

**WESTINGHOUSE PROPRIETARY CLASS 3**



**IMPLEMENTATION OF ZIRLO™ CLADDING  
MATERIAL IN CE NUCLEAR POWER  
FUEL ASSEMBLY DESIGNS**

**DATE: NOVEMBER 2001**

**CENPD-404-NP-A**

**REVISION 0**

**WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC COMPANY LLC**

© 2001 Westinghouse Electric Company LLC  
All Rights Reserved



## **Legal Notice**

This report was prepared as an account of work performed by Westinghouse Electric Company LLC. Neither Westinghouse Electric Company LLC nor any person acting on its behalf:

- Makes any warranty or representation, express or implied including the warranties of fitness for a particular purpose or merchantability, with respect to the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of the information contained in this report, or that the use of any information, apparatus, method or process disclosed in this report may not infringe privately owned rights; or
- Assumes any liabilities with respect to the use of, or for damages resulting from the use of, any information, apparatus, method or process disclosed in this report.

## **Copyright Notice**

This report has been prepared by Westinghouse Electric Company LLC (WEC) and bears a Westinghouse Electric Company LLC copyright notice. Information in this report is the property of and contains copyright information owned by WEC and /or its subcontractors and suppliers. It is transmitted to you in confidence and trust, and you agree to treat this document and the information contained therein in strict accordance with the terms and conditions of the agreement under which it was provided to you.

You are permitted to make the number of copies of the information contained in this report which are necessary for your internal use in connection with your implementation of the report results for your plant(s) in your normal conduct of business. Should implementation of this report involve a third party, you are permitted to make the number of copies of the information contained in this report which are necessary for the third party's use in supporting your implementation at your plant(s) in your normal conduct of business if you have received the prior, written consent of WEC to transmit this information to a third party or parties. All copies made by you must include the copyright notice in all instances and the proprietary notice if the original was identified as proprietary.

The NRC is permitted to make the number of copies beyond those necessary for its internal use that are necessary in order to have one copy available for public viewing in the appropriate docket files in the NRC public document room in Washington, DC if the number of copies submitted is insufficient for this purpose, subject to the applicable federal regulations regarding restrictions on public disclosure to the extent such information has been identified as proprietary. Copies made by the NRC must include the copyright notice in all instances and the proprietary notice if the original was identified as proprietary.

# **CENPD-404-NP-A**

## **U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

### **SAFETY EVALUATION REPORT**

### **REQUIRED MATERIALS**

### **NON-PROPRIETARY VERSIONS**

1. USNRC Letter, "Safety Evaluation of Topical Report CENPD-404-P, Revision 0, 'Implementation of ZIRLO Material Cladding in CE Nuclear Power Fuel Assembly Designs' (TAC No. MB1035)"
2. CENPD-404-NP-A, Revision 0, "Implementation of ZIRLO™ Material Cladding in CE Nuclear Power Fuel Assembly Designs"
3. Letter, LD-2001-0028, "Assessment of Ft. Calhoun Fuel Rod Fretting History and Root Cause As It Relates to Implementation of ZIRLO™ Cladding Material in Fuel Designed By CE Nuclear Power"
4. Letter, LD-2001-0045, "Response to Requests for Additional Information on Topical Report CENPD-404-P, Rev. 0"
5. Letter, LD-2001-0046, "Ductility of ZIRLO™ and Zircaloy-4 After High Temperature Oxidation in Steam"
6. Letter, LTR-NRC-01-32, "Selected Page Revisions for Topical Report CENPD-404-P, Rev. 0"

# **CENPD-404-NP-A**

## **U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

### **SAFETY EVALUATION REPORT**

#### **REQUIRED MATERIALS**

1. USNRC Letter, "Safety Evaluation of Topical Report CENPD-404-P, Revision 0, 'Implementation of ZIRLO Material Cladding in CE Nuclear Power Fuel Assembly Designs' (TAC No. MB1035)"



**UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

September 12, 2001

Mr. Philip W. Richardson, Manager  
Windsor Nuclear Licensing  
Westinghouse Electric Company  
2000 Day Hill Road  
Windsor, CT 06095

**SUBJECT: SAFETY EVALUATION OF TOPICAL REPORT CENPD-404-P, REVISION 0,  
"IMPLEMENTATION OF ZIRLO MATERIAL CLADDING IN CE NUCLEAR  
POWER FUEL ASSEMBLY DESIGNS" (TAC NO. MB1035)**

Dear Mr. Richardson:

The NRC staff has completed its review of the subject topical report which was submitted by CE Nuclear Power LLC (CENP) by letter dated January 22, 2001, as supplemented by letters dated May 3, August 10 (two letters), and August 27, 2001. It should be noted that during the period between the submittal of this topical report (CENPD-404-P) and the issuance of this safety evaluation (SE), CENP the original submitting company has undergone an organizational change. CENP was a company owned by Westinghouse LLC (WEC). CENP has merged into WEC and no longer exists. Accordingly, references in the attached SE to the former name (e.g., CE Nuclear Power LLC or CENP) are understood to be equivalent to references to WEC. However, in order to differentiate between the parts of WEC, this SE uses CENP to refer to the part of WEC that formerly existed as CENP.

ZIRLO is a zirconium-based fuel rod cladding material which the NRC previously reviewed and approved for use by WEC, the ZIRLO developer. The intent of the current submittal was to obtain NRC review and approval to implement ZIRLO fuel rod cladding in CENP designed nuclear power plants. The subject topical report provides justification for applying NRC-approved ZIRLO properties and correlations in NRC-approved CENP design and licensing analysis methodologies.

The staff has found that CENPD-404-P, Revision 0, "Implementation of ZIRLO Cladding Material in CE Nuclear Power Fuel Assembly Designs" is acceptable for referencing in licensing applications for CE designed nuclear power plants to the extent specified and under the limitations delineated in the report and in the associated SE. The safety evaluation defines the basis for acceptance of the report.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 2.790, we have determined that the enclosed SE does not contain proprietary information. However, we will delay placing the SE in the public document room for a period of ten (10) working days from the date of this letter to provide you with the opportunity to comment on the proprietary aspects only. If you believe that any information in the SE is proprietary, please identify such information line by line and define the basis pursuant to the criteria of 10 CFR 2.790.

We do not intend to repeat our review of the matters described in the subject report, and found acceptable, when the report appears as a reference in license applications, except to ensure that the material presented applies to the specific plant involved. Our acceptance applies only to matters approved in the report.

Mr. Phillip W. Richardson

- 2 -

In accordance with procedures established in NUREG-0390, the NRC requests that WEC publish accepted versions of the submittal, proprietary (-P) and non-proprietary (-NP), within 3 months of receipt of this letter. The accepted versions shall incorporate (1) this letter and the enclosed safety evaluation between the title page and the abstract, and (2) all requests for additional information from the staff and all associated responses, and (3) an "-A" (designating "accepted") following the report identification symbol.

Should our criteria or regulations change so that our conclusions as to the acceptability of the report are invalidated, WEC and/or the applicants referencing the topical report will be expected to revise and resubmit their respective documentation, or submit justification for the continued applicability of the topical report without revision of their respective documentation.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Stuart A. Richards", followed by the word "FOR" in a similar script.

Stuart A. Richards, Director  
Project Directorate IV  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Project No. 692

Enclosure: Safety Evaluation

cc w/encl: See next page

Westinghouse Electric Company LLC Windsor Office

cc:

Mr. Charles B. Brinkman, Manager  
Washington Operations  
Westinghouse Electric Company  
12300 Twinbrook Parkway, Suite 330  
Rockville, MD 20852

Mr. Philip W. Richardson, Manager  
Windsor Nuclear Licensing  
M. S. 126009 - 1901  
Westinghouse Electric Company LLC  
2000 Day Hill Road  
Windsor, CT 06095-0500

Mr. Virgil Paggen  
M. S. 126009 - 1901  
Westinghouse Electric Company LLC  
2000 Day Hill Road  
Windsor, CT 06095 - 0500



UNITED STATES  
**NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

TOPICAL REPORT CENPD-404-P, REVISION 0,

"IMPLEMENTATION OF ZIRLO CLADDING MATERIAL IN CE NUCLEAR POWER

FUEL ASSEMBLY DESIGNS"

PROJECT NO. 692

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated January 22, 2001, CE Nuclear Power LLC (CENP) submitted Topical Report CENPD-404-P Revision 0, "Implementation of ZIRLO Cladding Material in CE Nuclear Power Fuel Assembly Designs" (CENPD-404-P) (Reference 1), for review and approval by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). Additional information was submitted by letters dated May 3, 2001, August 10, 2001 (two letters) and August 27, 2001 (References 2-5). ZIRLO is a zirconium-based fuel rod cladding material, which the NRC previously reviewed and approved (Reference 6) for use by Westinghouse Electric Company LLC (WEC), the ZIRLO developer. The intent of the current submittal was to obtain NRC review and approval to implement ZIRLO fuel rod cladding in CENP designed nuclear power plants. The NRC has previously reviewed and approved the various fuel design and licensing methodologies employed by CENP and the requested implementation of the ZIRLO fuel rod cladding will not change those or the manner in which they are used. The ZIRLO material properties and correlations will also remain unchanged, as will the CENP phenomenological models that the NRC previously reviewed and approved. Thus CENP submitted the subject topical report solely to provide justification for applying NRC-approved ZIRLO properties and correlations in NRC-approved CENP design and licensing analysis methodologies.

It should be noted that during the period between the submittal of this topical report (CENPD-404-P) and the issuance of this safety evaluation (SE), CENP the original submitting company has undergone an organizational change. CENP was a company owned by WEC. CENP has merged into WEC and no longer exists. Accordingly, references in this SE to the former name (e.g., CE Nuclear Power LLC or CENP) are understood to be equivalent to references to WEC. However, in order to differentiate between the parts of WEC, this SE uses CENP to refer to the part of WEC that formerly existed as CENP.

OPTIN, the Zircaloy-4 fuel cladding material that is currently used in CENP plants, is nearing its performance limits in high-duty applications. Since small amounts of oxide spalling have been observed on OPTIN clad fuel in CENP plants, a more robust cladding with respect to corrosion and dimensional stability is desired. Use of ZIRLO cladding has been widespread since its



approval in 1991. No spallation has been observed on ZIRLO clad fuel, and the oxidation is significantly reduced compared to that with Zircaloy-4. Consequently, CENP plant licensees are interested in using ZIRLO-clad fuel to support more economic core designs and power uprates.

CENPD-404-P summarizes the ZIRLO material properties as they pertain to fuel rod cladding and provides an evaluation of these properties and the correlations that CENP intends to use in design and licensing analysis activities. CENPD-404-P also identifies the specific CENP topical reports that would be impacted by the implementation of ZIRLO cladding, and describes the substitutions that would be required as a result of the proposed ZIRLO implementation. In addition, CENPD-404-P provides the information needed to implement ZIRLO thereby precluding the need for CENP to revise and the NRC to review the dozen or more individual topical reports. As a result, those affected individual topical reports and the associated NRC SEs will remain the licensing basis for their subject methodologies, as modified by the implementation of the material properties described in CENPD-404-P. Nothing in any of the previously NRC-approved topical reports has been changed, with the exception of the linking of the information in one to the other for the purpose of gaining NRC approval for the use of ZIRLO-clad material in CENP designed fuel assemblies and the analysis of those fuel assemblies and the cores in which they reside.

Areas in which evaluations are performed include fuel performance, mechanical design, emergency core cooling system (ECCS) performance analysis (loss-of-coolant accident (LOCA)), non-LOCA transient analysis, and nuclear engineering (physics). Examples of these evaluations were performed to demonstrate that the impact on performance (thermal, mechanical, LOCA, non-LOCA, physics) was as expected and is generally small or negligible. In addition, since the ZIRLO cladding will be implemented in Zircaloy-4 cages with no changes to structural materials, CENPD-404-P provided a review of Westinghouse experience with ZIRLO cladding and Zircaloy-4 structural components to justify full batch implementation in CENP fuel design.

## 2.0 EVALUATION

Since the NRC staff previously reviewed and approved the use of ZIRLO cladding material, the review of CENPD-404-P focused on the applicable WEC ZIRLO experience, implementation in CENP plants, and issues that have arisen since the original ZIRLO approval in 1991. In the course of the review, the NRC staff held meetings and weekly teleconferences (June - August 2001) with WEC in order to expedite the review process. The staff asked many questions and requested clarifications and additional information in many areas. By letter dated August 10, 2001 (Reference 3), WEC provided its responses to the staff's requests. As part of its review the staff examined the following areas: fuel performance, mechanical design, ECCS performance analysis, non-LOCA transient analysis, and nuclear engineering. In addition, the staff focused its review on four specific areas, including (1) batch implementation without lead test assemblies, (2) the fuel rod fretting problems in WEC fuel that was previously manufactured for a CENP plant, (3) the use of Zircaloy-4 properties and correlations instead of measured ZIRLO properties and specifically ZIRLO correlations, and (4) questions regarding ductility of Zirconium 1 percent Niobium cladding.

## 2.1 Batch Implementation

Batch implementation of a new cladding material such as ZIRLO would normally be preceded by a series of lead test assemblies designed to demonstrate the performance of the cladding material. In this case, batch implementation without lead test assemblies was requested because of the extensive use of ZIRLO in WEC-designed reactors prior to this application and because CENP has had good fuel performance experience with advanced cladding alloys that are similar to ZIRLO. The WEC experience includes more than 1 million ZIRLO fuel rods in assemblies with ZIRLO and Zircaloy-4 optimized fuel assembly type spacer grids without incidence of leakers due to grid-to-rod fretting.

As the industry has moved toward greater plant operating efficiencies and the economic benefits derived from higher power ratings, extended burnups, and higher operating temperatures, the resulting harsher core environments have placed greater demands on the fuel. These aggressive fuel duty conditions include high fuel rod surface temperatures, with subcooled boiling and high power densities at longer residence times. With more demanding pressurized-water-reactor (PWR) fuel duties has come closer evaluation of the corrosion resistance of the fuel cladding. The OPTIN cladding is nearing its limits in terms of corrosion. High corrosion levels and some small areas of spallation have been observed on OPTIN fuel rods that are subjected to these demanding conditions. ZIRLO-clad fuel has operated in higher duty and more demanding conditions without excessive corrosion and no oxide spallation observed. The staff has reviewed the information and data provided on comparisons of corrosion, and agrees that ZIRLO is the superior material from a corrosion standpoint. Although ZIRLO is approved to burnup levels of 62 GWD/MTU for Westinghouse, CENPD-404-P requested approval to only 60 GWD/MTU for use in CENP plants in order to keep it consistent with the approved burnup level for CENP methodologies.

