

No. 92-114
Tel. 301/504-2240

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
(Thursday, July 30, 1992)

NOTE TO EDITORS:

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has received the attached letter-type report concerning integral system and separate effects testing programs in support of certification of the Westinghouse Electric Corporation's AP600 standard plant design.

#

Attachments:
As stated

July 17, 1992

The Honorable Ivan Selin
Chairman
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Dear Chairman Selin:

SUBJECT: INTEGRAL SYSTEM AND SEPARATE EFFECTS TESTING IN SUPPORT
OF THE WESTINGHOUSE AP600 PLANT DESIGN CERTIFICATION

During the 387th meeting of the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, July 9-11, 1992, we discussed the programs of integral system and separate effects testing being planned by both Westinghouse and NRC to support the certification effort for the Westinghouse Electric Corporation's AP600 passive plant design. We held discussions on this matter during our 381st through 384th (January-April 1992) meetings, inclusive. Our Subcommittee on Thermal Hydraulic Phenomena held meetings on December 17, 1991, March 3, 1992, and June 23-24, 1992 to review this issue. During these meetings, we had the benefit of discussions with representatives of the Westinghouse Electric Corporation and the NRC staff. We also had benefit of the referenced documents. We have previously reported to you on this matter in our letters of March 10 and April 6, 1992.

BACKGROUND

Appropriately validated thermal hydraulic computer models must be relied on to support the safety assessments required for certification of the AP600. Westinghouse has indicated that it plans to use its more mechanistic assessment code, WCOBRA/TRAC, only for large-break LOCA analyses, and will rely on its evaluation model, NOTRUMP, for analyses of all other design-basis events. The NRC plans to use RELAP5/MOD3 to support its assessments.

The NOTRUMP code is an evaluation model code that is based on 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix K, requirements. The other two codes, WCOBRA/TRAC and RELAP5/MOD3, are more mechanistic codes that have been qualified as best-estimate tools only for large-break LOCAs. All of these analysis tools will be required to simulate the AP600 behavior in regimes where the codes are known to be weak. These regimes include phenomena such as horizontal (perhaps countercurrent stratified) flows, interface movements, thermal stratification, rapid "shock" condensation, boron mixing, and low-pressure gravity-driven flows.

To develop the necessary data for improvement and validation of these models for AP600 assessment, Westinghouse now has plans for conducting a number of separate effects tests at several different facilities, and integral system tests. The integral system test programs are to be conducted in a low-pressure facility now nearing final design at the Oregon State University (OSU) and in an existing high-pressure facility, SPES (in Italy), to be modified to better simulate AP600.

The NRC has proposed to conduct high-pressure confirmatory testing by modifying and using the existing ROSA-IV facility at JAERI in Japan. The modified facility will be referred to as ROSA-V. The NRC has no specific plans for additional separate effects testing. The staff does plan to conduct low-pressure integral system testing in the OSU facility after the Westinghouse program has been completed.

At this time, we have the following comments and recommendations regarding various aspects of these planned and proposed efforts.

WESTINGHOUSE PROGRAM

We believe that, with certain enhancements, the Westinghouse program will be adequate for the certification process. We have the following specific comments and recommendations:

- We are concerned that Westinghouse plans to rely primarily on its NOTRUMP evaluation model (EM) code. It is a step backwards to use computer codes of only EM sophistication and capabilities to evaluate the thermal hydraulic behavior of new nuclear power plants.
- The Westinghouse separate effects tests of most importance to the certification of AP600 are the Core Make-up Tank (CMT) tests and the Automatic Depressurization System (ADS) tests. The test matrices for these do not cover ranges of conditions that are broad enough to yield an adequate data base for the required model development. We recommend that pressure disturbances of the types that would be caused by either ADS valve actuation or by rapid steam condensation when cold CMT fluid is injected into the downcomer region be part of the test program.
- An additional separate effects test facility is needed to investigate the asymmetric effects associated with the downcomer and with the cold-side plenum of the steam generator.
- SPES is generally a good choice for conducting full-height, full-pressure integral system tests. However, in addition

to the scaling problems associated with a high ratio of surface area to fluid volume that plague small-scale simulations of this kind (and must be dealt with), the proposed modified version, SPES-II, has two important scaling defects that should be eliminated: (a) the aspect ratio (height to diameter) of the simulated pressurizer is different from that of the AP600 and (b) the cold leg configuration is not geometrically similar to that of AP600.

We recommend that Westinghouse be required to preserve the scaling of the pressurizer and the geometrical configuration of the cold legs, to better simulate AP600 behavior (this would include simulation of a reactor coolant pump in each leg).

