight HI-TRAC VW Lift

The HI-TRAC VW transfer cask is at its heaviest weight when it is being lifted out of the loading pit with the MPC full of fuel and water and the MPC lid lying on it for shielding protection (Table 3.2.8). The threaded lift points provide for the anchor locations for lifting.

The stress analysis of the transfer cask consists of two steps:

- i. A strength evaluation of the tapped connection points to ensure that it will not undergo yielding at 3 times D^* and failure at 10 times D^* .
- ii. A strength evaluation of the HI-TRAC VW vessel using strength of materials formula to establish the stress field under D^* . The primary membrane plus primary bending stresses

MATERIAL ADOPTED IN THE HI-STAR 190 SAR

HI-STAR 190 Chapter 3 Supporting Material

- iii. Inasmuch as the transfer of heat occurs from inside the basket region to the outside, the temperature field in the MPC is spatially distributed with the lowest values reached at the periphery of the basket.

As noted in Chapter 1 and in Section 3.2, the height of the PWR MPC cavity can vary within a rather large range to accommodate spent nuclear fuel of different lengths. The heat load limits in Table 1.2.3 (PWR MPC) and Table 1.2.4 (BWR MPC) for regionalized storage are, however, fixed regardless of the fuel (and hence MPC cavity) length. Because it is not a priori obvious whether the shortest or the longest fuel case will govern, thermal analyses are performed for the minimum¹, reference and maximum height MPCs. Table 2.1.1 allows two different fuel assembly lengths under “minimum” category for PWR fuel. Unless specified in this chapter, the term “minimum” or “short” is used for all short fuel assembly arrays except 15x15I short fuel defined in Chapter 2.

4.4.1.1 Description of the 3-D Thermal Model

- i. Overview

The HI-STORM FW System is equipped with two MPC designs, MPC-37 and MPC-89 engineered to store 37 and 89 PWR and BWR fuel assemblies respectively. The interior of the MPC is a 3-D array of square shaped cells inside an irregularly shaped basket outline confined inside the cylindrical space of the MPC cavity. To ensure an adequate representation of these features, a 3-D geometric model of the MPC is constructed using the FLUENT CFD code pre-processor [4.1.2]. Because the fuel basket is made of a single isotropic material (Metamic-HT), the 3-D thermal model requires no idealizations of the fuel basket structure. However, since it is impractical to model every fuel rod in every stored fuel assembly explicitly, the cross-section bounded by the inside of the storage cell (inside of the fuel channel in the case of BWR MPCs), which surrounds the assemblage of fuel rods and the interstitial helium gas (also called the “rodded region”), is replaced with an “equivalent” square homogeneous section characterized by an effective thermal conductivity. Homogenization of the cell cross-section is discussed under item (ii) below. For thermal-hydraulic simulation, each fuel assembly in its storage cell is represented by an equivalent porous medium. For BWR fuel, the presence of the fuel channel divides the storage cell space into two distinct axial flow regions, namely, the in-channel (rodded) region and the square prismatic annulus region (in the case of PWR fuel this modeling complication does not exist). The methodology to represent the spent fuel storage space as a homogeneous region with equivalent conductivities is identical to that used in the HI-STORM 100 Docket No. 72-1014 [4.1.8].

¹ Both allowable PWR fuel assembly lengths under “minimum” category as shown in Table 2.1.1 are evaluated in this chapter.

ii. Details of the 3-D Model

The HI-STORM FW fuel basket is modeled in the same manner as the model described in the HI-STAR 180 SAR (NRC Docket No. 71-9325) [4.1.11]. Modeling details are provided in the following:

Fuel Basket 3D Model

The MPC-37 and MPC-89 fuel baskets are essentially an array of square cells within an irregularly shaped basket outline. The fuel basket is confined inside a cylindrical cavity of the MPC shell. Between the fuel basket-to-shell spaces, thick Aluminum basket shims are installed to facilitate heat dissipation. To ensure an adequate representation of the fuel basket a geometrically accurate 3D model of the array of square cells and Metamic-HT plates is constructed using the FLUENT pre-processor. Other than the representation of fuel assemblies inside the storage cell spaces as porous region with effective thermal-hydraulic properties as described in the next paragraph, the 3D model includes an explicit articulation of other canister parts. The basket shims are explicitly modeled in the peripheral spaces. The fuel basket is surrounded by the MPC shell and outfitted with a solid welded lid above and a baseplate below. All of these physical details are explicitly articulated in a quarter-symmetric 3D thermal model of the HI-STORM FW.

Fuel Region Effective Planar Conductivity

In the HI-STORM FW thermal modeling, the cross section bounded by the inside of a PWR storage cell and the channeled area of a BWR storage cell is replaced with an “equivalent” square section characterized by an effective thermal conductivity in the planar and axial directions. Figure 4.4.1 pictorially illustrates this concept. The two conductivities are unequal because while in the planar direction heat dissipation is interrupted by inter-rod gaps; in the axial direction heat is dissipated through a continuous medium (fuel cladding). The equivalent planar conductivity of the storage cell space is obtained using a 2D conduction-radiation model of the bounding PWR and BWR fuel storage scenarios defined in the table below. The fuel geometry, consisting of an array of fuel rods with helium gaps between them residing in a storage cell, is constructed using the ANSYS code [4.1.1] and lowerbound conductivities under the assumed condition of stagnant helium (no-helium-flow-condition) are obtained. In the axial direction, an area-weighted average of the cladding and helium conductivities is computed. Axial heat conduction in the fuel pellets is conservatively ignored.

The effective fuel conductivity is computed under four bounding fuel storage configurations for PWR fueled MPC-37 and one bounding scenario for BWR fueled MPC-89. The fuel storage configurations are defined below:

Storage Scenario	MPC	Fuel
PWR: 15x15I Short Fuel	Minimum Height MPC-37 for 15x15I fuel assembly array	15x15I in Table 2.1.2
PWR: Short Fuel	Minimum Height MPC-37 for all fuel assembly arrays except 15x15I	14x14 Ft. Calhoun

PWR: Standard Fuel	Reference Height MPC-37	W-17x17
PWR: XL Fuel	Maximum Height MPC-37	AP1000
BWR	MPC-89	GE-10x10

The fuel region effective conductivity is defined as the calculated equivalent conductivity of the fuel storage cell due to the combined effect of conduction and radiation heat transfer in the manner of the approach used in the HI-STORM 100 system (Docket No. 72-1014). Because radiation is proportional to the fourth power of absolute temperature, the effective conductivity is a strong function of temperature. The ANSYS finite element model is used to characterize fuel resistance at several representative storage cell temperatures and the effective thermal conductivity as a function of temperature obtained for all storage configurations defined above and tabulated in Table 4.4.1.

Heat Rejection from External Surfaces

The exposed surfaces of the HI-STORM FW dissipate heat by radiation and external natural convection heat transfer. Radiation is modeled using classical equations for radiation heat transfer (Rohsenow & Hartnett [4.2.2]). Jakob and Hawkins [4.2.9] recommend the following correlations for natural convection heat transfer to air from heated vertical and horizontal surfaces:

Turbulent range:

$$h = 0.19 (\Delta T)^{1/3} \text{ (Vertical, GrPr} > 10^9)$$

$$h = 0.18 (\Delta T)^{1/3} \text{ (Horizontal Cylinder, GrPr} > 10^9)$$

(in conventional U.S. units)

Laminar range:

$$h = 0.29 \left(\frac{\Delta T}{L}\right)^{1/4} \text{ (Vertical, GrPr} < 10^9)$$

$$h = 0.27 \left(\frac{\Delta T}{D}\right)^{1/4} \text{ (Horizontal Cylinder, GrPr} < 10^9)$$

(in conventional U.S. Units)

where ΔT is the temperature differential between the cask's exterior surface and ambient air and GrPr is the product of Grashof and Prandtl numbers. During storage conditions, the cask cylinder and top surfaces are cooled by natural convection. The corresponding length scales L for these surfaces are the cask diameter and length, respectively. As described in Section 4.2, GrPr can be expressed as $L^3 \Delta T Z$, where Z (from Table 4.2.7) is at least 2.6×10^5 at a conservatively high surface temperature of 340°F. Thus the turbulent condition is always satisfied assuming a lowerbound L (8 ft) and a small ΔT ($\sim 10^\circ\text{F}$).

Determination of Solar Heat Input

The intensity of solar radiation incident on exposed surfaces depends on a number of time varying parameters. The solar heat flux strongly depends upon the time of the day as well as on latitude and day of the year. Also, the presence of clouds and other atmospheric conditions (dust, haze, etc.) can significantly attenuate solar intensity levels. In the interest of conservatism, the effects of dust, haze, angle of incidence, latitude, etc. that act to reduce insolation, are neglected.

The insolation energy absorbed by the HI-STORM FW is the product of incident insolation and surface absorptivity. To model insolation heating a reasonably bounding absorptivity equal to 0.85 is incorporated in the thermal models. The HI-STORM FW thermal analysis is based on 12-hour daytime insolation specified in Article 71.71(c) (1) of the Transport Regulations [4.6.1]. During long-term storage, the HI-STORM FW Overpack is cyclically subjected to solar heating during the 12-hour daytime period followed by cooling during the 12-hour nighttime. Due to the large mass of metal and the size of the cask, the dynamic time lag exceeds the 12-hour heating period. Accordingly, the HI-STORM FW model includes insolation on exposed surfaces averaged over a 24-hour time period.

HI-STORM FW Annulus

The HI-STORM FW is engineered with internal flow passages to facilitate heat dissipation by ventilation action. During fuel storage ambient air is drawn from intake ducts by buoyancy forces generated by the heated column of air in the HI-STORM FW annulus. The upward moving air extracts heat from the MPC external surfaces by convection heat transfer. As great bulk of the heat is removed by the annulus air, the adequacy of the grid deployed to model annulus heat transfer must be confirmed prior to performing design basis calculations. To this end a grid sensitivity study is conducted in Subsection 4.4.1.6 to define the converged grid discretization of the annulus region. The converged grid is deployed to evaluate the thermal state of the HI-STORM FW system under normal, off-normal and accident conditions of storage.

iii. Principal Attributes of the 3D Model

The 3-D model implemented to analyze the HI-STORM FW system is entirely based on the HI-STORM 100 thermal model except that the radiation effect is simulated by the more precise “DO” model (in lieu of the DTRM model used in HI-STORM 100) in FLUENT in the manner of HI-STAR 180 in docket 71-9325. This model has the following key attributes:

- a) The fuel storage spaces are modeled as porous media having effective thermal-hydraulic properties.
- b) In the case of BWR MPC-89, the fuel bundle and the small surrounding spaces inside the fuel “channel” are replaced by an equivalent porous media having the flow impedance properties computed using a conservatively articulated 3-D CFD model [4.4.2]. The space between the BWR fuel channel and the storage cell is represented as an open flow annulus. The fuel channel is also explicitly modeled.

The channeled space within is also referred to as the “rodded region” that is modeled as a porous medium. The fuel assembly is assumed to be positioned coaxially with respect to its storage cell. The MPC-89 storage cell occupied with channeled BWR fuel is shown in Figure 4.4.4.

In the case of the PWR CSF, the porous medium extends to the entire cross-section of the storage cell. As described in [4.4.2], the CFD models for both the BWR and PWR storage geometries are constructed for the Design Basis fuel defined in Table 2.1.4. The model contains comprehensive details of the fuel which includes grid straps, BWR water rods and PWR guide and instrument tubes (assumed to be plugged for conservatism).

- c) The effective conductivities of the MPC storage spaces are computed for bounding fuel storage configurations defined in Paragraph 4.4.1.1(ii). The in-plane thermal conductivities are obtained using ANSYS [4.1.1] finite element models of an array of fuel rods enclosed by a square box. Radiation heat transfer from solid surfaces (cladding and box walls) is enabled in these models. Using these models the effective conduction-radiation conductivities are obtained and reported in Table 4.4.1. For heat transfer in the axial direction an area weighted mean of cladding and helium conductivities are computed (see Table 4.4.1). Axial conduction heat transfer in the fuel pellets and radiation heat dissipation in the axial direction are conservatively ignored. Thus, the thermal conductivity of the rodded region, like the porous media simulation for helium flow, is represented by a 3-D continuum having effective planar and axial conductivities. In the interest of conservatism, thermal analysis of normal storage condition in HI-STORM FW and normal onsite transfer condition in HI-TRAC VW (Section 4.5) are performed with a 10% reduced effective thermal conductivity of fuel region.
- d) The internals of the MPC, including the basket cross-section, aluminum shims, bottom flow holes, top plenum, and circumferentially irregular downcomer formed by the annulus gap in the aluminum shims are modeled explicitly. For simplicity, the flow holes are modeled as rectangular openings with an understated flow area.
- e) The inlet and outlet vents in the HI-STORM FW overpack are modeled explicitly to incorporate any effects of non-axisymmetry of inlet air passages on the system’s thermal performance.
- f) The air flow in the HI-STORM FW/MPC annulus is simulated by the $k-\omega$ turbulence model with the transitional option enabled. The adequacy of this turbulence model is confirmed in the Holtec benchmarking report [4.1.6]. The annulus grid size is selected to ensure a converged solution.(See Section 4.4.1.6).

- g) A limited number of fuel assemblies (upto 12 in MPC-37 and upto 16 in MPC-89) classified as damaged fuel are permitted to be stored in the MPC inside Damaged Fuel Containers (DFCs). A DFC can be stored in the outer peripheral locations of both MPC-37 and MPC-89 as shown in Figures 2.1.1 and 2.1.2, respectively. DFC emplaced fuel assemblies have a higher resistance to helium flow because of the debris screens. However, DFC fuel storage does not affect temperature of hot fuel stored in the core of the basket because DFC storage is limited by Technical Specifications for placement in the peripheral storage locations away from hot fuel. For this reason the thermal modeling of the fuel basket under the assumption of all storage spaces populated with intact fuel is justified.
- h) As shown in HI-STORM FW drawings in Section 1.5 the HI-STORM FW overpack is equipped with an optional heat shield to protect the inner shell and concrete from radiation heating by the emplaced MPC. The inner and outer shells and concrete are explicitly modeled. All the licensing basis thermal analyses explicitly include the heat shields. A sensitivity study is performed as described in paragraph 4.4.1.9 to evaluate the absence of heat shield on the overpack inner shell and overpack lid.
- i) To maximize lateral resistance to heat dissipation in the fuel basket, 0.8 mm full length inter- panel gaps are conservatively assumed to exist at all intersections. This approach is identical to that used in the thermal analysis of the HI-STAR 180 Package in Docket 71-9325. The shims installed in the MPC peripheral spaces (See MPC-37 and MPC-89 drawings in Section 1.5) are explicitly modeled. For conservatism bounding as-built gaps (3 mm basket-to-shims and 3 mm shims-to-shell) are assumed to exist and incorporated in the thermal models.
- j) The thermal models incorporate all modes of heat transfer (conduction, convection and radiation) in a conservative manner.
- k) The Discrete Ordinates (DO) model, previously utilized in the HI-STAR 180 docket (Docket 71-9325), is deployed to compute radiation heat transfer.
- l) Laminar flow conditions are applied in the MPC internal spaces to obtain a lowerbound rate of heat dissipation.

The 3-D model described above is illustrated in the cross-section for the MPC-89 and MPC-37 in Figures 4.4.2 and 4.4.3, respectively. A closeup of the fuel cell spaces which explicitly include the channel-to-cell gap in the 3-D model applicable to BWR fueled basket (MPC-89) is shown in Figure 4.4.4. The principal 3-D modeling conservatisms are listed below:

- 1) The storage cell spaces are loaded with high flow resistance design basis fuel assemblies (See Table 2.1.4).

- 2) Each storage cell is generating heat at its limiting value under the regionalized storage scenarios defined in Chapter 2, Section 2.1.
- 3) Axial dissipation of heat by conduction in the fuel pellets is neglected.
- 4) Dissipation of heat from the fuel rods by radiation in the axial direction is neglected.
- 5) The fuel assembly channel length for BWR fuel is overstated.
- 6) The most severe environmental factors for long-term normal storage - ambient temperature of 80°F and 10CFR71 insolation levels - were coincidentally imposed on the system.
- 7) Reasonably bounding solar absorptivity of HI-STORM FW overpack external surfaces is applied to the thermal models.
- 8) To understate MPC internal convection heat transfer, the helium pressure is understated.
- 9) No credit is taken for contact between fuel assemblies and the MPC basket wall or between the MPC basket and the basket supports.
- 10) Heat dissipation by fuel basket peripheral supports is neglected.
- 11) Lowerbound fuel basket emissivity function defined in the Metamic-HT Sourcebook [4.2.6] is adopted in the thermal analysis.
- 12) Lowerbound stainless steel emissivity obtained from cited references (See Table 4.2.1) are applied to MPC shell.
- 13) The k- ω model used for simulating the HI-STORM FW annulus flow yields uniformly conservative results [4.1.6].
- 14) Fuel assembly length is conservatively modeled equal to the height of the fuel basket.

The effect of crud resistance on fuel cladding surfaces has been evaluated and found to be negligible [4.1.8]. The evaluation assumes a thick crud layer (130 μm) with a bounding low conductivity (conductivity of helium). The crud resistance increases the clad temperature by a very small amount ($\sim 0.1^\circ\text{F}$) [4.1.8]. Accordingly this effect is neglected in the thermal evaluations.

4.4.1.2 Fuel Assembly 3-Zone Flow Resistance Model¹

The HI-STORM FW System is evaluated for storage of representative PWR and BWR fuel assemblies determined by a separate analysis, to provide maximum resistance to the axial flow of helium. These are (i) PWR fuel: W17x17 and (ii) BWR fuel: GE10x10. During fuel storage helium enters the MPC fuel cells from the bottom plenum and flows upwards through the open spaces in the fuel storage cells and exits in the top plenum. Because of the low flow velocities the helium flow in the fuel storage cells and MPC spaces is in the laminar regime ($Re < 100$). The bottom and top plenums are essentially open spaces engineered in the fuel basket ends to facilitate helium circulation. In the case of BWR fuel storage, a channel enveloping the fuel bundle divides the flow in two parallel paths. One flow path is through the in-channel or rodded region of the storage cell and the other flow path is in the square annulus area outside the

¹ This Sub-section duplicates the methodology used in the HI-STORM FSAR, Rev. 7, supporting CoC Amendment # 5 in Docket 72-1014 [4.1.8].

A survey of the elevation of nuclear plants in the U.S. shows that nuclear plants are situated near about sea level or elevated slightly (~1000 ft). The effect of the elevation on peak fuel cladding temperatures is evaluated by performing calculations for a HI-STORM FW system situated at an elevation of 1500 feet. At this elevation the ambient temperature would decrease by approximately 5°F (See Table above). The peak cladding temperatures are calculated under the reduced ambient temperature and pressure at 1500 feet elevation for the limiting regionalized storage scenario evaluated in Table 4.4.2. The results are presented in Table 4.4.9.

These results show that the PCT, including the effects of site elevation, continues to be well below the regulatory cladding temperature limit of 752°F. In light of the above evaluation, it is not necessary to place ISFSI elevation constraints for HI-STORM FW deployment at elevations up to 1500 feet. If, however, an ISFSI is sited at an elevation greater than 1500 feet, the effect of altitude on the PCT shall be quantified as part of the 10 CFR 72.212 evaluation for the site using the site ambient conditions.

4.4.4.4 Evaluation of Overpack Heat Shields

As discussed in Sub-section 4.4.1.9 above, a thermal evaluation is performed to evaluate the effect of removal of heat shields from a HI-STORM overpack. The predicted temperatures from this sensitivity study of normal condition of storage are summarized in Table 4.4.14. The peak cladding temperature, basket and MPC component temperatures decrease due to removal of heat shields. As expected, the results demonstrate an increase in overpack component temperatures. However, the overpack component temperatures are below their respective normal temperature limits with significant margins. Therefore, removal of heat shields does not have a detrimental effect on the system's thermal performance.

The temperatures of overpack components increase due to removal of heat shields under normal conditions of storage. This temperature increase is then added to the predicted temperatures of all the off-normal and accident conditions discussed in Section 4.6. The resulting temperatures are still well below their respective temperature limits which demonstrate that safety conclusions made for all the off-normal and accident condition evaluations in Section 4.6 remain valid even after the removal of heat shields from the HI-STORM overpack.

4.4.5 Maximum Internal Pressure

4.4.5.1 MPC Helium Backfill Pressure

The quantity of helium emplaced in the MPC cavity shall be sufficient to produce an operating pressure of 7.1 and 7.0 atmospheres (absolute) respectively for loading patterns A and B during normal storage conditions defined in Table 4.1.1. Thermal analyses performed on the different MPC designs indicate that this operating pressure requires a certain minimum helium backfill pressure (P_b) specified at a reference temperature (70°F). The minimum backfill pressure for each MPC type is provided in Table 4.4.7. A theoretical upper limit on the helium backfill

pressure also exists and is defined by the design pressure of the MPC vessel (Table 2.2.1). The upper limit of P_b is also reported in Table 4.4.7. To bound the minimum and maximum backfill pressures listed in Table 4.4.7 with a margin, a helium backfill specification is set forth in Table 4.4.8.

To provide additional helium backfill range for less than design basis heat load canisters a Sub-Design-Basis (SDB) heat load scenario is defined below:

- (i) MPC-37 under 80% Pattern A Heat Load (Table 1.2.3)
- (ii) MPC-37 under 90% Pattern A Heat Load (Table 1.2.3)
- (iii) MPC-89 under 80% Design Heat Load (Table 1.2.4)
- (iv) MPC-37 under vacuum drying threshold heat load in Table 4.5.11.
- (v) MPC-89 under vacuum drying threshold heat load in Table 4.5.1*.

The storage cell and MPC heat load limits under the SDB scenario (i), (ii) & (iii) are specified in Table 4.4.11. Calculations for bounding scenarios (i), (ii) & (iii) show that the maximum cladding temperature under the SDB scenario meet the ISG-11 temperature limits. The helium backfill pressure limits supporting this scenario are defined in Table 4.4.10. These backfill limits maybe optionally adopted by a cask user if the decay heats of the loaded fuel assemblies meet the SDB decay heat limits stipulated above.

Two methods are available for ensuring that the appropriate quantity of helium has been placed in an MPC:

- i. By pressure measurement
- ii. By measurement of helium backfill volume (in standard cubic feet)

The direct pressure measurement approach is more convenient if the FHD method of MPC drying is used. In this case, a certain quantity of helium is already in the MPC. Because the helium is mixed inside the MPC during the FHD operation, the temperature and pressure of the helium gas at the MPC's exit provides a reliable means to compute the inventory of helium. A shortfall or excess of helium is adjusted by a calculated raising or lowering of the MPC pressure such that the reference MPC backfill pressure is within the range specified in Table 4.4.8 or Table 4.4.10 (as applicable).

When vacuum drying is used as the method for MPC drying, then it is more convenient to fill the MPC by introducing a known quantity of helium (in standard cubic feet) by measuring the quantity of helium introduced using a calibrated mass flow meter or other measuring apparatus. The required quantity of helium is computed by the product of net free volume and helium specific volume at the reference temperature (70°F) and a target pressure that lies in the mid-range of the Table 4.4.8 pressures.