As previously stated, only the OPTIN cladding will be replaced with ZIRLO cladding. The structural material including the grids will continue to be Zircaloy-4. Also, because several factors contribute to grid-to-rod fretting, CENP evaluated the effect of using ZIRLO cladding in the CENP fuel designs by assessing the difference that would be expected in each contributing factor. On the basis of these results, CENPD-404-P stated that the implementation of ZIRLO cladding is expected to cause little if any change in the fretting wear. Given all of the variations in conditions, the best basis for comparing fretting behavior is the actual performance in reactors where the transition was already made to ZIRLO cladding without changing the structural material. CENPD-404-P provided data showing the WEC experience in which the fuel batches had ZIRLO cladding and no changes were made to the spacer grid or material. The staff reviewed the data provided, which showed considerable experience with ZIRLO cladding and Zircaloy-4 structural material without fretting failures. Operation without fretting failures after introduction of ZIRLO cladding in different designs provides confidence that there is no significant change in the failure margin with the introduction of ZIRLO.

WEC developed the concept of fuel duty index and later the modified fuel duty index. The fuel duty index model was briefly presented in CENPD-404-P, but the staff did not review that model as part of its review of the topical report. However, the staff acknowledges that the model appears to be a useful tool. The modified fuel duty index is dependent upon the time averaged oxide layer surface temperature, the total irradiation time, and the boiling rate. A plot of measured oxide thickness versus the modified fuel duty index for Westinghouse plants shows

much better agreement than when oxide thickness is plotted versus burnup. The modified fuel duty index is also useful for plant-to-plant comparisons of how aggressive the fuel duty has been. Using this concept, CENP showed that the most aggressive CENP plants are well within the data base for the WEC plants.

Because of the improved corrosion and axial growth performance, the extensive experience with ZIRLO clad fuel in WEC plants, and the good fretting experience for several designs, the staff agrees that it is acceptable to approve ZIRLO cladding for use in CENP-designed plants on a batch basis. However, the fuel duty will be limited to that previously experienced by CENP-designed plants with some provision for adequate margin to accommodate variations in core design (e.g., cycle length, plant operating conditions, etc.) until data for actual ZIRLO performance has been obtained. This limitation will be addressed on a plant-specific basis when the use of ZIRLO is requested.

## 2.2 Fuel Rod Fretting Problems in WEC Fuel Previously Manufactured for a CENP-Designed Plant

WEC had supplied fuel for use in a CENP plant before CENPD-404-P was submitted. This fuel had a history of leaking fuel rods as a result of fretting in Cycles 14 through 18 at the Ft. Calhoun Plant. The staff requested that details of the root cause investigation of the Ft. Calhoun fuel fretting be provided. In response (Reference 2), a brief history of the fuel including a comparison of the fuel features, number of fuel rods and number of failures was provided. In addition, the modifications to the fuel assembly that were introduced were described. The WEC root cause investigation concluded that the Ft. Calhoun fuel failures were due to grid design not the ZIRLO cladding material. While the cladding material through the mechanical properties does play a role in grid-to-rod fretting (a different rod growth characteristic will affect how the cladding is exposed to the weaning surface of the grid support), the design of the grid is the dominant factor in determining whether fretting failures will occur. On the basis of its review of the material provided and examination of actual grid structures, the staff agrees that the root cause of the Ft. Calhoun fuel fretting failures was most likely the grid design. Furthermore, since the grid structure that will be used in future CENP fuel with ZIRLO cladding will be the CENP grid structure (not a WEC-designed grid structure), the staff considers that the issue of fuel rod fretting problems in WEC fuel previously manufactured for CENP plants has been adequately addressed.

## 2.3 Use of Zircaloy-4 Properties and Correlations Instead of Measured ZIRLO Properties and Specifically ZIRLO Correlations

During the review of Section 4, "Fuel Performance," of CENPD-404-P, it became very clear to the staff that in most cases the cladding-related models and cladding material properties used were those of Zircaloy-4 or OPTIN not ZIRLO. CENP argued that the differences were small and the effects negligible. In some cases, ZIRLO measurements were available for comparison with the Zircaloy-4 data, but no actual ZIRLO data is available in other cases. This was the same approach that WEC used in the original application of ZIRLO (Reference 6). The staff questioned this approach extensively. The applicant provided additional information and justification for this approach. Where data was available, the staff compared the available data to assess whether the differences were in fact small, and attempted to evaluate the effect of the differences. The applicant provided additional information as regarding the magnitude of the

effect. For instance with regard to thermal conductivity, the two equations that represent thermal conductivity vs. temperature for ZIRLO and Zircaloy-4 are identical in their functional form. Over the temperatures of interest for fuel performance (500°F to 700°F), the values of thermal conductivity are nearly identical. At an average clad temperature of 700°F, the difference in thermal conductivity would translate into less than a 5°F difference in fuel rod temperature. No thermal conductivity data was available for ZIRLO above 1300°F. The applicant argued that the ZIRLO value, if measured, would be slightly larger than the Zircaloy-4 value and, thus, would be conservative. The staff compared the Zircaloy-4 data for thermal conductivity in the 1300°F to 2200°F range with publicly available data for another Zirconium 1 percent niobium alloy, and found that there was little difference between the two.

The applicant made similar arguments and justifications for thermal expansion, modulus of elasticity, and Poisson's ratio. While this use of Zircaloy-4 or OPTIN properties instead of ZIRLO properties is not the preferred method of implementing the ZIRLO properties, the staff could not identify a safety significant effect related to its use.

#### 2.4 Ductility of Zircaloy-4 and ZIRLO after High Temperature Oxidation in Steam

ZIRLO is a modification of Zircaloy-4 that includes a reduction in the tin and iron content, elimination of the chromium content and addition of 1 percent niobium. A technical paper by J. Bohmert, entitled "Embrittlement of ZrNb1 at Room Temperature After High-Temperature Oxidation in Steam Atmosphere" (Reference 7), raised questions about the validity of the 17 percent oxidation criterion for LOCA conditions for ZrNb1 fuel rod cladding. WEC uses this criterion for LOCA evaluations involving ZIRLO clad fuel. The NRC staff informed WEC about this paper and these questions. In response, WEC met with the NRC staff on February 26 and May 16, 2001, to discuss the subject and present data from testing on ZIRLO cladding. The staff requested the data from the testing and WEC provided a report documenting the results of the testing performed at its facilities to demonstrate the validity of the 17 percent oxidation criterion for ZIRLO cladding. The report described the tests performed, the high-temperature steam furnace used, the metallography, the ring compression tests, and the results.

The following major differences between the oxidation and embrittlement behavior of Zircaloy-4 and ZrNb1, as observed and reported in the work by Bohmert, were the basis for questioning the validity of the applicability of the 17 percent oxidation criterion for ZrNb1 cladding.

- The oxidation layer on the Zircaloy-4 specimens remained black and adherent while the ZrNb1 specimens had a heterogeneous appearance with multilayer oxide scales that tended to flake.
- There was a higher hydrogen uptake for the ZrNb1 specimens than for Zircaloy-4 specimens.
- There was a more rapid ductility reduction for the ZrNb1 specimens, leading to complete embrittlement at a small oxide layer thickness of ~ 5 percent.

The staff reviewed the WEC report, including the data and results presented. On the basis of that review, the staff agrees with the following conclusions.

- High temperature steam oxidation resulted in similar oxygen pickup in ZIRLO and Zircaloy-4 for a given oxide thickness.
- The stabilized alpha phase is harder than the prior-beta phase, which contains a lower oxygen concentration.
- Hydrogen pickup was low (<100 ppm) in both alloys following high temperature steam oxidation.
- Zircaloy-4 and ZIRLO show the same trends in ring compression tests at both room temperature and 275°F with both alloys surpassing the 10 percent criteria at 17 percent oxidation. (Relative displacements below 10 percent are considered brittle and displacements above 10 percent were classified as ductile or partially ductile.)

In addition, WEC reported that the oxides remained black and adherent for all ZIRLO as well as all Zircaloy-4 specimens.

On the basis of its review of the report and discussions with WEC, the staff agrees with WEC that the questions raised by the Bohmert paper about the validity of the 17 percent oxidation criteria for LOCA conditions for ZrNb1 fuel rod cladding do not apply to the ZIRLO cladding material. Thus, the staff concludes that the existing regulatory criteria regarding LOCAs specified in Title 10, Section 50.46, of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR 50.46) continue to remain applicable for ZIRLO.

## 2.5 Fuel Performance Code

The CENP fuel performance code for reload designs and safety analyses, known as FATES3B, analyzes thermal and mechanical behavior of a fuel rod under steady-state and anticipated transient conditions. The code can be applied to uranium dioxide fuel (UO<sub>2</sub>), erbia bearing UO<sub>2</sub> fuel, and gadolinia bearing fuel. However, the FATES3B code is rather old, and has not been updated since it was approved in 1992.

CENP adopted ZIRLO cladding properties and correlations from WCAP-12610-P-A and added them to the FATES3B code. In a response to the staff's questions (Reference 3), CENP listed several thermal and mechanical properties of ZIRLO for use in FATES3B, including axial growth, creep, hardness, emissivity, hydride reorientation, modulus of elasticity, Poisson's ratio, thermal conductivity, and thermal expansion. However, as previously explained only two properties, axial growth and creep, were actually changed in the conversion to ZIRLO materials in FATES3B. The same values were used for both ZIRLO and Zircaloy-4 for the rest of the properties. CENP contended that the use of the Zircaloy-4 values for the rest of the properties did not represent a significant deviation from the original results of the FATES3B analyses. While this practice is quite unusual, the staff does not find any major discrepancy compared to the CENP results for these properties. In light of the increasing efforts by the industry to develop new cladding materials, the staff notes that this practice should not be used in the future, and future applicants will be expected to fully measure and develop the material properties of proposed new cladding alloys.

CENP stated that the FATES3B code performs numerous safety and licensing analyses. These analyses are typical safety and licensing analyses to qualify new fuel designs that use advanced cladding, and the previously approved methodologies remain unchanged.

## 2.6 Material Properties

As mentioned earlier, CENP has proposed to change only the axial growth and creep correlations of ZIRLO for FATES3B. According to the FATES3B code structure, the creep correlations have two parts. The first part is a nominal creep correlation for analyzing cladding creepdown under compressive reactor coolant system pressure during normal operations. The second part is the same creep correlation with an upper bound multiplier added for determining the maximum allowable internal rod pressure under the "no cladding liftoff" criterion when the rod pressure starts exceeding the coolant system pressure. For the axial growth and creep models in FATES3B, CENP employed approved correlations of ZIRLO material properties. Thus, the staff considers that the axial growth and creep models are acceptable for ZIRLO licensing applications.

### 2.6.1 Cladding Creepdown

The cladding creepdown model for ZIRLO was approved in the PAD 4.0 code and adopted in the FATES3B code. CENP verified the FATES3B results against the ZIRLO data with measured creepdown data from North Anna Unit 1. The results showed that the predicted diameters were in reasonable agreement with the measured diameters. Since the predictions are consistent with the observations, the staff concludes that the use of the ZIRLO creepdown model in FATES3B is acceptable for licensing applications.

### 2.6.2 No-Clad-Liftoff Creep

There are three criteria to be examined when a fuel vendor proposes to allow fuel rod internal pressure to exceed the system pressure. They are (1) no-clad-liftoff (NCLO), (2) no hydride reorientation, and (3) no departure from nucleate boiling (DNB) propagation. The NCLO criterion is designed to limit the fuel rod internal pressure, when exceeding the system pressure, so that the fuel remains in contact with the cladding. The intent of this design criterion is to prevent adverse effects on the fuel performance, such as increasing reactivity, which would occur if the fuel cladding gap reopens. The maximum allowable internal pressure achieved depends on the cladding creep rate, fuel swelling rate, and plant operational schemes. Since ZIRLO tends to have a lower creep rate than the Zircaloy-4, the use of ZIRLO cladding will result in higher internal pressure than the use of Zircaloy-4 cladding for a PWR fuel rod.

Cladding creep rates are slightly different under tensile or compressive stress states. Several investigators have observed that the tensile creep rate can be higher than the compressive creep rate. An increase in tensile creep over compressive creep would reduce the margin to the maximum allowable rod pressure. During the PAD 4.0 review, the staff asked WEC as to why there was no difference between tensile and compressive creep rates. WEC responded that, while there appeared to be a small difference in creep rates for the two stress states, it was within the uncertainty of the data-base and, therefore, there was no need to differentiate the creep rates for these two stress states. The staff reevaluated the data-base and agreed

that there was considerable scatter in creep data, and very few comparisons are available between these two stress states to offer definitive conclusions. Furthermore, the staff noted that WEC had provided a relatively small creep database for ZIRLO. As a result of these discussions between the staff and WEC, WEC introduced additional conservatism into its creep model for the NCLO analysis. In addition, WEC committed to acquire more in-reactor creep data under both tensile and compressive stress conditions for ZIRLO material. Recently, WEC provided the staff with a detailed irradiation program for ZIRLO to fulfill this commitment.

CENP has adopted the WEC position in the NCLO analysis for the FATES3B code. As expected, the results showed that there were higher maximum rod pressures for ZIRLO than for Zircaloy-4 fuel rods. On the basis of the approved creep model and the commitment to acquire additional data, the staff considers that the creep model for the NCLO criterion is acceptable for FATES3B. In the event that new data emerges to show that the NCLO creep model requires modification, the NRC staff will review the model and CENP will be required to modify the NCLO creep model for FATES3B.

CENP examined the presence of hydrides and the potential for hydride reorientation as a result of operations with rod internal pressure in excess of the system pressure. CENP determined that plant operation with ZIRLO will be similar to operation with Zircaloy-4, thus, the potential for stress induced hydride reorientation did not change with the use of ZIRLO material from the previous analysis and conclusions based on the Zircaloy-4 material. CENP also reviewed the DNB propagation analysis. High temperature creep and rupture properties of ZIRLO have been incorporated into the approved analysis. A comparison of high temperature creep and rupture of ZIRLO with Zircaloy-4 indicated that ZIRLO was less likely than Zircaloy-4 to initiate DNB propagation. The staff has reviewed these creep and rupture properties, and accepted them in the approved WCAP-12610-P-A. Therefore, the staff concludes that there are no differences between ZIRLO and Zircaloy-4 with regard to hydride reorientation and the DNB propagation analyses.