- The method proposed for simulating steam generator tube ruptures in SPES-II is flawed in that it does not appear to allow the break flow from the primary system to be from both the hot and cold sides of the tube. We recommend that Westinghouse develop a better simulation method.
- The OSU low-pressure integral system testing facility is well conceived. We commend Westinghouse for its efforts with respect to this facility. Our evaluation of the scaling rationale for the facility design (discussed during the subcommittee meeting of June 23-24, 1992) is that it is soundly based. Further, the 400 psia design capability should allow considerable simulation of high-pressure effects, while providing the more important low-pressure behavior.

NRC PROGRAM

Our understanding of the justification provided by the NRC staff for its proposed confirmatory high-pressure integral system testing in the ROSA-V facility is as follows:

- Because ROSA-V is considerably larger than SPES-II, such confirmatory testing would provide an additional check on the adequacy of the scaling capabilities of the codes, and would help confirm that important effects have not been overlooked.
- The confirmatory test program would provide the opportunity to maintain the staff's thermal hydraulic expertise and up-to-date knowledge in this field.

While we agree that the above considerations have some merit, we have not been persuaded that confirmatory high-pressure testing by the staff is needed before the AP600 design certification and,

even if this were the case, we have significant reservations about the adequacy of the ROSA-V facility for this purpose. These positions are based on the following observations:

- The NRC staff has not presented convincing arguments supporting its needs for confirmatory testing, particularly at high pressures.
- The SPES-II facility appears to be sufficient to meet all the high-pressure integral system testing needs. The NRC will be able to use the SPES-II facility for its confirmatory testing needs just as it plans to use the OSU facility.
- The desired staff experience will come from pre-test and post-test evaluations of the various tests using the RELAP5/MOD3 code. This experience can just as easily be obtained by evaluating the SPES-II and OSU tests and results.
- The ROSA-V facility contains several atypicalities that will manifest themselves in difficult-to-explain behavior relative to that expected for AP600 (the sensitivity of the ROSA-V thermal hydraulic behavior is well documented in the INEL report, NUREG/CR-5853).
- The tests would be in a distant location. There would be a very limited number of tests, because of the expense involved. In addition, we are concerned that the adequacy of instrumentation (for example) might have to be compromised in order to reduce overall program costs.

For the above reasons, we believe that NRC resources would be better used by focusing on three areas: (a) possible additional separate effects testing to support the modeling needs for RELAP5/MOD3, (b) participation in the pre-test and post-test analyses efforts associated with the SPES-II and the OSU test programs, and (c) consideration of utilizing the SPES-II facility for high-pressure confirmatory testing needs in the same way the staff plans to use the OSU facility for its confirmatory low-pressure testing needs.

To accomplish the above objectives, we believe that the staff should consider the establishment of a task force of experts in related fields to assist it in the development of the analytical and experimental programs necessary for timely certification of the AP600 passive plant design.

Sincerely,

Paul Shewmon
Acting Chairman

References:

1. U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, NUREG/CR-5853, "Investigation of the Applicability and Limitations of the ROSA-IV Large Scale Test Facility for AP600 Safety Assessment (Draft)," dated May 1992
2. T. Boucher, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, et al., "Scaling Issues for a Thermal-Hydraulic Integral Test Facility," Paper transmitted via a memorandum from L. Shotkin, NRC-RES, for P. Boehnert, ACRS, dated June 29, 1992
3. Oregon State University Report, OSU-NE-9204 (Draft), "Scaling Analysis for the OSU AP600 Integral System and Long Term Cooling Test Facility," J. Reyes, Jr., dated June 1992 (**W Proprietary Report**)
4. Letter dated January 22, 1992, from G. Saporano, ENEA, Italy, to E. S. Beckjord, NRC, transmitting documentation on SPES test facility
5. Memorandum dated June 13, 1991 from S. Modro, INEL, for L. Shotkin, NRC-RES, transmitting draft report, "Evaluation of Scaled Integral Test Facility Concepts for the AP600" by Modro, et al.
6. U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, SECY-92-219, "NRC-Sponsored Confirmatory Testing of the Westinghouse AP600 Design," dated June 16, 1992 (**Predecisional**)
7. U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, SECY-92-219A, "Addendum to SECY-92-219 - Providing Additional Information to Justify Sole Source Procurement," dated July 9, 1992 (**Predecisional**)
8. Memorandum dated April 21, 1992, from S. Chilk, Secretary, for J. M. Taylor, EDO, and W. Parler, General Counsel, Subject: SECY-92-037 - Need for NRC-Sponsored Confirmatory Integral System Testing of the Westinghouse AP600 Design
9. Westinghouse Topical Report, WCAP-13277, "Scaling, Design and Verification of the SPES-2, the Italian Experimental Facility Simulator of the AP600 Plant," dated April 1992 (**W Proprietary Report**)