¹ Threshold scenarios (iv) and (v) are bounded by scenarios (i) and (iii) respectively because the core Region 1 assembly heat loads and total cask heat loads are bounded by the Sub-Design Basis heat loads in Table 4.4.11.

The net free volume of the MPC is obtained by subtracting B from A, where

A = MPC cavity volume in the absence of contents (fuel and non-fuel hardware) computed from nominal design dimensions

B = Total volume of the contents (fuel including DFCs, if used) based on nominal design dimensions

Using commercially available mass flow totalizers or other appropriate measuring devices, an MPC cavity is filled with the computed quantity of helium.

4.4.5.2 MPC Pressure Calculations

The MPC is initially filled with dry helium after fuel loading and drying prior to installing the MPC closure ring. During normal storage, the gas temperature within the MPC rises to its maximum operating basis temperature. The gas pressure inside the MPC will also increase with rising temperature. The pressure rise is determined using the ideal gas law. The MPC gas pressure is also subject to substantial pressure rise under hypothetical rupture of fuel rods and large gas inventory non-fuel hardware (PWR BPRAs). To minimize MPC gas pressures the number of BPRAs containing fuel assemblies must be limited to 30.

Table 4.4.4 presents a summary of the MPC free volumes determined for the fixed height MPC-89 and lowerbound height MPC-37 fuel storage scenarios. The MPC maximum gas pressure is computed for a postulated release of fission product gases from fuel rods into this free space. For these scenarios, the amounts of each of the release gas constituents in the MPC cavity are summed and the resulting total pressures determined from the ideal gas law. A concomitant effect of rod ruptures is the increased pressure and molecular weight of the cavity gases with enhanced rate of heat dissipation by internal helium convection and lower cavity temperatures. As these effects are substantial under large rod ruptures the 100% rod rupture accident is evaluated with due credit for increased heat dissipation under increased pressure and molecular weight of the cavity gases. Based on fission gases release fractions (NUREG 1536 criteria [4.4.1]), rods' net free volume and initial fill gas pressure, maximum gas pressures with 1% (normal), 10% (off-normal) and 100% (accident condition) rod rupture are given in Table 4.4.5. The results of the calculations support the following conclusions:

- (i) The maximum computed gas pressures reported in Table 4.4.5 under all design basis thermal loadings defined in Section 4.4 are all below the MPC internal design pressures for normal, off-normal and accident conditions specified in Table 2.2.1.
- (ii) The MPC gas pressure obtained under loading Pattern A is essentially same as in Pattern B. Accordingly Pattern A loading condition for pressure boundary evaluation of MPC in the HI-TRAC and under off-normal and accident conditions is retained.

Evaluation of Non-Fuel Hardware

The inclusion of PWR non-fuel hardware (BPRA control elements and thimble plugs) to the PWR basket influences the MPC internal pressure through two distinct effects. The presence of non-fuel hardware increases the effective basket conductivity, thus enhancing heat dissipation and lowering fuel temperatures as well as the temperature of the gas filling the space between fuel rods. The gas volume displaced by the mass of non-fuel hardware lowers the cavity free volume. These two effects, namely, temperature lowering and free volume reduction, have opposing influence on the MPC cavity pressure. The first effect lowers gas pressure while the second effect raises it. In the HI-STORM FW thermal analysis, the computed temperature field (with non-fuel hardware excluded) has been determined to provide a conservatively bounding temperature field for the PWR baskets. The MPC cavity free space is computed based on conservatively computed volume displacement by fuel with non-fuel hardware included. This approach ensures conservative bounding pressures.

During in-core irradiation of BPRAs, neutron capture by the B-10 isotope in the neutron absorbing material produces helium. Two different forms of the neutron absorbing material are used in BPRAs: Borosilicate glass and B₄C in a refractory solid matrix (Al₂O₃). Borosilicate glass (primarily a constituent of Westinghouse BPRAs) is used in the shape of hollow pyrex glass tubes sealed within steel rods and supported on the inside by a thin-walled steel liner. To accommodate helium diffusion from the glass rod into the rod internal space, a relatively high void volume (~40%) is engineered in this type of rod design. The rod internal pressure is thus designed to remain below reactor operation conditions (2,300 psia and approximately 600°F coolant temperature). The B₄C- Al₂O₃ neutron absorber material is principally used in B&W and CE fuel BPRA designs. The relatively low temperatures of the poison material in BPRA rods (relative to fuel pellets) favor the entrapment of helium atoms in the solid matrix.

Several BPRA designs are used in PWR fuel. They differ in the number, diameter, and length of poison rods. The older Westinghouse fuel (W-14x14 and W-15x15) has used 6, 12, 16, and 20 rods per assembly BPRAs and the later (W-17x17) fuel uses up to 24 rods per BPRA. The BPRA rods in the older fuel are much larger than the later fuel and, therefore, the B-10 isotope inventory in the 20-rod BPRAs bounds the newer W-17x17 fuel. Based on bounding BPRA rods internal pressure, a large hypothetical quantity of helium (7.2 g-moles/BPRA) is assumed to be available for release into the MPC cavity from each BPRA containing fuel assembly. For a bounding evaluation the maximum permissible number of BPRA containing fuel assemblies (see discussion at the beginning of this Section) are assumed to be loaded. The MPC cavity pressures (including helium from BPRAs) are summarized in Table 4.4.5 for the bounding MPC-37 (minimum MPC height and heat load Patterns A and B) and MPC-89 (design heat load) storage scenarios.

4.4.6 Engineered Clearances to Eliminate Thermal Interferences

Thermal stress in a structural component is the resultant sum of two factors, namely: (i) restraint of free end expansion and (ii) non-uniform temperature distribution. To minimize thermal

4.5 THERMAL EVALUATION OF SHORT-TERM OPERATIONS

4.5.1 Thermally Limiting Evolutions During Short-Term Operations

Prior to placement in a HI-STORM FW overpack, an MPC must be loaded with fuel, outfitted with closures, dewatered, dried, backfilled with helium and transported to the HI-STORM FW module. In the unlikely event that the fuel needs to be returned to the spent fuel pool, these steps must be performed in reverse. Finally, if required, transfer of a loaded MPC between HI-STORM FW overpacks or between a HI-STAR transport overpack and a HI-STORM FW storage overpack must be carried out in a safe manner. All of the above operations, henceforth referred to as “short-term operations”, are short duration events that would likely occur no more than once or twice for an individual MPC.

Chapter 9 provides a description of the typical loading steps involved in moving nuclear fuel from the spent fuel pool to dry storage in the HI-STORM FW system. The transition from a wet to a dry environment, to comply with ISG-11, Rev. 3, must occur without exceeding the short-term operation temperature limits (see Table 4.3.1).

The loading steps that present the limiting thermal condition during short term operations for the fuel are those when either one or both of the following conditions exist:

- i. The MPC’s fuel storage space is evacuated of fluids resulting in a significant decrease in internal heat transmission rates. This condition obtains if the vacuum drying method for removing moisture from the canister is employed.
- ii. The removal of heat from the external surfaces of the MPC is impeded because of the air gap between the canister and HI-TRAC VW. This condition exists, for example, when the loaded MPC is being moved inside HI-TRAC VW for staging and transfer of the MPC to the HI-STORM FW overpack.

In this section, the thermally limiting scenarios during short-term operations are identified and analyzed.

Because onsite transport of the MPC occurs with the HI-TRAC VW in the vertical orientation, the thermosiphon action within the MPC is preserved at all times. The only (rare) departure from a purely vertical orientation occurs if a tilting of the HI-TRAC VW is needed to clear an obstruction such as a low egress bay door opening at a plant. In such a case the operational imperative for HI-TRAC VW tilting must be ascertained and the permissible duration of non-vertical configuration must be established on a site-specific basis and compliance with the thermal limits of ISG-11 [4.1.4] must be demonstrated as a part of the site-specific safety evaluation under 10CFR72.212.

MATERIAL ADOPTED IN THE HI-STAR 190 SAR

HI-STAR 190 Chapter 5 Supporting Material

5.4 SHIELDING EVALUATION

The MCNP-4A code was used for all of the shielding analyses [5.1.1]. MCNP is a continuous energy, three-dimensional, coupled neutron-photon-electron Monte Carlo transport code. Continuous energy cross section data are represented with sufficient energy points to permit linear-linear interpolation between points. The individual cross section libraries used for each nuclide are those recommended by the MCNP manual. All of these data are based on ENDF/B-V data. MCNP has been extensively benchmarked against experimental data by the large user community. References [5.4.2], [5.4.3], and [5.4.4] are three examples of the benchmarking that has been performed.

The energy distribution of the source term, as described earlier, is used explicitly in the MCNP model. A different MCNP calculation is performed for each of the three source terms (neutron, decay gamma, and ^{60}Co). The axial distribution of the fuel source term is described in Table 2.1.11 and Figures 2.1.3 and 2.1.4. The PWR and BWR axial burnup distributions were obtained from References [5.4.5] and [5.4.6], respectively. These axial distributions were obtained from operating plants and are representative of PWR and BWR fuel with burnups greater than 30,000 MWD/MTU. The ^{60}Co source in the hardware was assumed to be uniformly distributed over the appropriate regions.

It has been shown that the neutron source strength varies as the burnup level raised by the power of 4.2. Since this relationship is non-linear and since the burnup in the axial center of a fuel assembly is greater than the average burnup, the neutron source strength in the axial center of the assembly is greater than the relative burnup times the average neutron source strength. In order to account for this effect, the neutron source strength in each of the 10 axial nodes listed in Table 2.1.11 was determined by multiplying the average source strength by the relative burnup level raised to the power of 4.2. The peak relative burnups listed in Table 2.1.11 for the PWR and BWR fuels are 1.105 and 1.195 respectively. Using the power of 4.2 relationship results in a 37.6% ($1.105^{4.2}/1.105$) and 76.8% ($1.195^{4.2}/1.195$) increase in the neutron source strength in the peak nodes for the PWR and BWR fuel, respectively. The total neutron source strength increases by 15.6% for the PWR fuel assemblies and 36.9% for the BWR fuel assemblies.

MCNP was used to calculate doses at the various desired locations. MCNP calculates neutron or photon flux and these values can be converted into dose by the use of dose response functions. This is done internally in MCNP and the dose response functions are listed in the input file in Appendix 5.C. The response functions used in these calculations are listed in Table 5.4.1 and were taken from ANSI/ANS 6.1.1, 1977 [5.4.1].

The dose rates at the various locations were calculated with MCNP using a two step process. The first step was to calculate the dose rate for each dose location per starting particle for each neutron and gamma group in the fuel and each axial location in the end fittings. The second and last step was to multiply the dose rate per starting particle for each group or starting location by the source strength (i.e. particles/sec) in that group or location and sum the resulting dose rates

17x17) found in references [5.2.5] and [5.2.7] to determine the TPD and BPRAs which produced the highest Cobalt-60 source term and decay heat for a specific burnup and cooling time. The bounding TPD was determined to be the Westinghouse 17x17 guide tube plug and the bounding BPRAs was actually determined by combining the higher masses of the Westinghouse 17x17 and 15x15 BPRAs into a singly hypothetical BPRAs. The masses of this TPD and BPRAs are listed in Table 5.2.30. As mentioned above, reference [5.2.5] describes the Westinghouse 14x14 water displacement guide tube plug as having a steel portion which extends into the active fuel zone. This particular water displacement guide tube plug was analyzed and determined to be bounded by the design basis TPD and BPRAs.

Once the bounding BPRAs and TPD were determined, the allowable Co-60 source and decay heat from the BPRAs and TPD were specified as: 50 curies Co-60 and 0.77 watts for each TPD and 895 curies Co-60 and 14.4 watts for each BPRAs. Table 5.2.31 shows the curies of Co-60 that were calculated for BPRAs and TPDs in each region of the fuel assembly (e.g. incore, plenum, top). An allowable burnup and cooling time, separate from the fuel assemblies, is used for BPRAs and TPDs. These burnup and cooling times assure that the Cobalt-60 activity remains below the allowable levels specified above. It should be noted that at very high burnups, greater than 200,000 MWD/MTU the TPD Co-60 source actually decreases as the burnup continues to increase. This is due to a decrease in the Cobalt-60 production rate as the initial Cobalt-59 impurity is being depleted. Conservatively, a constant cooling time has been specified for burnups from 180,000 to 630,000 MWD/MTU for the TPDs.

Section 5.4.6 discusses the increase in the cask dose rates due to the insertion of BPRAs or TPDs into fuel assemblies.

5.2.4.2 CRA and APSRs

Control rod assemblies (CRAs) (including control element assemblies and rod cluster control assemblies) and axial power shaping rod assemblies (APSRs) are an integral portion of a PWR fuel assembly. These devices are utilized for many years (upwards of 20 years) prior to discharge into the spent fuel pool. The manner in which the CRAs are utilized vary from plant to plant. Some utilities maintain the CRAs fully withdrawn during normal operation while others may operate with a bank of rods partially inserted (approximately 10%) during normal operation. Even when fully withdrawn, the ends of the CRAs are present in the upper portion of the fuel assembly since they are never fully removed from the fuel assembly during operation. The result of the different operating styles is a variation in the source term for the CRAs. In all cases, however, only the lower portion of the CRAs will be significantly activated. Therefore, when the CRAs are stored with the PWR fuel assembly, the activated portion of the CRAs will be in the lower portion of the cask. CRAs are fabricated of various materials. The cladding is typically stainless steel, although inconel has been used. The absorber can be a single material or a combination of materials. AgInCd is possibly the most common absorber although B₄C in aluminum is used, and hafnium has also been used. AgInCd produces a noticeable source term in the 0.3-1.0 MeV range due to the activation of Ag. The source term from the other absorbers is negligible, therefore the AgInCd CRAs are the bounding CRAs.

HOLTEC INTERNATIONAL COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL

APSRs are used to flatten the power distribution during normal operation and as a result these devices achieve a considerably higher activation than CRAs. There are two types of B&W stainless steel clad APSRs: gray and black. According to reference [5.2.5], the black APSRs have 36 inches of AgInCd as the absorber while the gray ones use 63 inches of inconel as the absorber. Because of the cobalt-60 source from the activation of inconel, the gray APSRs produce a higher source term than the black APSRs and therefore are the bounding APSR.

Since the level of activation of CRAs and APSRs can vary, the quantity that can be stored in an MPC is being limited. These devices are required to be stored in the locations as outlined in Section 2.1.9.

In order to determine the impact on the dose rates around the HI-STORM 100 System, source terms for the CRAs and APSRs were calculated using SAS2H and ORIGEN-S. In the ORIGEN-S calculations the cobalt-59 impurity level was conservatively assumed to be 0.8 gm/kg for stainless steel and 4.7 gm/kg for inconel. These calculations were performed by irradiating 1 kg of steel, inconel, and AgInCd using the flux calculated for the design basis B&W 15x15 fuel assembly. The total curies of cobalt for the steel and inconel and the 0.3-1.0 MeV source for the AgInCd were calculated as a function of burnup and cooling time to a maximum burnup of 630,000 MWD/MTU. For burnups beyond 45,000 MWD/MTU, it was assumed, for the purpose of the calculation, that the burned fuel assembly was replaced with a fresh fuel assembly every 45,000 MWD/MTU. This was achieved in ORIGEN-S by resetting the flux levels and cross sections to the 0 MWD/MTU condition after every 45,000 MWD/MTU. The sources were then scaled by the appropriate mass using the flux weighting factors for the different regions of the assembly to determine the final source term. Two different configurations were analyzed for both the CRAs and APSRs with an additional third configuration analyzed for the APSRs. The configurations, which are summarized below, are described in Tables 5.2.32 for the CRAs and Table 5.2.33 for the APSR. The masses of the materials listed in these tables were determined from a review of [5.2.5] with bounding values chosen. The masses listed in Tables 5.2.32 and 5.2.33 do not match exact values from [5.2.5] because the values in the reference were adjusted to the lengths shown in the tables.

Configuration 1: CRA and APSR

This configuration had the lower 15 inches of the CRA and APSR activated at full flux with two regions above the 15 inches activated at a reduced power level. This simulates a CRA or APSR which was operated at 10% insertion. The regions above the 15 inches reflect the upper portion of the fuel assembly.

Configuration 2: CRA and APSR

This configuration represents a fully removed CRA or APSR during normal core operations. The activated portion corresponds to the upper portion of a fuel assembly above the active fuel length with the appropriate flux weighting factors used.

Configuration 3: APSR

This configuration represents a fully inserted gray APSR during normal core operations. The region in full flux was assumed to be the 63 inches of the absorber.

Tables 5.2.34 and 5.2.35 present the source terms, including decay heat, that were calculated for the CRAs and APSRs respectively. The only significant source from the activation of inconel or steel is Co-60 and the only significant source from the activation of AgInCd is from 0.3-1.0 MeV. The source terms for CRAs, Table 5.2.34, were calculated for a maximum burnup of 630,000 MWD/MTU and a minimum cooling time of 5 years. Because of the significant source term in APSRs that have seen extensive in-core operations, the source term in Table 5.2.35 was calculated to be a bounding source term for a variable burnup and cooling time as outlined in Section 2.1.9. The very larger Cobalt-60 activity in configuration 3 in Table 5.2.35 is due to the assumed Cobalt-59 impurity level of 4.7 gm/kg. If this impurity level were similar to the assumed value for steel, 0.8 gm/kg, this source would decrease by approximately a factor of 5.8.

Section 5.4.6 discusses the effect on dose rate of the insertion of APSRs into the inner four fuel assemblies in the MPC-24 and inner twelve fuel assemblies in the MPC-32, as well as the insertion of CRAs into the inner twelve fuel assemblies of the MPC-24 and MPC-32.

5.2.5 Choice of Design Basis Assembly

The analysis presented in this chapter was performed to bound the fuel assembly classes listed in Tables 2.1.1 and 2.1.2. In order to perform a bounding analysis, a design basis fuel assembly must be chosen. Therefore, a fuel assembly from each fuel class was analyzed and a comparison of the neutrons/sec, photons/sec, and thermal power (watts) was performed. The fuel assembly that produced the highest source for a specified burnup, cooling time, and enrichment was chosen as the design basis fuel assembly. A separate design basis assembly was chosen for the PWR MPCs (MPC-24 and MPC-32) and the BWR MPCs (MPC-68).

5.2.5.1 PWR Design Basis Assembly

Table 2.1.1 lists the PWR fuel assembly classes that were evaluated to determine the design basis PWR fuel assembly. Within each class, the fuel assembly with the highest UO₂ mass was analyzed. Since the variations of fuel assemblies within a class are very minor (pellet diameter, clad thickness, etc.), it is conservative to choose the assembly with the highest UO₂ mass. For a given class of assemblies, the one with the highest UO₂ mass will produce the highest radiation source because, for a given burnup (MWD/MTU) and enrichment, the highest UO₂ mass will have produced the most energy and therefore the most fission products.

Table 5.2.25 presents the characteristics of the fuel assemblies analyzed to determine the design basis zircaloy clad PWR fuel assembly. The corresponding fuel assembly array class from Section 2.1.9 is also listed in the table. The fuel assembly listed for each class is the assembly with the highest UO₂ mass. The St. Lucie and Ft. Calhoun classes are not present in Table 5.2.25. These assemblies are shorter versions of the CE 16x16 and CE 14x14 assembly classes,

HOLTEC INTERNATIONAL COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL

Table 5.4.16

DOSE RATES DUE TO CRAs FROM THE 100-TON HI-TRAC
FOR NORMAL CONDITIONS

Dose Point Location	MPC-24		MPC-32	
	Config. 1 (mrem/hr)	Config. 2 (mrem/hr)	Config. 1 (mrem/hr)	Config. 2 (mrem/hr)
ADJACENT TO THE 100-TON HI-TRAC				
1	49.65	8.99	25.25	5.12
2	3.15	0.08	0.12	0.01
3	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5 (pool lid)	1061.33	213.34	1504.83	300.86
5 (transfer lid)	1846.04	349.09	2785.92	521.49
5 (t-outer)	36.32	5.82	15.21	2.76
ONE METER FROM THE 100-TON HI-TRAC				
1	28.42	3.59	5.11	0.97
2	13.64	1.19	0.67	0.09
3	0.20	0.02	0.02	0.00
4	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5 (transfer lid)	545.93	100.60	638.62	119.05
5 (t-outer)	29.81	5.51	30.89	5.88

Notes:

- Refer to Figures 5.1.2 and 5.1.4 for dose locations.
- Dose location 5 (t-outer) is the radial segment at dose location 5 (transfer lid) which is 30-42 and 54-66 inches from the center of the lid for the adjacent and one meter locations, respectively. The inner radius of the HI-TRAC is 34.375 in. and the outer radius of the water jacket is 44.375 in.
- Dose rate based on no water within the MPC. For the majority of the duration that the HI-TRAC pool lid is installed, the MPC cavity will be flooded with water. The water within the MPC greatly reduces the dose rate.

Table 5.4.17

DOSE RATES DUE TO APSRs FROM THE 100-TON HI-TRAC
FOR NORMAL CONDITIONS

Dose Point Location	MPC-24			MPC-32		
	Config. 1 (mrem/hr)	Config. 2 (mrem/hr)	Config. 3 (mrem/hr)	Config. 1 (mrem/hr)	Config. 2 (mrem/hr)	Config. 3 (mrem/hr)
ADJACENT TO THE 100-TON HI-TRAC						
1	12.42	2.35	12.25	57.80	11.73	56.80
2	0.21	0.01	9.12	0.29	0.02	17.70
3	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.09
5 (pool lid)	1996.57	371.98	1941.51	3243.57	645.11	3698.77
5 (transfer)	3021.08	572.85	2994.54	5522.01	1035.17	5664.10
5 (t-outer)	3.41	0.54	3.57	33.25	5.97	31.46
ONE METER FROM THE 100-TON HI-TRAC						
1	2.73	0.46	3.49	11.69	2.22	11.36
2	0.61	0.07	3.31	1.55	0.20	6.53
3	0.02	0.00	0.04	0.05	0.01	0.08
4	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.09
5 (transfer)	458.06	84.81	444.44	1288.04	240.05	1211.44
5 (t-outer)	17.11	3.19	17.36	64.18	12.16	62.83

Notes:

- Refer to Figures 5.1.2 and 5.1.4 for dose locations.
- Dose location 5 (t-outer) is the radial segment at dose location 5 (transfer lid) which is 30-42 and 54-66 inches from the center of the lid for the adjacent and one meter locations, respectively. The inner radius of the HI-TRAC is 34.375 in. and the outer radius of the water jacket is 44.375 in.
- Dose rate based on no water within the MPC. For the majority of the duration that the HI-TRAC pool lid is installed, the MPC cavity will be flooded with water. The water within the MPC greatly reduces the dose rate.

Configuration 3: APSR

This configuration represents a fully inserted gray APSR during normal core operations. The region in full flux was assumed to be the 63 inches of the absorber.

