BROWNS FERRY NUCLEAR PLANT

Simulator Four Year Certification Update Report

Test Period 1996 - 1999

Report Prepared By:	Patrick J. Arundel Simulator Certification Engineer	/	10/28/99
Report Approved By:	Thomas S. Albright Simulator Services Manager	1	11/4/99

Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant Simulator Four Year Certification Update Report Test Period 1996-1999

	Table of Contents	
<u>Topic</u>	Pa	ge
I.	INTRODUCTION]
II.	GENERAL DISCUSSION]
III.	DESCRIPTION OF COMPLETED TESTS]
	 A. Steady State Tests B. Drift Tests C. Transient Tests D. Procedure Tests E. Malfunction Tests F. Real Time Tests G. Simulator Fidelity H. Simulator Limitations I. Simulator Exceptions 	··· 2 ··· 2 ··· 2 ··· 6 ··· 6
IV.	STATUS OF UNRESOLVED TEST PERFORMANCE DISCREPANCIES REPORTED IN 1995	
V.	UNRESOLVED TEST PERFORMANCE DISCREPANCIES AND RESOLUTION SCHEDULE	
VI.	DESCRIPTION OF TEST DIFFERENCES FOR THE NEXT FOUR YEAR TEST PERIOD	
VII.	SCHEDULE FOR TESTING DURING THE NEXT FOUR YEAR TEST PERIOD	8
List o	of Tables	
Ta Ta Ta Ta Ta Ta	able 1Critical and Non-Critical Test Parametersable 2Transient Test Listable 3Procedure Test Listable 4Malfunction Test Listable 5Limitations Listable 6Open Exception Report Listable 7Schedule for the Resolution of Test Discrepancies.able 8Schedule for Testing During the Next Four Year Test Period	···· 2

I. INTRODUCTION

This test report is required by 10 CFR 55.45(b)(5)(ii), to be submitted to NRC every four years on the anniversary of the initial certification report. The four year NRC Form-474 initial certification report date was December 13, 1991.

Simulator test schedules were given in the four year report submitted in December 1995 to NRC. Tests were completed as required by American National Standards Institute (ANSI) 3.5-1985 and were performed each year as outlined in the four year proposed schedule. This report outlines the methods and the unresolved discrepancies for each test. The anniversary date for this four year report is December 13, 1999.

II. GENERAL DISCUSSION

The Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant (BFN) simulator has been used for operator training since 1976 (originally built by Singer-Link). It is used to license operators on both Units 2 and 3 with Unit 2 as the simulator reference unit. Since the last four year report submitted in 1995, the Browns Ferry simulator has been used continually for various training at BFN. The simulator has been maintained in accordance with ANSI-3.5 and additional self-imposed requirements. Tuning adjustments are routinely made as plant data is made available and plant design changes have been implemented to ensure simulation models are maintained as close to the referenced unit as practical.

The BFN simulator computer system has been upgraded since the last four year report which was issued on December 13, 1995. The simulator computer systems (Encore 9780s and Concurrent 6650s), originally installed in 1991, were replaced with single-board VME based SPARC8VT computers. Also the ICS computer (VAX 6000) and DECNET intercommunications protocol were replaced with an ALPHA workstation and TCP/IP protocol. The new computer system provides tremendous processing power for simulation, improves software development and maintenance tools, and is Y2K compliant.

Major plant design changes have also been made to the BFN simulator since the previous report. The reactor feedwater level control system and reactor recirculation control system, consisting of GEMAC controllers and software, were replaced with FOXBORO stimulated digital control systems. The GE Power Range Neutron Monitoring upgrade was also installed. This included the instability detection system. Additionally, the simulator was modified to support 105 percent power uprate and 24 month fuel cycles. All simulator computer systems and microprocessor driven instruments were tested and certified as Y2K ready.

III. DESCRIPTION OF COMPLETED TESTS

This section summarizes the tests completed on the simulator over the past four years. Detailed test documentation is maintained by the Simulator Services group at the BFN Training Center for review, in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR 55.45(b)(5)(iii). The unresolved discrepancies are described in Section V, Unresolved Test Performance Discrepancies and Resolution Schedule. Any test discrepancies identified during certification testing are resolved though the simulator discrepancy report (DR) or simulator design change request (DCR) process.