### 2.6.3 Rod Axial Growth

Fuel rod axial growth occurs during reactor operations as a result of fast neutron irradiation. WEC has obtained new data from irradiation history and improved the growth correlation for ZIRLO. The improved correlation was approved in the PAD 4.0 code. CENP adopted this approved correlation in the FATES3B code. The FATES3B results of axial growth were consistent with the PAD 4.0 data-base. Thus, the staff considers that the rod axial growth model is acceptable for FATES3B.

## 2.7 Fuel Thermal-Mechanical Analysis

The use of ZIRLO cladding for fuel rod designs will potentially affect the overall thermal-mechanical analyses. CENP reviewed and summarized those analyses that may be affected by the cladding change. The thermal-mechanical analyses involved not only FATES3B code, but also other approved computer codes. For these computer codes, CENP has implemented the necessary cladding properties for ZIRLO.

### 2.7.1 Power-to-Melt Analysis

CENP performed power-to-melt analyses using the FATES3B code for 14x14 and 16x16 fuel designs. The results showed that the limiting power-to-melt conditions occurred at the beginning of life, and that the trend consistently decreases toward the end of life. These results were typical for Zircaloy-4 as well as ZIRLO. Therefore, the staff considers that the power-to-melt analyses are acceptable for CENP 14x14 and 16x16 fuel designs.

### 2.7.2 Creep Collapse

If axial gaps exist between fuel pellets during operations, the cladding could creep inward as a result of higher coolant system pressure and cause the fuel rod to collapse and fail prematurely. The potential for creep collapse usually occurs early in life. In order to prevent this from occurring, the fuel rods are usually pre-pressurized with helium to certain pressure in order to reduce the chance of creep collapse.

CENP had an approved code, CEPAN, to predict the cladding collapse in conjunction with inputs from FATES3B code. CENP has implemented the approved creep correlations for the CEPAN code. The CENP analysis will ensure that no creep collapse occurs for ZIRLO fuel rods. Based on the approved creep correlation and methodology, the staff concludes that the creep collapse analysis is acceptable for ZIRLO.

### 2.7.3 Assembly Growth and Shoulder Gap

The fuel assembly, like the fuel rods, will grow axially under irradiation conditions. The clearance between the fuel rods and the upper end fitting is called a shoulder gap. If this clearance diminishes, the fuel rods will start contacting the upper end fitting, and fuel rod bowing will occur. Fuel rod bowing can induce some DNB penalties. Therefore, maintaining an adequate shoulder gap through the fuel lifetime is important for fuel mechanical designs. CENP has an approved computer code known as SIGREEP to predict assembly growth and shoulder gap changes.

The assembly axial growth is mainly controlled by the growth of the guide tubes. For CENP 14x14 and 16x16 fuel designs, the guide tubes continue to be made of Zircaloy-4. Thus, the use of ZIRLO cladding does not affect the SIGREEP analysis. CENP analysis will ensure that adequate shoulder gaps are maintained for ZIRLO fuel. Thus the staff accepts the CENP shoulder gap assessment.

### 2.7.4 Rod Internal Pressure

The fuel rod internal pressure has been used as one of the calibration parameters to ensure that the analytical tools are sufficiently conservative so that the rod pressures are not underestimated. The FATES3B code was used to calculate rod pressures under different operating conditions. The operating conditions that are considered include the peak linear heat generation rate (LHGR), the nominal LHGR, and the peak LHGR with transient conditions. In all cases, the code consistently predicted higher rod pressures for the ZIRLO fuel than for the Zircaloy-4 fuel for 14x14 and 16x16 fuel designs. Since the FATES3B code used the same



thermal conductivity correlation for ZIRLO and Zircaloy-4, the staff considers that the rod pressure analysis is conservative for ZIRLO fuel, and therefore is acceptable.

#### 2.7.5 Fuel Centerline Temperature

The fuel centerline temperature is another calibration parameter like rod internal pressure. With the same philosophy, the fuel performance code must conservatively predict the fuel centerline temperatures. CENP uses the FATES3B code for fuel temperature calculations in limiting operating conditions. The results of CENP calculations showed that the code consistently predicted slightly higher fuel temperatures for the ZIRLO fuel than for the Zircaloy-4 fuel at hottest axial locations for 14x14 and 16x16 fuel designs. Since the FATES3B code has enough conservatism built in for the Zircaloy-4 fuel temperature analysis, and the ZIRLO results are even more conservative, the staff considers that the fuel temperature analysis is acceptable for ZIRLO.

#### 2.7.6 Swelling and Rupture

The ZIRLO swelling and rupture model is described in the approved WCAP-12610-P-A (Reference 6). This model, developed according to the NUREG-0630 methodology, is a correlation of rupture strain versus rupture temperature that conservatively bounds the ZIRLO data. CENP implemented this model in its large- and small-break LOCA (LBLOCA and SBLOCA) evaluation models. The assembly flow blockage as a result of rupture strains was also approved in WCAP-12610-P-A. The flow blockage model was only applied for the LBLOCA analysis. Based on the approved models in WCAP-12610-P-A, the staff concludes that the swelling and rupture model and assembly flow blockage model are acceptable for ZIRLO applications.

#### 2.7.7 LOCA Initial Conditions

The FATES3B code provides the initial conditions, including fuel temperature and rod pressure, for LOCA analysis. These initial conditions were derived under bounding axial and radial power histories, coupled with transient characteristics for UO<sub>2</sub> fuel and erbia-bearing fuel. CENP provided the peak pellet volume-averaged fuel temperatures for 14x14 and 16x16 fuel designs. The results showed that the limiting conditions for a LOCA occurred at the beginning of life (BOL) for ZIRLO fuel. This observation is consistent with the traditional conclusion that the LOCA is limited at BOL for Zircaloy-4 clad fuel. CENP concluded that the ZIRLO clad fuel temperatures were similar to the Zircaloy-4 clad fuel temperatures to the end of life.

The staff recognizes the possibility that the limiting LOCA initial conditions may shift from BOL toward the middle of life (MOL) under aggressive operating schemes. If this situation occurs, WEC will re-analyze the impact on 10 CFR 50.46 requirements for ZIRLO fuel design. Based on the approved methodology of the FATES3B code and the similarity between ZIRLO and Zircaloy-4 clad fuel temperatures, the staff concludes that the LOCA initial conditions are acceptable for ZIRLO applications.

## 2.8 CENPD-404-P LOCA Analysis Methods

Section 6.0 of CENPD-404-P and a "roadmap" provided at the NRC/CENP February 8, 2001, meeting describe how CENP's SBLOCA and LBLOCA analysis methodologies account for ZIRLO fuel in performing licensing-basis calculations. The documents indicate that the LOCA methodologies would generally be applied in the same way as described in WCAP-12610-P-A and its Appendices F and G to perform analyses that account for ZIRLO fuel using WEC's LOCA methodologies.

WCAP-12610, Appendices F and G, dealing with LBLOCA and SBLOCA, were reviewed and approved by the NRC. The review of Appendices F and G primarily focused on the effect of ZIRLO on mixed-core LOCA analyses, and whether a separate mixed-core penalty would be needed for LOCA analyses. The review revealed that for Zircaloy-4 and ZIRLO fuels of like features (geometry, including spacers, flow mixing vanes, cladding surface texture, etc.), a mixed-core penalty need not be added for each/either fuel. In representing ZIRLO, use of the Baker-Just equation (and any other Appendix K-specified treatment) was granted, but only after WEC had provided justification that it (they) conservatively represented ZIRLO. This was done to avoid an unnecessary conflict with Appendix K, which would have resulted in a need to issue an exemption from elements of Appendix K to reference that regulation in showing compliance.

Given the similarity between ZIRLO and Zircaloy-4, the staff found that for Zircaloy-4 and ZIRLO fuels of like features (geometry, including spacers, flow mixing vanes, cladding surface texture, etc.), a mixed-core penalty need not be added for each/either fuel. However, the SE did not remove the obligation to evaluate each type of cladding separately using the fuel heatup model.

CENP proposes to represent ZIRLO fuel by assuming some ZIRLO-specific properties and some properties that are specific to Zircaloy-4 in the LOCA analyses. The list of substituted properties varies between SBLOCA and LBLOCA analyses, between various stages of the LOCA events, and between the various models that comprise the LOCA methodologies. CENP stated that the substitution of Zircaloy-4 properties for ZIRLO properties was justified because either the specific calculational model does not use the specific property, the properties of the two materials were close enough to be interchangeable, or the impact of the substitution on calculated peak cladding temperature (PCT) was negligible. CENP provided information to support the substitutions using its LOCA methodologies and constituent models as they are presently configured and codified.

On the basis of its review of the information provided, the staff concludes that, while the properties of Zircaloy-4 are not strictly the properties of ZIRLO, the proposed substitution is acceptable using the present CENP methodologies as CENP asserts and justifies. However, this finding applies only to the present CENP LOCA methodologies and constituent models as they are presently configured and codified. Changes to the LOCA methodologies and models could affect the relative PCT impact between the substituted properties and the ZIRLO-specific properties. If the CENP LOCA methodologies and/or constituent models are changed in the future, documentation supporting the change(s) should include justification of the continued applicability of the methodology or model to ZIRLO.

## 2.9 Non-LOCA Accidents

The effect on non-LOCA accidents of changing from OPTIN to ZIRLO depends on the difference in thermophysical properties of OPTIN and ZIRLO. Except for the phase change temperature shift on the specific heat versus temperature relationship, the properties are essentially identical. Thus, for the non-LOCA accident analyses in which the clad temperature does not exceed 1380°F, the use of ZIRLO cladding will have no effect on the analysis because there is no difference in the input parameters. A review of the non-LOCA licensing basis analyses concluded that only one non-LOCA licensing basis analysis (the control element assembly (CEA) ejection) resulted in clad temperatures that were predicted to reach 1380°F.

Approximately 24 existing CEA ejection cases were repeated using the ZIRLO specific heat properties to determine the impact of using ZIRLO. The results from the ZIRLO cases remained within approximately  $\pm 10$  cal/gm of the results for OPTIN in all cases. The following criteria used to ensure that fuel dispersal into the coolant, gross lattice distortion and severe shock waves do not occur are:

- The average fuel pellet energy at the hot spot remains below 200 cal/gm as calculated by a point kinetics synthesis method.
- Fuel centerline temperature is limited to less than the incipient melting temperature of the fuel.
- Peak RCS pressure is less than that which would cause clad stresses to exceed the faulted condition stress limits.

The staff believes that the first criterion listed above is nonconservative in light of test data from foreign test reactors on reactivity-initiated accidents. CENP has addressed this issue in a response to a staff question (Reference 3). The point kinetics calculation is extremely conservative in that it overestimates the core average power excursion and highly overestimates the hot spot power excursion compared to a more detailed three-dimensional (3-D) calculation. Using bounding values and uncertainties, a 3-D space-time method produces results less than 100 cal/gm. The staff considers this acceptable because the probability of control element assembly ejection accidents is low, and the 3-D calculation still contains considerable conservatism. It should be noted that for some CENP plants, DNB is used as an alternative fuel failure criteria. The staff finds this acceptable.

## 2.10 Nuclear Engineering

The change in the cladding material from OPTIN to ZIRLO will have a negligible effect on nuclear performance since the primary change in physics properties is a small increase in neutron absorption attributable to the addition of niobium. An increase in neutron absorption of this magnitude has no effect on nuclear performance. Thus, no modifications were made to the nuclear engineering methodologies or computer codes. This is the same approach that was used for the previous application of ZIRLO. The staff agrees that the change would be negligible and, thus, finds this approach acceptable.

### 3.0 CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the evaluation discussed above, the staff concludes that it is acceptable for WEC to use ZIRLO as the cladding material for CENP-designed plants subject to the following conditions to which WEC has agreed (Reference 5):

- (1) The corrosion limit, as predicted by the best-estimate model will remain below 100 microns for all locations of the fuel.
- (2) All the conditions listed in the SEs for all the CENPD methodologies used for ZIRLO fuel analysis will continue to be met, except that the use of ZIRLO cladding in addition to Zircaloy-4 cladding is now approved.
- (3) All CENP methodologies will be used only within the range for which ZIRLO data was acceptable and for which the verifications discussed in CENPD-404-P and responses to requests for additional information were performed.
- (4) Until data is available demonstrating the performance of ZIRLO cladding in CENP designed plants, the fuel duty will be limited for each CENP designed plant with some provision for adequate margin to account for variations in core design (e.g., cycle length, plant operating conditions, etc.). Details of this condition will be addressed on a plant specific basis during the approval to use ZIRLO in a specific plant.
- (5) The burnup limit for this approval is 60 GWD/MTU.

### 4.0 REFERENCES

1. Letter from Philip W. Richardson, CE Nuclear Power LLC to NRC Document Control Desk, January 22, 2001.
2. Letter from Philip W. Richardson, Westinghouse Electric Company LLC to NRC Document Control Desk, May 3, 2001.
3. Letter from Philip W. Richardson, Westinghouse Electric Company LLC to NRC Document Control Desk, August 10, 2001.
4. Letter from Philip W. Richardson, Westinghouse Electric Company LLC (LD-2001-0046, Revision 0) to John S. Cushing, NRC, August 10, 2001.
5. Letter from Philip W. Richardson, Westinghouse Electric Company LLC to NRC Document Control Desk, August 27, 2001.
6. WCAP-12610-P-A, "Vantage+ Fuel Assembly Reference Core Report," April 1995.
7. Nuclear Engineering and Design, Volume 147, No. 1, Page 53, Comparative Studies on High-Temperature Corrosion of ZrNb1 and Zircaloy-4.

Principal Contributor: M. Chatterton

Date: September 12, 2001

**WESTINGHOUSE PROPRIETARY CLASS 2**

## **CENPD-404-NP-A**

**U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

**SAFETY EVALUATION REPORT**

**REQUIRED MATERIALS**

2. CENPD-404-NP-A, Revision 0, "Implementation of ZIRLO™ Material Cladding in CE Nuclear Power Fuel Assembly Designs"

**WESTINGHOUSE PROPRIETARY CLASS 3**



**IMPLEMENTATION OF ZIRLO™ CLADDING  
MATERIAL IN CE NUCLEAR POWER  
FUEL ASSEMBLY DESIGNS**

**DATE: NOVEMBER 2001**

**CENPD-404-NP-A**

**REVISION 0**

**WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC COMPANY LLC**

© 2001 Westinghouse Electric Company LLC  
All Rights Reserved



## **ABSTRACT**

This topical report describes the implementation of Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) approved Westinghouse Electric Company developed ZIRLO™ fuel rod cladding material properties and correlations in NRC approved CE Nuclear Power LLC (CENP) design and licensing safety analysis procedures. These procedures include analyses, computer codes, and application methodologies. The ZIRLO™ cladding material is being introduced as an adjunction to the existing CENP OPTIN (optimized Zircaloy-4) cladding material currently in use, not as a replacement for it.