Tables 5.2.34 and 5.2.35 present the source terms, including decay heat, that were calculated for the CRAs and APSRs respectively. The only significant source from the activation of inconel or steel is Co-60 and the only significant source from the activation of AgInCd is from 0.3-1.0 MeV. The source terms for CRAs, Table 5.2.34, were calculated for a maximum burnup of 630,000 MWD/MTU and a minimum cooling time of 5 years. Because of the significant source term in APSRs that have seen extensive in-core operations, the source term in Table 5.2.35 was calculated to be a bounding source term for a variable burnup and cooling time as outlined in Section 2.1.9. The very larger Cobalt-60 activity in configuration 3 in Table 5.2.35 is due to the assumed Cobalt-59 impurity level of 4.7 gm/kg. If this impurity level were similar to the assumed value for steel, 0.8 gm/kg, this source would decrease by approximately a factor of 5.8.

Section 5.4.6 discusses the effect on dose rate of the insertion of APSRs into the inner four fuel assemblies in the MPC-24 and inner twelve fuel assemblies in the MPC-32, as well as the insertion of CRAs into the inner twelve fuel assemblies of the MPC-24 and MPC-32.

5.2.5 Choice of Design Basis Assembly

The analysis presented in this chapter was performed to bound the fuel assembly classes listed in Tables 2.1.1 and 2.1.2. In order to perform a bounding analysis, a design basis fuel assembly must be chosen. Therefore, a fuel assembly from each fuel class was analyzed and a comparison of the neutrons/sec, photons/sec, and thermal power (watts) was performed. The fuel assembly that produced the highest source for a specified burnup, cooling time, and enrichment was chosen as the design basis fuel assembly. A separate design basis assembly was chosen for the PWR MPCs (MPC-24 and MPC-32) and the BWR MPCs (MPC-68).

5.2.5.1 PWR Design Basis Assembly

Table 2.1.1 lists the PWR fuel assembly classes that were evaluated to determine the design basis PWR fuel assembly. Within each class, the fuel assembly with the highest UO₂ mass was analyzed. Since the variations of fuel assemblies within a class are very minor (pellet diameter, clad thickness, etc.), it is conservative to choose the assembly with the highest UO₂ mass. For a given class of assemblies, the one with the highest UO₂ mass will produce the highest radiation source because, for a given burnup (MWD/MTU) and enrichment, the highest UO₂ mass will have produced the most energy and therefore the most fission products.

Table 5.2.25 presents the characteristics of the fuel assemblies analyzed to determine the design basis zircaloy clad PWR fuel assembly. The corresponding fuel assembly array class from Section 2.1.9 is also listed in the table. The fuel assembly listed for each class is the assembly with the highest UO₂ mass. The St. Lucie and Ft. Calhoun classes are not present in Table 5.2.25. These assemblies are shorter versions of the CE 16x16 and CE 14x14 assembly classes,

HOLTEC INTERNATIONAL COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL

respectively. Therefore, these assemblies are bounded by the CE 16x16 and CE 14x14 classes and were not explicitly analyzed. Since the Indian Point 1, Haddam Neck, and San Onofre 1 classes are stainless steel clad fuel, these classes were analyzed separately and are discussed below. All fuel assemblies in Table 5.2.25 were analyzed at the same burnup and cooling time. The initial enrichment used in the analysis is consistent with Table 5.2.24. The results of the comparison are provided in Table 5.2.27. These results indicate that the B&W 15x15 fuel assembly has the highest radiation source term of the zircaloy clad fuel assembly classes considered in Table 2.1.1. This fuel assembly also has the highest UO₂ mass (see Table 5.2.25) which confirms that, for a given initial enrichment, burnup, and cooling time, the assembly with the highest UO₂ mass produces the highest radiation source term. The power/assembly values used in Table 5.2.25 were calculated by dividing 110% of the thermal power for commercial PWR reactors using that array class by the number of assemblies in the core. The higher thermal power, 110%, was used to account for potential power uprates. The power level used for the B&W15 is an additional 17% higher for consistency with previous revisions of the FSAR which also used this assembly as the design basis assembly.

The Haddam Neck and San Onofre 1 classes are shorter stainless steel clad versions of the WE 15x15 and WE 14x14 classes, respectively. Since these assemblies have stainless steel clad, they were analyzed separately as discussed in Section 5.2.3. Based on the results in Table 5.2.27, which show that the WE 15x15 assembly class has a higher source term than the WE 14x14 assembly class, the Haddam Neck, WE 15x15, fuel assembly was analyzed as the bounding PWR stainless steel clad fuel assembly. The Indian Point 1 fuel assembly is a unique 14x14 design with a smaller mass of fuel and clad than the WE14x14. Therefore, it is also bounded by the WE 15x15 stainless steel fuel assembly.

As discussed below in Section 5.2.5.3, the allowable burnup limits in Section 2.1.9 were calculated for different array classes rather than using the design basis assembly to calculate the allowable burnups for all array classes. As mentioned above, the design basis assembly has the highest neutron and gamma source term of the various array classes for the same burnup and cooling time. In order to account for the fact that different array classes have different allowable burnups for the same cooling time, burnups which bound the 14x14A array class were used with the design basis assembly for the analysis in this chapter because those burnups bound the burnups from all other PWR array classes. This approach assures that the calculated source terms and dose rates will be conservative.

5.2.5.2 BWR Design Basis Assembly

Table 2.1.2 lists the BWR fuel assembly classes that were evaluated to determine the design basis BWR fuel assembly. Since there are minor differences between the array types in the GE BWR/2-3 and GE BWR/4-6 assembly classes, these assembly classes were not considered individually but rather as a single class. Within that class, the array types, 7x7, 8x8, 9x9, and 10x10 were analyzed to determine the bounding BWR fuel assembly. Since the Humboldt Bay 7x7 and Dresden 1 8x8 are smaller versions of the 7x7 and 8x8 assemblies they are bounded by the 7x7 and 8x8 assemblies in the GE BWR/2-3 and GE BWR/4-6 classes. Within each array

HOLTEC INTERNATIONAL COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL

type, the fuel assembly with the highest UO_2 mass was analyzed. Since the variations of fuel assemblies within an array type are very minor, it is conservative to choose the assembly with the highest UO_2 mass. For a given array type of assemblies, the one with the highest UO_2 mass will produce the highest radiation source because, for a given burnup (MWD/MTU) and enrichment, it will have produced the most energy and therefore the most fission products. The Humboldt Bay 6x6, Dresden 1 6x6, and LaCrosse assembly classes were not considered in the determination of the bounding fuel assembly. However, these assemblies were analyzed explicitly as discussed below.

Table 5.2.26 presents the characteristics of the fuel assemblies analyzed to determine the design basis zircaloy clad BWR fuel assembly. The corresponding fuel assembly array class from Section 2.1.9 is also listed in the table. The fuel assembly listed for each array type is the assembly that has the highest UO_2 mass. All fuel assemblies in Table 5.2.26 were analyzed at the same burnup and cooling time. The initial enrichment used in these analyses is consistent with Table 5.2.24. The results of the comparison are provided in Table 5.2.28. These results indicate that the 7x7 fuel assembly has the highest radiation source term of the zircaloy clad fuel assembly classes considered in Table 2.1.2. This fuel assembly also has the highest UO_2 mass which confirms that, for a given initial enrichment, burnup, and cooling time, the assembly with the highest UO_2 mass produces the highest radiation source term. According to Reference [5.2.6], the last discharge of a 7x7 assembly was in 1985 and the maximum average burnup for a 7x7 during their operation was 29,000 MWD/MTU. This clearly indicates that the existing 7x7 assemblies have an average burnup and minimum cooling time that is well within the burnup and cooling time limits in Section 2.1.9. Therefore, the 7x7 assembly has never reached the burnup level analyzed in this chapter. However, in the interest of conservatism the 7x7 was chosen as the bounding fuel assembly array type. The power/assembly values used in Table 5.2.26 were calculated by dividing 120% of the thermal power for commercial BWR reactors by the number of assemblies in the core. The higher thermal power, 120%, was used to account for potential power uprates. The power level used for the 7x7 is an additional 4% higher for consistency with previous revisions of the FSAR which also used this assembly as the design basis assembly.

Since the LaCrosse fuel assembly type is a stainless steel clad 10x10 assembly it was analyzed separately. The maximum burnup and minimum cooling time for this assembly are limited to 22,500 MWD/MTU and 10-year cooling as specified in Section 2.1.9. This assembly type is discussed further in Section 5.2.3.

The Humboldt Bay 6x6 and Dresden 1 6x6 fuel are older and shorter fuel than the other array types analyzed and therefore are considered separately. The Dresden 1 6x6 was chosen as the design basis fuel assembly for the Humboldt Bay 6x6 and Dresden 1 6x6 fuel assembly classes because it has the higher UO_2 mass. Dresden 1 also contains a few 6x6 MOX fuel assemblies, which were explicitly analyzed as well.

Reference [5.2.6] indicates that the Dresden 1 6x6 fuel assembly has a higher UO_2 mass than the Dresden 1 8x8 or the Humboldt Bay fuel (6x6 and 7x7). Therefore, the Dresden 1 6x6 fuel assembly was also chosen as the bounding assembly for damaged fuel and fuel debris for the

HOLTEC INTERNATIONAL COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL

for PWR and BWR fuel, respectively. Using this comparison, it may be possible to bound the entire inventory with a single burnup and enrichment value (in combination with a lower bound cooling time). Additional considerations for this approach are as follows:

- The comparison was performed for design basis fuel. It is expected that the same conclusions would be valid for other fuel types, but that has not been demonstrated.
- Small deviations from the combinations listed in Table 5.2.24 for a limited number of assemblies would have an insignificant effect on doses (see Section 5.2.2) and may therefore be accepted without further evaluation.
- Assemblies with an enrichment below that listed in Table 5.2.24 for a given burnup may still be bounded by the assemblies with a higher burnup listed in that table, since the comparison shows margin in most cases. Therefore, a site-specific expansion of the table using source term comparisons may still allow a single bounding burnup and enrichment combination to be used in the dose analysis.

5.2.6 Thoria Rod Canister

Dresden Unit 1 has a single DFC containing 18 thoria rods which have obtained a relatively low burnup, 16,000 MWD/MTU. These rods were removed from two 8x8 fuel assemblies which contained 9 rods each. The irradiation of thorium produces an isotope which is not commonly found in depleted uranium fuel. Th-232 when irradiated produces U-233. The U-233 can undergo an (n,2n) reaction which produces U-232. The U-232 decays to produce Tl-208 which produces a 2.6 MeV gamma during Beta decay. This results in a significant source in the 2.5-3.0 MeV range which is not commonly present in depleted uranium fuel. Therefore, this single DFC container was analyzed to determine if it was bounded by the current shielding analysis.

A radiation source term was calculated for the 18 thoria rods using SAS2H and ORIGEN-S for a burnup of 16,000 MWD/MTU and a cooling time of 18 years. Table 5.2.36 describes the 8x8 fuel assembly that contains the thoria rods. Table 5.2.37 and 5.2.38 show the gamma and neutron source terms, respectively, that were calculated for the 18 thoria rods in the thoria rod canister. Comparing these source terms to the design basis 6x6 source terms for Dresden Unit 1 fuel in Tables 5.2.7 and 5.2.18 clearly indicates that the design basis source terms bound the thoria rods source terms in all neutron groups and in all gamma groups except the 2.5-3.0 MeV group. As mentioned above, the thoria rods have a significant source in this energy range due to the decay of Tl-208.

Section 5.4.8 provides a further discussion of the thoria rod canister and its acceptability for storage in the HI-STORM 100 System.

5.2.7 Fuel Assembly Neutron Sources

Neutron source assemblies (NSAs) are used in reactors for startup. There are different types of neutron sources (e.g. californium, americium-beryllium, plutonium-beryllium, polonium-beryllium, antimony-beryllium). These neutron sources are typically inserted into the water rod

of a fuel assembly and are usually removable.

5.2.7.1 PWR Neutron Source Assemblies

During in-core operations, the stainless steel and inconel portions of the NSAs become activated, producing a significant amount of Co-60. Reference [5.2.5] provides the masses of steel and inconel for the NSAs. Using these masses it was determined that the total activation of a primary or secondary source is bound by the total activation of a BPRA (see Table 5.2.31). Therefore, storage of NSAs is acceptable and a detailed dose rate analysis using the gamma source from activated NSAs is not performed. Conservatively, the burnup and cooling time limits for TPDs, as listed in Section 2.1.9, are being applied to NSAs since they cover a larger range of burnups.

Antimony-beryllium sources are used as secondary (regenerative) neutron sources in reactor cores. The Sb-Be source produces neutrons from a gamma-n reaction in the beryllium, where the gamma originates from the decay of neutron-activated antimony. The very short half-life of ^{124}Sb , 60.2 days, however results in a complete decay of the initial amount generated in the reactor within a few years after removal from the reactor. The production of neutrons by the Sb-Be source through regeneration in the MPC is orders of magnitude lower than the design-basis fuel assemblies. Therefore Sb-Be sources do not contribute to the total neutron source in the MPC.

Primary neutron sources (californium, americium-beryllium, plutonium-beryllium and polonium-beryllium) are usually placed in the reactor with a source-strength on the order of $5\text{E}+08$ n/s. This source strength is similar to, but not greater than, the maximum design-basis fuel assembly source strength listed in Tables 5.2.15 and 5.2.16.

By the time NSAs are stored in the MPC, the primary neutron sources will have been decaying for many years since they were first inserted into the reactor (typically greater than 10 years). For the ^{252}Cf source, with a half-life of 2.64 years, this means a significant reduction in the source intensity; while the ^{210}Po -Be source, with a half-life of 138 days, is virtually eliminated. The ^{238}Pu -Be and ^{241}Am -Be sources, however, have a significantly longer half-life, 87.4 years and 433 years, respectively. As a result, their source intensity does not decrease significantly before storage in the MPC. Since the ^{238}Pu -Be and ^{241}Am -Be sources may have a source intensity similar to a design-basis fuel assembly when they are stored in the MPC, only a single NSA is permitted for storage in the MPC. Since storage of a single NSA would not significantly increase the total neutron source in an MPC, storage of NSAs is acceptable and detailed dose rate analysis of the neutron source from NSAs is not performed.

For ease of implementation in the CoC, the restriction concerning the number of NSAs is being applied to all types of NSAs. In addition, conservatively NSAs are required to be stored in the inner region of the MPC basket as specified in Section 2.1.9.

5.2.7.2 BWR Neutron Source Assemblies

Dresden Unit 1 has a few antimony-beryllium neutron sources. These sources have been analyzed

HOLTEC INTERNATIONAL COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL

in Section 5.4.7 to demonstrate that they are acceptable for storage in the HI-STORM 100 System.

5.2.8 Stainless Steel Channels

The LaCrosse nuclear plant used two types of channels for their BWR assemblies: stainless steel and zircaloy. Since the irradiation of zircaloy does not produce significant activation, there are no restrictions on the storage of these channels and they are not explicitly analyzed in this chapter. The stainless steel channels, however, can produce a significant amount of activation, predominantly from Co-60. LaCrosse has thirty-two stainless steel channels, a few of which have been in the reactor core for, approximately, the lifetime of the plant. Therefore, the activation of the stainless steel channels was conservatively calculated to demonstrate that they are acceptable for storage in the HI-STORM 100 system. For conservatism, the number of stainless steel channels in an MPC-68 is being limited to sixteen and Section 2.1.9 requires that these channels be stored in the inner sixteen locations.

The activation of a single stainless steel channel was calculated by simulating the irradiation of the channels with ORIGEN-S using the flux calculated from the LaCrosse fuel assembly. The mass of the steel channel in the active fuel zone (83 inches) was used in the analysis. For burnups beyond 22,500 MWD/MTU, it was assumed, for the purpose of the calculation, that the burned fuel assembly was replaced with a fresh fuel assembly every 22,500 MWD/MTU. This was achieved in ORIGEN-S by resetting the flux levels and cross sections to the 0 MWD/MTU condition after every 22,500 MWD/MTU.

LaCrosse was commercially operated from November 1969 until it was shutdown in April 1987. Therefore, the shortest cooling time for the assemblies and the channels is 13 years. Assuming the plant operated continually from 11/69 until 4/87, approximately 17.5 years or 6388 days, the accumulated burnup for the channels would be 186,000 MWD/MTU (6388 days times 29.17 MW/MTU from Table 5.2.3). Therefore, the cobalt activity calculated for a single stainless steel channel irradiated for 180,000 MWD/MTU was calculated to be 667 curies of Co-60 for 13 years cooling. This is equivalent to a source of $4.94\text{E}+13$ photons/sec in the energy range of 1.0-1.5 MeV.

In order to demonstrate that sixteen stainless steel channels are acceptable for storage in an MPC-68, a comparison of source terms is performed. Table 5.2.8 indicates that the source term for the LaCrosse design basis fuel assembly in the 1.0-1.5 MeV range is $6.34\text{E}+13$ photons/sec for 10 years cooling, assuming a 144 inch active fuel length. This is equivalent to $4.31\text{E}+15$ photons/sec/cask. At 13 years cooling, the fuel source term in that energy range decreases to $4.31\text{E}+13$ photons/sec which is equivalent to $2.93\text{E}+15$ photons/sec/cask. If the source term from the stainless steel channels is scaled to 144 inches and added to the 13 year fuel source term the result is $4.30\text{E}+15$ photons/sec/cask ($2.93\text{E}+15$ photons/sec/cask + $4.94\text{E}+13$ photons/sec/channel x 144 inch/83 inch x 16 channels/cask). This number is equivalent to the 10 year $4.31\text{E}+15$ photons/sec/cask source calculated from Table 5.2.8 and used in the shielding

discusses the placement of temporary shielding in this area. For the 100-ton HI-TRAC, the optional temporary shield ring will replace the water that was lost from the axial reduction in the water jacket thereby eliminating the localized hot spot. When the HI-TRAC is in the horizontal position, during transport operations, it will (at a minimum) be positioned a few feet off the ground by the transport vehicle and therefore this location below the lifting trunnions will be positioned above people which will minimize the effect on personnel exposure. In addition, good operating practice will dictate that personnel remain at least a few feet away from the transport vehicle. During vertical transport of a loaded HI-TRAC, the localized hot spot will be even further from the operating personnel. Based on these considerations, the conclusion is that this localized hot spot does not significantly impact the personnel exposure.

5.4.2 Damaged Fuel Post-Accident Shielding Evaluation

5.4.2.1 Dresden 1 and Humboldt Bay Damaged Fuel

As discussed in Section 5.2.5.2, the analysis presented below, even though it is for damaged fuel, demonstrates the acceptability of storing intact Humboldt Bay 6x6 and intact Dresden 1 6x6 fuel assemblies.

For the damaged fuel and fuel debris accident condition, it is conservatively assumed that the damaged fuel cladding ruptures and all the fuel pellets fall and collect at the bottom of the damaged fuel container. The inner dimension of the damaged fuel container, specified in the Design Drawings of Chapter 1, and the design basis damaged fuel and fuel debris assembly dimensions in Table 5.2.2 are used to calculate the axial height of the rubble in the damaged fuel container assuming 50% compaction. Neglecting the fuel pellet to cladding inner diameter gap, the volume of cladding and fuel pellets available for deposit is calculated assuming the fuel rods are solid. Using the volume in conjunction with the damaged fuel container, the axial height of rubble is calculated to be 80 inches.

Dividing the total fuel gamma source for a 6x6 fuel assembly in Table 5.2.7 by the 80 inch rubble height provides a gamma source per inch of $3.41\text{E}+12$ photon/s. Dividing the total neutron source for a 6x6 fuel assembly in Table 5.2.18 by 80 inches provides a neutron source per inch of $2.75\text{E}+05$ neutron/s. These values are both bounded by the BWR design basis fuel gamma source per inch and neutron source per inch values of $1.08\text{E}+13$ photon/s and $9.17\text{E}+05$ neutron/s, respectively, for a burnup and cooling time of 40,000 MWD/MTU and 5 years. These BWR design basis values were calculated by dividing the total source strengths for 40,000 MWD/MTU and 5 year cooling by the active fuel length of 144 inches. Therefore, damaged Dresden 1 and Humboldt Bay fuel assemblies are bounded by the design basis intact BWR fuel assembly for accident conditions. No explicit analysis of the damaged fuel dose rates from Dresden 1 or Humboldt Bay fuel assemblies are provided as they are bounded by the intact fuel analysis.

5.4.2.2 Generic PWR and BWR Damaged Fuel

The Holtec Generic PWR and BWR DFCs are designed to accommodate any PWR or BWR fuel assembly that can physically fit inside the DFC. Damaged fuel assemblies under normal conditions, for the most part, resemble intact fuel assemblies from a shielding perspective. Under accident conditions, it can not be guaranteed that the damaged fuel assembly will remain intact. As a result, the damaged fuel assembly may begin to resemble fuel debris in its possible configuration after an accident.

Since damaged fuel is identical to intact fuel from a shielding perspective no specific analysis is required for damaged fuel under normal conditions. However, a generic shielding evaluation was performed to demonstrate that fuel debris under normal or accident conditions, or damaged fuel in a post-accident configuration, will not result in a significant increase in the dose rates around the 100-ton HI-TRAC. Only the 100-ton HI-TRAC was analyzed because it can be concluded that if the dose rate change is not significant for the 100-ton HI-TRAC then the change will not be significant for the 125-ton HI-TRACs or the HI-STORM overpacks.

Fuel debris or a damaged fuel assembly which has collapsed can have an average fuel density which is higher than the fuel density for an intact fuel assembly. If the damaged fuel assembly was to fully or partially collapse, the fuel density in one portion of the assembly would increase and the density in the other portion of the assembly would decrease. This scenario was analyzed with MCNP-4A in a conservative bounding fashion to determine the potential change in dose rate as a result of fuel debris or a damaged fuel assembly collapse. The analysis consisted of modeling the fuel assemblies in the damaged fuel locations in the MPC-24 (4 peripheral locations in the MPC-24E or MPC-24EF) and the MPC-68 (16 peripheral locations) with a fuel density that was twice the normal fuel density and correspondingly increasing the source rate for these locations by a factor of two. A flat axial power distribution was used which is approximately representative of the source distribution if the top half of an assembly collapsed into the bottom half of the assembly. Increasing the fuel density over the entire fuel length, rather than in the top half or bottom half of the fuel assembly, is conservative and provides the dose rate change in both the top and bottom portion of the cask.

Tables 5.4.13 and 5.4.14 provide the results for the MPC-24 and MPC-68, respectively. Only the radial dose rates are provided since the axial dose rates will not be significantly affected because the damaged fuel assemblies are located on the periphery of the baskets. A comparison of these results to the results in Tables 5.1.7 and 5.4.9 indicate that the dose rates in the top and bottom portion of the 100-ton HI-TRAC increase by less than 27% while the dose rate in the center of the HI-TRAC actually decreases a little bit. The increase in the bottom and top is due to the assumed flat power distribution. The dose rates shown in Tables 5.4.13 and 5.4.14 were averaged over the circumference of the cask. Since almost all of the peripheral cells in the MPC-68 are filled with DFCs, an azimuthal variation would not be expected for the MPC-68. However, since there are only 4 DFCs in the MPC-24E, an azimuthal variation in dose due to the damaged fuel/fuel debris might be expected. Therefore, the dose rates were evaluated in four smaller regions, one outside each DFC, that encompass about 44% of the circumference. There was no significant change in the dose rate as a result of the localized dose calculation. These results

indicate that the potential effect on the dose rate is not very significant for the storage of damaged fuel and/or fuel debris. This conclusion is further reinforced by the fact that the majority of the significantly damaged fuel assemblies in the spent fuel inventories are older assemblies from the earlier days of nuclear plant operations. Therefore, these assemblies will have a considerably lower burnup and longer cooling times than the assemblies analyzed in this chapter.