A. Steady State Tests

Steady State Tests were performed annually. Plant critical and non-critical test parameters (refer to Table 1) were compared to the equivalent simulator values at each of three power levels. The error was calculated based on plus or minus 2 percent of span for critical and plus or minus 10 percent of span for non-critical parameters. A total of twelve discrepancies were captured in DRs in the last four years: two DRs remain to be resolved.

TADLET				
CRITICAL TEST PARAMETERS	NON-CRITICAL TEST PARAMETERS			
Reactor Thermal Power MWT	Reactor Feedpump Individual Flows			
Reactor Electrical Power MWE	Reactor Feedpump Individual Pressures			
APRM Power	Reactor Feedpump Turbine Speeds			
Power Range Channels	Reactor Feedpump Suction Header Pressure			
Recirculation Pump Flows	Condenser Pump Discharge Header Pressure			
Total Core Flow	Condenser Pump Discharge Header Flow			
Reactor Feedwater Temperature	Condenser Booster Pump Suction Header Press			
Reactor Water Level	Condenser Booster Pump Discharge Header Press			
Reactor Pressure Wide Range	Condenser Hotwell Level			
Reactor Pressure Narrow Range	Condenser Hotwell Temperature			
Reactor Feedwater Flow to Reactor	Reactor Feedwater Pressure to Reactor			
Main Steam Flow Leaving Reactor	Feedwater Heater Shell Steam Pressures			
Condenser Hotwell Pressure	Recirculation Jet Pump Loops Flows			
Control Rod Drive Flow	Recirculation Jet Pump Calibrated Flows			
First Stage Pressure Governor End	RWCU Demineralizer Flows			
	RWCU Loop Inlet Temperature			
	RWCU Loop Outlet Temperature			

TABLE 1

B. Drift Tests

Drift Tests were performed annually. The simulator was reset to 100 percent power and data was collected for an hour for each critical parameter at a rate of one sample per second. Plots were made with this data to check for stability. A parameter would fail the test if it drifted beyond plus or minus 2 percent of the initial value. No test discrepancies occurred.

C. Transient Tests

The ten Transient Tests were performed annually (refer to Table 2). Data was collected for required parameters at a rate of four samples per second. Each year the test results were plotted and compared with responses from the prior year and with initial certification data by a Browns Ferry Simulator certification team. Additionally, data collected from plant transients, when available, was compared to simulator responses. A total of four discrepancies were captured in DRs in the last four years: these discrepancies were resolved.

TABLE 2

	TRANSIENT TEST LIST
1.	Manual Reactor Trip
2.	Simultaneous Trip of All Feedwater Pumps
3.	Simultaneous Closure of All MSIVs
4.	Simultaneous Trip of All Recirculation Pumps
5.	Single Recirculation Pump Trip
6.	Main Turbine Trip at Max Power that Does Not Result in Reactor Trip
7.	Maximum Power Ramp (100% To 75% Then Back Up To 100%)
8.	Maximum Size Reactor Coolant System Rupture Combined with Loss of All Offsite Power
9.	Maximum Size Un-Isolable Main Steam Line Rupture
10	. Simultaneous Closure of all Main Steam Isolation Valves Combined with Single Stuck Open
	Safety/Relief Valve. (Inhibit activation of high pressure Emergency Core Cooling Systems.)

D. Procedure Tests

To distribute the work load between each testing year, approximately 25 percent of the procedure tests were performed each year. At the completion of the four year test cycle, each of the procedure tests had been completed. Table 3 provides a summary of the tests performed. Each test used the latest revision of Unit 2 controlled procedures. A total of nine discrepancies were captured in DRs in the last four years: two DRs remain to be resolved.