This topical report provides an integrated description of the incorporation of the Westinghouse developed ZIRLO™ cladding material into CENP fuel assembly designs. ZIRLO™ material properties are documented in NRC approved Westinghouse Electric Company topical reports. CENP has confirmed the range in the Westinghouse developed properties and data to also cover CENP's implementation. Similarly, Westinghouse performed data reduction and correlation development activities, including the definition of property uncertainties, in a specific manner which has also been confirmed to be compatible with CENP's intended application. Finally, CENP design and licensing safety analysis activities require the application of performance criteria or limits, which have been NRC approved for the CENP Zircaloy-4 cladding material, and have been confirmed to be consistent with, and applicable to, ZIRLO™ cladding as well. Following this extensive evaluation, CENP has concluded that application of ZIRLO™ in its existing fuel designs is straightforward and will not result in any surprises nor undesirable changes in predicted fuel performance or safety analysis results. To the contrary, use of ZIRLO™ results in significant improvements in waterside corrosion and provides a desirable and robust addition to CENP fuel designs. While modifications are required to include the ZIRLO™ option, no modifications are required to already NRC accepted ZIRLO™ properties or CENP application methodologies, design performance criteria, or regulatory acceptance criteria.

This topical report, with NRC approval, in combination with the applicable references discussed within each section constitutes justification for implementation of ZIRLO™ cladding material into CENP fuel designs and analysis methodologies.

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b><u>Section</u></b>	<b><u>Title</u></b>	<b><u>Page No.</u></b>
	<b>Abstract</b>	i
	<b>Table of Contents</b>	ii
	<b>List of Tables</b>	ix
	<b>List of Figures</b>	xi
	<b>Acronyms</b>	xiv
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Purpose</b>	1-1
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Background</b>	2-1
<b>3.0</b>	<b>ZIRLO™ FUEL DESIGN FEATURES IN CENP PLANTS</b>	3-1
3.1	ZIRLO™ Fuel Rod Cladding	3-1
3.2	Fuel Assembly Structural Materials	3-2
3.3	Applicable Westinghouse Experience Data Base	3-2
3.4	ZIRLO™ Cladding and Fuel Duty Considerations	3-3
3.5	Full Batch Implementation of ZIRLO™ Cladding in CENP 14x14 and 16x16 Fuel Designs	3-6
3.6	ZIRLO™ Application to High Burnup	3-7
3.6.1	Application to NRC Approved 60 MWd/kgU Peak Pin Burnup	3-8
3.6.2	Application to 62 MWd/kgU in Conjunction with CENP High Burnup OPTIN Topical	3-8
3.7	References	3-10
<b>4.0</b>	<b>FUEL PERFORMANCE</b>	4-1
4.1	Introduction	4-1
4.2	Summary of Cladding-Related Models in the Fuel Performance Evaluation Models	4-2
4.3	ZIRLO™ Properties for FATES3B Fuel Performance	4-3



4.3.1	ZIRLO™ Cladding Creep Correlations	4-4
4.3.1.1	Thick-Wall Cylinder Stress Equations	4-9
4.3.1.2	Equivalent Stress-Strain Relationships	4-10
4.3.1.3	Isotropy and Prandti-Reuss Equations	4-11
4.3.1.4	NCLO Application and Creep Rate Uncertainty	4-12
4.3.2	Fuel Rod Axial Growth	4-12
4.3.3	Cladding Thermal Conductivity	4-14
4.3.4	Cladding Thermal Expansion	4-14
4.3.5	Other ZIRLO™ Fuel Performance Properties and Correlations	4-16
4.3.5.1	Modulus of Elasticity	4-16
4.3.5.2	Poisson's Ratio	4-16
4.3.5.3	Hemispherical Emittance	4-17
4.3.5.4	Diamond Pyramid Hardness (DPH)	4-17
4.3.6	Verification of FATES3B (Creepdown)	4-18
4.3.7	Design Criteria and Methodology Validation	4-19
4.4	Application of ZIRLO™ and DNB Analysis	4-20
4.4.1	Impact on CHF and DNBR	4-20
4.4.2	Impact on DNB Propagation (NCLO)	4-21
4.4.2.1	High Temperature Creep and Rupture	4-21
4.4.2.2	Strain Criterion for Channel Blockage	4-25
4.4.2.3	DNB Propagation Methodology	4-26
4.4.2.4	Discussion of Conservatism for DNB Propagation	4-27
4.4.2.5	Hydrides and Hydride Reorientation in ZIRLO™	4-27
4.5	Waterside Corrosion Limits	4-28

4.5.1	OPTIN Waterside Corrosion Analysis	4-28
4.5.2	ZIRLO™ Waterside Corrosion Analysis	4-29
4.6	Impact of ZIRLO™ on Fuel Performance	4-30
4.6.1	ZIRLO™ Impact on Thermal Performance	4-30
4.6.1.1	Fuel Temperatures	4-31
4.6.1.2	Power-to-Centerline Melt (PTM)	4-32
4.6.1.3	Internal Hot Gas Pressure	4-32
4.6.1.4	Critical Pressure Limit for NCLO	4-32
4.6.1.5	Other Design and Licensing Applications	4-33
4.6.2	ZIRLO™ Impact on DNB Propagation	4-33
4.7	Conclusions	4-34
4.8	References	4-35
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Fuel Mechanical Design</b>	<b>5-1</b>
5.1	Introduction	5-1
5.2	Cladding Parameters Used in Fuel Mechanical Design Methodology	5-1
5.2.1	CEPAN Model	5-2
5.2.2	SIGREEP Model	5-3
5.2.3	Rod Bow Model	5-4
5.2.4	Seismic/LOCA Model	5-4
5.3	ZIRLO™ Mechanical Design Properties	5-4
5.3.1	ZIRLO™ Creep Considerations	5-4
5.3.1.1	Creep Correlations for Cladding Collapse Method	5-5
5.3.2	Fuel Rod Axial Growth	5-6
5.3.3	Cladding Thermal Conductivity	5-7

5.3.4	Thermal Expansion	5-7
5.3.5	Stain Capability	5-7
5.3.6	Fatigue Capability	5-8
5.3.7	Mechanical Strength	5-8
5.3.7.1	Yield Strength	5-8
5.3.7.2	Ultimate Strength	5-9
5.3.8	Modulus of Elasticity	5-9
5.3.9	Poisson's Ratio	5-9
5.3.10	Oxide Buildup	5-9
5.3.11	Density	5-10
5.4	Fuel Mechanical Design Impact	5-10
5.4.1	Creep Collapse	5-10
5.4.1.1	Conclusion Related to Creep Collapse	5-11
5.4.2	Fuel Rod Stress	5-11
5.4.2.1	Conclusion Related to Fuel Rod Stress	5-11
5.4.3	Fuel Rod Strain	5-12
5.4.3.1	Conclusion Related to Fuel Rod Strain	5-12
5.4.4	Fuel Rod Fatigue Damage	5-13
5.4.4.1	Conclusion Related to Fuel Rod Fatigue Damage	5-13
5.4.5	Shoulder Gap Margin	5-14
5.4.5.1	Conclusion Related to Shoulder Gap Margin	5-14
5.4.6	Rod Bow	5-14
5.4.6.1	Conclusions Related to Rod Bow	5-15
5.4.7	Grid-to-Rod Fretting Wear	5-15
5.4.7.1	Grid-to-Rod Fretting Wear at Zircaloy Spacer Grids	5-16

5.4.7.2	Evaluation of the Change to ZIRLO™ Cladding on Grid-to-Rod Fretting Wear	5-17
5.4.7.3	Conclusions Related to Grid-to-Rod Fretting Wear	5-18
5.4.8	Fuel Assembly Considerations	5-19
5.4.8.1	Fuel Assembly Bow	5-19
5.4.8.2	Spacer Grid Irradiation Growth and Spring Tab Relaxation	5-20
5.4.8.3	Fuel Assembly Hold Down Margin	5-20
5.4.8.4	Assembly Structural Performance	5-21
5.4.8.4.1	Spent Fuel Handling	5-21
5.4.8.4.2	Fuel Assembly Damage Under Seismic and LOCA Loads	5-21
5.5	Overall Conclusion for Fuel Mechanical Design	5-22
5.6	References	5-23
<b>6.0</b>	<b>ECCS Performance Analysis</b>	<b>6-1</b>
6.1	Introduction	6-1
6.2	Summary of Cladding-Related Models in the CENP ECCS Performance Evaluation Models	6-2
6.2.1	CEFLASH-4A	6-3
6.2.2	CEFLASH-4AS	6-4
6.2.3	COMPERC-II	6-5
6.2.4	STRIKIN-II	6-5
6.2.5	PARCH	6-6
6.2.6	COMZIRC	6-7
6.2.7	HCROSS	6-7
6.3	ZIRLO™ Properties and Correlations in the CENP ECCS Performance Evaluation Models	6-8
6.3.1	Specific Heat	6-8

6.3.2	Density	6-8
6.3.3	Thermal Conductivity	6-9
6.3.4	Thermal Emissivity	6-10
6.3.5	Thermal Expansion	6-11
6.3.6	Modulus of Elasticity	6-12
6.3.7	Poisson's Ratio	6-13
6.3.8	Diamond Pyramid Hardness	6-14
6.3.9	Cladding Rupture Temperature	6-15
6.3.9.1	CENP Large Break LOCA Evaluation Model	6-15
6.3.9.2	CENP Small Break LOCA Evaluation Model	6-16
6.3.10	Cladding Rupture Strain	6-17
6.3.10.1	CENP Large Break LOCA Evaluation Model	6-17
6.3.10.2	CENP Small Break LOCA Evaluation Model	6-18
6.3.11	Assembly Blockage versus Rupture Temperature	6-18
6.3.12	Pre-Rupture Plastic Strain	6-18
6.3.13	Metal-Water Reaction Rate	6-19
6.4	Interface with Fuel Performance Model, FATES3B	6-21
6.5	Impact of ZIRLO™ on ECCS Performance	6-22
6.5.1	LBLOCA ECCS Performance	6-22
6.5.1.1	Method of Analysis	6-22
6.5.1.2	Plant Design Data	6-23
6.5.1.3	Results	6-23
6.5.2	SBLOCA ECCS Performance	6-27
6.5.2.1	Method of Analysis	6-27

## List of Tables

<u>Table No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
3.3-1	ZIRLO™ Operating Experience	3-11
3.3-2	ZIRLO™ High Burnup Experience	3-12
3.3-3	Summary of Westinghouse LTA Programs	3-13
3.5-1	CENP PWR Lead Fuel Programs	3-14
3.5-2	Chemical Compositions of Cladding Alloys	3-15
4.2-1	CENP Zircaloy-4 Clad Property Correlation Used in Fuel Performance	4-37
5.2-1	Topical Reports and Safety Evaluations for the Mechanical Design Models	5-25
5.2-2	Cladding Models Used in Mechanical Design Models	5-26
5.4.7-1	Implementation of Advanced Laser Welded Grids	5-27
5.4.7-2	Grid-to-Rod Fretting Wear Induced Failures in CENP US PWR Fuel Supplied Since 1984	5-28
5.4.7-3	Effect of Cladding Material Change on Factors Contribution to Fretting Failures	5-29
5.4.7-4	Relevant Experience	5-30
5.4.7-5	Additional Experience	5-31
6.2-1	Topical Reports and Safety Evaluation Reports for the 1999 EM and the S2M	6-33
6.2-2	Cladding Models Used in the 1999 EM and S2M Evaluation Models	6-34
6.3.1-1	ZIRLO™ Specific Heat Used in Westinghouse Appendix K Evaluation Models	6-35
6.3.1-2	ZIRLO™ Specific Heat Used in Westinghouse Best Estimate Evaluation Model	6-36

6.5.2.2	Plant Design Data	6-27
6.5.2.3	Results	6-28
6.6	Conclusions	6-29
6.7	References	6-30
<b>7.0</b>	<b>Non-LOCA Accidents</b>	7-1
7.1	Introduction	7-1
7.2	Summary of Cladding-related Models in the Non-LOCA Transient Evaluation Models	7-1
7.2.1	STRIKIN-II Code	7-2
7.2.2	CENTS Code	7-2
7.2.3	CESEC Code	7-3
7.2.4	HERMITE Code	7-3
7.3	ZIRLO™ Impact on Accident Parameters	7-4
7.3.1	CEA Ejection	7-5
7.3.2	Locked Rotor/Shaft Break	7-6
7.4	Conclusions	7-7
7.5	References	7-8
<b>8.0</b>	<b>Nuclear Design</b>	8-1
8.1	Impact of ZIRLO™ Implementation on Nuclear Design	8-1
<b>9.0</b>	<b>Summary and Conclusions on ZIRLO™ Cladding Implementation</b>	9-1

<u>Table No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
6.3.1-3	Zircaloy-4 Specific Heat Used in CENP ECCS Performance Evaluation Models	6-37
6.3.9.1-1	ZIRLO™ Cladding Rupture Temperature Model	6-38
6.3.10.1-1	ZIRLO™ Cladding Rupture Strain Model	6-39
6.3.11-1	ZIRLO™ Cladding Assembly Blockage Model	6-40
6.5.1.2-1	Important Plant Design Data Used in the LBLOCA ECCS Performance Analysis of ZIRLO™ Cladding	6-41
6.5.1.3-1	Important Results of the LBLOCA ECCS Performance Analysis of ZIRLO™ Cladding for the Maximum Initial Fuel Stored Energy Cases	6-42
6.5.1.3-2	Important Results of the LBLOCA ECCS Performance Analysis of ZIRLO™ Cladding for the Maximum Initial Rod Internal Pressure Cases	6-43
6.5.1.3-3	Comparison of ZIRLO™ and Zircaloy-4 Maximum Cladding Temperatures for the LBLOCA ECCS Performance Analysis	6-44
6.5.2.2-1	Important Plant Design Data Used in the SBLOCA ECCS Performance Analysis of ZIRLO™ Cladding	6-45
6.5.2.3-1	Important Results of the SBLOCA ECCS Performance Analysis of ZIRLO™ Cladding	6-46
7.3-1	Non-LOCA Events Typically Analyzed for CENP Designed Nuclear Power Plants	7-9