The MPC-32 was not explicitly analyzed for damaged fuel or fuel debris in this chapter. However, based on the analysis described above for the MPC-24 and the MPC-68, it can be concluded that the shielding performance of the MPC-32 will not be significantly affected by the storage of damaged fuel.

5.4.3 Site Boundary Evaluation

NUREG-1536 [5.2.1] states that detailed calculations need not be presented since SAR Chapter 12 assigns ultimate compliance responsibilities to the site licensee. Therefore, this subsection describes, by example, the general methodology for performing site boundary dose calculations. The site-specific fuel characteristics, burnup, cooling time, and the site characteristics would be factored into the evaluation performed by the licensee.

As an example of the methodology, the dose from a single HI-STORM overpack loaded with an MPC-24 and various arrays of loaded HI-STORMs at distances equal to and greater than 100 meters were evaluated with MCNP. In the model, the casks were placed on an infinite slab of dirt to account for earth-shine effects. The atmosphere was represented by dry air at a uniform density corresponding to 20 degrees C. The height of air modeled was 700 meters. This is more than sufficient to properly account for skyshine effects. The models included either 500 or 1050 meters of air around the cask. Based on the behavior of the dose rate as a function of distance, 50 meters of air, beyond the detector locations, is sufficient to account for back-scattering. Therefore, the HI-STORM MCNP off-site dose models account for back scattering by including more than 50 meters of air beyond the detector locations for all cited dose rates. Since gamma back-scattering has an effect on the off-site dose, it is recommended that the site-specific evaluation under 10CFR72.212 include at least 50 to 100 meters of air, beyond the detector locations, in the calculational models.

The MCNP calculations of the off-site dose used a two-stage process. In the first stage a binary surface source file (MCNP terminology) containing particle track information was written for particles crossing the outer radial and top surfaces of the HI-STORM overpack. In the second stage of the calculation, this surface source file was used with the particle tracks originating on the outer edge of the overpack and the dose rate was calculated at the desired location (hundreds of meters away from the overpack). The results from this two-stage process are statistically the same as the results from a single calculation. However, the advantage of the two-stage process is that each stage can be optimized independently.

into account peaking due to radiation streaming or azimuthal variation. For the MPC-32, the peak-to-average values calculated for the MPC-24 were used.

5.4.2 Damaged Fuel Post-Accident Shielding Evaluation

As discussed in Subsection 5.2.5.2, the analysis presented below, even though it is for damaged fuel, demonstrates the acceptability of transporting intact Humboldt Bay 6x6 and intact Dresden 1 6x6 fuel assemblies. As discussed in Subsection 5.2.8, the Trojan damaged fuel and fuel debris were not explicitly analyzed because they are bounded by the intact fuel assemblies.

For the damaged fuel and fuel debris accident condition, it is conservatively assumed the damaged fuel cladding ruptures and all the fuel pellets fall and collect at the bottom of the damaged fuel container. The inner dimension of the damaged fuel container, specified in the Design Drawings of Section 1.4, and the design basis damaged fuel and fuel debris assembly dimensions in Table 5.2.2 are used to calculate the axial height of the rubble in the damaged fuel container assuming 50% compaction. Neglecting the fuel pellet to cladding inner diameter gap, the volume of cladding and fuel pellets available for deposit is calculated assuming the fuel rods are solid. Using the volume in conjunction with the damaged fuel container, the axial height of rubble is calculated to be 80 inches.

Some of the 6x6 assemblies described in Table 5.2.2 were manufactured with Inconel grid spacers (the mass of inconel is listed in Table 5.2.2). The calculated ^{60}Co activity from these spacers was 66.7 curies for a burnup of 30,000 MWD/MTU and a cooling time of 18 years. Including this source with the total fuel gamma source for damaged fuel in Table 5.2.6 and dividing by the 80 inch rubble height provides a gamma source per inch of $3.47\text{E}+12$ photon/s. Dividing the total neutron source for damaged fuel in Table 5.2.14 by 80 inches provides a neutron source per inch of $5.24\text{E}+5$ neutron/s. These values are both bounded by the BWR design basis fuel gamma source per inch and neutron source per inch values of $5.03\text{E}+12$ photon/s and $6.63\text{E}+5$ neutron/s. These BWR design basis values were calculated by dividing the total source strengths as calculated from Tables 5.2.5 and 5.2.13 (39,500 MWD/MTU and 14 year cooling values) by the active fuel length of 144 inches. Additionally, a separate analysis added the calculated ^{60}Co activity from the Inconel grid spacers to the 1.0 to 1.5 MeV energy range of the gamma source rather than to the total of the fuel gamma source. While the gamma source in the 1.0 to 1.5 MeV range is not bounded, the resulting dose rate is still below the limit, since the contribution from the other energy ranges are lower. The resulting side dose rates from the damaged fuel assemblies are approximately 20 to 25% lower than the side dose rates from the design basis BWR intact fuel assemblies. Therefore, the design basis damaged fuel assembly is bounded by the design basis intact BWR fuel assembly for accident conditions. No explicit analysis of the damaged fuel dose rates are provided as they are bounded by the intact fuel analysis.

5.3 MODEL SPECIFICATIONS

The shielding analysis of the HI-STORM 100 System was performed with MCNP-4A [5.1.1]. MCNP is a Monte Carlo transport code that offers a full three-dimensional combinatorial geometry modeling capability including such complex surfaces as cones and tori. This means that no gross approximations were required to represent the HI-STORM 100 System, including the HI-TRAC transfer casks, in the shielding analysis. A sample input file for MCNP is provided in Appendix 5.C.

As discussed in Section 5.1.1, off-normal conditions do not have any implications for the shielding analysis. Therefore, the MCNP models and results developed for the normal conditions also represent the off-normal conditions. Section 5.1.2 discussed the accident conditions and stated that the only accident that would impact the shielding analysis would be a loss of the neutron shield (water) in the HI-TRAC. Therefore, the MCNP model of the normal HI-TRAC condition has the neutron shield in place while the accident condition replaces the neutron shield with void. Section 5.1.2 also mentioned that there is no credible accident scenario that would impact the HI-STORM shielding analysis. Therefore, models and results for the normal and accident conditions are identical for the HI-STORM overpack.

5.3.1 Description of the Radial and Axial Shielding Configuration

Chapter 1 provides the drawings that describe the HI-STORM 100 System, including the HI-TRAC transfer casks. These drawings, using nominal dimensions, were used to create the MCNP models used in the radiation transport calculations. Modeling deviations from these drawings are discussed below. Figures 5.3.1 through 5.3.6 show cross sectional views of the HI-STORM 100 overpack and MPC as it was modeled in MCNP for each of the MPCs. Figures 5.3.1 through 5.3.3 were created with the MCNP two-dimensional plotter and are drawn to scale. The inlet and outlet vents were modeled explicitly, therefore, streaming through these components is accounted for in the calculations of the dose adjacent to the overpack and at 1 meter. Figure 5.3.7 shows a cross sectional view of the 100-ton HI-TRAC with the MPC-24 inside as it was modeled in MCNP. Since the fins and pocket trunnions were modeled explicitly, neutron streaming through these components is accounted for in the calculations of the dose adjacent to the overpack and 1 meter dose. In Section 5.4.1, the dose effect of localized streaming through these compartments is analyzed.

Figure 5.3.10 shows a cross sectional view of the HI-STORM 100 overpack with the as-modeled thickness of the various materials. The dimensions for the HI-STORM 100S and HI-STORM 100S Version B overpacks are also shown on Figure 5.3.10. This figure notes two different dimensions for the inner and outer shells. These values apply only to the HI-STORM 100 and 100S. In these overpacks, the inner and outer shells can be manufactured from 1.25 and 0.75 inch thick steel, respectively, or both shells can be manufactured from 1 inch thick steel. The HI-STORM 100 and 100S were modeled as 1.25 and 0.75 inch thick shells.

Figures 5.3.11, 5.3.18, and 5.3.22 are axial representations of the HI-STORM 100, HI-STORM 100S, and HI-STORM 100S Version B overpacks, respectively, with the various as-modeled dimensions indicated.

Only the HI-STORM 100S Version B is analyzed in this chapter. This is reasonable because the HI-STORM 100S Version B overpack is shorter than the other overpacks, and the MPC is positioned closer to the inlet vent which results in higher dose rates at the inlet vent compared to the other overpacks. In addition, the HI-STORM 100S Version B has slightly higher offsite dose than the other overpacks.

Figures 5.3.12, 5.3.13, and 5.3.23 show axial cross-sectional views of the 100-, 125-ton, and 100D HI-TRAC transfer casks, respectively, with the as-modeled dimensions and materials specified. Figures 5.3.14, 5.3.15, and 5.3.20 show fully labeled radial cross-sectional views of the HI-TRAC 100, 125, and 125D transfer casks, respectively. Figure 5.3.14 also provides the information for the HI-TRAC 100D. Finally, Figures 5.3.16 and 5.3.17 show fully labeled diagrams of the transfer lids for the HI-TRAC 100 and 125 transfer casks. Since lead plate may be used instead of poured lead in the pool and transfer lids, there exists the possibility of a gap between the lead plate and the surrounding steel walls. This gap was accounted for in the analysis as depicted on Figures 5.3.16 and 5.3.17. The gap was not modeled in the pool lid since the gap will only exist on the outer edges of the pool lid and the highest dose rate is in the center. (All results presented in this chapter were calculated with the gap with the exception of the results presented in Figures 5.1.6, 5.1.7, and 5.1.11 which did not include the gap.) The HI-TRAC 100D and 125D do not utilize the transfer lid, rather they utilize the pool lid in conjunction with the mating device. Therefore the dose rates reported for the pool lid in this chapter are applicable to both the HI-TRAC 125 and 125D and the HI-TRAC 100 and 100D while the dose rates reported for the transfer lid are applicable only to the HI-TRAC 100 and 125. Consistent with the analysis of the transfer lid in which only the portion of the lid directly below the MPC was modeled, the structure of the mating device which surrounds the pool lid was not modeled.

Since the HI-TRAC 125D has fewer radial ribs, the dose rate at the midplane of the HI-TRAC 125D is higher than the dose rate at the midplane of the HI-TRAC 125. The HI-TRAC 125D has steel ribs in the lower water jacket while the HI-TRAC 125 does not. These additional ribs in the lower water jacket reduce the dose rate in the vicinity of the pool lid for the HI-TRAC 125D compared to the HI-TRAC 125. Since the dose rates at the midplane of the HI-TRAC 125D are higher than the HI-TRAC 125, the results on the radial surface are only presented for the HI-TRAC 125D in this chapter.

To reduce the gamma dose around the inlet and outlet vents, stainless steel cross plates, designated gamma shield cross plates[†] (see Figures 5.3.11 and 5.3.18), have been installed inside

[†] This design embodiment, formally referred to as “Duct Photon Attenuator,” has been disclosed as an invention by Holtec International for consideration by the US Patent Office for issuance of a patent under U.S. law.

all vents in all overpacks. The steel in these plates effectively attenuates the fuel and ^{60}Co gammas that dominated the dose at these locations prior to their installation. Figure 5.3.19 shows three designs for the gamma shield cross plates to be used in the inlet and outlet vents. The designs in the top portion of the figure are mandatory for use in the HI-STORM 100 and 100S overpacks during normal storage operations and were assumed to be in place in the shielding analysis. The designs in the middle portion of the figure may be used instead of the mandatory designs in the HI-STORM 100S overpack to further reduce the radiation dose rates at the vents. These optional gamma shield cross plates could further reduce the dose rate at the vent openings by as much as a factor of two. The designs in the bottom portion of the figure are mandatory for use in the HI-STORM 100S Version B overpack during normal storage operations and were assumed to be in place in the shielding analysis.

Calculations were performed to determine the acceptability of homogenizing the fuel assembly versus explicit modeling. Based on these calculations it was concluded that it was acceptable to homogenize the fuel assembly without loss of accuracy. The width of the PWR and BWR homogenized fuel assembly is equal to 15 times the pitch and 7 times the pitch, respectively. Homogenization resulted in a noticeable decrease in run time.

Several conservative approximations were made in modeling the MPC. The conservative approximations are listed below.

1. The basket material in the top and bottom 0.9 inches where the MPC basket flow holes are located is not modeled. The length of the basket not modeled (0.9 inches) was determined by calculating the equivalent area removed by the flow holes. This method of approximation is conservative because no material for the basket shielding is provided in the 0.9-inch area at the top and bottom of the MPC basket.
2. The upper and lower fuel spacers are not modeled, as the fuel spacers are not needed on all fuel assembly types. However, most PWR fuel assemblies will have upper and lower fuel spacers. The fuel spacer length for the design basis fuel assembly type determines the positioning of the fuel assembly for the shielding analysis, but the fuel spacer materials are not modeled. This is conservative since it removes steel that would provide a small amount of additional shielding.
3. For the MPC-32, MPC-24, and MPC-68, the MPC basket supports are not modeled. This is conservative since it removes steel that would provide a small increase in shielding. The optional aluminum heat conduction elements are also conservatively not modeled.
4. The MPC-24 basket is fabricated from 5/16 inch thick cell plates. It is conservatively assumed for modeling purposes that the structural portion of the MPC-24 basket is uniformly fabricated from 9/32 inch thick steel. The Boral and

In performing the SAS2H and ORIGEN-S calculations, a single full power cycle was used to achieve the desired burnup. This assumption, in conjunction with the above-average specific powers listed in Tables 5.2.1, 5.2.2, 5.2.15, 5.2.18, and 5.2.32 resulted in conservative source term calculations.

Subsections 5.2.1 and 5.2.2 describe the calculation of the gamma and neutron source terms for zircaloy clad fuel while Subsection 5.2.3 discusses the calculation of the gamma and neutron source terms for the stainless steel clad fuel.

5.2.1 Gamma Source

Tables 5.2.3 through 5.2.6, 5.2.33, 5.2.40, and 5.2.41 provide the gamma source in MeV/s and photons/s as calculated with SAS2H and ORIGEN-S for the design bases intact fuels for the MPC-24, MPC-32, MPC-68, the design basis damaged fuel, and the Trojan fuel. Table 5.2.16 provides the gamma source in MeV/s and photons/s for the design basis MOX fuel. NUREG-1617 [5.2.1] states that "In general, only gammas from approximately 0.8 MeV-2.5 MeV will contribute significantly to the external radiation levels." However, specific analysis for the HI-STAR 100 system has revealed that, due to the magnitude of the gamma source in the energy range just below 0.8 MeV, gammas with energies as low as 0.45 MeV must be included in the shielding analysis. The effect of gammas with energies above 3.0 MeV, on the other hand, was found to be insignificant (less than 1% of the total gamma dose). This is due to the fact that the source of gammas in this range (i.e., above 3.0 MeV) is extremely low (less than 1% of the total source). Therefore, all gammas with energies in the range of 0.45 to 3.0 MeV are included in the shielding calculations. Photons with energies below 0.45 MeV are too weak to penetrate the steel of the overpack, and photons with energies above 3.0 MeV are too few to contribute significantly to the external dose. As discussed earlier, the MPC-24, MPC-32, and the MPC-68 are analyzed for transportation of spent nuclear fuel with varying minimum enrichments, burnup levels and cooling times. This section provides the radiation source for each of the burnup levels and cooling times evaluated.

The primary source of activity in the non-fuel regions of an assembly arise from the activation of ^{59}Co to ^{60}Co . The primary source of ^{59}Co in a fuel element is the steel and inconel structural material. The zircaloy in these regions is neglected since it does not have a significant ^{59}Co impurity level. Reference [5.2.3] indicates that the ^{59}Co impurity level in steel is 800 ppm or 0.8 gm/kg and in inconel is approximately 4700 ppm or 4.7 gm/kg. In the early to mid 1980s, the fuel vendors reduced the ^{59}Co impurity level in both inconel and steel to less than 500 ppm or 0.5 gm/kg. Prior to that, the impurity level in inconel in fuel assemblies was typically less than 1200 ppm or 1.2 gm/kg. Nevertheless, a conservative ^{59}Co impurity level of 1.0 gm/kg was used for the stainless steel end fittings and a highly conservative impurity level of 4.7 gm/kg was used for the inconel.

5.4 SHIELDING EVALUATION

5.4.1 Methods

A significant number of conservative assumptions are applied throughout the shielding calculations. These assumptions will assure that the actual dose rates will always be below the calculated dose rates, and below the regulatory limits. Selected key assumptions are:

- Minimum dimensions are used in the shielding models in some key areas
- A single cycle is used in the source term calculations, resulting in conservative source terms.
- A bounding value of 2 g Co-59 per kg stainless steel is used for the steel activation
- In the source term calculation for the MOX assemblies, an infinite array of MOX assemblies in the core is assumed. A more realistic configuration where UO₂ assemblies surround MOX assemblies would result in lower source terms
- For normal conditions, the axial profile of the neutron sources for both UO₂ and MOX assemblies is based on the UO₂ behavior, i.e. for the source strength increasing with the burnup to the power of 4.2. This is conservative for MOX assemblies, since their source term only increases with the burnup to the power of about 1.7.

The MCNP-4A code [5.1.1] was used for all of the shielding analyses. MCNP is a continuous energy, three-dimensional, coupled neutron-photon-electron Monte Carlo transport code. Continuous energy cross-section data is represented with sufficient energy points to permit linear-linear interpolation between these points. The individual cross section libraries used for each nuclide are those recommended by the MCNP manual. All of these data are based on ENDF/B-V data. The large user community has extensively benchmarked MCNP against experimental data. References [5.4.2], [5.4.3], and [5.4.4] are three examples of the benchmarking that has been performed. MCNP-4A is the same code that has been used as the shielding code in all of Holtec's dry storage and transportation analyses. Note also that the principal approach in the shielding analysis here is identical to the approach in licensing applications previously reviewed and approved by the USNRC.

The energy distribution of the source term, as described earlier, is used explicitly in the MCNP model. A different MCNP calculation is performed for each of the three source terms (neutron, decay gamma, and ⁶⁰Co). The axial distribution of the fuel source term is based on the axial burnup distributions listed in Table 1.2.11 for UO₂ and MOX assemblies. These axial burnup distributions are representative of the fuel to be loaded. The ⁶⁰Co source in the hardware is assumed as uniformly distributed over the appropriate regions.

It is well understood that the neutron source strength of UO₂ assemblies varies with the burnup level raised to the power of 4.2. For MOX assemblies, a similar relation is determined based on the source term calculations described in Section 5.2. In this case, the neutron source strength

varies with the burnup level raised to the power of 1.7. Since these relationships are non-linear and since the burnup in the axial center of a fuel assembly is greater than the average burnup, the neutron source strength in the axial center of the assembly is greater than the relative burnup times the average neutron source strength. In order to account for this effect, the neutron source strength in each of the 32 axial nodes listed in Table 1.2.11 was determined by multiplying the average source strength by the relative burnup level raised to the power of 4.2 or 1.7. The peak relative burnup for UO₂ fuel is 1.08. Using the power of 4.2 relationship results in a 28 % (1.08^{4.2}/1.08) increase in the neutron source strength in the peak node for the UO₂ fuel. For MOX fuel, the increase at the peak node is about 7 %. For all calculations of normal conditions, the higher increase from the UO₂ fuel is conservatively used for all assemblies in the basket, including the MOX assemblies. For the accident conditions, where the dose rates are dominated by the neutron source from the MOX assemblies, the increase from the MOX assemblies is used, however, it is based conservatively on the burnup raised to the power of 2.0 instead of the power of 1.7 that was determined for the MOX fuel.

The dose rates at the various locations were calculated with MCNP using a two-step process. The first step was to calculate the dose rate for each dose location per starting particle for each neutron and gamma group in each basket region for each axial and azimuthal dose location. The second step is to multiply the dose rate per starting particle for each energy group and basket location (i.e., tally output/quantity) by the source strength (i.e. particles/sec) in that group and sum the resulting dose rates for all groups and basket locations in each dose location. The normalization of these results and calculation of the total dose rate from neutrons, fuel gammas or Co-60 gammas is performed with the following equation.

$$T_{final} = \sum_{j=1}^M \left[\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{T_{i,j}}{Fm_i} * F_{i,j} \right] \quad \text{(Equation 5.4.1)}$$

where,

T_{final} = Final dose rate (rem/h) from neutrons, fuel gammas, or Co-60

N = Number of groups (neutrons, fuel gammas) or Number of axial sections (Co-60 gammas)

M = Number of regions in the basket

T_{i,j} = Tally quantity from particles originating in MCNP in group/section i and region j (rem/h)(particles/sec)

F_{i,j} = Fuel Assembly source strength in group i and region j (particles/sec)

Fm_i = Source fraction used in MCNP for group i

Note that dividing by Fm_i (normalization) is necessary to account for the number of MCNP particles that actually start in group i. Also note that T_i is already multiplied by a dose conversion factor in MCNP.

Since MCNP is a statistical code, there is an uncertainty associated with the calculated values. In MCNP the uncertainty is expressed as the relative error that is defined as the standard deviation

of the mean divided by the mean. The standard deviations of the various results were statistically combined to determine the standard deviation of the total dose in each dose location. The estimated variance of the total dose rate, S^2_{total} , is the sum of the estimated variances of the individual dose rates S^2_i . The estimated total dose rate, estimated variance, and relative error [5.1.1] are derived according to Equations 5.4.2 through 5.4.5. Note that relative errors are dimensionless numbers that can be either presented as fractions or as percentages; throughout this chapter they are listed as a percentage values.

$$R_i = \frac{\sqrt{S_i^2}}{T_i} \quad (\text{Equation 5.4.2})$$

$$S^2_{Total} = \sum_{i=1}^n S_i^2 \quad (\text{Equation 5.4.3})$$

$$T_{Total} = \sum_{i=1}^n T_i \quad (\text{Equation 5.4.4})$$

$$R_{Total} = \frac{\sqrt{S^2_{Total}}}{T_{Total}} = \frac{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n S_i^2}}{T_{Total}} = \frac{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (R_i \times T_i)^2}}{T_{Total}} \quad (\text{Equation 5.4.5})$$

where,

- i = tally component index
- n = total number of components
- T_{Total} = total estimated tally
- T_i = tally i component
- S^2_{Total} = total estimated variance
- S^2_i = variance of the i component
- R_i = relative error of the i component
- R_{Total} = total estimated relative error

The standard deviation of the result depends on the variance reduction parameters used in the analyses, and the number of starting particles for each run. These parameters were chosen so that the total relative error for the dose rates presented in this chapter is typically less than 4 %.

Note that the two-step approach outlined above allows the accurate consideration of the neutron and gamma source spectrum, and the location of the individual assemblies, since the tallies are calculated in MCNP as a function of the starting energy group and the assembly location, and

then in the second step multiplied with the source strength in each group in each location. It is therefore equivalent to a one-step calculation where source terms are directly specified in the MCNP input files, except for the following approximations:

Fuel is modeled as fresh UO_2 fuel in MCNP, with an upper bound enrichment. This is discussed in further detail in Subsection 5.4.6, where calculations are presented that use spent fuel compositions for UO_2 and MOX fuel in the MCNP calculations.