			TABLE 3		
	·		PROCEDURE TEST LIST		
Annual					
	Test Procedure Description				
	Period				
Ending		1 O		· · · · ·	
1996		T	rocedures (GOIs)		
1997		lance Instruct			
1998	¥	<u> </u>	g Procedures (EOIs)		
1999			Procedures (AOIs)		
NOTE:	year. Det	tailed procedur	we which set of procedures were performed during re numbers are not used because they may change. f each test year.		
E.	Malfunct	tion Tests			
	After ins Malfunct	erting each n tion Cause an	cycle, each of the required malfunctions had be nalfunction, simulator response was compared ad Effects document, plant procedures, and availy, a check was made to ensure that an appropriate	to the ailable actual	
	operator features be remov	n existed, the s would take (if any) could yed. A total	e simulator could be operated to a steady state the same actions in the reference plant, the va d be manipulated, and whether or not the malfu of five discrepancies were captured in DRs in t is to be resolved.	condition, riable rate unction could	
	operator features be remov	n existed, the s would take (if any) could ved. A total a DR remain	e simulator could be operated to a steady state the same actions in the reference plant, the va d be manipulated, and whether or not the malfu of five discrepancies were captured in DRs in t as to be resolved. TABLE 4	condition, riable rate unction could	
	operator features be remov	n existed, the s would take (if any) could ved. A total a DR remain	e simulator could be operated to a steady state the same actions in the reference plant, the va d be manipulated, and whether or not the malfu of five discrepancies were captured in DRs in t is to be resolved.	condition, riable rate unction could	
Annual Test	operator features be remov	n existed, the s would take (if any) could ved. A total a DR remain	e simulator could be operated to a steady state the same actions in the reference plant, the va d be manipulated, and whether or not the malfu of five discrepancies were captured in DRs in t as to be resolved. TABLE 4	condition, riable rate unction could	
Annual Test Period Ending	operator features be remov years: on	n existed, the s would take (if any) could ved. A total to DR remain	e simulator could be operated to a steady state the same actions in the reference plant, the va d be manipulated, and whether or not the malfu of five discrepancies were captured in DRs in t is to be resolved. TABLE 4 MALFUNCTION TEST LIST	condition, riable rate inction could the last four	
Period	operator features be remov years: on	n existed, the s would take (if any) could yed. A total he DR remain Malfunction	e simulator could be operated to a steady state the same actions in the reference plant, the va d be manipulated, and whether or not the malfu of five discrepancies were captured in DRs in t as to be resolved. TABLE 4 MALFUNCTION TEST LIST Malfunction	condition, riable rate inction could the last four ANSI-3.5 Section	
Period Ending	operator features be remov years: on	n existed, the s would take (if any) could ved. A total of the DR remain Malfunction Number	e simulator could be operated to a steady state the same actions in the reference plant, the va d be manipulated, and whether or not the malfu of five discrepancies were captured in DRs in t as to be resolved. TABLE 4 MALFUNCTION TEST LIST Malfunction Description	condition, riable rate inction could the last four ANSI-3.5 Section	
Period Ending	operator features be remov years: on Item Number	n existed, the s would take (if any) could ved. A total as DR remain Malfunction Number TH33	e simulator could be operated to a steady state the same actions in the reference plant, the va d be manipulated, and whether or not the malfu of five discrepancies were captured in DRs in t as to be resolved. <u>TABLE 4</u> <u>MALFUNCTION TEST LIST</u> <u>Malfunction</u> <u>Description</u> <u>Main Steam Line Break Inside Containment</u>	condition, riable rate inction could the last four ANSI-3.5 Section 3.1.2(1b,20)	
Period Ending	operator features be remov years: on Item Number	n existed, the s would take (if any) could yed. A total of DR remain Malfunction Number TH33 CU04	e simulator could be operated to a steady state the same actions in the reference plant, the va d be manipulated, and whether or not the malfu of five discrepancies were captured in DRs in the st to be resolved. TABLE 4 MALFUNCTION TEST LIST Malfunction Description Main Steam Line Break Inside Containment RWCU System Suction Line Break	condition, riable rate unction could the last four ANSI-3.5 Section 3.1.2(1b,20) 3.1.2(1b)	