## List of Figures

<u>Figure No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
3.3-1	ZIRLO™ Cladding in Westinghouse-Fueled PWRs	3-16
3.4-1	ZIRLO™ Measured Oxide Thickness vs. Fuel Duty Index	3-17
3.4-2	ZIRLO™ Measured Oxide Thickness vs. Modified Fuel Duty Index	3-18
4.3.6-1	FATES3B ZIRLO™ Diametral Creepdown – North Anna 1	4-38
4.3.6-2	FATES3B ZIRLO™ Diametral Creepdown – North Anna 1 Assembly Rod Average	4-39
4.3.6-3	FATES3B ZIRLO™ Diametral Creepdown	4-40
4.5.2-1	Maximum ZIRLO™ Cladding Oxide Thickness versus Rod Average Burnup	4-41
4.6.1-1	Radial Peaking Factor versus Burnup – 14x14 Design	4-42
4.6.1-2	Radial Peaking Factor versus Burnup – 16x16 Design	4-43
4.6.1-3	Axial Power Distributions – 14x14 Design	4-44
4.6.1-4	Axial Power Distributions – 16x16 Design	4-45
4.6.1.2-1	Power-to-Centerline Melt – 14x14 Design	4-46
4.6.1.2-2	Power-to-Centerline Melt – 16x16 Design	4-47
4.6.1.3-1	Maximum Internal Hot Gas Pressure – 14x14 Design	4-48
4.6.1.3-2	Maximum Internal Hot Gas Pressure – 16x16 Design	4-49
4.6.2-1	DNB Propagation Strain for Calvert Cliffs Steam Line Break	4-50
4.6.2-2	Strain Prediction for ZIRLO™ at 71.72 MPa and 973°K	4-51
4.6.2-3	Strain Prediction for ZIRLO™ at 35 MPa and 1093°K	4-52
4.6.2-4	Strain Prediction for ZIRLO™ at 15 MPa and 1073°K	4-53
4.6.2-5	Strain Prediction for ZIRLO™ at 4.64 MPa and 1323°K	4-54

<b><u>Figure No.</u></b>	<b><u>Title</u></b>	<b><u>Page No.</u></b>
6.3.1-1	Comparison of the Westinghouse EM Specific Heat Models for ZIRLO™ to the CENP EM Specific Heat Models for Zircaloy-4	6-47
6.3.3-1	Comparison of the Westinghouse EM Thermal Conductivity Model for ZIRLO™ to the CENP EM Thermal Conductivity Models for Zircaloy-4	6-48
6.3.4-1	CENP EM Thermal Emissivity Model for Zircaloy-4	6-49
6.3.5-1	Comparison of the Westinghouse EM Thermal Expansion Model for ZIRLO™ to the CENP EM Thermal Expansion Models for Zircaloy-4	6-50
6.3.6-1	CENP EM Modulus of Elasticity Model for Zircaloy-4	6-51
6.3.7-1	CENP EM Poisson's Ratio Model for Zircaloy-4	6-52
6.3.8-1	CENP EM Diamond Pyramid Hardness Model for Zircaloy-4	6-53
6.3.9.1-1	Comparison of the ZIRLO™ and NUREG-0630 Cladding Rupture Temperature Models	6-54
6.3.9.2-1	Comparison of the ZIRLO™ and CENP SBLOCA EM Cladding Rupture Temperature Models	6-55
6.3.10.1-1	Comparison of the ZIRLO™ and NUREG-0630 Cladding Rupture Strain Models	6-56
6.3.10.2-1	Comparison of the ZIRLO™ and CENP SBLOCA EM Cladding Rupture Strain Models	6-57
6.3.11-1	Comparison of the ZIRLO™ and NUREG-0630 Assembly Blockage Models	6-58
6.3.13-1	Comparison of the ZIRLO™ and Baker-Just Model Parabolic Rate Correlations	6-59
6.5.1.3-1	Peak Cladding Temperature for the LBLOCA ECCS Performance Analysis of ZIRLO™ Cladding (0.6 DEG/PD Break, Maximum Stored Energy Case)	6-60
6.5.1.3-2	Hot Spot Gap Conductance for the LBLOCA ECCS Performance Analysis of ZIRLO™ Cladding (0.6 DEG/PD Break, Maximum Stored Energy Case)	6-61

<b><u>Figure No.</u></b>	<b><u>Title</u></b>	<b><u>Page No.</u></b>
6.5.1.3-3	Hot Spot Heat Transfere Coefficient for the LBLOCA ECCS Performance Analysis of ZIRLO™ Cladding (0.6 DEG/PD Break, Maximum Stored Energy Case)	6-62
6.5.1.3-4	Maximum Cladding Oxidation Percentage for the LBLOCA EDDS Performamnce Analysis of ZIRLO™ Cladding (0.6 DEG/PD Break, Maximum Stored Energy Case)	6-63
6.5.2.3-1	Peak Cladding Temperature for the SBLOCA ECCS Performance Analysis of ZIRLO™ Cladding (0.1 ft <sup>2</sup> /PD Break)	6-64
6.5.2.3-2	Coolant Temperature at the Elevation of the PCT for the SBLOCA ECCS Performance Analysis of ZIRLO™ (0.1 ft <sup>2</sup> /PD Break)	6-65
6.5.2.3-3	Heat Transfer Coefficient at the Elevation of the PCT for the SBLOCA ECCS Performance Analysis Of ZIRLO™ Cladding (0.1 ft <sup>2</sup> /PD Break)	6-66

## List of Acronyms

<u>Acronym</u>	<u>Definition</u>
AOO	Anticipated Operational Occurrence
CEA	Control Element Assembly
CEDM	Control Element Drive Mechanism
CENP	CE Nuclear Power LLC
DEG/PD	Double-Ended Guillotine/Pump Discharge
DNB	Departure from Nucleate Boiling
DPH	Diamond Pyramid Hardness
ECCS	Emergency Core Cooling System
EM	Evaluation Model
EOL	End Of Life
FDI	Fuel Duty Index
FSAR	Final Safety analysis Report
HFP	Hot Full Power
HZP	Hot Zero Power
LBLOCA	Large Break Loss-of-Coolant Accident
LHR	Linear Heat Rate
LOCA	Loss of Coolant Accident
LTA	Lead Test Assemblies
NCLO	No-Clad-Lift-Off
NRC	Nuclear Regulatory Commission
OFA	Optimized Fuel Assembly
OPTIN™	Optimized Process Low Tin Zircaloy-4
PCT	Peak Cladding Temperature
PLHGR	Peak Linear Heat Generation Rate
PTM	Power-to-Centerline Melt
PWR	Pressurized Water Reactor
RCP	Reactor Coolant Pump
RCS	Reactor Coolant System
S2M	<u>Supplement 2 Evaluation Model</u>
SAFDL	Specified Acceptable Fuel Design Limit
SBLOCA	Small Break Loss-of-Coolant Accident
SER	Safety Evaluation Report
SIT	Safety Injection Tank
SRP	Standard Review Plan
STD	Standard
UO <sub>2</sub>	Uranium Dioxide
Westinghouse	Westinghouse Electric Company LLC

## **1.0 Purpose**

This report describes the implementation of Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) approved Westinghouse Electric Company developed ZIRLO™ fuel rod cladding material properties and correlations in the NRC approved CE Nuclear Power LLC (CENP) design and licensing analysis procedures. These procedures include analyses, computer codes, and application methodologies. ZIRLO™ cladding properties and correlations are implemented in addition to the existing CENP Zircaloy-4 properties and correlations currently in use.

Following extensive evaluation, CENP has concluded that the application of these ZIRLO™ properties is straightforward and does not result in any surprises nor undesirable changes in predicted fuel performance. While modifications are required to certain computer codes and analyses, no modifications are required for application methodologies or to performance criteria.

Use of ZIRLO™ fuel rod cladding results in significant improvements in waterside corrosion and provides a desirable and robust addition to CENP nuclear fuel designs.

## 2.0 Background

ZIRLO™ material properties are provided in NRC approved Westinghouse topical reports in several different formats consistent with Westinghouse requirements. Some correlations are presented with the measured property data, and some property data are in the form of tabular and/or graphical presentation. All measured properties cover a specific range of independent variables (i.e., temperature, stress, neutron flux and fluence, etc.). The range in the data has been confirmed to adequately cover CENP's implementation requirements as well. Measurements were made in a specific manner that has also been confirmed to be consistent and compatible with the intended implementation. Similarly, Westinghouse has performed data reduction and correlation development, including the definition of property uncertainties, in a specific manner that is also compatible with CENP's intended implementation. Finally, CENP design and licensing analysis activities require the application of performance criteria or limits, which have been NRC approved for CENP for Zircaloy-4, and have been demonstrated to be consistent with, and applicable to, ZIRLO™ behavior.

This report collects and summarizes the ZIRLO™ material properties as they pertain to fuel rod cladding material and provides an evaluation of those properties and correlations CENP intends to use in design and licensing analysis activities. Specific topical reports impacted by the implementation of ZIRLO™ cladding are identified and descriptions of required substitutions for implementing ZIRLO™ are provided. Furthermore, licensing analysis examples are provided which describe the specific changes anticipated in individual performance parameters and demonstrate that the impact is acceptable and does not result in any ZIRLO™ operational surprises in CENP fuel designs.

The evaluations include the Fuel Performance, Mechanical Design, Emergency Core Cooling System (ECCS) Performance Analysis (Loss of Coolant Accident (LOCA)), Non-LOCA Transient Analysis, and Nuclear Engineering (Physics) disciplines. The methodologies employed within this group of disciplines are themselves individually discussed and have been reviewed and accepted for use by the NRC via more than a dozen separate topical reports and their respective NRC Safety Evaluation Reports (SERs). One of the purposes of this report is to provide, in one place, the information needed for ZIRLO™ implementation, thereby precluding

the need for revision by CENP, and review by the NRC, of the dozen or more individual topical reports. The affected individual topical reports and associated NRC SERs are, and will, remain the licensing basis for their subject methodology. Detailed report cross-references are provided, for both users and NRC reviewers, delineating where the original comparable Zircaloy-4 cladding material discussions occur in these individual underlying base methodology topical reports. It is important to note that the methodology discussions provided herein do not supercede the original methodology discussion and justifications found in the referenced underlying base topical reports upon which the NRC's acceptance was originally formulated. Methodology discussions provided herein are only meant to provide a basic understanding of the methodology so that justification for implementation of ZIRLO™ cladding material properties into that methodology can be understood. That is, ZIRLO™ cladding material has already been accepted for use by the NRC for use in conjunction with Westinghouse design and safety analysis methodologies and nothing herein should be construed to change in any way the underlying ZIRLO™ topical reports or their NRC acceptance. Likewise, CENP design and safety analysis methodologies have already been accepted for use by the NRC, albeit for OPTIN™ cladding material, and nothing herein should be construed to change in any way the underlying methodology topical reports or NRC acceptance. This topical report simply brings together these previously NRC accepted topical reports and explains their linkage (i.e., ZIRLO™ into CENP fuel designs and safety analysis methodologies). Nothing in any of the previously NRC approved topical reports has been changed save the linking of the information in one to the other for the purpose of gaining NRC approval for the use of ZIRLO™ clad material in CENP designed fuel assemblies and the analysis of those fuel assemblies and the cores in which they reside.

Thus, this topical report, with NRC approval, in combination with the applicable references discussed within each subsequent section constitutes justification for CENP to implement ZIRLO™ cladding into the CENP fuel designs.

### 3.0 ZIRLO™ Fuel Design Features in CENP Plants

The purpose of this section is to provide an overview of ZIRLO™ fuel rod cladding material implementation in CENP designed nuclear fuel assemblies and to provide justification for full batch implementation. Full batch implementation is based on significant Westinghouse experience with the successful performance of fuel assemblies with ZIRLO™ cladding in either Zircaloy-4 or ZIRLO™ structural components. In addition to the Westinghouse experience, this section presents similar CENP experience with advanced cladding alloys and structural components which are similar to ZIRLO™. Finally, the recent industry trend toward more severe fuel rod duty cycles has been evaluated and compared to Westinghouse fuel duty experience with ZIRLO™ performance in Westinghouse designed fuel. It is shown that CENP implementation is bounded by the Westinghouse ZIRLO™ experience. Thus, the significant amount of in-reactor experience and available test data supports full batch implementation of CENP designed ZIRLO™ clad fuel.

#### 3.1 ZIRLO™ Fuel Rod Cladding

ZIRLO™ is a Westinghouse proprietary modification of Zircaloy-4 material achieved by reducing the tin and iron content, eliminating the chromium content, and adding one percent niobium. OPTIN™ is the cladding material currently used in CENP fuel designs and is an Optimized Process Low Tin cladding that falls within the overall Zircaloy-4 material specification. The ZIRLO™ material composition and properties are described in Appendix A of Reference 3-1 and OPTIN cladding in Section 1-5 of Reference 3-3. The following table compares the two alloys:

<u>Element</u>	<u>ZIRLO Alloy</u>	<u>CENP OPTIN</u>
Sn, wt%	0.8-1.2	1.2-1.44
Fe, wt%	0.09-0.13	0.18-0.24
Cr, wt%	-	0.07-0.13
Nb, wt%	0.8-1.2	-
O, wt%	0.08-0.16	0.10-0.16
Zr, wt%	Balance	Balance



The changes in levels of tin, chromium, and niobium have an impact on the two-phase transformation temperatures. Tin is an alpha phase stabilizer, and chromium and niobium are beta stabilizers. However, niobium is a stronger beta stabilizer than chromium (a weak stabilizer). The net result is that compared to OPTIN, ZIRLO™ has lower two-phase transformation temperatures. Measurements performed at the Westinghouse Research Laboratories show that ZIRLO™ starts the transformation at 750° C and ends at 940° C. This compares to temperatures of 815°C and 970°C for Zircaloy-4. Since both the ZIRLO™ and OPTIN alloys are about 98 percent zirconium, the properties of the two alloys are not significantly different, except to the extent that they are affected by the differences in the phase change temperatures and tube manufacturing process.

The reports describing the ZIRLO™ properties and models and NRC approvals are given in References 3-1, 3-2 and 3-8. The implementation of the ZIRLO™ properties and models in CENP methods and the impact of ZIRLO™ on Fuel Performance, Mechanical Design, ECCS Performance, Non-LOCA Accidents and Nuclear Design are discussed in the remaining sections of this report.

### **3.2 Fuel Assembly Structural Materials**

The ZIRLO™ cladding described in Section 3.1 will be implemented in CENP 14x14 and 16x16 fuel designs. Currently, CENP fuel designs utilize OPTIN cladding in Zircaloy-4 structural components. The Zircaloy-4 material used for mixing and non-mixing vane spacer grids, guide tubes, and end fittings are not being changed to ZIRLO™ in conjunction with the cladding material change. CENP has extensive successful experience with the current Zircaloy-4 structural component materials. No changes are being made to these materials at this time.