The second approximation is related to the axial burnup profile. The profile is modeled by assigning a source probability to each of the 32 axial sections of the active region, based on a representative axial burnup profile. For fuel gammas, the probability is proportional to the burnup, since the gamma source strength changes essentially linearly with burnup. For neutrons, the probability is proportional to the burnup raised to the power of 4.2, since the neutron source strength is proportional to the burnup raised to about that power [5.1.5]. This is a standard approach that has been previously used in the licensing calculations for the HI-STAR 100 cask [1.0.4, 1.05] and HI-STORM 100 system [1.2.7]. To show the quality of this approximation for the neutron source, a comparison of the probability distribution used in the calculations with a probability distribution directly derived from a burnup distribution and the depletion calculations was performed. The UO_2 burnup distribution listed in Table 1.2.11 is used, assuming an initial enrichment of 4.5 wt% and 4 years cooling time. The results are presented in Table 5.4.13. The results from the depletion calculations are normalized to the source strength for the assembly average burnup, to allow a direct comparison with the probability distribution used in MCNP. The values in Table 5.4.13 show that for the total source the difference is negligible (about 2%) , and that even for individual axial sections the difference is no more than 3.5 %. The approximation using a probability distribution is therefore sufficiently accurate to model the axial burnup distribution.

For each basket, several loading patterns are defined in Subsection 1.2.2. These loading patterns allow a large degree of flexibility in loading the cask, while at the same time ensuring that the regulatory dose limits are met. For each pattern, a reference loading is specified in Subsection 1.2.2, where the maximum burnup, minimum cooling time, and initial enrichment (for UO_2 assemblies) is specified for each of the 8 regions in the basket. For the MOX assemblies, four limiting isotope vectors are specified in Section 5.2. Dose rate comparisons for cases with different MOX vectors show that the dose rates from MOX vectors MV1 and MV4 are essentially the same, while dose rates from the MOX vectors MV2 and MV3 are lower. Therefore, all calculations are performed using MOX vector MV1, which bounds all MOX assemblies that conform with any of those four MOX vectors. In addition to the reference condition, a list of alternative burnup/cooling time/enrichment combinations is specified for each basket region, that results in essentially the same dose rate as the reference loading in the location, i.e. which is equivalent to the reference condition. These lists are determined starting from the reference condition, and then varying the conditions in each region separately and determining those conditions that result in a dose rate at 2 m from the radial surface of the cask under normal conditions equal to or just below the dose rate from the reference loading. All those calculations utilize the two-step process of calculating dose rates outlined earlier in this subsection. Since this process separates the MCNP transport calculation from applying the fuel

5.4.5 Fuel Reconfiguration

The structural analyses of fuel rods in Subsection 2.11 show that the fuel is expected to remain essentially undamaged during the hypothetical accident conditions. The design basis calculations for the hypothetical accident conditions therefore use the same model to represent fuel as the calculations for normal conditions. The current subsection presents additional calculations to show that even if some fuel reconfigurations should occur, the dose rates would still be expected to remain below the regulatory limits.

Fuel reconfiguration would result in areas of increased and reduced fuel volume in the basket, together with the corresponding increase and reduction of the source terms. As a bounding approach, three hypothetical scenarios are analyzed, that each assumes extreme local increase or reduction of the fuel. Similar analyses have been performed for damaged fuel in the HI-STORM (Subsection 5.4.2.2 in the HI-STORM FSAR [5.1.4]). The scenarios are:

1. The active regions of all fuel assemblies are modeled as collapsed to their half height, with a corresponding increase in density (two times the nominal density value). The collapsed fuel is located in the lower half of the assembly, i.e. closer to the bottom of the cask, which has less shielding in the axial direction than the top of the cask. However, since the structural calculations in Chapter 2 show that the steel backbone structures of the impact limiters will remain essentially intact and attached to the cask, those structures are considered in the model, while they were conservatively neglected in the design basis calculations for the hypothetical accident conditions. The collapse could lead to a situation where axial sections of higher and lower burnups are collapsed into each other. Therefore, in this scenario, a flat axial burnup profile was utilized for the fuel. This would maximize dose rates in axial direction at the bottom of the cask (Dose Location 5).
2. The second scenario uses the same physical model as in Scenario 1, but a compressed axial profile is used instead of a flat profile. This maintains the source term peak at the center of the fuel height, and therefore maximizes the dose rate in radial direction.
3. To evaluate the potential effect of large areas with a reduced fuel amount, the third scenario retains the full fuel height, but reduces the fuel density and the source strength by factor 2.

For all three scenarios, only the neutron and (n,γ) calculations were performed for simplification, since the total dose rates are dominated by the neutron dose rates.

The results from the three scenarios described above along with a nominal reference case for accident conditions are shown in Table 5.4.6. The F-37 basket was used in all cases and the dose rates presented in the table are for all five dose point locations (see Figure 5.1.2).

The results show that the design basis dose rates are bounding in most dose locations. Further, all analyzed fuel reconfiguration scenarios meet the dose rate regulatory requirements. It can therefore be concluded that any fuel reconfiguration during hypothetical accident conditions will

not result in dose rates that exceed the regulatory limits, and will in most cases even result in a reduction of dose rates compared to undamaged fuel.

5.4.6 Effect of Uncertainties

The design basis calculations presented in Section 5.1 and Subsection 5.4.4 are based on a range of conservative assumptions, but do not explicitly account for uncertainties in the methodologies, codes and input parameters, that is, it is assumed that the effect of uncertainties is small compared to the numerous conservatisms in the analyses. To show that this assumption is valid, this section presents calculations and results based on a different approach, where calculations are performed as “best estimate” calculations, and then estimated uncertainties are added. The results based on this approach are then compared to results in Subsection 5.4.4.

The conservatisms that are considered to have a substantial effect on the dose rates and that are modified in the calculations presented in this subsection are as follow:

- Effective density of the homogenized material representing the fuel and corresponding fuel hardware in the active region in the MCNP calculations: The design basis calculations are based on the lightest assembly, resulting in a density of 3.807 g/cm^3 . For heavier assembly versions, the effective density could be up to about 4.0 g/cm^3 . For the calculations performed here, a typical value of 3.9 g/cm^3 is used.
- Holtite pocket thickness: The design basis calculations are based on the Holtite Pocket Thickness of 75 mm, while the nominal dimension is 78 mm. Instead of changing the geometry of the MCNP model, the density of the Holtite is increased from 0.95 g/cm^3 to 0.99 g/cm^3 to account for the thickness difference.
- Fuel is modeled in the design basis calculations as fresh UO_2 fuel with an enrichment of 5 wt% ^{235}U for the F-32, and 3.5 wt% ^{235}U for the F-37[†]. However, the maximum dose rates correspond to high burnup fuel, such as UO_2 fuel with 66 GWd/MTU at 7 or 8 years cooling time for uniform loading (see Table 1.2.8, Pattern E, and Table 1.2.9, Pattern D). The neutron multiplication factor of the basket in the calculations is therefore significantly higher than when loaded with design basis fuel. This results in an overestimation of neutron and (n, γ) dose rates in the calculations. For the best estimate calculations in this section, the composition of the fresh fuel in the MCNP models is replaced by the composition of spent fuel, but still retaining some conservatism: a burnup of 51 GWd/MTHM is assumed for all fuel. UO_2 fuel is modeled with 4.5 wt% initial enrichment and 3 years cooling time, while MOX fuel is modeled with MOX Vector MV1 and 11 years cooling time.

[†] Note that the reduced enrichment for the F-37 was chosen to reflect the fuel burnup that is required for this basket for reactivity control. The calculations in Chapter 6 show that with fresh UO_2 fuel of that enrichment, the maximum k_{eff} is comparable to that of the configurations with spent fuel, as also stated in Subsection 5.3.1.2.

not result in dose rates that exceed the regulatory limits, and will in most cases even result in a reduction of dose rates compared to undamaged fuel.

5.4.6 Effect of Uncertainties

The design basis calculations presented in Section 5.1 and Subsection 5.4.4 are based on a range of conservative assumptions, but do not explicitly account for uncertainties in the methodologies, codes and input parameters, that is, it is assumed that the effect of uncertainties is small compared to the numerous conservatisms in the analyses. To show that this assumption is valid, this section presents calculations and results based on a different approach, where calculations are performed as “best estimate” calculations, and then estimated uncertainties are added. The results based on this approach are then compared to results in Subsection 5.4.4.

The conservatisms that are considered to have a substantial effect on the dose rates and that are modified in the calculations presented in this subsection are as follow:

- Effective density of the homogenized material representing the fuel and corresponding fuel hardware in the active region in the MCNP calculations: The design basis calculations are based on the lightest assembly, resulting in a density of 3.807 g/cm^3 . For heavier assembly versions, the effective density could be up to about 4.0 g/cm^3 . For the calculations performed here, a typical value of 3.9 g/cm^3 is used.
- Holtite pocket thickness: The design basis calculations are based on the Holtite Pocket Thickness of 75 mm, while the nominal dimension is 78 mm. Instead of changing the geometry of the MCNP model, the density of the Holtite is increased from 0.95 g/cm^3 to 0.99 g/cm^3 to account for the thickness difference.
- Fuel is modeled in the design basis calculations as fresh UO_2 fuel with an enrichment of 5 wt% ^{235}U for the F-32, and 3.5 wt% ^{235}U for the F-37[†]. However, the maximum dose rates correspond to high burnup fuel, such as UO_2 fuel with 66 GWd/MTU at 7 or 8 years cooling time for uniform loading (see Table 1.2.8, Pattern E, and Table 1.2.9, Pattern D). The neutron multiplication factor of the basket in the calculations is therefore significantly higher than when loaded with design basis fuel. This results in an overestimation of neutron and (n, γ) dose rates in the calculations. For the best estimate calculations in this section, the composition of the fresh fuel in the MCNP models is replaced by the composition of spent fuel, but still retaining some conservatism: a burnup of 51 GWd/MTHM is assumed for all fuel. UO_2 fuel is modeled with 4.5 wt% initial enrichment and 3 years cooling time, while MOX fuel is modeled with MOX Vector MV1 and 11 years cooling time.

[†] Note that the reduced enrichment for the F-37 was chosen to reflect the fuel burnup that is required for this basket for reactivity control. The calculations in Chapter 6 show that with fresh UO_2 fuel of that enrichment, the maximum k_{eff} is comparable to that of the configurations with spent fuel, as also stated in Subsection 5.3.1.2.

- Under accident conditions, the design basis calculations conservatively neglect the impact limiters. With the impact limiter removed, the dose locations in axial direction are placed at 1 m from the cask. The structural calculations presented in Chapter 2 show clearly that the steel backbone of the impact limiters remains intact and attached to the cask. This is the actual defined function of the backbone, in order to make the crush material perform more effectively. For the best estimate calculations presented here, the impact limiter backbones are retained. However, the axial dose locations remain unchanged, placing the dose point closer than 1 m to the surface.
- The other conservative assumption under accident conditions is that the Holtite-B neutron absorber is completely replaced by voids. It is assumed to be completely lost as a result of the fire accident. The thermal calculation in Chapter 3 show that the temperature at the inner boundary of the Holtite only reaches about 180 °C, which is below the design temperature of 204 °C for this material. Further, the material is tightly enclosed in the shield cylinder. Therefore it will thermally decompose, with gases escaping through the pressure relief devices, rather than burn. It is therefore expected that some intact Holtite and some residue will remain in the Holtite pockets, however, the exact amount and configuration is unclear. For the best estimate calculation presented here, it is assumed that material representing 20 % of the initial weight remains in the pockets. The material is conservatively assumed to be pure carbon, i.e. all hydrogen and B₄C is considered lost.

The uncertainties that have a relevant impact on the dose rates are as follows:

- Statistical uncertainties of the MCNP calculations. Typically, the total values have uncertainties between 1 % and 4 %, while the uncertainty of individual components can be higher.
- Effect of the uncertainty of the input parameters to the depletion analyses. These are discussed in Subsection 5.2.3.1. The calculations presented here use an uncertainty of 7.3 % for the gamma and 13.9 % for the neutron and (n,γ) calculations.
- Effect of the uncertainty of the depletion analyses. These are discussed in Subsection 5.2.3.3. The calculations presented here use an uncertainty of 7 % for the gamma and 15 % for the neutron and (n,γ) calculations.

The uncertainties from the depletion inputs and calculations are not necessarily independent from each other for the different components of the dose rates (fuel gammas, neutrons, etc). Therefore, the total uncertainty is calculated here in a different and more conservative fashion than for the total values listed in Section 5.1:

- For each of four dose components listed in Tables 5.4.9 through 5.4.12 (Fuel Gammas, Co-60 Gammas, Neutrons, and Gammas from Neutron Capture), the uncertainty is calculated by statistically combining the uncertainty from the MCNP calculation, the depletion input, and the depletion calculation.
- For each of those components, the dose rate including the uncertainty is then calculated. This value is also listed in the tables.
- The total dose rate is then simply determined by adding the dose rates for the components.

- The combined uncertainty for the total value is then calculated from the total dose rate with and without uncertainty.

All values discussed above are included in Tables 5.4.9 through 5.4.12.

The results in Tables 5.4.2 through 5.4.5 show that the dose rates closest to the regulatory limits occur under normal conditions at 2 m and under accident conditions, and at dose location 2 (radial) and location 5 (axial, bottom). For normal conditions, the maximum values are shown for the F-32, for Loading Pattern B at Dose Location 2, and for Loading Pattern A at dose location 5. For accident conditions, the maximum value for dose location 2 is shown for the F-37 for Loading Pattern D, and for dose location 5 for the F-32 for Loading Pattern D. All those cases are re-analyzed using the best-estimate approach. Note that the UO₂ and MOX spent fuel compositions are allocated in the MNCP models according to the respective loading plan. For example, for the F-32 Configuration A, MOX fuel is modeled in 4 locations, while all other 28 locations are modeled with UO₂ fuel. Also note that not all individual calculations were re-performed, specifically,

- Spent MOX and UO₂ fuel is only considered in the neutron and (n,γ) calculations
- For accident cases, only the neutron and (n,γ) calculations were re-performed, since the neutrons dominate the total dose rates.

Results are presented in Tables 5.4.9 through 5.4.12. The tables show the calculated dose rates, the individual and combined uncertainties, and total dose rates with and without uncertainties. For comparison purposes, the tables also show the dose rates of the design basis calculations. In all cases, the total dose rates, including uncertainties, are comparable to or lower than the corresponding values from the design basis calculations. This provides further confirmation that the design basis calculations are reasonable and conservative.

TABLE 5.4.9

DOSE RATE VALUES FOR NORMAL CONDITIONS OF TRANSPORT CALCULATED WITH AND WITHOUT UNCERTAINTIES, F-32 BASKET, LOADING PATTERN B, DOSE LOCATION 2, TWO METER DISTANCE

	Fuel Gammas	Co-60 Gammas	Neutrons	Gammas from Neutron Capture	Total
Best Estimate Dose Rate (mSv/h)	0.0413	0.0023	0.0228	0.0063	0.0726
MCNP Uncertainty (%)	1.1	1.7	1.1	0.9	0.72
Depletion Input Uncertainty (%)	7.3	7.3	13.9	13.9	X
Depletion Code Uncertainty (%)	7	7	15	15	X
Combined Uncertainty (%)	10.2	10.3	20.5	20.5	14.3
Dose Rate including Uncertainty (mSv/h)	0.0455	0.0025	0.0274	0.0076	0.0830
Design Basis Dose Rate (mSv/h)	0.0422	0.0023	0.0296	0.0076	0.0816

Table 5.4.10

DOSE RATE VALUES FOR NORMAL CONDITIONS OF TRANSPORT CALCULATED
WITH AND WITHOUT UNCERTAINTIES,
F-32 BASKET, LOADING PATTERN A, DOSE LOCATION 5, TWO METER DISTANCE

	Fuel Gammas	Co-60 Gammas	Neutrons	Gammas from Neutron Capture	Total
Best Estimate Dose Rate (mSv/h)	0.0062	0.0261	0.0426	0.0005	0.0754
MCNP Uncertainty (%)	4.1	1.3	3.5	5.2	2.1
Depletion Input Uncertainty (%)	7.3	7.3	13.9	13.9	X
Depletion Code Uncertainty (%)	7	7	15	15	X
Combined Uncertainty (%)	11.0	10.2	20.8	21.1	16.3
Dose Rate including Uncertainty (mSv/h)	0.0068	0.0287	0.0515	0.0006	0.0877
Design Basis Dose Rate (mSv/h)	0.0064	0.0261	0.0530	0.0007	0.0861

Table 5.4.11

DOSE RATE VALUES FOR HYPOTHETICAL ACCIDENT CONDITIONS CALCULATED
WITH AND WITHOUT UNCERTAINTIES,
F-37 BASKET, LOADING PATTERN C, DOSE LOCATION 2, ONE METER DISTANCE

	Fuel Gammas	Co-60 Gammas	Neutrons	Gammas from Neutron Capture	Total
Best Estimate Dose Rate (mSv/h)	0.06	<0.01	7.54	0.03	7.62
MCNP Uncertainty (%)	2.04	5.26	0.82	3.13	0.81
Depletion Input Uncertainty (%)	7.3	7.3	13.9	13.9	X
Depletion Code Uncertainty (%)	7	7	15	15	X
Combined Uncertainty (%)	10.3	11.4	20.5	20.7	20.2
Dose Rate including Uncertainty (mSv/h)	0.06	<0.01	9.08	0.04	9.17
Design Basis Dose Rate (mSv/h)	0.06	<0.01	9.77	0.02	9.86

Table 5.4.12

DOSE RATE VALUES FOR HYPOTHETICAL ACCIDENT CONDITIONS CALCULATED
WITH AND WITHOUT UNCERTAINTIES,
F-32 BASKET, LOADING PATTERN D, DOSE LOCATION 5, ONE METER DISTANCE

	Fuel Gammas	Co-60 Gammas	Neutrons	Gammas from Neutron Capture	Total
Best Estimate Dose Rate (mSv/h)	0.35	1.57	2.63	0.01	4.56
MCNP Uncertainty (%)	1.9	0.5	0.5	2.2	0.4
Depletion Input Uncertainty (%)	7.3	7.3	13.9	13.9	X
Depletion Code Uncertainty (%)	7	7	15	15	X
Combined Uncertainty (%)	10.4	10.1	20.5	20.6	16.1
Dose Rate including Uncertainty (mSv/h)	0.39	1.73	3.17	0.01	5.30
Design Basis Dose Rate (mSv/h)	0.19	1.20	7.17	0.01	8.57

MATERIAL ADOPTED IN THE HI-STAR 190 SAR

HI-STAR 190 Chapter 6 Supporting Material

Table 2.1.2

PWR FUEL ASSEMBLY CHARACTERISTICS (Note 1)

Fuel Assembly Array/ Class	14x14 A	14x14 B	14x14 C	15x15 B	15x15 C
No. of Fuel Rod Locations	179	179	176	204	204
Fuel Clad O.D. (in.)	≥ 0.400	≥ 0.417	≥ 0.440	≥ 0.420	≥ 0.417
Fuel Clad I.D. (in.)	≤ 0.3514	≤ 0.374	≤ 0.3880	≤ 0.3736	≤ 0.3640
Fuel Pellet Dia. (in.) (Note 3)	≤ 0.3444	≤ 0.367	≤ 0.3805	≤ 0.3671	≤ 0.3570
Fuel Rod Pitch (in.)	≤ 0.556	≤ 0.566	≤ 0.580	≤ 0.563	≤ 0.563
Active Fuel Length (in.)	≤ 150				
No. of Guide and/or Instrument Tubes	17	17	5 (Note 2)	21	21
Guide/Instrument Tube Thickness (in.)	≥ 0.017	≥ 0.017	≥ 0.038	≥ 0.015	≥ 0.0165

Table 2.1.2 (continued)

PWR FUEL ASSEMBLY CHARACTERISTICS (Note 1)

Fuel Assembly Array/Class	15x15 D	15x15 E	15x15 F	15x15 H	15x15 I
No. of Fuel Rod Locations	208	208	208	208	216
Fuel Clad O.D. (in.)	≥ 0.430	≥ 0.428	≥ 0.428	≥ 0.414	≥ 0.413
Fuel Clad I.D. (in.)	≤ 0.3800	≤ 0.3790	≤ 0.3820	≤ 0.3700	≤ 0.3670
Fuel Pellet Dia. (in.) (Note 3)	≤ 0.3735	≤ 0.3707	≤ 0.3742	≤ 0.3622	≤ 0.3600
Fuel Rod Pitch (in.)	≤ 0.568	≤ 0.568	≤ 0.568	≤ 0.568	≤ 0.550
Active Fuel Length (in.)	≤ 150				
No. of Guide and/or Instrument Tubes	17	17	17	17	9 (Note 4)
Guide/Instrument Tube Thickness (in.)	≥ 0.0150	≥ 0.0140	≥ 0.0140	≥ 0.0140	≥ 0.0140

Table 2.1.2 (continued)

PWR FUEL ASSEMBLY CHARACTERISTICS (Note 1)

Fuel Assembly Array and Class	16x16 A	17x17A	17x17 B	17x17 C	17x17 D	17x17 E
No. of Fuel Rod Locations	236	264	264	264	264	265
Fuel Clad O.D. (in.)	≥ 0.382	≥ 0.360	≥ 0.372	≥ 0.377	≥ 0.372	≥ 0.372
Fuel Clad I.D. (in.)	≤ 0.3350	≤ 0.3150	≤ 0.3310	≤ 0.3330	≤ 0.3310	≤ 0.3310
Fuel Pellet Dia. (in.) (Note 3)	≤ 0.3255	≤ 0.3088	≤ 0.3232	≤ 0.3252	≤ 0.3232	≤ 0.3232
Fuel Rod Pitch (in.)	≤ 0.506	≤ 0.496	≤ 0.496	≤ 0.502	≤ 0.496	≤ 0.496
Active Fuel length (in.)	≤ 150	≤ 150	≤ 150	≤ 150	≤ 170	≤ 170
No. of Guide and/or Instrument Tubes	5 (Note 2)	25	25	25	25	24
Guide/Instrument Tube Thickness (in.)	≥ 0.0350	≥ 0.016	≥ 0.014	≥ 0.020	≥ 0.014	≥ 0.014

Notes:

1. All dimensions are design nominal values. Maximum and minimum dimensions are specified to bound variations in design nominal values among fuel assemblies within a given array/class.
2. Each guide tube replaces four fuel rods.
3. Annular fuel pellets are allowed in the top and bottom 12" of the active fuel length.
4. One Instrument Tube and eight Guide Bars (Solid ZR).

