

D920610

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

Dear Chairman Selin:

SUBJECT: TESTING AND ANALYSIS PROGRAMS IN SUPPORT OF THE
SIMPLIFIED BOILING WATER REACTOR DESIGN CERTIFICATION

During the 385th and 386th meetings of the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, May 6-9 and June 4-5, 1992, we reviewed the testing and analysis programs in progress and proposed by GE Nuclear Energy (GE) in support of the certification effort for the Simplified Boiling Water Reactor (SBWR) passive plant design. Our Subcommittee on Thermal Hydraulic Phenomena held meetings to discuss this topic on April 23 and June 2, 1992. During these meetings, we had the benefit of discussions with representatives of GE and the NRC staff. We also had the benefit of the documents referenced.

GE will use its best-estimate code, TRACG, to evaluate the SBWR thermal hydraulic behavior under accident conditions ranging from ATWS with instabilities to long-term behavior of the Passive Containment Cooling System (PCCS). GE representatives presented a very good analysis of processes and phenomena important to accident scenarios postulated for the SBWR. The results were summarized in tables which are to be used by GE to validate the TRACG computer code. However, these same tables appear not to have been used to guide the design and operation of the experimental facilities that are to support the code validation process.

The GE experimental program consists of three elements:

- 1) Laboratory scale experiments to obtain fundamental heat transfer data,
- 2) Separate effects tests to obtain data for parts of the total system and full-scale components where necessary, and
- 3) Integral system tests to obtain system data.

Although we were shown some comparisons of TRACG predictions with data from GE's integral system tests (GIST and GIRAFFE facilities), the question of whether or not the facilities can scale the important phenomena was not addressed in either GE's presentation or in the documents supplied to the ACRS by GE. A rigorous scaling analysis is needed if integral system test data alone are to be used to demonstrate that a TRACG calculation is meaningful.

We have some comments about the elements of the GE test plan. The initial conditions for the integral system tests are based on conditions assumed to exist some time after vessel

depressurization. These conditions include an initial drywell and PCCS nitrogen mass fraction of 15 percent. The nitrogen concentration could be much higher. GE should develop a basis for its choices of initial conditions or broaden its test matrix to include some tests at much higher values of the nitrogen concentration, both in the drywell and in the PCCS.

Separate effects tests to be conducted in the PANTHERS facility will yield the data needed to characterize heat exchanger behavior under a variety of expected conditions. In particular, GE has agreed to add instrumentation to the individual heat exchanger tubes to obtain local heat transfer data. This will make the GIRAFFE integral system experiments more meaningful. We believe GE has been very responsive to issues raised by both the ACRS and the NRC staff in this regard.

The oscillatory behavior observed in the GIRAFFE integral system tests needs more detailed study to ensure that the suppression pool does not overheat due to steam bypass of the PCCS through the suppression pool top horizontal vents. The steam flow rate will be low which could lead to a stratified condition. The suppression pool is not a very effective heat sink when this process occurs. This may well require a separate effects study to obtain data for development of a low steam flow model for the horizontal vent. Further, review of the GIRAFFE facility instrumentation is needed to ensure that the resulting data will support TRACG model validation.

The SBWR has full pressure isolation condensers (IC) capable of removing 4.5 percent of full power decay heat at full system pressure. The behavior of isolation condensers is well understood and introduces no new processes. GE has indicated that it will collect relevant IC operating data for staff review. The SBWR is automatically depressurized when the vessel water level drops to some prescribed value by a staged opening of squib-type valves. Further, GE has had a great deal of experience with automatic depressurization and only the squib-type valve itself is of a new design. As a result, we do not believe that full-height, full-pressure integral system testing is required for certification of the SBWR design.

The GE program includes conduct of integral system testing at the PANDA facility located in Switzerland. The NRC staff would like GE to obtain data from this facility in time to support its design certification review of the SBWR. To do so, GE would have to accelerate its schedule by six months. We agree with the NRC staff that further integral system testing of the PCCS is needed prior to the final design approval. It has not been demonstrated by GE that existing data obtained from GIRAFFE or GIST testing are sufficient for validation of the TRACG code, nor that the PANDA test facility will yield the needed data. A more definitive assessment by GE is needed; this assessment should include both the scaling rationale for the GIRAFFE, GIST, and PANDA facilities, and a demonstration of how the effects of test facility scaling distortion impact the important processes and phenomena outlined by GE in its evaluation of TRACG. As a part of such an effort, it may be possible to show that one can obtain the needed data by some combination of

additional separate effects tests and judicious use of the GIRAFFE and GIST facilities.

To summarize, we agree with the NRC staff views that full-height, full-pressure integral system testing is not needed to support the SBWR design certification. Further, we agree that early integral system testing of the PCCS is essential to meet the present design certification schedule. We have not, however, seen evidence that the PANDA facility is adequate to obtain the needed data.

Sincerely,

David A. Ward
Chairman

References:

1. Memorandum dated February 26, 1992, for the Commissioners from James M. Taylor, Executive Director for Operations, transmitting Advance Copy of proposed Commission paper, "Evaluation of the General Electric Company's (GE's) Test Program to Support Design Certification for the Simplified Boiling Water Reactor (SBWR)"
2. Letter dated February 3, 1992, from R. C. Mitchell, GE Nuclear Energy, to U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Subject: GE Response to Request for Information on SBWR Testing Program
3. Joint Study Report, "Feature Technology of Simplified BWR (Phase I) GIRAFFE (Final Report)," dated November 1990, The Japan Atomic Power Company, et al. (GE Proprietary Information)
4. GE Nuclear Energy, GEFR-00850, "Simplified Boiling Water Reactor (SBWR) Program Gravity-Driven Cooling System (GDCS) Integrated Systems Test - Final Report," A.F. Billig, dated October 1989 (Applied Technology Restriction)
5. "ALPHA - The Long Term Passive Decay Heat Removal and Aerosol Retention Program at the Paul Scherrer Institute, Switzerland," by P. Coddington, et al., Paul Scherrer Institute, undated
6. Paper from the Proceedings of The International Conference on Multiphase Flows '91 - Tsukuba, Japan, September 24-27, "Condensation in a Natural Circulation Loop with Noncondensable Gases Part 1 - Heat Transfer," K. M. Vierow, GE Nuclear Energy, and V. Schrock, University of California
7. GE Draft Report: "Test Specification for IC & PCC Tests," undated (GE Proprietary Information)
8. Paper submitted to the Department of Energy, "The Effect of Noncondensable Gases on Steam Condensation Under Forced Convection Conditions," M. Siddique, Ph.D. Thesis -

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, dated January 1992