Period Ending	operator features be remov years: on Item Number 1 2 3	n existed, the s would take (if any) could ved. A total of the DR remain Malfunction Number TH33 CU04 TH21	e simulator could be operated to a steady state the same actions in the reference plant, the va d be manipulated, and whether or not the malfu of five discrepancies were captured in DRs in the sto be resolved. <u>TABLE 4</u> <u>MALFUNCTION TEST LIST</u> <u>Malfunction</u> <u>Description</u> <u>Main Steam Line Break Inside Containment</u> <u>RWCU System Suction Line Break</u> <u>Recirculation Pump Suction Line Break</u>	condition, riable rate inction could the last four ANSI-3.5 Section 3.1.2(1b,20) 3.1.2(1b) 3.1.2(1c)	
Period Ending	operator features be remov years: on Item Number 1 2 3 4	n existed, the s would take (if any) could ved. A total a DR remain Malfunction Number TH33 CU04 TH21 TH22	e simulator could be operated to a steady state the same actions in the reference plant, the va d be manipulated, and whether or not the malfu of five discrepancies were captured in DRs in the sto be resolved. TABLE 4 MALFUNCTION TEST LIST Malfunction Description Main Steam Line Break Inside Containment RWCU System Suction Line Break Recirculation Pump Suction Line Break Coolant Leak Inside Drywell	condition, riable rate inction could the last four ANSI-3.5 Section 3.1.2(1b,20) 3.1.2(1b) 3.1.2(1c) 3.1.2(1c) 3.1.2(1d)	
Period Ending	operator features be remov years: on Item Number 1 2 3 4 5	n existed, the s would take (if any) could yed. A total me DR remain Malfunction Number TH33 CU04 TH21 TH22 AD01	e simulator could be operated to a steady state the same actions in the reference plant, the va d be manipulated, and whether or not the malfu of five discrepancies were captured in DRs in the st obe resolved. TABLE 4 MALFUNCTION TEST LIST Malfunction Description Main Steam Line Break Inside Containment RWCU System Suction Line Break Recirculation Pump Suction Line Break Coolant Leak Inside Drywell Relief Valve Failures	condition, riable rate inction could the last four ANSI-3.5 Section 3.1.2(1b,20) 3.1.2(1c) 3.1.2(1c) 3.1.2(1c) 3.1.2(1d) 3.1.2(2)	
Period Ending	operator features be remove years: on Item Number 1 2 3 4 5 6	n existed, the s would take (if any) could ved. A total a DR remain Malfunction Number TH33 CU04 TH21 TH22 AD01 IA01	e simulator could be operated to a steady state the same actions in the reference plant, the va d be manipulated, and whether or not the malfu of five discrepancies were captured in DRs in the sto be resolved. TABLE 4 MALFUNCTION TEST LIST Malfunction Description Main Steam Line Break Inside Containment RWCU System Suction Line Break Recirculation Pump Suction Line Break Coolant Leak Inside Drywell Relief Valve Failures Loss of Control Air	condition, riable rate inction could the last four ANSI-3.5 Section 3.1.2(1b,20) 3.1.2(1c) 3.1.2(1c) 3.1.2(1c) 3.1.2(1d) 3.1.2(2) 3.1.2(3)	
Period Ending	operator features be removing years: on litem Number 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	n existed, the s would take (if any) could ved. A total of the DR remain Malfunction Number TH33 CU04 TH21 TH22 AD01 IA01 DG02	e simulator could be operated to a steady state the same actions in the reference plant, the va d be manipulated, and whether or not the malfu of five discrepancies were captured in DRs in the sto be resolved. TABLE 4 MALFUNCTION TEST LIST Malfunction Description Main Steam Line Break Inside Containment RWCU System Suction Line Break Recirculation Pump Suction Line Break Coolant Leak Inside Drywell Relief Valve Failures Loss of Control Air DG Trip	condition, riable rate anction could the last four ANSI-3.5 Section 3.1.2(1b,20) 3.1.2(1b) 3.1.2(1c) 3.1.2(1c) 3.1.2(1d) 3.1.2(2) 3.1.2(3) 3.1.2(3)	
Period Ending	operator features be remove years: on litem Number 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	n existed, the s would take (if any) could yed. A total of the DR remain Malfunction Number TH33 CU04 TH21 TH22 AD01 IA01 DG02 ED01	e simulator could be operated to a steady state the same actions in the reference plant, the va d be manipulated, and whether or not the malfu of five discrepancies were captured in DRs in the st to be resolved. TABLE 4 MALFUNCTION TEST LIST Malfunction Description Main Steam Line Break Inside Containment RWCU System Suction Line Break Recirculation Pump Suction Line Break Coolant Leak Inside Drywell Relief Valve Failures Loss of Control Air DG Trip Loss of Offsite Power	condition, riable rate inction could the last four ANSI-3.5 Section 3.1.2(1b,20) 3.1.2(1c) 3.1.2(1c) 3.1.2(1c) 3.1.2(1d) 3.1.2(2) 3.1.2(3)	

Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant Simulator Four Year Certification Update Report Test Period 1996-1999

		<u>N</u>	ALFUNCTION TEST LIST		
Domod		Malfunction Number	Malfunction Description	ANSI-3.5 Section	
1997	1	TH03	Recirculation Pump Trip	3.1.2(4)	
	2	OG 02	Loss of Condenser Vacuum	3.1.2(5)	
	3	FW20	Condenser Hotwell Level Automatic Makeup Failure	3.1.2(5)	
	4	SW04	RCW Pump Trip	3.1.2(6)	
	5	SW06	Partial Loss of Plant Preferred System	3.1.2(6)	
	6	TH31	Fail the Following Pressure Instruments	3.1.2(7)	
	7	SW01	Loss of RBCCW Flow to the Drywell	3.1.2(8)	
	8	FW01	Condensate Pump Trip	3.1.2(9)	
	9	FW22	Spurious RFPT Low Suction Pressure Trip	3.1.2(10)	
	10	RC03	RCIC Low Suction Pressure Turbine Trip	3.1.2(10)	
1998	1	RP01	RPS Channel MG Set Failure	3.1.2(11)	
	2	RD04	Drift Any Control Rod Out	3.1.2(12)	
	3	RD05	Uncouple Any Control Rod	3.1.2(12)	
	4	RD 06	Stick Any Control Rod	3.1.2(2,13)	
	5	RD07	Drift Any Control Rod In	3.1.2(12)	
	6	RD13	RMCS Timer Failure	3.1.2(13)	
	7	TH23	Fuel Cladding Damage	3.1.2(14)	
	8	TC01	Turbine Trip	3.1.2(15)	
	9	EG01	Generator Lockout Due to Transformer Faults	3.1.2(16)	
	10	TH15	Recirculation System Speed Demand Failure	3.1.2(17)	
1999	1	NM16	PRNM NUMAC Critical Failure	3.1.2(19,21)	
	2	FW19	Feedwater Line Break in Main Steam Tunnel	3.1.2(20)	
	3	NM05	IRM Failure	3.1.2(21)	
	4	FW30	Woodward Governor Speed Control Handswitch Failure	3.1.2(22)	
	5	TC06	Pressure Regulator Fails Open	3.1.2(22,25)	
	6	CS04	Core Spray Logic Power Failure	3.1.2(23)	
	7	ED27	250V RMOV Board Breaker Failure	3.1.2(23)	
	8	RP 06	Auto Scram Channel Failure	3.1.2(24)	
	9	TC02	Turbine Bypass Valves Control Unit Failure	3.1.2(24)	

Note: The test period ends on December 13 of each test year.

F. Real Time Tests

Computer real time test are run to test the computer complex for verification of real time test. Two types of Real Time Tests were performed:

- 1. The simulator was set to 100% power initial condition and was placed in Run for 10 minutes. A stop watch was used to independently verify 10 minutes of computer simulation. Problem time and stop watch time matched after the 10 minutes.
- 2. The simulator uses a real time executive test, which runs continually and monitors the execution of all simulation models. It also logs in a variable the longest frame time over a period of time. One steady state and three transient tests were collected over one minute and the longest frame times were collected and plotted. In all tests, there was more than fifty percent spare time.

No Real Time Test discrepancies were found.

G. Simulator Fidelity

As modifications are being initiated in the plant, design change packages are reviewed by the simulator staff for applicability. Additionally, photographs are made of the plant Main Control Room panels for comparison with the simulator. Items that were identified as having training impact were incorporated into the simulator under the DCR process. Plant changes are required to be compiled at least annually, and appropriate simulator modifications are required to be made within the following year. The required modifications were implemented within these time limits.

H. Simulator Limitations

The Browns Ferry simulator imposes six Limitations (refer to Table 5). The limitations prevent simulator events from exceeding plant design limits. To avoid negative training, which could result from simulator operation during such events, the occurrence of an event on the simulator that progresses beyond the plant design limits causes the simulator to automatically stop (simulator is forced to freeze and a message is displayed on the instructor station indicating the limitation that was exceeded).

TABLE	5
-------	---

	LIMITATIONS LIST	
1.	Drywell pressure exceeds the design limit (< -2 psig or > 63 psig).	
2.	Fuel clad temperature exceeds the clad melt point (2200 degrees Fahrenheit).	
3.	Reactor vessel pressure exceeds design limit (1375 psig).	
4.	Water entering steam turbines.	
5.	Suppression pool temperature exceeds boiling point.	
6.	Core average void fraction > 90% and water level < -400 inches.	