Table 2.1.3

BWR FUEL ASSEMBLY CHARACTERISTICS (Note 1)

Fuel Assembly Array and Class	7x7 B	8x8 B	8x8 C	8x8 D	8x8 E
Maximum Planar-Average Initial Enrichment (wt.% ²³⁵ U) (Note 14)	≤ 4.8	≤ 4.8	≤ 4.8	≤ 4.8	≤ 4.8
No. of Fuel Rod Locations	49	63 or 64	62	60 or 61	59
Fuel Clad O.D. (in.)	≥ 0.5630	≥ 0.4840	≥ 0.4830	≥ 0.4830	≥ 0.4930
Fuel Clad I.D. (in.)	≤ 0.4990	≤ 0.4295	≤ 0.4250	≤ 0.4230	≤ 0.4250
Fuel Pellet Dia. (in.)	≤ 0.4910	≤ 0.4195	≤ 0.4160	≤ 0.4140	≤ 0.4160
Fuel Rod Pitch (in.)	≤ 0.738	≤ 0.642	≤ 0.641	≤ 0.640	≤ 0.640
Design Active Fuel Length (in.)	≤ 150	≤ 150	≤ 150	≤ 150	≤ 150
No. of Water Rods (Note 10)	0	1 or 0	2	1 - 4 (Note 6)	5
Water Rod Thickness (in.)	N/A	≥ 0.034	> 0.00	> 0.00	≥ 0.034
Channel Thickness (in.)	≤ 0.120	≤ 0.120	≤ 0.120	≤ 0.120	≤ 0.100

Table 2.1.3 (continued)

BWR FUEL ASSEMBLY CHARACTERISTICS (Note 1)

Fuel Assembly Array and Class	8x8F	9x9 A	9x9 B	9x9 C	9x9 D
Maximum Planar-Average Initial Enrichment (wt.% ²³⁵ U) (Note 14)	≤ 4.5 (Note 12)	≤ 4.8	≤ 4.8	≤ 4.8	≤ 4.8
No. of Fuel Rod Locations	64	74/66 (Note 4)	72	80	79
Fuel Clad O.D. (in.)	≥ 0.4576	≥ 0.4400	≥ 0.4330	≥ 0.4230	≥ 0.4240
Fuel Clad I.D. (in.)	≤ 0.3996	≤ 0.3840	≤ 0.3810	≤ 0.3640	≤ 0.3640
Fuel Pellet Dia. (in.)	≤ 0.3913	≤ 0.3760	≤ 0.3740	≤ 0.3565	≤ 0.3565
Fuel Rod Pitch (in.)	≤ 0.609	≤ 0.566	≤ 0.572	≤ 0.572	≤ 0.572
Design Active Fuel Length (in.)	≤ 150	≤ 150	≤ 150	≤ 150	≤ 150
No. of Water Rods (Note 10)	N/A (Note 2)	2	1 (Note 5)	1	2
Water Rod Thickness (in.)	≥ 0.0315	> 0.00	> 0.00	≥ 0.020	≥ 0.0300
Channel Thickness (in.)	≤ 0.055	≤ 0.120	≤ 0.120	≤ 0.100	≤ 0.100

Table 2.1.3 (continued)

BWR FUEL ASSEMBLY CHARACTERISTICS (Note 1)

Fuel Assembly Array and Class	9x9 E (Note 3)	9x9 F (Note 3)	9x9 G	10x10 A	10x10 B
Maximum Planar-Average Initial Enrichment (wt.% ²³⁵ U) (Note 14)	≤ 4.5 (Note 12)	≤ 4.5 (Note 12)	≤ 4.8	≤ 4.8	≤ 4.8
No. of Fuel Rod Locations	76	76	72	92/78 (Note 7)	91/83 (Note 8)
Fuel Clad O.D. (in.)	≥ 0.4170	≥ 0.4430	≥ 0.4240	≥ 0.4040	≥ 0.3957
Fuel Clad I.D. (in.)	≤ 0.3640	≤ 0.3860	≤ 0.3640	≤ 0.3520	≤ 0.3480
Fuel Pellet Dia. (in.)	≤ 0.3530	≤ 0.3745	≤ 0.3565	≤ 0.3455	≤ 0.3420
Fuel Rod Pitch (in.)	≤ 0.572	≤ 0.572	≤ 0.572	≤ 0.510	≤ 0.510
Design Active Fuel Length (in.)	≤ 150	≤ 150	≤ 150	≤ 150	≤ 150
No. of Water Rods (Note 10)	5	5	1 (Note 5)	2	1 (Note 5)
Water Rod Thickness (in.)	≥ 0.0120	≥ 0.0120	≥ 0.0320	≥ 0.030	> 0.00
Channel Thickness (in.)	≤ 0.120	≤ 0.120	≤ 0.120	≤ 0.120	≤ 0.120

Table 2.1.3 (continued)

BWR FUEL ASSEMBLY CHARACTERISTICS (Note 1)

Fuel Assembly Array and Class	10x10 C	10x10 F	10x10 G
Maximum Planar-Average Initial Enrichment (wt.% ²³⁵ U) (Note 14)	≤ 4.8	≤ 4.7 (Note 13)	≤ 4.6 (Note 12)
No. of Fuel Rod Locations	96	92/78 (Note 7)	96/84
Fuel Clad O.D. (in.)	≥ 0.3780	≥ 0.4035	≥ 0.387
Fuel Clad I.D. (in.)	≤ 0.3294	≤ 0.3570	≤ 0.340
Fuel Pellet Dia. (in.)	≤ 0.3224	≤ 0.3500	≤ 0.334
Fuel Rod Pitch (in.)	≤ 0.488	≤ 0.510	≤ 0.512
Design Active Fuel Length (in.)	≤ 150	≤ 150	≤ 150
No. of Water Rods (Note 10)	5 (Note 9)	2	5 (Note 9)
Water Rod Thickness (in.)	≥ 0.031	≥ 0.030	≥ 0.031
Channel Thickness (in.)	≤ 0.055	≤ 0.120	≤ 0.060

Table 2.1.3 (continued)

BWR FUEL ASSEMBLY CHARACTERISTICS

NOTES:

1. All dimensions are design nominal values. Maximum and minimum dimensions are specified to bound variations in design nominal values among fuel assemblies within a given array/class.
2. This assembly is known as “QUAD+.” It has four rectangular water cross segments dividing the assembly into four quadrants.
3. For the SPC 9x9-5 fuel assembly, each fuel rod must meet either the 9x9E or the 9x9F set of limits or clad O.D., clad I.D., and pellet diameter
4. This assembly class contains 74 total rods; 66 full length rods and 8 partial length rods.
5. Square, replacing nine fuel rods.
6. Variable.
7. This assembly contains 92 total fuel rods; 78 full length rods and 14 partial length rods.
8. This assembly class contains 91 total fuel rods; 83 full length rods and 8 partial length rods.
9. One diamond-shaped water rod replacing the four center fuel rods and four rectangular water rods dividing the assembly into four quadrants.
10. These rods may also be sealed at both ends and contain ZR material in lieu of water.
11. Not Used
12. When loading fuel assemblies classified as damaged fuel assemblies, all assemblies in the MPC are limited to 4.0 wt.% U-235.
13. When loading fuel assemblies classified as damaged fuel assemblies, all assemblies in the MPC are limited to 4.6 wt.% U-235.
14. In accordance with the definition of undamaged fuel assembly, certain assemblies may be limited to 3.3 wt.% U-235. When loading these fuel assemblies, all assemblies in the MPC are limited to 3.3 wt.% U-235.

6.2

SPENT FUEL LOADING

Specifications for the BWR and PWR fuel assemblies that were analyzed in this criticality evaluation are given in Tables 6.2.1 and 6.2.2, respectively. For the BWR fuel characteristics, the number and dimensions for the water rods are the actual number and dimensions. For the PWR fuel characteristics, the actual number and dimensions of the control rod guide tubes and thimbles are used. Table 6.2.1 lists 72 unique BWR assemblies while Table 6.2.2 lists 46 unique PWR assemblies, all of which were explicitly analyzed for this evaluation. Examination of Tables 6.2.1 and 6.2.2 reveals that there are a large number of minor variations in fuel assembly dimensions.

Due to the large number of minor variations in fuel assembly dimensions, the use of explicit dimensions in defining the authorized contents could limit the applicability of the HI-STAR 100 System. To resolve this limitation, bounding criticality analyses are presented in this section for a number of defined fuel assembly classes for both fuel types (PWR and BWR). The results of the bounding criticality analyses justify using bounding fuel dimensions for defining the authorized contents.

6.2.1 Definition of Assembly Classes

For each array size (e.g., 6x6, 7x7, 15x15, etc.), the fuel assemblies have been subdivided into a number of defined classes, where a class is defined in terms of the (1) number of fuel rods; (2) pitch; (3) number and locations of guide tubes (PWR) or water rods (BWR); and (4) cladding material. The assembly classes for BWR and PWR fuel are defined in Tables 6.2.1 and 6.2.2, respectively. It should be noted that these assembly classes are unique to this evaluation and are not known to be consistent with any class designations in the open literature.

For each assembly class, calculations have been performed for all of the dimensional variations for which data is available (i.e., all data in Tables 6.2.1 and 6.2.2). These calculations demonstrate that the maximum reactivity corresponds to:

- maximum active fuel length,
- maximum fuel pellet diameter,
- minimum cladding outside diameter (OD),
- maximum cladding inside diameter (ID),
- minimum guide tube/water rod thickness, and
- maximum channel thickness (for BWR assemblies only).

Therefore, for each assembly class, a bounding assembly was defined based on the above characteristics and a calculation for the bounding assembly was performed to demonstrate compliance with the regulatory requirement of $k_{\text{eff}} < 0.95$. In some assembly classes this bounding assembly corresponds directly to one of the actual (real) assemblies; while in most

Table 6.2.1 (page 1 of 6)
 BWR FUEL CHARACTERISTICS AND ASSEMBLY CLASS DEFINITIONS
 (all dimensions are in inches)

Fuel Assembly Designation	Clad Material	Pitch	Number of Fuel Rods	Cladding OD	Cladding Thickness	Pellet Diameter	Active Fuel Length	Number of Water Rods	Water Rod OD	Water Rod ID	Channel Thickness	Channel ID
6x6A Assembly Class												
6x6A01	Zr	0.694	36	0.5645	0.0350	0.4940	110.0	0	n/a	n/a	0.060	4.290
6x6A02	Zr	0.694	36	0.5645	0.0360	0.4820	110.0	0	n/a	n/a	0.060	4.290
6x6A03	Zr	0.694	36	0.5645	0.0350	0.4820	110.0	0	n/a	n/a	0.060	4.290
6x6A04	Zr	0.694	36	0.5550	0.0350	0.4820	110.0	0	n/a	n/a	0.060	4.290
6x6A05	Zr	0.696	36	0.5625	0.0350	0.4820	110.0	0	n/a	n/a	0.060	4.290
6x6A06	Zr	0.696	35	0.5625	0.0350	0.4820	110.0	1	0.0	0.0	0.060	4.290
6x6A07	Zr	0.700	36	0.5555	0.03525	0.4780	110.0	0	n/a	n/a	0.060	4.290
6x6A08	Zr	0.710	36	0.5625	0.0260	0.4980	110.0	0	n/a	n/a	0.060	4.290
6x6B (MOX) Assembly Class												
6x6B01	Zr	0.694	36	0.5645	0.0350	0.4820	110.0	0	n/a	n/a	0.060	4.290
6x6B02	Zr	0.694	36	0.5625	0.0350	0.4820	110.0	0	n/a	n/a	0.060	4.290
6x6B03	Zr	0.696	36	0.5625	0.0350	0.4820	110.0	0	n/a	n/a	0.060	4.290
6x6B04	Zr	0.696	35	0.5625	0.0350	0.4820	110.0	1	0.0	0.0	0.060	4.290
6x6B05	Zr	0.710	35	0.5625	0.0350	0.4820	110.0	1	0.0	0.0	0.060	4.290
6x6C Assembly Class												
6x6C01	Zr	0.740	36	0.5630	0.0320	0.4880	77.5	0	n/a	n/a	0.060	4.542
7x7A Assembly Class												
7x7A01	Zr	0.631	49	0.4860	0.0328	0.4110	80	0	n/a	n/a	0.060	4.542

Table 6.2.1 (page 2 of 6)
 BWR FUEL CHARACTERISTICS AND ASSEMBLY CLASS DEFINITIONS
 (all dimensions are in inches)

Fuel Assembly Designation	Clad Material	Pitch	Number of Fuel Rods	Cladding OD	Cladding Thickness	Pellet Diameter	Active Fuel Length	Number of Water Rods	Water Rod OD	Water Rod ID	Channel Thickness	Channel ID
7x7B Assembly Class												
7x7B01	Zr	0.738	49	0.5630	0.0320	0.4870	150	0	n/a	n/a	0.080	5.278
7x7B02	Zr	0.738	49	0.5630	0.0370	0.4770	150	0	n/a	n/a	0.102	5.291
7x7B03	Zr	0.738	49	0.5630	0.0370	0.4770	150	0	n/a	n/a	0.080	5.278
7x7B04	Zr	0.738	49	0.5700	0.0355	0.4880	150	0	n/a	n/a	0.080	5.278
7x7B05	Zr	0.738	49	0.5630	0.0340	0.4775	150	0	n/a	n/a	0.080	5.278
7x7B06	Zr	0.738	49	0.5700	0.0355	0.4910	150	0	n/a	n/a	0.080	5.278
8x8A Assembly Class												
8x8A01	Zr	0.523	64	0.4120	0.0250	0.3580	110	0	n/a	n/a	0.100	4.290
8x8A02	Zr	0.523	63	0.4120	0.0250	0.3580	120	0	n/a	n/a	0.100	4.290

Table 6.2.1 (page 3 of 6)
 BWR FUEL CHARACTERISTICS AND ASSEMBLY CLASS DEFINITIONS
 (all dimensions are in inches)

Fuel Assembly Designation	Clad Material	Pitch	Number of Fuel Rods	Cladding OD	Cladding Thickness	Pellet Diameter	Active Fuel Length	Number of Water Rods	Water Rod OD	Water Rod ID	Channel Thickness	Channel ID
8x8B Assembly Class												
8x8B01	Zr	0.641	63	0.4840	0.0350	0.4050	150	1	0.484	0.414	0.100	5.278
8x8B02	Zr	0.636	63	0.4840	0.0350	0.4050	150	1	0.484	0.414	0.100	5.278
8x8B03	Zr	0.640	63	0.4930	0.0340	0.4160	150	1	0.493	0.425	0.100	5.278
8x8B04	Zr	0.642	64	0.5015	0.0360	0.4195	150	0	n/a	n/a	0.100	5.278
8x8C Assembly Class												
8x8C01	Zr	0.641	62	0.4840	0.0350	0.4050	150	2	0.484	0.414	0.100	5.278
8x8C02	Zr	0.640	62	0.4830	0.0320	0.4100	150	2	0.591	0.531	0.000	no channel
8x8C03	Zr	0.640	62	0.4830	0.0320	0.4100	150	2	0.591	0.531	0.080	5.278
8x8C04	Zr	0.640	62	0.4830	0.0320	0.4100	150	2	0.591	0.531	0.100	5.278
8x8C05	Zr	0.640	62	0.4830	0.0320	0.4100	150	2	0.591	0.531	0.120	5.278
8x8C06	Zr	0.640	62	0.4830	0.0320	0.4110	150	2	0.591	0.531	0.100	5.278
8x8C07	Zr	0.640	62	0.4830	0.0340	0.4100	150	2	0.591	0.531	0.100	5.278
8x8C08	Zr	0.640	62	0.4830	0.0320	0.4100	150	2	0.493	0.425	0.100	5.278
8x8C09	Zr	0.640	62	0.4930	0.0340	0.4160	150	2	0.493	0.425	0.100	5.278
8x8C10	Zr	0.640	62	0.4830	0.0340	0.4100	150	2	0.591	0.531	0.120	5.278
8x8C11	Zr	0.640	62	0.4830	0.0340	0.4100	150	2	0.591	0.531	0.120	5.215
8x8C12	Zr	0.636	62	0.4830	0.0320	0.4110	150	2	0.591	0.531	0.120	5.215

Table 6.2.1 (page 4 of 6)
 BWR FUEL CHARACTERISTICS AND ASSEMBLY CLASS DEFINITIONS
 (all dimensions are in inches)

Fuel Assembly Designation	Clad Material	Pitch	Number of Fuel Rods	Cladding OD	Cladding Thickness	Pellet Diameter	Active Fuel Length	Number of Water Rods	Water Rod OD	Water Rod ID	Channel Thickness	Channel ID
8x8D Assembly Class												
8x8D01	Zr	0.640	60	0.4830	0.0320	0.4110	150	2 large/ 2 small	0.591/ 0.483	0.531/ 0.433	0.100	5.278
8x8D02	Zr	0.640	60	0.4830	0.0320	0.4110	150	4	0.591	0.531	0.100	5.278
8x8D03	Zr	0.640	60	0.4830	0.0320	0.4110	150	4	0.483	0.433	0.100	5.278
8x8D04	Zr	0.640	60	0.4830	0.0320	0.4110	150	1	1.34	1.26	0.100	5.278
8x8D05	Zr	0.640	60	0.4830	0.0320	0.4100	150	1	1.34	1.26	0.100	5.278
8x8D06	Zr	0.640	60	0.4830	0.0320	0.4110	150	1	1.34	1.26	0.120	5.278
8x8D07	Zr	0.640	60	0.4830	0.0320	0.4110	150	1	1.34	1.26	0.080	5.278
8x8D08	Zr	0.640	61	0.4830	0.0300	0.4140	150	3	0.591	0.531	0.080	5.278
8x8E Assembly Class												
8x8E01	Zr	0.640	59	0.4930	0.0340	0.4160	150	5	0.493	0.425	0.100	5.278
8x8F Assembly Class												
8x8F01	Zr	0.609	64	0.4576	0.0290	0.3913	150	4 [†]	0.291 [†]	0.228 [†]	0.055	5.390
9x9A Assembly Class												
9x9A01	Zr	0.566	74	0.4400	0.0280	0.3760	150	2	0.98	0.92	0.100	5.278
9x9A02	Zr	0.566	66	0.4400	0.0280	0.3760	150	2	0.98	0.92	0.100	5.278
9x9A03	Zr	0.566	74/66	0.4400	0.0280	0.3760	150/90	2	0.98	0.92	0.100	5.278
9x9A04	Zr	0.566	66	0.4400	0.0280	0.3760	150	2	0.98	0.92	0.120	5.278

[†] Four rectangular water cross segments dividing the assembly into four quadrants

Table 6.2.1 (page 5 of 6)
 BWR FUEL CHARACTERISTICS AND ASSEMBLY CLASS DEFINITIONS
 (all dimensions are in inches)

Fuel Assembly Designation	Clad Material	Pitch	Number of Fuel Rods	Cladding OD	Cladding Thickness	Pellet Diameter	Active Fuel Length	Number of Water Rods	Water Rod OD	Water Rod ID	Channel Thickness	Channel ID
9x9B Assembly Class												
9x9B01	Zr	0.569	72	0.4330	0.0262	0.3737	150	1	1.516	1.459	0.100	5.278
9x9B02	Zr	0.569	72	0.4330	0.0260	0.3737	150	1	1.516	1.459	0.100	5.278
9x9B03	Zr	0.572	72	0.4330	0.0260	0.3737	150	1	1.516	1.459	0.100	5.278
9x9C Assembly Class												
9x9C01	Zr	0.572	80	0.4230	0.0295	0.3565	150	1	0.512	0.472	0.100	5.278
9x9D Assembly Class												
9x9D01	Zr	0.572	79	0.4240	0.0300	0.3565	150	2	0.424	0.364	0.100	5.278
9x9E Assembly Class [†]												
9x9E01	Zr	0.572	76	0.4170	0.0265	0.3530	150	5	0.546	0.522	0.120	5.215
9x9E02	Zr	0.572	48 28	0.4170 0.4430	0.0265 0.0285	0.3530 0.3745	150	5	0.546	0.522	0.120	5.215
9x9F Assembly Class [†]												
9x9F01	Zr	0.572	76	0.4430	0.0285	0.3745	150	5	0.546	0.522	0.120	5.215
9x9F02	Zr	0.572	48 28	0.4170 0.4430	0.0265 0.0285	0.3530 0.3745	150	5	0.546	0.522	0.120	5.215
9x9G Assembly Class												
9x9G01	Zr	0.572	72	0.4240	0.0300	0.3565	150	1	1.668	1.604	0.120	5.278

[†] The 9x9E and 9x9F fuel assembly classes represent a single fuel type containing fuel rods with different dimensions (SPC 9x9-5). In addition to the actual configuration (9x9E02 and 9x9F02), the 9x9E class contains a hypothetical assembly with only small fuel rods (9x9E01), and the 9x9F class contains a hypothetical assembly with only large rods (9x9F01). This was done in order to simplify the specification of this assembly for the authorized contents.

Table 6.2.1 (page 6 of 6)
 BWR FUEL CHARACTERISTICS AND ASSEMBLY CLASS DEFINITIONS
 (all dimensions are in inches)

Fuel Assembly Designation	Clad Material	Pitch	Number of Fuel Rods	Cladding OD	Cladding Thickness	Pellet Diameter	Active Fuel Length	Number of Water Rods	Water Rod OD	Water Rod ID	Channel Thickness	Channel ID
10x10A Assembly Class												
10x10A01	Zr	0.510	92	0.4040	0.0260	0.3450	155	2	0.980	0.920	0.100	5.278
10x10A02	Zr	0.510	78	0.4040	0.0260	0.3450	155	2	0.980	0.920	0.100	5.278
10x10A03	Zr	0.510	92/78	0.4040	0.0260	0.3450	155/90	2	0.980	0.920	0.100	5.278
10x10B Assembly Class												
10x10B01	Zr	0.510	91	0.3957	0.0239	0.3413	155	1	1.378	1.321	0.100	5.278
10x10B02	Zr	0.510	83	0.3957	0.0239	0.3413	155	1	1.378	1.321	0.100	5.278
10x10B03	Zr	0.510	91/83	0.3957	0.0239	0.3413	155/90	1	1.378	1.321	0.100	5.278
10x10C Assembly Class												
10x10C01	Zr	0.488	96	0.3780	0.0243	0.3224	150	5	1.227	1.165	0.055	5.457
10x10D Assembly Class												
10x10D01	SS	0.565	100	0.3960	0.0200	0.3500	83	0	n/a	n/a	0.08	5.663
10x10E Assembly Class												
10x10E01	SS	0.557	96	0.3940	0.0220	0.3430	83	4	0.3940	0.3500	0.08	5.663

Table 6.2.2 (page 1 of 4)
PWR FUEL CHARACTERISTICS AND ASSEMBLY CLASS DEFINITIONS
(all dimensions are in inches)

Fuel Assembly Designation	Clad Material	Pitch	Number of Fuel Rods	Cladding OD	Cladding Thickness	Pellet Diameter	Active Fuel Length	Number of Guide Tubes	Guide Tube OD	Guide Tube ID	Guide Tube Thickness
14x14A Assembly Class											
14x14A01	Zr	0.556	179	0.400	0.0243	0.3444	150	17	0.527	0.493	0.0170
14x14A02	Zr	0.556	179	0.400	0.0243	0.3444	150	17	0.528	0.490	0.0190
14x14A03	Zr	0.556	179	0.400	0.0243	0.3444	150	17	0.526	0.492	0.0170
14x14B Assembly Class											
14x14B01	Zr	0.556	179	0.422	0.0243	0.3659	150	17	0.539	0.505	0.0170
14x14B02	Zr	0.556	179	0.417	0.0295	0.3505	150	17	0.541	0.507	0.0170
14x14B03	Zr	0.556	179	0.424	0.0300	0.3565	150	17	0.541	0.507	0.0170
14x14B04	Zr	0.556	179	0.426	0.0310	0.3565	150	17	0.541	0.507	0.0170
14x14C Assembly Class											
14x14C01	Zr	0.580	176	0.440	0.0280	0.3765	150	5	1.115	1.035	0.0400
14x14C02	Zr	0.580	176	0.440	0.0280	0.3770	150	5	1.115	1.035	0.0400
14x14C03	Zr	0.580	176	0.440	0.0260	0.3805	150	5	1.111	1.035	0.0380
14x14D Assembly Class											
14x14D01	SS	0.556	180	0.422	0.0165	0.3835	144	16	0.543	0.514	0.0145

Table 6.2.2 (page 2 of 4)
 PWR FUEL CHARACTERISTICS AND ASSEMBLY CLASS DEFINITIONS
 (all dimensions are in inches)

Fuel Assembly Designation	Clad Material	Pitch	Number of Fuel Rods	Cladding OD	Cladding Thickness	Pellet Diameter	Active Fuel Length	Number of Guide Tubes	Guide Tube OD	Guide Tube ID	Guide Tube Thickness
14x14E Assembly Class											
14x14E01 [†]	SS	0.453 and 0.441	162 3 8	0.3415 0.3415 0.3415	0.0120 0.0285 0.0200	0.313 0.280 0.297	102	0	n/a	n/a	n/a
14x14E02 [†]	SS	0.453 and 0.441	173	0.3415	0.0120	0.313	102	0	n/a	n/a	n/a
14x14E03 [†]	SS	0.453 and 0.441	173	0.3415	0.0285	0.280	102	0	n/a	n/a	n/a
15x15A Assembly Class											
15x15A01	Zr	0.550	204	0.418	0.0260	0.3580	150	21	0.533	0.500	0.0165

[†] This is the fuel assembly used at Indian Point 1 (IP-1). This assembly is a 14x14 assembly with 23 fuel rods omitted to allow passage of control rods between assemblies. It has a different pitch in different sections of the assembly, and different fuel rod dimensions in some rods.