### **3.3 Applicable Westinghouse Experience Data Base**

The ZIRLO™ cladding material described in Section 3-1 is in widespread use domestically in at least 38 Westinghouse designed nuclear power plants, as of the end of 1999. Table 3.3-1 summarizes the ZIRLO™ operating experience for cladding, guide tubes, and spacer grids.

Figure 3.3-1 provides a forecast of the number of plants expected to use ZIRLO™ in regions and full core applications in the future. Table 3.3-2 provides a summary of the high burnup experience of ZIRLO™ as of July 1999 and Table 3.3-3 summarizes the current LTA programs.

ZIRLO™ has improved corrosion resistance compared to Zircaloy-4 [

.] Also, no oxide spalling has been observed in current ZIRLO™ fuel for either low or high duty operation. Westinghouse has also implemented over 1 million ZIRLO™ fuel rods in assemblies with ZIRLO™ and Zircaloy-4 Optimized Fuel Assembly (OFA) type spacer grids without incidence of leakers due to grid-to-rod fretting. The OFA type spacer grids utilizes a vertical type grid spring. Fuel rod fretting failures have been observed in Westinghouse fuel with a slanted grid spring [ ] design; however this design is being modified to improve its grid-to-rod fretting resistance. Further discussion on grid-to-rod fretting is provided in Section 5.4.7.

### **3.4 ZIRLO™ Cladding and Fuel Duty Considerations**

There has been an industry trend toward greater Pressurized Water Reactor (PWR) plant operating efficiencies over the last decade. The economic benefits derived from higher power ratings, extended burnups, and higher operating temperatures have led to aggressive fuel duty conditions, characterized by high fuel rod surface temperatures, with subcooled boiling, and high power densities at ever-greater residence times. Such harsher core environments have placed greater demands on fuel than ever before.

More demanding PWR fuel duties have necessitated closer evaluation of the corrosion resistance of fuel cladding materials. It has been common practice within the nuclear industry to present experimental fuel rod corrosion data as plots of the maximum oxide measured on a fuel rod versus the fuel rod average burnup. This type of plot is a convenient way to represent the data, since the measured oxide and burnup data are readily available. However, this representation of the data can be misleading. The plots show the range of burnups and thickness for which corrosion data are available. However, only limited conclusions about corrosion performance can, or should, be drawn from these plots.

Fuel rod corrosion is only a weak function of burnup, through the dependence on the fast flux. It is primarily a function of time at temperature. There are factors such as fast flux, coolant lithium concentration, boiling duty, cladding microstructural instability, and cladding hydrogen levels that may enhance the in-pile thermal corrosion rate compared to the out-of-pile thermal corrosion rate. However, these factors tend to increase the overall sensitivity of the in-pile corrosion rate to temperature variations, not to decrease it.

Fuel rod corrosion does increase with burnup, because burnup increases with time, a primary variable. However, for a given burnup and cladding type the corrosion can vary substantially due to other factors. These factors include the coolant inlet temperature, the coolant flow rate, the power peaking factors, adjacent rod powers, and the number of cycles, or time, taken to achieve the burnup. Corrosion values of the same cladding type obtained from two different reactors at equal burnups may vary substantially even though in both cases the cladding is behaving exactly as expected. This makes it very difficult to compare the relative merits of cladding types irradiated in different reactors, or even with different fuel management schemes within the same reactor.

Westinghouse has investigated alternatives to presenting corrosion data as a function of burnup. After some investigation, a term was identified which is called the Fuel Duty Index (FDI). FDI is defined as

$$FDI = \{(T_{avg} - 580)/100\} \cdot (Hrs/1000)\}^2 \quad (3-1)$$

where

$T_{avg}$  = Time averaged oxide layer surface temperature, °F

Hrs = Total Irradiation time, hours

Comparisons of measured corrosion values illustrate that simple relationships exist between the measured corrosion values and the FDI. These relations exists for all grid spans of the fuel rod, not just the peak corrosion span, for reactors with different thermal duties, and for different fuel cycling schemes. Figure 3.4-1 is a plot of measured oxide thickness versus FDI for ZIRLO™ cladding. Further detail on the development of the FDI model can be found in Reference 3-4.

Corrosion data for ZIRLO™ cladding that was recently measured on lead test assemblies (LTA) have shown different behavior with respect to the FDI than was shown by earlier data. There are several groups of data that show significant deviations from a linear relation between measured oxide thickness and FDI. [

.]

The deviations were associated with significant boiling during multiple irradiation cycles. [

.]

When the cladding is in boiling, the surface temperature is essentially constant at a few degrees above the saturation temperature and the FDI becomes independent of the heat flux. It is known that the corrosion rate is dependent on the boiling rate. Thus, an additional term was added to the FDI to account for the increase in duty under boiling conditions. Since corrosion rate depends on the boiling rate, [

.]

A modified FDI, [

]

A plot of the measured oxide thickness versus the modified FDI is shown in Figure 3.4-2. There is a much better overall trend of measured thickness with the modified FDI. Figure 3.4-2 represents the current corrosion performance versus fuel duty for the current ZIRLO™ cladding database.

### 3.5 Full Batch Implementation of ZIRLO™ Cladding in CENP 14x14 and 16x16 Fuel Designs

Full batch implementation of ZIRLO™ cladding may be implemented for the following CENP 14x14 and 16x16 fuel designs:

<u>Array Size</u>	<u>Grid Design</u>	<u>Mixing Vanes</u>	<u>Spring Design</u>	<u>Pellet Design</u>
16x16	STD	No	Cantilevered	Standard Pellet
16x16	STD	No	Cantilevered	Value Added Pellet
14x14	STD	No	Cantilevered	Value Added Pellet
14x14	Turbo	Yes	"I" Spring	Value Added Pellet

The Zircaloy-4 Standard (STD) grid is the current spacer design used in CENP 14x14 and 16x16 fuel designs. The STD grid does not use mixing vanes and utilizes a cantilevered type grid spring. The Zircaloy-4 Turbo grid is a next generation type spacer design for the 14x14 geometry. A next generation type spacer grid may also be considered for use in the 16x16 geometry in the future. The 14x14 Turbo grid is scheduled for initial full batch implementation in Calvert Cliffs Unit 1 in the Spring of 2002. The Turbo grid uses mixing vanes to improve Departure from Nucleate Boiling (DNB) performance and an "I" spring (vertical type) to improve grid-to-rod fretting resistance. The "I" spring contains increased contact length and is cold-worked so the spring grows outward toward the fuel rod (due to irradiation), thus maintaining contact with the fuel rod. Further details on Turbo grid fuel is described in Reference 3-5. Both grid types have demonstrated good wear performance in-reactor. The STD grid has been used at least 30 years in-reactor with some fuel failures (with low safety significance) due to loose cells [

.] For Turbo grid fuel, recent LTA examinations have shown a significant improvement in fuel rod wear performance compared to STD grids for symmetric assemblies adjacent to the core shroud. The implementation of ZIRLO™ cladding in both STD and Turbo grid designs may produce a reduction in wear margin relative to OPTIN cladding due to the reduced axial growth and oxide thickness of the ZIRLO™ cladding. However, it is expected that this reduction in wear margin can be accommodated in the initially planned fuel designs, similar to what was observed

when ZIRLO™ was implemented in the Westinghouse OFA grid design. Further discussion on grid-to-rod fretting is provided in Section 5.4.7.

CENP has implemented different advanced cladding materials in LTAs utilizing the STD and Turbo grid designs. Table 3.5-1 summarizes these LTA test programs. In these test programs fuel rod wear measurements have been made which demonstrate negligible wear differences due to the use of the advanced cladding materials. Some of these materials are similar to ZIRLO™ in that tin content was reduced and niobium added. Table 3.5-2 summarizes the differences in chemical compositions of the different advanced cladding materials evaluated. Even though the composition of the advanced cladding materials used in these LTAs are not exactly the same as ZIRLO™ cladding, the wear performance for ZIRLO™ is expected to be similar particularly with a robust CENP spacer grid design similar to the Westinghouse OFA spacer grid design.

CENP uses two different type of fuel pellet designs, standard and value added. The value added fuel pellet contains smaller end dishes, an increased diameter, and a slight increase in density to increase uranium loading compared to the standard fuel pellet design. The FATES3B fuel performance code will be used to evaluate both pellet designs in the reload analysis with the ZIRLO™ cladding.

ZIRLO™ cladding is more robust than OPTIN cladding due to its improved corrosion resistance and lack of oxide spallation. Small amounts of oxide spallation have been recently observed in OPTIN cladding in two cycle high duty fuel assemblies. Typical maximum FDI values for CENP plant designs were evaluated using the methodology described in Section 3.4. A maximum value of [ ] was calculated for 14x14 fuel and [ ] for 16x16 fuel. Therefore, the application of ZIRLO™ in CENP plants is well within the ZIRLO™ database shown in Figure 3.4-2.

### **3.6 ZIRLO™ Application to High Burnup**

ZIRLO™ has been approved by the NRC as an acceptable cladding material and is licensable to a peak rod average burnup of 62 MWd/kgU (References 3-1, 3-2, and 3-8). Furthermore, ZIRLO™ cladding has been shown to be capable of significantly higher burnups than 62 MWd/kgU because of its resistance to waterside corrosion and improved dimensional stability

under irradiation. CENP burnup application will remain consistent with approved burnups for the CENP fleet of plants as described below.

### **3.6.1 Application to NRC Approved 60 MWd/kgU Peak Pin Burnup**

The current NRC approved 1-pin peak burnup limit for the CENP 14x14 fuel design is 60 MWd/kgU, Reference 3-6. Similarly, the approved 1-pin peak burnup limit for the CENP 16x16 fuel design is also 60 MWd/kgU, Reference 3-7. Consequently, CENP will limit ZIRLO™ cladding to a 1-pin peak burnup of 60 MWd/kgU, even though it has demonstrated acceptable performance in excess of this value.

### **3.6.2 Application to 62 MWd/kgU in Conjunction with CENP High Burnup OPTIN Topical**

Reference 3-3 provided the justification for extending the operation of CENP PWR fuel designs to peak pin burnups in excess of 60 MWd/kgU. Although Reference 3-3 requested a peak burnup of 65 MWd/kgU, it is now understood by CENP that burnup will be limited for the foreseeable future by the NRC to 62 MWd/kgU. As documented in Reference 3-3, it was intended that OPTIN cladding only be irradiated to burnups in excess of 60 MWd/kgU under operating conditions characterized as low duty. It is recognized that if the duty cycle is too severe, one or more of the design and safety analysis criteria could be threatened. Consequently, it became necessary to define the low duty application of Reference 3-3 in order to continue forward. Efforts to successfully define low duty and obtain approval of Reference 3-3 are in progress.

Design and licensing issues for extending peak burnups above 60 MWd/kgU have been addressed in Reference 3-3 for the other fuel assembly components. The models related to the fuel stack, for example, were shown to be valid and acceptable to 65 MWd/kgU. The response of the fuel assembly and structural components to extended burnup were also shown to be acceptable. Therefore, the substitution of a more robust cladding material such as ZIRLO™ supports the successful operation to 62 MWd/kgU without duty limitations. Existing duty cycles are within the successful experience database for ZIRLO™ cladding.

Consequently, it is expected that NRC approval of Reference 3-3 will be consistent with the restriction that the 1-pin burnup limit of CENP plants utilizing ZIRLO™ cladding will be 62 MWd/kgU and that the low duty cycle defined for OPTIN will not be applied to CENP fuel assemblies that utilize ZIRLO™ cladding.



### 3.7 References

- 3-1 WCAP-12610-P-A, "Vantage+ Fuel Assembly Reference Core Report", April 1995.
- 3-2 WCAP-15063-P-A, Rev. 1 w/errata, "Westinghouse Improved Performance Analysis and Design Model (PAD 4.0), July 2000.
- 3-3 CENPD-388-P, "Extension of the 1-Pin Burnup Limit to 65 MWd/kgU for ABB PWR Fuel with OPTIN cladding", February 1998.
- 3-4 R. S. Kaiser, W. J. Leech, A. L. Casadei, "The Fuel Duty Index (FDI) – A New Measure of Fuel Rod Cladding Performance", Light Water Reactor Fuel Performance Conference Proceedings, Park City Utah, April 10-13, 2000.
- 3-5 Z. E. Karoutas, "Supporting Test Data and Analysis for ABB CE's TURBO™ PWR Fuel Design" presented at 12<sup>th</sup> Annual KAIF/KNS Conference, April 3-4, 1997, in Seoul Korea.
- 3-6 CEN-382(B)-P-A, "Verification of the Acceptability of a 1-Pin Burnup Limit of 60 MWD/kgU for Combustion Engineering 14x14 PWR Fuel", August 1993.
- 3-7 CEN-386-P-A, "Verification of the Acceptability of a 1-Pin Burnup Limit of 60 MWD/kgU for Combustion Engineering 16x16 PWR Fuel", August 1992.
- 3-8 WCAP-12488-A, "Westinghouse Fuel Criteria Evaluation Process", October 1994.

**Table 3.3-1**  
**ZIRLO™ Operating Experience**

**Table 3.3-2**  
**ZIRLO™ High Burnup Experience**

**Table 3.3-3**

**Summary of Westinghouse LTA Programs**



**Table 3.5-2**

**Chemical Compositions of Cladding Alloys**

**Figure 3.3-1**  
**ZIRLO Cladding in Westinghouse-Fueled PWRs**



Figure 3.4-1 ZIRLO Measured Oxide Thickness vs. Fuel Duty Index







Figure 3.4-2 ZIRLO Measured Oxide Thickness vs. Modified Fuel Duty Index



## 4.0 Fuel Performance

### 4.1 Introduction

Reload fuel performance design and safety analyses are performed with the FATES3B computer code. FATES3B is applied to uranium dioxide ( $\text{UO}_2$ ) fuel pellets, erbia bearing  $\text{UO}_2$  fuel pellets, and gadolinia bearing  $\text{UO}_2$  fuel pellets. Historically, the cladding material was Zircaloy-4. Following acceptance of the Westinghouse developed ZIRLO™ cladding material for use the NRC incorporated ZIRLO™, along with Zircaloy, into the pertinent sections of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations. Westinghouse developed ZIRLO™ cladding material properties and correlations have been added to the FATES3B code. FATES3B is used for thermal performance evaluations under normal operation considering steady-state and anticipated transient conditions. The power-to-centerline melt Specified Acceptable Fuel Design Limit (SAFDL) and maximum pressure SAFDL are shown to be met using FATES3B. Additionally, FATES3B is used to generate initial fuel/clad conditions for other design analyses, transient analyses, and accident analyses. A separate procedure for the prediction of fuel rod deformation and burst behavior under conditions of DNB for the purpose of evaluating DNB propagation has been developed. This procedure, which handles accumulation of large deformations, is a standalone computer code called INTEG (INTEGration). INTEG has also been modified to handle high temperature ZIRLO™ creep and burst behavior.