I. Simulator Exceptions

Significant differences in simulator fidelity, other than those addressed by open DRs or DCRs, are tracked as Exception Reports (refer to Table 6 for the current list). Each have been evaluated to have no negative impact on training.

IABLE 0						
	OPEN EXCEPTION REPORT LIST					
Exception Number*	Open Date	Exception Description				
1	1 11/22/91 Additional camera equipment mounted in ceiling of simulator that is not present in the plant control room.					
2	11/22/91	Simulator room lighting does not match the plant control room lighting.				
4	11/22/91	Panel 2-9-47 is only partially simulated.				
5	11/22/91	Panel 0-9-56 is not simulated.				
6	11/22/91	Panel 2-9-9 is not simulated.				
7	11/22/91	Panel 2-9-46 is not simulated.				
8	11/22/91	Panel 2-9-24 is not simulated.				
9	11/22/91	Panel 2-9-44 is not simulated.				
10	11/22/91	Panel 2-9-59 is not simulated.				
11	11/22/91	Panel 2-9-22 is not simulated.				
12	11/22/91	Electrical operator typer is not simulated.				
13	11/22/91	Drywell TV monitor is not simulated.				
14	11/22/91	Panel 2-9-54 has additional instruments.				

TABLE 6

*Note: For brevity, closed Exceptions are not listed.

IV. Status of Unresolved Test Performance Discrepancies Reported in 1995

Five open test discrepancies were documented in the four year report submitted in 1995. All five items were resolved.

V. Unresolved Test Performance Discrepancies and Resolution Schedule

Five open test discrepancies exist at the start of the next four year testing period. They are planned for resolution as shown in Table 7.

		TABLE 7				
SCHEDULE FOR THE RESOLUTION OF TEST DISCREPANCIES						
Test	Discrepancy	Description of Discrepancy	Scheduled Date			
Steady State	DR-3539	Main Steam Flow leaving the reactor did not fall within criteria for critical parameters.	12/13/2000			
	DR-3540	Reactor feedwater temperature did not fall within the criteria for critical parameters.	12/13/2000			
Procedure	DR-3531	Discrepancies were noted between the BFNP simulator and the Abnormal Operating Instructions.	12/13/2000			
	DR-3532	Malfunction description for malfunction ED25 is incorrect.	12/13/2000			
Malfunction	DR-3538	Simulator response did not match the malfunction cause and effects document for malfunction FW19.	12/13/2000			

VI. DESCRIPTION OF TEST DIFFERENCES FOR THE NEXT FOUR YEAR TEST PERIOD

During the next four year test period, each simulator test is planned to be performed in a manner similar to that of the previous period; no changes are anticipated in critical and non-critical test parameters.

VII. SCHEDULE FOR TESTING DURING THE NEXT FOUR YEAR TEST PERIOD

Table 8 lists planned test starting dates for the next simulator reporting cycle. The next anniversary of the Four Year Simulator Test Report is December 13, 2003. The only impact to this process may be due to regulatory changes to 10CFR55.45 and supporting documents that are in the planning stages at the time of this report.

Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant Simulator Four Year Certification Update Report Test Period 1996-1999

TABLE 8							
SCHED	ULE FOR TESTING	JURING THE	NEXT FOUR YE	<u>AR TEST PER</u>	IOD		
		Planned Start	Planned Start	Planned	Planned Start		
		Year 1	Year 2	Start Year 3	Year 4		
Tes	t Type	(Test Period	(Test Period	(Test Period	(Test Period		
Procedure * (25% annually)		Ending	Ending	Ending	Ending		
		12/13/2000)	12/13/2001)	12/13/2002)	12/13/2003)		
		7/1/2000	7/1/2001	7/1/2002	7/1/2003		
Transient/Real Time (100%annually)		8/1/2000	8/1/2001	8/1/2002	8/1/2003		
Malfunction **	(25% annually)	9/1/2000	9/1/2001	9/1/2002	9/1/2003		
Steady State	(100%annually)	10/1/2000	10/1/2001	10/1/2002	10/1/2003		

Note: * Procedure tests will be conducted each test year in the pattern shown in Table 3.

** Malfunction tests will be conducted each test year in the pattern shown in Table 4.