Table 6.2.2 (page 3 of 4)
 PWR FUEL CHARACTERISTICS AND ASSEMBLY CLASS DEFINITIONS
 (all dimensions are in inches)

Fuel Assembly Designation	Clad Material	Pitch	Number of Fuel Rods	Cladding OD	Cladding Thickness	Pellet Diameter	Active Fuel Length	Number of Guide Tubes	Guide Tube OD	Guide Tube ID	Guide Tube Thickness
15x15B Assembly Class											
15x15B01	Zr	0.563	204	0.422	0.0245	0.3660	150	21	0.533	0.499	0.0170
15x15B02	Zr	0.563	204	0.422	0.0245	0.3660	150	21	0.546	0.512	0.0170
15x15B03	Zr	0.563	204	0.422	0.0243	0.3660	150	21	0.533	0.499	0.0170
15x15B04	Zr	0.563	204	0.422	0.0243	0.3659	150	21	0.545	0.515	0.0150
15x15B05	Zr	0.563	204	0.422	0.0242	0.3659	150	21	0.545	0.515	0.0150
15x15B06	Zr	0.563	204	0.420	0.0240	0.3671	150	21	0.544	0.514	0.0150
15x15C Assembly Class											
15x15C01	Zr	0.563	204	0.424	0.0300	0.3570	150	21	0.544	0.493	0.0255
15x15C02	Zr	0.563	204	0.424	0.0300	0.3570	150	21	0.544	0.511	0.0165
15x15C03	Zr	0.563	204	0.424	0.0300	0.3565	150	21	0.544	0.511	0.0165
15x15C04	Zr	0.563	204	0.417	0.0300	0.3565	150	21	0.544	0.511	0.0165
15x15D Assembly Class											
15x15D01	Zr	0.568	208	0.430	0.0265	0.3690	150	17	0.530	0.498	0.0160
15x15D02	Zr	0.568	208	0.430	0.0265	0.3686	150	17	0.530	0.498	0.0160
15x15D03	Zr	0.568	208	0.430	0.0265	0.3700	150	17	0.530	0.499	0.0155
15x15D04	Zr	0.568	208	0.430	0.0250	0.3735	150	17	0.530	0.500	0.0150
15x15E Assembly Class											
15x15E01	Zr	0.568	208	0.428	0.0245	0.3707	150	17	0.528	0.500	0.0140
15x15F Assembly Class											
15x15F01	Zr	0.568	208	0.428	0.0230	0.3742	150	17	0.528	0.500	0.0140

Table 6.2.2 (page 4 of 4)
PWR FUEL CHARACTERISTICS AND ASSEMBLY CLASS DEFINITIONS
(all dimensions are in inches)

Fuel Assembly Designation	Clad Material	Pitch	Number of Fuel Rods	Cladding OD	Cladding Thickness	Pellet Diameter	Active Fuel Length	Number of Guide Tubes	Guide Tube OD	Guide Tube ID	Guide Tube Thickness
15x15G Assembly Class											
15x15G01	SS	0.563	204	0.422	0.0165	0.3825	144	21	0.543	0.514	0.0145
15x15H Assembly Class											
15x15H01	Zr	0.568	208	0.414	0.0220	0.3622	150	17	0.528	0.500	0.0140
16x16A Assembly Class											
16x16A01	Zr	0.506	236	0.382	0.0250	0.3255	150	5	0.980	0.900	0.0400
16x16A02	Zr	0.506	236	0.382	0.0250	0.3250	150	5	0.980	0.900	0.0400
17x17A Assembly Class											
17x17A01	Zr	0.496	264	0.360	0.0225	0.3088	150	25	0.474	0.442	0.0160
17x17A02	Zr	0.496	264	0.360	0.0250	0.3030	150	25	0.480	0.448	0.0160
17x17B Assembly Class											
17x17B01	Zr	0.496	264	0.374	0.0225	0.3225	150	25	0.482	0.450	0.0160
17x17B02	Zr	0.496	264	0.374	0.0225	0.3225	150	25	0.474	0.442	0.0160
17x17B03	Zr	0.496	264	0.376	0.0240	0.3215	150	25	0.480	0.448	0.0160
17x17B04	Zr	0.496	264	0.372	0.0205	0.3232	150	25	0.427	0.399	0.0140
17x17B05	Zr	0.496	264	0.374	0.0240	0.3195	150	25	0.482	0.450	0.0160
17x17B06	Zr	0.496	264	0.372	0.0205	0.3232	150	25	0.480	0.452	0.0140
17x17C Assembly Class											
17x17C01	Zr	0.502	264	0.379	0.0240	0.3232	150	25	0.472	0.432	0.0200
17x17C02	Zr	0.502	264	0.377	0.0220	0.3252	150	25	0.472	0.432	0.0200

6.2 SPENT FUEL LOADING

Due to the large number of minor variations in the fuel assembly dimensions, the use of explicit dimensions in defining the authorized contents could limit or complicate the applicability of the HI-STORM FW system. To resolve this limitation, a number of fuel assembly classes for both fuel types (PWR and BWR) are defined based on bounding fuel dimensions. The results of parametric studies justify using those bounding fuel dimensions for defining the authorized contents.

6.2.1 Definition of Assembly Classes

For each array size the fuel assemblies have been subdivided into a number of defined classes, where a class is defined in terms of (1) the number of fuel rods; (2) pitch; and (3) number and locations of guide tubes (PWR) or water rods (BWR). The assembly classes for PWR and BWR fuel are defined in Chapter 2, Tables 2.1.2 and 2.1.3, respectively. It should be noted that these assembly classes are consistent with the class designations in the HI-STORM 100 FSAR (Docket No. 72-1014). Specifically, assembly classes with the same identifier refer to the same set of limiting dimensions. However, some classes have been removed and others have been added compared to the HI-STORM 100.

In HI-STORM 100 FSAR (Docket No. 72-1014), extensive analyses of fuel dimensional variations have been performed. These calculations demonstrate that the maximum reactivity corresponds to:

- maximum active fuel length,
- maximum fuel pellet diameter,
- maximum fuel rod pitch,
- minimum cladding outside diameter (OD),
- maximum cladding inside diameter (ID),
- minimum guide tube/water rod thickness, and
- maximum channel thickness (for BWR assemblies only).

The reason that those are bounding dimensions, i.e. that they result in maximum reactivity is directly based on, and can be directly derived from the three main characteristics affecting reactivity, namely 1) characteristics of the fission process; 2) the characteristics of the fuel assemblies and 3) the characteristics of the neutron absorber in the basket. These affect the reactivity as follows:

- The neutrons generated by fission are fast neutrons while the neutrons that initiate the fission need to be thermal neutrons. A moderator (water) is therefore necessary for the nuclear chain reaction to continue.

- Fuel assemblies are predominantly characterized by the amount of fuel and the fuel-to-water (moderator) ratio. Increasing the amount of fuel, or the enrichment of the fuel, will increase the amount of fissile material, and therefore increase reactivity. Regarding the fuel-to-water ratio, it is important to note that commercial PWR and BWR assemblies are undermoderated, i.e. they do not contain enough water for a maximum possible reactivity.
- The neutron poison in the basket walls uses B-10, which is an absorber of thermal neutrons. This poison therefore also needs water (moderator) to be effective. This places a specific importance on the amount of water between the outer rows of the fuel assemblies and the basket cell walls. Note that this explains some of the differences in reactivity between the different assembly types in the same basket, even for the same enrichment, where assemblies with a smaller cross section, i.e. which have more water between the periphery of the assembly and the surrounding wall, generally have a lower reactivity.

Based on these characteristics, the following conclusions can be made:

- Since fuel assemblies are undermoderated, any changes in geometry inside the fuel assembly that increases the amount of water while maintaining the amount of fuel are expected to increase reactivity. This explains why reducing the cladding or guide tube/water rod thicknesses, or increasing the fuel rod pitch results in an increase in reactivity.
- Increasing the active length will increase the amount of fuel while maintaining the fuel-to-water ratio, and therefore increase reactivity.
- The channel of the BWR assembly is a structure located outside of the rod array. It therefore does not affect the water-to-fuel ratio within the assembly. However, it reduces the amount of water between the assembly and the neutron poison, therefore reducing the effective thermalization for the poison. Therefore, an increase of the channel wall thickness will increase reactivity.
- In respect to the effect of the fuel pellet diameter, several compensatory effects need to be considered. Increasing the diameter will tend to increase the reactivity due to the increase in the fuel amount. However, it will also change the fuel-to-water-ratio, and will therefore make the fuel more undermoderated, which in turn tends to reduce reactivity. The effect of this change in moderation may depend on the condition of the pellet-to-clad gap. Assuming an empty pellet-to clad gap, which would be consistent with undamaged fuel rods, the change in moderation is small, and the net effect is an increase in reactivity, since the effect of the increase in the fissionable material dominates. In this case, the maximum pellet diameter is more reactive. When the pellet-to-clad gap is conservatively flooded, as recommended by NUREG 1536 (see section 6.4.2.3), a reduction of the fuel pellet diameter will also result in an increase in the amount of water, i.e. have a double effect on the water-to-fuel ratio. In this case, it is possible that a slight reduction may result in no reduction or even an increase in reactivity. However, this is caused by a further amplification of the conservative assumption of the flooded pellet-to-clad gap, not

by a positive increase in reactivity from the reduction in fuel (which would be counter-intuitive). Therefore, in order not to overstate the conservative effect of the flooded fuel-to-clad gap, the calculations for the variation of the fuel pellet diameter are performed for a flooded gap of constant thickness by also changing the clad ID.

Since all assemblies have the same principal design, i.e. consist of bundles of clad fuel rods, most of them with embedded guide/instrument tubes or water rods or channels, the above conclusions apply to all of them, and the bounding dimensions are therefore also common to all fuel assemblies analyzed here. Nevertheless, to clearly demonstrate that the main assumption is true, i.e. that all assemblies are undermoderated, a study was performed for all assembly types where the pellet-to-clad gap is empty instead of being flooded (a conservative assumption for the design basis calculations, see Section 6.4.2.3) The results are listed in Table 6.2.3, in comparison with the results of the reference cases with the flooded gap from Section 6.1 for those assembly types. In all cases, the reactivity is reduced compared to the reference case. This verifies that all assembly types considered here are in fact undermoderated, and therefore validates the main assumption stated above. All assembly types are therefore behaving in a similar fashion, and the bounding dimensions are therefore applicable to all assembly types. This discussion and the corresponding conclusions not only affect fuel behavior, but also other moderation effects, and is therefore further referenced in Section 6.3.1 and 6.4.2

As a result, the authorized contents in Subsection 2.1 are defined in terms of those bounding assembly parameters for each class.

Nevertheless, to further demonstrate that the aforementioned characteristics are in fact bounding for the HI-STORM FW, parametric studies were performed on reference PWR and BWR assemblies, namely PWR assembly class 17x17B and BWR assembly class 10x10A. The results of these studies are shown in Table 6.2.1 and 6.2.2, and verify the bounding parameters listed above. Note that in the studies presented in Tables 6.2.1 and 6.2.2, the fuel pellet diameter and cladding inner diameter are changed together. This is to keep the cladding-to-pellet gap, which is conservatively flooded with pure water in all cases (see Section 6.4.2.3), at a constant thickness, to ensure the studies evaluate the fuel parameters rather than the moderation conditions, as discussed above.

In addition to those dimensions, additional fuel assembly characteristics important to criticality control are the location of guide tubes, water rods, part length rods, and rods with differing dimensions (classes 9x9E/F only). These are identified in the assembly cross sections provided in Appendix 6.B, Section B.4.

In all cases, the gadolinia (Gd_2O_3) normally incorporated in BWR fuel, and Integral Fuel Burnable Absorbers (IFBA) used in PWR fuel was conservatively neglected.

Some assembly classes contain partial length rods. There are differences in location of those partial length rods within the assembly that influence how those rods affect reactivity: Assembly classes 9x9A, 10x10A, 10x10B and 10x10F have partial length rods that are completely

surrounded by full length rods, whereas assembly class 10x10G has those partial length rods on the periphery of the assembly or facing the water gap, where they directly only face two full length rods (see Appendix 6.B, Section B.4). To determine a bounding configuration for those assembly classes where partial length rods are completely surrounded by full length rods, calculations are listed in Table 6.2.2 for the actual (real) assembly configuration and for the axial segments (assumed to be full length) with and without the partial length rods. The results show that the configurations with only the full length rods present, i.e. where the partial length rods are assumed completely absent from the assembly, is bounding. This is an expected outcome, since LWR assemblies are typically undermoderated, therefore reducing the fuel-to-water-ratio within the rod array tends to increase reactivity. Consequently, all assembly classes that contain partial length rods surrounded by full-length rods are analyzed with the partial length rods absent. For assembly class 10x10G, calculations with different assumptions for the length of the part-length rods are presented in Table 6.2.7, and show that reducing the length of the part length rods reduces reactivity. This means that the reduction in the fuel amount is more dominating than the change in moderation for this configuration. For this class, all rods therefore are assumed full length. Note that in neither of the cases is the configuration with the actual part length rods bounding. The specification of the authorized contents has therefore no minimum requirement for the active fuel length of the partial length rods.

BWR assemblies are specified in Table 2.1.3 with a maximum planar-average enrichment. The analyses presented in this chapter use a uniform enrichment, equal to the maximum planar-average. Analyses presented in the HI-STORM FSAR ([6.0.1], Chapter 6, Appendix 6.B) show that this is a conservative approach, i.e. that a uniform enrichment bounds the planar-average enrichment in terms of the maximum k_{eff} . To verify that this is applicable to the HI-STORM FW, those calculations were re-performed in the MPC-89. The results are presented in Table 6.2.4, and show that, as expected, the planar average enrichments bound or are statistically equivalent to the distributed enrichment in the HI-STORM FW as they do in the HI-STORM 100. To confirm that this is also true for the higher enrichments analyzed here, additional calculations were performed and are presented in Table 6.2.2 in comparison with the results for the uniform enrichment. Since the maximum planar-average enrichment of 4.8 wt% ^{235}U is above the actual enrichments of those assemblies, actual (as-built) enrichment distributions are not available. Therefore, several bounding cases are analyzed. Note that since the maximum planar-average enrichment of 4.8 wt% ^{235}U is close to the maximum rod enrichment of 5.0 wt% ^{235}U , the potential enrichment variations within the cross section are somewhat limited. To maximize the differences in enrichment under these conditions, the analyzed cases assume that about 50% of the rods in the cross section are at an enrichment of 5.0 wt% ^{235}U , while the balance of the rods are at an enrichment of about 4.6 wt%, resulting in an average of 4.8 wt%. Calculations are performed for cross sections where all full-length and part-length, or only all full-length rods are present. For each case, two conditions are analyzed that places the different enrichment in areas with different local fuel-to-water ratios. Specifically, one condition places the higher enriched rods in locations where they are more surrounded by other rods, whereas the other condition places them in locations where they are more surrounded by water, such as near the water-rods or the periphery of the assembly. The results are also included in table 6.2.2 and show that in all cases, the maximum k_{eff} calculated for the distributed enrichments are statistically equivalent to

HOLTEC INTERNATIONAL COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL

or below those for the uniform enrichments. Therefore, modeling BWR assemblies with distributed enrichments using a uniform enrichment equal to the planar-average value is acceptable and conservative. The assumed enrichment distributions analyzed are shown in Appendix 6.B.

Note that for some BWR fuel assembly classes, the Zircaloy water rod tubes are artificially replaced by water in the bounding cases to remove the requirement for water rod thickness from the specification of the authorized contents. For these cases, the bounding water rod thickness is listed as zero.

Two BWR classes (8x8B and 8x8D) are specified with slight variation in the number of fuel and/or water rods (see Section 6.B.4). The results listed in Section 6.1 utilize the minimum number of fuel rods, i.e. maximizing the water-to-fuel ratio. To show that this is appropriate and bounding, calculations were also performed with the alternative configurations, and are presented in Table 6.2.5. The results show that the reference conditions used for the calculations documented in Section 6.1 are in fact bounding.

For BWR assembly class 9x9E/F, two patterns of water rods were analyzed (see Section 6.B.4). The comparison is also presented in Table 6.2.5 and shows that the condition with the larger water rod spacing is bounding.

For PWR assembly class 15x15I (see Section 6.B.4), calculations with and without guide rods were performed. The comparison is also presented in Table 6.2.5. The case without the guide rods is used as the design basis case for this assembly type, therefore, no specific restrictions on the location and number of guide rods exists.

Typically, PWR fuel assemblies are designed with solid fuel pellets throughout the entire active fuel length. However, some PWR assemblies contain annular fuel pellets in the top and bottom 6 to 8 inches of the active fuel length. This changes the fuel to water ratio in these areas, which could have an effect on reactivity. However, the top and bottom of the active length are areas with high neutron leakage, and changes in these areas typically have no significant effect on reactivity. Studies with up to 12 inches of annular pellets at the top and bottom performed for the HI-STORM FW with various pellet IDs (see Table 6.2.6) confirm this, i.e., shown no significant reactivity effects, even if the annular region of the pellet is flooded with pure water. All calculations for PWR fuel assemblies are therefore performed with solid fuel pellets along the entire length of the active fuel region, and the results are directly applicable to those PWR assemblies with annular fuel pellets. This is consistent with the HI-STORM 100, where the same analyzed conditions are analyzed and qualified.

APPENDIX 6.B: DISTRIBUTED ENRICHMENTS IN BWR FUEL

Fuel assemblies used in BWRs utilize fuel rods of varying enrichments as a means of controlling power peaking during in-core operation. For calculations involving BWR assemblies, the use of a uniform (planar-average) enrichment, as opposed to the distributed enrichments normally used in BWR fuel, produces conservative results. Calculations have been performed to confirm that this statement remains valid in the geometry of the MPC-68. These calculations are based on fuel assembly designs currently in use and two hypothetical distributions, all intended to illustrate that calculations with uniform average enrichments are conservative.

The average enrichment is calculated as the linear average of the various fuel rod enrichments, i.e.,

$$\bar{E} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n E_i,$$

where E_i is the enrichment in each of the n rods, and \bar{E} is the assembly average enrichment. This parameter conservatively characterizes the fuel assembly and is readily available for specific fuel assemblies in determining the acceptability of the assembly for placement in the MPC-68 cask.

The criticality calculations for average and distributed enrichment cases are compared in Table 6.B.1 to illustrate and confirm the conservatism inherent in using average enrichments. With two exceptions, the cases analyzed represent realistic designs currently in use and encompass fuel with different ratios of maximum pin enrichment to average assembly enrichment. The two exceptions are hypothetical cases intended to extend the models to higher enrichments and to demonstrate that using the average enrichment remains conservative.

Table 6.B.1 shows that, in all cases, the averaged enrichment yields conservative values of reactivity relative to distributed enrichments for both the actual fuel designs and the hypothetical higher enrichment cases. Thus, it is concluded that uniform average enrichments will always yield higher (more conservative) values for reactivity than the corresponding distributed enrichments.[†]

[†] This conclusion implicitly assumes the higher enrichment fuel rods are located internal to the assembly (as in BWR fuel), and the lower enriched rods are on the outside.

Table 6.B.1

COMPARISON CALCULATIONS FOR BWR FUEL WITH AVERAGE AND
DISTRIBUTED ENRICHMENTS

Case	Average %E	Peak Rod E%	Calculated k_{eff}	
			Average E	Distributed E
8x8C04	3.01	3.80	0.8549	0.8429
8x8C04	3.934	4.9	0.9128	0.9029
8x8D05	3.42	3.95	0.8790	0.8708
8x8D05	3.78	4.40	0.9030	0.8974
8x8D05	3.90	4.90	0.9062	0.9042
9x9B01	4.34	4.71	0.9347	0.9285
9x9D01	3.35	4.34	0.8793	0.8583
Hypothetical #1 (48 outer rods of 3.967%E, 14 inner rods of 5.0%)	4.20	5.00	0.9289	0.9151
Hypothetical #2 (48 outer rods of 4.354%E, 14 inner rods of 5.0%)	4.50	5.00	0.9422	0.9384

- analysis. This configuration is illustrated in Figure 6.4.9.
3. Fuel pellets lost from the assembly and forming powdered fuel dispersed through a volume equivalent to the height of the original fuel. (Flow channel and clad material assumed to disappear).

Results of the analyses, shown in Table 6.4.5, confirm that, in all cases, the maximum reactivity is well below the regulatory limit. There is no significant difference in reactivity between the two DFC types. Collapsed fuel reactivity (simulating fuel debris) is low because of the reduced moderation. Dispersed powdered fuel results in low reactivity because of the increase in ^{238}U neutron capture (higher effective resonance integral for ^{238}U absorption).

The loss of fuel rods results in a small increase in reactivity (i.e., rods assumed to collapse, leaving a smaller number of rods still intact). The peak reactivity occurs for 8 missing rods, and a smaller (or larger) number of intact rods will have a lower reactivity, as indicated in Table 6.4.5.