A summary of the CENP Zircaloy-4 cladding material model and property descriptions, pointing to associated topical reports, is provided in Section 4.2. ZIRLO™ properties and correlations for FATES3B are described in Section 4.3. Section 4.3 also provides a justification and description for the applications in FATES3B. High temperature correlations used in INTEG and justification for the ZIRLO™ correlations are described in Section 4.4. Waterside corrosion is described in Section 4.5. Finally, Section 4.6 provides a discussion of the expected influence of ZIRLO™ on the performance parameters for typical CENP 14x14 and 16x16 fuel designs.

## **4.2 Summary of Cladding-Related Models in the Fuel Performance Evaluation Models**

This section provides an overview of the fuel performance models pertaining to the fuel rod cladding which are used in design and licensing analyses. Fuel performance analyses are performed with the fuel performance code FATES3B, References 4-1, 4-2, and 4-3. The no-clad-lift-off (NCLO) maximum pressure criterion with justification for fuel rod operation with maximum internal hot gas pressure in excess of the reactor coolant system (RCS) pressure is described in Reference 4-4. The evaluation of maximum internal hot gas pressure during normal operation and the calculation for the maximum allowable internal pressure to meet a NCLO criterion is performed with FATES3B. A consequence of operation with higher than RCS pressure is the possibility of fuel rod ballooning under DNB and propagating DNB conditions to adjacent fuel rods. DNB propagation evaluations for transients and DNB accidents are performed with the INTEG code. High temperature cladding properties used in INTEG are described in Reference 4-4. DNB propagation evaluations are performed when the internal pressure exceeds nominal RCS pressure during normal operation. Other fuel models related to the additions of the burnable absorber materials erbia and gadolinia are described in References 4-5, 4-6, and 4-7. Design and licensing applications of the FATES3B and INTEG computer codes described in References 4-8 and 4-9 include:

- maximum internal hot gas pressure
- critical pressure for NCLO
- fission gas release (mechanical design evaluations)
- minimum internal gas pressure (mechanical design evaluations)
- power-to-centerline melt
- initial hot and average fuel rod conditions in hot assembly (LOCA and non-LOCA evaluations)
- engineering factor on LHR and stored energy
- core average densification factor
- fuel stored energy for containment analysis
- maximum fuel-clad gap conductance
- minimum fuel-clad gap conductance
- maximum internal gas pressure in spent fuel pool
- temperature-power correlations for physics

- high temperature creep and rupture for DNB propagation

A summary of the NRC accepted CENP topical report references which contain cladding properties and correlations used for fuel performance analyses is given in Table 4.2-1. Sections of these reports where the cladding properties and correlations are described and/or description of clad behavioral models where they are used are identified within the table. The cladding properties and correlations as described herein will be applied for reload fuel batches in CENP designed nuclear power plants where ZIRLO™ is used. This ZIRLO™ report is consistent with the historically established process of submitting individual reports on new materials when introduced into CENP fuel designs.

#### **4.3 ZIRLO™ Properties for FATES3B Fuel Performance**

An important behavior of fuel rod cladding is the creep deformation. Cladding creep is important during fuel-clad gap closure (compressive creepdown and gap thermal response) and is important during postulated pressure induced outward creep (tensile creep) during the later life of the fuel rod. Typically, tensile creep might occur after sufficient fission gas has been generated and released to the fuel rod plenum to result in the potential for pressure induced fuel-clad separation during normal operation. Such fuel-clad separation is considered to be a potential damage condition (possibly leading to failure) and is prevented by imposing the maximum pressure NCLO criterion. Also, high temperature tensile creep and potential bursting is important during DNB transients. Ballooning of the fuel rod is evaluated to determine the extent of DNB propagation to adjacent fuel rods from fuel rods initially in DNB due to degraded thermal-hydraulic conditions that exist during the transient.

A second important characteristic of the cladding is waterside corrosion behavior. ZIRLO™ cladding material is more resistant to corrosion than standard Zircaloy-4 or OPTIN™ and results in an improved and, therefore, acceptable performance in CENP nuclear fuel designs.

The third important property of the cladding which affects fuel performance is axial growth of the fuel rod because growth has an impact on the plenum volume available for fission gases released from the fuel pellets. Consequently, axial growth directly impacts internal gas pressure.

Additional cladding properties and correlations considered in CENP fuel performance are thermal conductivity, thermal expansion, elastic modulus, surface hardness (DPH), hemispherical emittance, and the Poisson's ratio. These properties play a minor role in the resulting thermal performance of ZIRLO™ compared to OPTIN.

ZIRLO™ cladding properties and correlations are individually discussed in the sections that follow.

It should be noted that certain dimensional characteristics of ZIRLO™ cladding affecting fuel performance are handled via analysis input parameters and are based on manufacturing tolerances, or are based on as-built measurements on a case-by-case basis if needed or desirable. Examples of these characteristics include surface roughness and fuel rod diametral or length tolerances. These dimensional characteristics are expected to be similar or identical to OPTIN cladding and are not discussed further herein. Section 4.6 evaluations performed to assess the effect of ZIRLO™ on CENP fuel performance presume identical values for these characteristics. Implementation of ZIRLO™ cladding in a reload batch will necessarily utilize the specific ZIRLO™ dimensional characteristics if they differ from those of OPTIN used in the evaluations.

#### **4.3.1 ZIRLO™ Cladding Creep Correlations**

The creep correlation for ZIRLO™ cladding (Reference 4-10) is empirical and is based on clad diametral creepdown deformation measurements which generally follow the first cycle of irradiation. First cycle creepdown measurements are used in order to eliminate or minimize pellet-clad interaction effects. Data for ZIRLO™ has been obtained from fuel rods irradiated[ .] The form of the correlation is based on a large combined Westinghouse database for ZIRLO™ and Zircaloy-4 cladding types as described in Reference 4-10. [

.] The ZIRLO™ creep correlations are incorporated into FATES3B as a user specified cladding option.

The relationships between loads and stresses are straightforward during the creepdown phase because there is no pellet-clad interaction, and loads are simply the internal gas pressure and

external system pressure. Similarly, the relationships under NCLO conditions are simple internal gas pressure versus external pressure. However, during pellet-clad interaction, the relationship is complicated. The pellet-clad interface conditions are not unique, well established conditions and, to a large extent, require somewhat arbitrary modeling assumptions on the interaction mechanisms. These assumptions include interface friction, possible pellet-clad lock-up (either locally or elsewhere along the fuel column), fuel-clad bonding, and even pellet mechanical response to an interference load (e.g., several pellet inelastic deformation mechanisms exist). There is a wide range of potentially reasonable models and, consequently, stress results. Several observations concerning potential fuel-clad interface conditions are applicable here:

- (1) The ZIRLO™ creep correlation is based on a fit to diameter measurements without pellet-clad interaction. Thus, the presence of a contact load is not relevant to the correlation's coefficients.
- (2) Application in FATES3B for creepdown does not involve pellet-clad interaction.
- (3) Application for outward creep for NCLO in FATES3B does not involve pellet-clad mechanical interference.
- (4) The creep correlation has no impact on axial deformations in FATES3B. Axial deformation of the fuel rod is based on the empirical rod growth correlation.
- (5) No pellet inelastic deformation models are used in FATES3B. Thus, the pellet forces the cladding outward at the restrained pellet swelling rate. Stress in the cladding automatically reaches an equilibrium condition with the required deformation regardless of the pellet-clad interface model used.
- (6) Cladding deformation during pellet clad contact has an insignificant impact on thermal performance or internal gas pressure.

Consequently, although the stress and strain formulations for ZIRLO™ creep correlations must be consistent with the development of the creep correlation, the mechanical interface model between pellet and cladding can and is independent. The stresses for ZIRLO™ cladding are obtained from the conventional thick-wall cylinder equations, consistent with model development.

The ZIRLO™ creep correlation, Reference 4-10, consists of two conventional components, irradiation creep and thermal creep. [

]

$$[ \quad ] \quad (4-1)$$

The accumulated thermal creep strain is given by

$$[ \quad ] \quad (4-2)$$

where

$$[ \quad ] \quad (4-2a)$$

$$[ \quad ] \quad (4-2b)$$

The thermal creep rate is obtained by differentiating Equation 4-2

$$[ \quad ] \quad (4-3)$$

where

$$[ \quad ] \quad (4-3a)$$

$$[ \quad ] \quad (4-3b)$$

$$[ \quad ] \quad (4-4)$$

The definitions of variables in the above equations are

$\dot{\epsilon}_{irr} = [ \quad ]$  irradiation creep rate, %/hour

$\dot{\epsilon}_{th} = [ \quad ]$  thermal creep rate, %/hour

$t =$  time, hours

$\sigma_{\theta} = [ \quad ]$  circumferential stress, MPa

$T =$  temperature, °K

$\dot{\phi} =$  fast neutron flux, n/cm<sup>2</sup>/sec,  $E > 1$  Mev

$\Phi =$  fast neutron fluence, n/cm<sup>2</sup>,  $E > 1$  Mev

$\epsilon_p = [ \quad ]$  primary strain, in/in

$K =$  time coefficient

$\dot{\epsilon}_{ths} =$  steady-state  $[ \quad ]$  circumferential  $[ \quad ]$  thermal creep rate, in/in

$$[ \quad ] \quad (4-5)$$

$$[ \quad ] \quad (4-6)$$

where

$E =$  elastic modulus, MPa

$T_F =$  temperature, °F

$$[ \quad ] \quad (4-7)$$

$$[ \quad ] \quad (4-8)$$

The combined irradiation and thermal creep rate is

$$[ \quad ] \quad (4-9)$$



$\dot{\epsilon}_{eff}$  = total [ ] creep rate, %/hour

$F_1$  = ZIRLO™ thermal creep [ ]

$F_2$  = ZIRLO™ irradiation creep [tuning coefficient]

$C_c$  = ZIRLO™ irradiation creep [ ] used in benchmarking,  
( $k$ ) of the North Anna 1 ZIRLO™ fuel rod design

[ $A$  =

$B_1$  =

$B_2$  =

$B_3$  =

$C$  =

$D$  =

$A_0$  =

$A_1$  =

$A_2$  =

$F_1$  =

$F_2$  =

$C_c$  = ]

[

]

(4-10a)

and

and

$$[ \quad \quad \quad ]$$

$$[ \quad \quad \quad ]$$

A comparison of measured ZIRLO™ creepdown with predicted creepdown from FATES3B is provided in Section 4.3.6 to verify that the application is acceptable.

#### 4.3.1.1 Thick-Wall Cylinder Stress Equations

Cladding stress used in the ZIRLO™ creep correlation development is determined from the classical elastic solution for a pressurized thick-wall cylinder. Although the stresses within the wall of a pressurized thick-wall cylinder are 3-dimensional, [

] Thus, the same thick-wall relationships must be applied in FATES3B to properly simulate creep behavior.

The classical thick-wall stress components in the circumferential, radial, and axial directions are given by

$$\sigma_{\theta} = \frac{P_g + P_c - k^2 P_s}{k^2 - 1} + \frac{P_g + P_c - P_s}{k^2 - 1} \frac{R_o^2}{r^2} \quad (4-11)$$

$$\sigma_r = \frac{P_g + P_c - k^2 P_s}{k^2 - 1} - \frac{P_g + P_c - P_s}{k^2 - 1} \frac{R_o^2}{r^2} \quad (4-12)$$

$$\sigma_z = \frac{P_g + P_c - k^2 P_s}{k^2 - 1} \quad (4-13)$$

$$k = \frac{R_o}{R_i} \quad (4-14)$$

$P_g$  = fuel rod internal gas pressure, psia

$P_c$  = pellet-clad mechanical interference pressure, psia

$P_s$  = reactor coolant system pressure, psia

$R_o$  = cladding outer radius, inches

$R_i$  = cladding inner radius, inches

$r$  = radial position within cladding, inches

Stress components [ ] are obtained by substitution of

$$[ ] \quad (4-15)$$

#### 4.3.1.2 Equivalent Stress-Strain Relationships

The cladding circumferential stress used in the creep equations is given by

$$[ ] \quad (4-16)$$

where

$$[ ]$$

[

]

[

]

(4-17)

[

]

[

]

(4-18)

[

]

[

]

#### 4.3.1.3 Isotropy and Prandtl-Reuss Equations

[

]

[

]

(4-19)

[

]

Substituting stress component equations from Section 4.3.1.1 into Equation 4-19 results in

[ ]

(4-20)

Use of Equation 4-20 in FATES3B is consistent with the creepdown data where creep correlation fitting coefficients are determined using measured hoop strains.

#### 4.3.1.4 NCLO Application and Creep Rate Uncertainty

A creep rate [ ] somewhat similar to a 95% probability) is applied for Zircaloy-4 cladding in the CENP fuel performance analysis for NCLO critical pressure in FATES3B as described in Reference 4-4. The ZIRLO™ cladding creep rate [ ] have been established in Reference 4-10 as lower and upper bounds, respectively, for creep rates at a 95% probability. The upper bound [ ] is used in the ZIRLO™ NCLO application in FATES3B.

Tensile creep behavior is treated the same as compressive creep for ZIRLO™ (Reference 4-10). As discussed in Reference 4-4, Section 4.1.1.1, some evidence exists that indicates tensile creep [ ] may not differ significantly from compressive creep. Since NCLO conditions of interest are in the neighborhood of [ ].

It has been concluded that the CENP internal pressure and the NCLO analysis is quite conservative (discussed in considerable detail in Reference 4-4). Thus, any small potential differences between tensile creep and compressive creep in the stress range of interest are insignificant.

