

ור/דב/ר Tables A-3, 4, 5 These are background reformations for some of the topics I would like to discuss lunge the July 30 meeting. Vuis Farmusly x 28166

## POOR ORIGINAL



1765 152 8001070263

## INTEROFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

ORIGI

July 23, 1979

GEG Idaho

C. F. Obenchain

J. L. LaChance

STEAM GENERATOR TUBE RUPTURE TASK PRELIMINARY PROPOSAL -

TASK :

Determine the number of steam generator tube ruptures during a LOCA which will result in elevated peak cladding temperatures in Westinghouse 2 and 3 loop plants. Combustion Engineering. and Babcock and Wilcox plants. The core thermal response is to be examined in this window regime.

ASSUMPTIONS:

The tube ruptures will be assumed to occur at the beginning of reflood during the worst LOCA - a 200% cold leg break. The tube ruptures will be assumed to occur at the inlet plenum of the intact loop steam generator(s). For the Westinghouse 3 loop plant, the tube ruptures will be assumed to occur equally in the 2 intact loop steam generators so as to maximize the time period in which secondary-to-primary flow occurs.

METHODS:

- Blowdown calculations will be performed for the CE and B&W plants using RELAP4/MOD6. No RELAP4 input decks are available for Westinghouse 2 and 3 loop plants. If no acceptable blowdown calculations can be located, a blowdown calculation for a W 4 loop plant. could be used.
- Refill calculations for the plants will be performed using the FLOOD4 code with a heat transfer coefficient of 5 Btu/hr-ft<sup>2</sup>-OF. This has been shown to be a realistic heat transfer coefficient during the refill period. A conservative alternative would be to assume adiabatic heat up by using a heat transfer coefficient of 0. The refill time period will be calculated by hand.

DELIMINARY

1765 153

8000000

C. F. Obenchain July 23, 1979 LaC-1-79 Page 2

PRELIMINARY

- The FLOOD4 code will be used to calculate the reflood 3. portion of the transients including simulated steam generator tube ruptures. The FLOOD4 code will require some modification in order to calculate transients in the CE 2 by 4 plant. Several assumptions will be required in setting up the FLOOD4 models that will significantly affect the calculated results. They are:
  - (a) The number of rods that can be top-down quenched has to be specified. Recommend allowing the whole core with exception of the hot fuel bundle to be capable of being top-down quenched if liquid in the upper plenum is available. This should result in maximum steam production in the system and the highest peak cladding temperature.
  - A minimum heat transfer coefficient is required (b) for the input model. In the window regime (stagnant or near stagnant core flow) the heat transfer in the core is determined by this parameter. Recommend using 5 Btu/hr-ft2.of since this is considered a reasonable value for a heat transfer coefficient during refill.
  - (c) The amount of secondary liquid vaporized in the primary has to be specified in the FLOOD4 model and drastically affects the calculated results in the negative core flow regime. Fortunately the calculated results in the positive core flow and stagnant core flow regimes are insenstive to this parameter. Recommend using a secondary-to-primary flow quality of 1.C. This represents the worst case since secondary liquid will not be available for top-down quenching of the core and also since steam binding will be maximized.

## PROCEDURE:

The steps required to perform this task and the labor and cost are summarized in the following table. The numbers presented are preliminary and considered conservative. Better estimates can be made once the task is better defined.

1765 154

8001 830 8001 830

8001

POOR ORIGIN

PREIMINA

C. F. Obenchain July 23, 1979 LaC-1-79 Page 3

Labor Cost Cost Cost Task Step Months/Cost (KS) (KS) (KS) (KS) 1. Run best estimate blow-3/14.5 10 24.5 24.5 down calculations for CE and BLW plantsa 2. Update FLOOD4 code 0.5/2.8 0.5 3.3 27.8 (Rex Shumway) 3. Create FLOOD4 input decks 7.2 1.5/7.2 35 for plants D 4. Perform refill calculations 37.4 .5/2.4 2.4 ---5. Perform reflood calculations 17.6 219.6 8 55 with tube ruptures assumed to occurc 6. Write report 2/9.6 9.6 64.6 ---TOTAL 9.5/46.1 18.5 64.6

PRELIMINARY POOR ORIGINAL

Computer

Total

Accumulated

1765 155

a Existing EM decks will be modified and blowdown calculations performed. Plants modeled are: CE-Calvert Cliffs, B&W-Oconee. An existing Westinghouse blowdown calculation for Zion plant will be used for W 2 and 3 loop plants. Modification of EM decks requires 2/3 of the time!

b FLOOD4 input data consists primarily of loop resistance values and system volume numbers. We have loop resistance information for the following plants: CE - Millstone B&W - Crystal River & Davis-Besse W 2 loop - Kewaunee W 3 loop - Kewaunee W 3 loop - Surry Hopefully the CE and B&W plants are similar to those modeled in blowdown calculations.

c One base case (no tube ruptures) and approximately 6 tube rupture transients for each plant will be run.

bt

cc: C. A. Dobbe C. F. Obenchain P. H. Vander Hyde L. J. Ybarrondo Cantral Files

PRELIMINARY