The analyses performed and summarized in Table 6.4.5 provide the relative magnitude of the effects on the reactivity. This information coupled with the maximum k_{eff} values listed in Table 6.1.3 and the conservatism in the analyses, demonstrates that the maximum k_{eff} of the damaged fuel in the most adverse post-accident condition will remain well below the regulatory requirement of $k_{\text{eff}} < 0.95$.

6.4.4.2 Generic BWR and PWR Damaged Fuel and Fuel Debris

The MPC-24E, MPC-32, and MPC-68 are designed to contain PWR and BWR damaged fuel and fuel debris, loaded into generic DFCs. The number of generic DFCs is limited to 16 for the MPC-68, to 4 for the MPC-24E, and to 8 for the MPC-32. The permissible locations of the DFCs are shown in Figure 6.4.11 for the MPC-68, in Figure 6.4.12 for the MPC-24E and in Figure 6.4.16 for the MPC-32.

Damaged fuel assemblies are assemblies with known or suspected cladding defects greater than pinholes or hairlines, or with missing rods, but excluding fuel assemblies with gross defects (for a full definition see Table 1.0.1). Therefore, apart from possible missing fuel rods, damaged fuel assemblies have the same geometric configuration as intact fuel assemblies and consequently the same reactivity. Missing fuel rods can result in a slight increase of reactivity. After a drop accident, however, it can not be assumed that the initial geometric integrity is still maintained. For a drop on either the top or bottom of the cask, the damaged fuel assemblies could collapse. This would result in a configuration with a reduced length, but increased amount of fuel per unit length. For a side drop, fuel rods could be compacted to one side of the DFC. In either case, a significant relocation of fuel within the DFC is possible, which creates a greater amount of fuel in some areas of the DFC, whereas the amount of fuel in other areas is reduced. Fuel debris can include a large variety of configurations ranging from whole fuel assemblies with severe damage down to individual fuel pellets.

In the cases of fuel debris or relocated damaged fuel, there is the potential that fuel could be present in axial sections of the DFCs that are outside the basket height covered with the fixed neutron absorber. However, in these sections, the DFCs are not surrounded by any intact fuel, only by basket cell walls, non-fuel hardware, and water and for the MPC-68 by a maximum of one other DFC. Studies have shown that this condition does not result in any significant effect on reactivity, compared to a condition where the damaged fuel and fuel debris is restricted to the axial section of the basket covered by the fixed neutron absorber. All calculations for generic BWR and PWR damaged fuel and fuel debris are therefore performed assuming that fuel is present only in the axial sections covered by the fixed neutron absorber, and the results are directly applicable to any situation where damaged fuel and fuel debris is located outside these sections in the DFCs.

To address all the situations listed above and identify the configuration or configurations leading to the highest reactivity, it is impractical to analyze a large number of different geometrical configurations for each of the fuel classes. Instead, a bounding approach is taken which is based on the analysis of regular arrays of bare fuel rods without cladding. Details and results of the analyses are discussed in the following sections.

All calculations for generic damaged fuel and fuel debris are performed using a full cask model with the maximum permissible number of Damaged Fuel Containers. For the MPC-68, the model therefore contains 52 intact assemblies, and 16 DFCs in the locations shown in Figure 6.4.11. For the MPC-24E, the model consists of 20 intact assemblies, and 4 DFCs in the locations shown in Figure 6.4.12. For the MPC-32, the model consists of 24 intact assemblies, and 8 DFCs in the locations shown in Figure 6.4.16. The bounding assumptions regarding the intact assemblies and the modeling of the damaged fuel and fuel debris in the DFCs are discussed in the following sections.

Note that since a modeling approach is used that bounds both damaged fuel and fuel debris without distinguishing between these two conditions, the term ‘damaged fuel’ as used throughout this chapter designates both damaged fuel and fuel debris.

6.4.4.2.1 Bounding Intact Assemblies

Intact BWR assemblies stored together with DFCs are limited to a maximum planar average enrichment of 3.7 wt% ^{235}U , regardless of the fuel class. The results presented in Table 6.1.7 are for different enrichments for each class, ranging between 2.7 and 4.2 wt% ^{235}U , making it difficult to identify the bounding assembly. Therefore, additional calculations were performed for the bounding assembly in each assembly class with a planar average enrichment of 3.7 wt%. The results are summarized in Table 6.4.7 and demonstrate that the assembly classes 9x9E and 9x9F have the highest reactivity. These two classes share the same bounding assembly (see footnotes for Tables 6.2.33 and 6.2.34 for further details). This bounding assembly is used as the intact BWR assembly for all calculations with DFCs.

Intact PWR assemblies stored together with DFCs in the MPC-24E are limited to a maximum enrichment of 4.0 wt% ^{235}U without credit for soluble boron and to a maximum enrichment of 5.0 wt% with credit for soluble boron, regardless of the fuel class. The results presented in Table 6.1.3 are for different enrichments for each class, ranging between 4.2 and 5.0 wt% ^{235}U , making it difficult to directly identify the bounding assembly. However, Table 6.1.4 shows results for an enrichment of 5.0 wt% for all fuel classes, with a soluble boron concentration of 300 ppm. The assembly class 15x15H has the highest reactivity. This is consistent with the results in Table 6.1.3, where the assembly class 15x15H is among the classes with the highest reactivity, but has the lowest initial enrichment. Therefore, in the MPC-24E, the 15x15H assembly is used as the intact PWR assembly for all calculations with DFCs.

Intact PWR assemblies stored together with DFCs in the MPC-32 are limited to a maximum enrichment of 5.0 wt%, regardless of the fuel class. Table 6.1.5 and Table 6.1.6 show results for enrichments of 4.1 wt% and 5.0 wt%, respectively, for all fuel classes. Since different minimum soluble boron concentrations are used for different groups of assembly classes, the assembly class with the highest reactivity in each group is used as the intact assembly for the calculations with DFCs in the MPC-32. These assembly classes are

- 14x14C for all 14x14 assembly classes;
- 15x15B for assembly classes 15x15A, B, C, G and I;
- 15x15F for assembly classes 15x15D, E, F and H;
- 16x16A; and
- 17x17C for all 17x17 assembly classes.

6.4.4.2.2 Bare Fuel Rod Arrays

A conservative approach is used to model both damaged fuel and fuel debris in the DFCs, using arrays of bare fuel rods:

- Fuel in the DFCs is arranged in regular, rectangular arrays of bare fuel rods, i.e. all cladding and other structural material in the DFC is replaced by water.
- For cases with soluble boron, additional calculations are performed with reduced water density in the DFC. This is to demonstrate that replacing all cladding and other structural material with borated water is conservative.
- The active length of these rods is chosen to be the maximum active fuel length of all fuel assemblies listed in Section 6.2, which is 155 inch for BWR fuel and 150 inch for PWR fuel.
- To ensure the configuration with optimum moderation and highest reactivity is analyzed, the amount of fuel per unit length of the DFC is varied over a large range. This is achieved by changing the number of rods in the array and the rod pitch. The number of rods are varied

HOLTEC INTERNATIONAL COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL

between 9 (3x3) and 189 (17x17) for BWR fuel, and between 64 (8x8) and 729 (27x27) for PWR fuel.

- Analyses are performed for the minimum, maximum and typical pellet diameter of PWR and BWR fuel.

This is a very conservative approach to model damaged fuel, and to model fuel debris configurations such as severely damaged assemblies and bundles of individual fuel rods, as the absorption in the cladding and structural material is neglected.

This is also a conservative approach to model fuel debris configurations such as bare fuel pellets due to the assumption of an active length of 155 inch (BWR) or 150 inch (PWR). The actual height of bare fuel pellets in a DFC would be significantly below these values due to the limitation of the fuel mass for each basket position.

To demonstrate the level of conservatism, additional analyses are performed with the DFC containing various realistic assembly configurations such as intact assemblies, assemblies with missing fuel rods and collapsed assemblies, i.e. assemblies with increased number of rods and decreased rod pitch.

As discussed in Section 6.4.4.2, all calculations are performed for full cask models, containing the maximum permissible number of DFCs together with intact assemblies.

As an example of the damaged fuel model used in the analyses, Figure 6.4.17 shows the basket cell of an MPC-32 with a DFC containing a 17x17 array of bare fuel rods.

Graphical presentations of the calculated maximum k_{eff} for typical cases as a function of the fuel mass per unit length of the DFC are shown in Figures 6.4.13 (BWR) and 6.4.14 (PWR, MPC-24E with pure water). The results for the bare fuel rods show a distinct peak in the maximum k_{eff} at about 2 kg UO_2/inch for BWR fuel, and at about 3.5 kg UO_2/inch for PWR fuel.

The realistic assembly configurations are typically about 0.01 (delta-k) or more below the peak results for the bare fuel rods, demonstrating the conservatism of this approach to model damaged fuel and fuel debris configurations such as severely damaged assemblies and bundles of fuel rods.

For fuel debris configurations consisting of bare fuel pellets only, the fuel mass per unit length would be beyond the value corresponding to the peak reactivity. For example, for DFCs filled with a mixture of 60 vol% fuel and 40 vol% water the fuel mass per unit length is 3.36 kg UO_2/inch for the BWR DFC and 7.92 kg UO_2/inch for the PWR DFC. The corresponding reactivities are significantly below the peak reactivity. The difference is about 0.005 (delta-k) for BWR fuel and 0.01 (delta-k) or more for PWR fuel. Furthermore, the filling height of the DFC

HOLTEC INTERNATIONAL COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL

would be less than 70 inches in these examples due to the limitation of the fuel mass per basket position, whereas the calculation is conservatively performed for a height of 155 inch (BWR) or 150 inch (PWR). These results demonstrate that even for the fuel debris configuration of bare fuel pellets, the model using bare fuel rods is a conservative approach.

6.4.4.2.3 Distributed Enrichment in BWR Fuel

BWR fuel usually has an enrichment distribution in each planar cross section, and is characterized by the maximum planar average enrichment. For intact fuel it has been shown that using the average enrichment for each fuel rod in a cross section is conservative, i.e. the reactivity is higher than calculated for the actual enrichment distribution (See Appendix 6.B). For damaged fuel assemblies, additional configurations are analyzed to demonstrate that the distributed enrichment does not have a significant impact on the reactivity of the damaged assembly under accident conditions. Specifically, the following two scenarios were analyzed:

- As a result of an accident, fuel rods with lower enrichment relocate from the top part to the bottom part of the assembly. This results in an increase of the average enrichment in the top part, but at the same time the amount of fuel in that area is reduced compared to the intact assembly.
- As a result of an accident, fuel rods with higher enrichment relocate from the top part to the bottom part of the assembly. This results in an increase of the average enrichment in the bottom part, and at the same time the amount of fuel in that area is increased compared to the intact assembly, leading to a reduction of the water content.

In both scenarios, a compensation of effects on reactivity is possible, as the increase of reactivity due to the increased planar average enrichment might be offset by the possible reduction of reactivity due to the change in the fuel to water ratio. A selected number of calculations have been performed for these scenarios and the results show that there is only a minor change in reactivity. These calculations are shown in Figure 6.4.13 in the group of the explicit assemblies. Consequently, it is appropriate to qualify damaged BWR fuel assemblies and fuel debris based on the maximum planar average enrichment. For assemblies with missing fuel rods, this maximum planar average enrichment has to be determined based on the enrichment and number of rods still present in the assembly when loaded into the DFC.

6.4.4.2.4 Results for the MPC-68

The MPC-68 allows the storage of up to sixteen DFCs in the shaded cells on the periphery of the basket shown in Figure 6.4.11. Additionally, up to 8 of these cells may contain DFCs with fuel debris. The various configurations outlined in Sections 6.4.4.2.2 and 6.4.4.2.3 are analyzed with an enrichment of the intact fuel of 3.7% ^{235}U and an enrichment of damaged fuel or fuel debris of 4.0% ^{235}U . For the intact assembly, the bounding assembly of the 9x9E and 9x9F fuel classes was chosen. This assembly has the highest reactivity of all BWR assembly classes for the initial

HOLTEC INTERNATIONAL COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL

To conservatively account for eccentric fuel positioning in the fuel storage cells, three different configurations are analyzed, and the results are compared to determine the bounding configuration:

- Cell Center Configuration: All assemblies centered in their fuel storage cell;
- Basket Center Configuration: All assemblies in the basket are moved as closely to the center of the basket as permitted by the basket geometry; and
- Basket Periphery Configuration: All assemblies in the basket are moved furthest away from the basket center, and as closely to the periphery of the basket as possible.

The results are presented in Table 6.3.5. The table shows the maximum k_{eff} value for centered and the two eccentric configurations for each condition, and the difference in k_{eff} between the centered and eccentric positioning. The results and conclusions are summarized as follows:

- For both the F-32 and F-37 basket, the cell centered configuration results in the highest reactivity.

Therefore, all further calculations, including those that demonstrate compliance with 10CFR71 requirements, are performed with assemblies centered in the basket cells.

6.3.5 Potential Fuel Reconfiguration under Accident Conditions

The cask is designed to remain internally dry under any accident conditions. Therefore, any fuel reconfiguration under accident conditions would be of no consequences. Nevertheless, as a defense-in-depth, analyses are performed assuming coinciding fuel reconfiguration and flooding of the cask.

[
Withheld in Accordance with 10 CFR 2.390

] In summary, these results show that credible damage of the fuel assemblies from transport accident conditions will not have a significant effect on the reactivity of the package.

6.3.6 Partial Loading

Each basket cell is completely surrounded by the basket walls containing neutron absorber material (B_4C). Under a partial loading situation, i.e. where one or more basket location are not occupied with fuel, the amount of fissile material is obviously reduced. Also, under the bounding condition of a fully flooded cask, the amount of water is increased. This will result in an increased moderation of neutrons in the empty cell locations. This increased moderation will increase the effectiveness of the surrounding thermal neutron absorber. Described differently, the now empty cell locations will act as additional flux traps. Therefore, due to the reduced amount of fissile material, and the increased neutron absorption, the reactivity of the package under

The basket is manufactured from individual slotted panels. The panels are expected to be in direct contact with each other (see Drawings in Chapter 1). However, to show that small gaps between panels would have essentially no effect on criticality, calculations are performed with a postulated 0.06" gap between panels, repeated in the axial direction every 10" in all panels. Since it is expected that the effect of these gaps would be small, these calculations were performed with a larger number of particles per cycle, larger number of inactive cycles, and a larger total number of cycles to improve the statistics of each run, so the real reactivity effect could be better separated from the statistical "noise". The results are summarized in Tables 6.3.6 and show that the METAMIC gap has a very small effect. Therefore, all calculations are performed without any gaps between panels.

Variations of water temperature in the cask were analyzed using CASMO-4. The analyses were performed for the assembly class 10x10A in the MPC-89, and for the assembly class 17x17B with 2000 ppm soluble boron in the water in the MPC-37. These are the same assemblies and conditions used for the fuel dimension studies in Section 6.2, and shown there to be representative of all assemblies qualified for those baskets. The results are presented in Table 6.3.1, and show that the minimum water temperature (corresponding to a maximum water density) are bounding. This condition is therefore used in all further calculations. This is expected since an increased temperature results in a reduced water density, a condition that is shown in Section 6.4 to result in reduced reactivities.

Calculations documented in Chapter 3 show that the baskets stay within the applicable structural limits during all normal and accident conditions. Furthermore, the neutron poison material is an integral and non-removable part of the basket material, and its presence is therefore not affected by the accident conditions. Except for the potential deflection of the basket walls that is already considered in the criticality models, damage to the cask under accident conditions is limited to possible loss of the water in the water jacket of the HI-TRAC VW. However, this condition is already considered in the calculational models. Other parameters important to criticality safety are fuel type and enrichment, which are not affected by the hypothetical accident conditions. The calculational models of the cask and basket for the accident conditions are therefore identical to the models for normal conditions, and no separate models need to be developed for accident conditions.

6.3.2 Cask Regional Densities

Composition of the various components of the principal designs of the HI-STORM FW system are listed in Table 6.3.4. The cross section set for each nuclide is listed in Table 6.3.8, and is consistent with the cross section sets used in the benchmarking calculations documented in Appendix A. Note that these are the default cross sections chosen by the code.

The HI-STORM FW system is designed such that the fixed neutron absorber will remain effective for a storage period greater than 60 years, and there are no credible means to lose it.

HOLTEC INTERNATIONAL COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL

The continued efficacy of the fixed neutron absorber is assured by acceptance testing, documented in Subsection 10.1.6.3, to validate the ^{10}B (poison) concentration in the fixed neutron absorber. To demonstrate that the neutron flux from the irradiated fuel results in a negligible depletion of the poison material over the storage period, an evaluation of the number of neutrons absorbed in the ^{10}B was performed. The calculation conservatively assumed a constant neutron source for 60 years equal to the initial source for the design basis fuel, as determined in Section 5.2, and shows that the fraction of ^{10}B atoms destroyed is less than 10^{-7} in 60 years. Thus, the reduction in ^{10}B concentration in the fixed neutron absorber by neutron absorption is negligible. Therefore, in accordance with 10CFR72.124(b), there is no need to provide a surveillance or monitoring program to verify the continued efficacy of the neutron absorber.

6.3.3 Eccentric Positioning of Assemblies in Fuel Storage Cells

The potential reactivity effect of eccentric positioning of assemblies in the fuel storage locations is accounted for in a conservatively bounding fashion, as described further in this subsection. The calculations in this subsection serve to identify the eccentric positioning of assemblies in the fuel storage locations, which results in a higher maximum k_{eff} value than the centered positioning. For the cases where the eccentric positioning results in a higher maximum k_{eff} value, the eccentric positioning is used for all corresponding cases reported in the summary tables in Section 6.1 and the results tables in Section 6.4.

To conservatively account for eccentric fuel positioning in the fuel storage cells, three different configurations are analyzed, and the results are compared to determine the bounding configuration:

- Cell Center Configuration: All assemblies centered in their fuel storage cell;
- Basket Center Configuration: All assemblies in the basket are moved as close to the center of the basket as permitted by the basket geometry; and
- Basket Periphery Configuration: All assemblies in the basket are moved furthest away from the basket center, and as close to the periphery of the basket as possible.

It should be noted that the two eccentric configurations are hypothetical, since there is no known physical phenomenon that could move all assemblies within a basket consistently to the center or periphery. However, since the configurations listed above bound all credible configurations, they are conservatively used in the analyses.

In Table 6.3.5, results are presented for all representative conditions. The table shows the maximum k_{eff} value for centered and the two eccentric configurations for each condition, and the difference in k_{eff} between the centered and eccentric positioning. In all cases, moving the assemblies and DFCs to the periphery of the basket results in a reduction in reactivity, compared to the cell centered position, and moving the assemblies and DFCs towards the center results in

6.4.2.4

Preferential Flooding

Two different potential conditions of preferential flooding are considered: preferential flooding of the MPC basket itself (i.e. different water levels in different basket cells), and preferential flooding involving Damaged Fuel Containers.

Preferential flooding of the MPC basket itself for any of the MPC fuel basket designs is not possible because flow holes are present on all four walls of each basket cell and on the two flux trap walls at both the top and bottom of the MPC basket. The flow holes are sized to ensure that they cannot be blocked by crud deposits. Because the fuel cladding temperatures remain below their design limits (as demonstrated in Chapter 3) and the inertial loading remains below 63g's (Section 2.9), the cladding remains intact. For damaged BWR fuel assemblies and BWR fuel debris, the assemblies or debris are pre-loaded into stainless steel Damaged Fuel Containers fitted with 250x250 fine mesh screens (20x20 for Trojan FFC) which prevent damaged fuel assemblies or fuel debris from blocking the basket flow holes. Therefore, the flow holes cannot be blocked and the MPC fuel baskets cannot be preferentially flooded.

However, when DFCs are present in the MPC, a condition could exist during the draining of the MPC, where the DFCs are still partly filled with water while the remainder of the MPC is dry. This condition would be the result of the water tension across the mesh screens. The maximum water level inside the DFCs for this condition is calculated from the dimensions of the mesh screen and the surface tension of water. The wetted perimeter of the screen openings is up to 50 ft per square inch of screen. With a surface tension of water of 0.005 lbf/ft, this results in a maximum pressure across the screen of 0.25 psi, corresponding to a maximum water height in the DFC of 7 inches. For added conservatism, a value of 12 inches is used. Assuming this condition, calculations are performed for the two possible DFC configurations:

- MPC-68 or MPC-68F with 68 DFCs (Assembly Classes 6x6A/B/C, 7x7A and 8x8A, see Subsection 6.4.4)
- MPC-24E or MPC-24EF with 4 DFCs and 20 intact assemblies (Bounding all PWR assembly classes, see Subsection 6.4.9)

For each configuration, the case resulting in the highest maximum k_{eff} for the fully flooded condition (see Subsections 6.4.4 and 6.4.9) is re-analyzed assuming the preferential flooding condition. For these analyses, the lower 12 inches of the active fuel in the DFCs and the water region below the active fuel (see Figure 6.3.7) are filled with full density water (1.0 g/cc). The remainder of the cask is filled with steam consisting of ordinary water at partial density (0.002 g/cc). All calculations are performed for a single unreflected cask. Table 6.4.10 lists the maximum k_{eff} for the configurations in comparison with the maximum k_{eff} for the fully flooded condition. For all configurations, the preferential flooding condition results in a lower maximum k_{eff} than the fully flooded condition. Thus, the preferential flooding condition is bounded by the

fully flooded condition.

In summary, it is concluded that the MPC fuel baskets cannot be preferentially flooded, and that the potential preferential flooding conditions involving DFCs are bounded by the result for the fully flooded condition listed in Subsections 6.4.4 and 6.4.9.

6.4.2.5 Hypothetical Accidents Conditions of Transport

The analyses presented in Section 2.7 of Chapter 2 and Section 3.5 of Chapter 3 demonstrate that the damage resulting from the hypothetical accident conditions of transport are limited to a loss of the neutron shield material as a result of the hypothetical fire accident. Because the criticality analyses do not take credit for the neutron shield material (Holtite-A), this condition has no effect on the criticality analyses.

As reported in Table 2.7.1, the minimum factor of safety for all MPCs as a result of the hypothetical accident conditions of transport is larger than 1.0 against the Level D allowables for Subsection NG, Section III of the ASME Code. Therefore, because the maximum box wall stresses are well within the ASME Level D allowables, the flux-trap gap change in the MPC-24 and MPC-24E/EF will be insignificant compared to the characteristic dimension of the flux trap.

Regarding the fuel assembly integrity, SAR Section 2.9 contains an evaluation of the fuel under accident conditions that concludes that the fuel rod cladding remains intact under the design basis deceleration levels set for the HI-STAR 100.

In summary, the hypothetical transport accidents have no adverse effect on the geometric form of the package contents important to criticality safety, and thus, are limited to the effects on internal and external moderation evaluated in Subsection 6.4.2.1.

6.4.3 Criticality Results

In calculating the maximum reactivity, the analysis used the following equation:

$$k_{eff}^{max} = k_c + K_c \sigma_c + Bias + \sigma_B$$

where:

- ⇒ k_c is the calculated k_{eff} under the worst combination of tolerances;
- ⇒ K_c is the K multiplier for a one-sided statistical tolerance limit with 95% probability at the 95% confidence level [6.1.8]. Each final k_{eff} value calculated by MCNP4a (or KENO5a) is the result of averaging 100 (or more) cycle k_{eff} values, and thus, is based on