#### 4.3.2 Fuel Rod Axial Growth

Fuel rod axial growth occurs in-reactor as a result of fast neutron irradiation. Fuel rod axial growth is applied in FATES3B to obtain clad length relative to the length of the fuel column to

determine the fuel rod end plenum length. FATES3B utilizes a best-estimate fuel rod growth model. The ZIRLO™ fuel rod growth model developed by Westinghouse was observed to be [

] of the Westinghouse Zircaloy-4 rod growth. Since Westinghouse Zircaloy-4 fuel rod growth is given by Reference 4-19 as

$$[ \quad ] \quad (4-21)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &[ \\ \Phi &= \\ A &= \\ n &= \quad ] \end{aligned}$$

then the growth for ZIRLO™ is given by [  $A$  ] or

$$[ \quad ]$$

Reference 4-10 further modified the axial growth of ZIRLO™ to include[  $\quad$  ]

$$[ \quad ] \quad (4-21a)$$

$$[ \quad ] \quad (4-21b)$$

and the fuel rod axial growth is

$$[ \quad ] \quad (4-22)$$

[

.]

### 4.3.3 Cladding Thermal Conductivity

The correlation for measured thermal conductivity of ZIRLO™ cladding material is provided in Reference 4-10. Thermal conductivity is given by

$$[ \quad ] \quad (4-23)$$

where

$k$  = thermal conductivity, BTU/(hr-ft-°F)

$T_F$  = temperature, °F

Thermal conductivity used in FATES3B for Zircaloy-4 (OPTIN) cladding material, Reference 4-1, is given by

$$[ \quad ] \quad (4-24)$$

This correlation for CENP OPTIN conductivity is nearly identical to ZIRLO™ conductivity over the range of interest for FATES3B and fuel mechanical design. Consequently, Equation 4-24 will be used for both ZIRLO™ and OPTIN. Thus, no modification to thermal conductivity is made in the CENP analyses.

### 4.3.4 Cladding Thermal Expansion

Reported thermal expansion coefficients for ZIRLO™ are anisotropic. Reference 4-12 provides the circumferential and axial thermal expansion for ZIRLO™ and Westinghouse Zircaloy-4 as

used in PAD 3.4. Thermal expansion was not modified for ZIRLO™ as documented by References 4-10 and 4-11. The thermal expansions in the circumferential and axial directions are given by

$$\left[ \begin{matrix} \epsilon_{\theta} \\ \epsilon_z \end{matrix} \right] = \frac{\alpha}{1 + \nu} \left[ \begin{matrix} 1 \\ \nu \end{matrix} \right] (T_F - T_0) \quad (4-25)$$

$$\left[ \begin{matrix} \epsilon_{\theta} \\ \epsilon_z \end{matrix} \right] = \frac{\alpha}{1 + \nu} \left[ \begin{matrix} 1 \\ \nu \end{matrix} \right] (T_F - T_0) \quad (4-26)$$

where

$\epsilon_{\theta}$  = circumferential thermal expansion, in/in

$\epsilon_z$  = axial thermal expansion, in/in

$T_F$  = temperature, °F

Axial thermal expansion for FATES3B is identical to Equation 4-26 and will continue to be used. The FATES3B radial thermal expansion, Reference 4-1, is given by

$$\left[ \begin{matrix} \epsilon_{\theta} \\ \epsilon_z \end{matrix} \right] = \frac{\alpha}{1 + \nu} \left[ \begin{matrix} 1 \\ \nu \end{matrix} \right] (T_F - T_0) \quad (4-27)$$

While the form of Equation 4-27 differs from Equation 4-25, a comparison of value as a function of temperature demonstrates that the thermal expansion in the temperature range of interest (i.e., at operating conditions) is nearly identical. Thus, Equation 4-27 will also be used for ZIRLO™ in FATES3B.



## 4.3.5 Other ZIRLO™ Fuel Performance Properties and Correlations

### 4.3.5.1 Modulus of Elasticity

The ZIRLO™ modulus of elasticity is inferred in Reference 4-12 to be the same as the PAD3.4 Zircaloy-4 and was not modified by References 4-10 and 4-11. Static moduli of elasticity are anisotropic and given by

$$\left[ \begin{array}{c} E_r \\ E_z \end{array} \right] \quad (4-28)$$

$$\left[ \begin{array}{c} E_r \\ E_z \end{array} \right] \quad (4-29)$$

where

$E_r$  = radial modulus of elasticity, psi

$E_z$  = axial modulus of elasticity, psi

$T_F$  = temperature, °F

The modulus of elasticity used in FATES3B for OPTIN is given by

$$\left[ \begin{array}{c} E_r \\ E_z \end{array} \right] \quad (4-30)$$

Since the value for the moduli of elasticity given by Equations 4-28, 4-29, and 4-30 do not differ significantly at cladding temperatures of interest, i.e., at operating temperatures used in design and licensing analyses, Equation 4-30 is also applied to ZIRLO™ in the CENP analyses.

### 4.3.5.2 Poisson's Ratio

Poisson's ratio for ZIRLO™ is anisotropic. Poisson's ratio for ZIRLO™ is inferred to be the same as the PAD 3.4 Zircaloy-4 (Reference 4-12) and has not been modified in later topical reports on ZIRLO™ (References 4-10 and 4-11). Poisson's ratio is given by

$$[ \quad ] \quad (4-31)$$

$$[ \quad ] \quad (4-32)$$

where

$\mu_r$  = radial Poisson's Ratio

$\mu_z$  = axial Poisson's Ratio

$T_F$  = temperature, °F

FATES3B applies Equation 4-32 for OPTIN and will apply the same equation to ZIRLO™.

#### 4.3.5.3 Hemispherical Emittance

Hemispherical emittance is a clad property applicable to the radiation heat transfer component of fuel-clad gap conductance. It is not used in Westinghouse fuel performance evaluations and has not been reported on by Westinghouse. Radiation heat transfer is not a significant contributor and, furthermore, differences in hemispherical emittance between Zircaloy-4 and ZIRLO™ would be expected to be very minor. Therefore, ZIRLO™ hemispherical emittance will be assumed to be the same as that which CENP employs for OPTIN. The effect of this assumption is insignificant.

#### 4.3.5.4 Diamond Pyramid Hardness (DPH)

The cladding surface hardness obtained from the diamond pyramid hardness (DPH) test is applied in the CENP fuel-clad contact conductance model. DPH is not used in the Westinghouse gap conductance model. However, contact conductance is a relatively small contributor to the overall gap conductance. Since DPH differences between ZIRLO™ and Zircaloy-4 are also expected to be small, DPH for ZIRLO™ is assumed to be the same as that which CENP employs for OPTIN. The effect of this assumption is insignificant.

#### 4.3.6 Verification of FATES3B (Creepdown)

The review of ZIRLO™ cladding material properties and correlations described above has resulted in the conclusion that only the ZIRLO™ creep (creepdown and NCLO applications) and ZIRLO™ axial growth correlations need to be modeled in the FATES3B fuel performance computer code to adequately simulate ZIRLO™ clad fuel rod performance in CENP nuclear fuel designs. Other thermal and mechanical properties used in FATES3B are sufficiently similar to, or identical to, Zircaloy-4 (OPTIN), and do not need to be modified.

The purpose of this section is to provide verification results of comparisons between the FATES3B predictions for creepdown of the North Anna Unit 1 fuel rods clad with ZIRLO™ with the measured creepdown data. For this benchmarking exercise, the North Anna Unit 1 fuel rods which were simulated with the PAD 4.0 code, Reference 4-10, were simulated with FATES3B modified for ZIRLO™ applications. The fuel stack was also modeled in FATES3B to simulate the expected behavior of the fuel based on the PAD 4.0 simulation. The data used for benchmarking FATES3B consists of [

] was irradiated for one cycle to minimize or eliminate pellet-clad interaction effects. These fuel rods attained an average burnup of about [

.] These [ ] fuel rods each experienced similar axial power shapes and peak power histories. Minor corrections were made to the diameter predictions to account for expected oxide thicknesses which were included in the Westinghouse measured diameters. Diameter measurements were made at up to [ ] of each fuel rod. However, the measurements were made at the [ ] for each rod.

A scatter plot of predicted versus measured diameter is shown in Figure 4.3.6-1 for individual measurements. These predictions are concluded to be very good. The diametral creepdown was also averaged for all [ ] fuel rods and plotted in Figure 4.3.6-2. Again, the predictions are concluded to be good. In general, the FATES3B predicted cladding creepdown for all [

] because the design characteristics and the power histories were nearly identical. The measured creepdown differed between individual fuel rods to a greater

degree than did the predictions. This observed behavior is not surprising and is typical of creepdown data. The maximum and the minimum creepdown distributions amongst the [ ] are shown in Figure 4.3.6-3 along with the FATES3B predictions for those rods. It can be seen that the predictions, which are nearly identical, are well bounded within the range of the measured data.

Thus, it is concluded that the FATES3B predictions of ZIRLO™ cladding creepdown are very good.

#### **4.3.7 Design Criteria and Methodology Validation**

Fuel rod thermal design criteria, the no-clad-lift-off (NCLO) criterion and the no centerline melt criterion, are verified as being met using the FATES3B fuel performance computer code. These criteria themselves are not impacted by the use of ZIRLO™ cladding material.

The design and licensing applications of FATES3B were summarized in Section 4.2. The introduction of ZIRLO™ cladding has no impact on the applications, application methodology, or on the conservatisms, other than the NCLO creep uncertainty of Section 4.3.1.4, defined for each application. The applications and conservatisms of the FATES3B code and analyses remain the same as described in References 4-8 and 4-9. References 4-8 and 4-9 were submitted in support of the FATES3B improvement topical reports, References 4-2 and 4-3.

A statistical analysis is employed in the determination of the engineering factor (Reference 4-1). In addition, a statistical evaluation of the uncertainty in fuel temperature predictions is employed to verify that fuel temperatures for the stored energy used for initializing Loss-of-Coolant Accidents (LOCA) evaluations bound the hot rod at a 95% probability or better. Substitution of ZIRLO™ does not alter the conservatism required to achieve a 95% probability on the stored energy.

The application of FATES3B in design and licensing analyses is [ ]. Conservative [ ] is introduced through certain input parameters depending on the particular application, including [ ].

Substitution of ZIRLO™ cladding does not alter this methodology.

#### **4.4 Application of ZIRLO™ and DNB Analysis**

ZIRLO™ cladding will not impact the models and methodology for the determination of DNB. However, cladding behavior during DNB is dependent on the properties of the ZIRLO™ cladding material. A discussion of DNB analyses of CENP nuclear fuel designs using ZIRLO™ clad fuel is provided below.

##### **4.4.1 Impact on CHF and DNBR**

There is no impact on Critical Heat Flux (CHF) due to use of ZIRLO™ cladding versus OPTIN cladding. The evaluation of CHF is determined by use of a Critical Heat Flux correlation which is dependent on spacer grid design and fuel geometry. The CE-1 CHF correlation defined in References 4-20 to 4-22 and the ABB-NV CHF correlation defined in Reference 4-23 are used for evaluating CHF for CENP 14x14 and 16x16 non-mixing vane grid fuel. The ABB-TV CHF correlation defined in Reference 4-23 is used for 14x14 Turbo mixing vane grid fuel. These CHF correlations were developed based on performing 5x5 or 6x6 array CHF tests with electrically heated rods fabricated with Inconel tubing. The measurement of CHF is dependent on local coolant conditions (i.e., pressure, mass velocity, quality) and geometry parameters (i.e., channel wetted hydraulic diameter, heated perimeter, grid design, grid spacing, cold wall, etc). Cladding material has not been found to have a meaningful influence on CHF.

The Departure from Nucleate Boiling Ratio (DNBR) safety limit can be affected for any different cladding material if fabrication tolerances on fuel rod outer diameter change. Any variation in fuel rod outer diameter would have a direct impact on fuel rod heat flux and DNBR. This variation is accounted for in the heat flux engineering factor which is addressed in the evaluation of the DNBR safety limit. If there is a change in the fuel rod outer diameter tolerances for the ZIRLO™ cladding, the variation will be accounted for in CENP's methodology.

#### 4.4.2 Impact on DNB Propagation (NCLO)

The impact of ZIRLO™ on DNB propagation is a consideration for DNB transients. High temperature creep and rupture of ZIRLO™ cladding during DNB is modeled and accounted for in the evaluations of fuel failure and the calculations of dose consequences.

##### 4.4.2.1 High Temperature Creep and Rupture

High temperature creep behavior of ZIRLO™, required for mechanistic DNB propagation evaluations (Reference 4-4), is obtained from Reference 4-11. High temperature creep strains were measured as a function of time on ZIRLO™ tubing under conditions of [ ]. Different deformation mechanisms were observed which depend on the stress level and phase of the material.

Strain rate is given by

$$\dot{\epsilon} = \frac{e}{t} \quad (4-33)$$

where

$S$  = hoop stress, MPa

$e$  = [ ] strain, in/in

$t$  = time, seconds

$T$  = temperature, °K

and

$$\dot{\epsilon} = \frac{e}{t}$$

$$\dot{\epsilon} = \frac{e}{t}$$

The coefficients are obtained directly from Reference 4-11. These coefficients [ $A$  and  $n$ ] are given in the following table for ZIRLO™:

[

] and should be calculated with the following coefficients:



[ ] creep rates (Reference 4-11) as given by the following equations.

$$[ \quad ]$$

$$[ \quad ] \quad (4-34)$$

$$[ \quad ] \quad (4-35)$$

The accumulated true strain  $e$  can be obtained from the numerical integration of Equation 4-33 and can be converted into engineering strain by the relationship

$$e = \ln(1 + \varepsilon)$$

or

$$\varepsilon = \exp(e) - 1$$

where

$\varepsilon$  = engineering strain, in/in

Since large deformations occur, the effect of an increasing diameter and a decreasing wall thickness must be included. Dimensional changes for large deformations are given by

$$D = D_o(1 + \varepsilon) \quad (4-36)$$

$$w = \frac{w_o}{(1 + \varepsilon)} \quad (4-37)$$

and the stress is given by



$$\left[ \frac{\Delta P}{D_o} \right] \quad (4-38)$$

where

$\Delta P$  = pressure difference across wall, MPa

$D_o$  = initial tube diameter, inches

$w_o$  = initial wall thickness, inches

$D$  = deformed diameter, inches

$w$  = deformed wall thickness, inches

An additional empirical correction to the calculated strain increment during a given time increment is required if the temperature is [ ] and the hoop stress is [ ] as recommended in Reference 4-11. This empirical correction, which accounts for the effect of [ ] reduces the calculated strain increment. The correction is provided in terms of the engineering strain.

$$\left[ \frac{\Delta \varepsilon_{eff}}{\Delta \varepsilon} \right]$$

$$\left[ \frac{\Delta \varepsilon_{eff}}{\Delta \varepsilon} \right] \quad (4-39)$$

where

$\Delta \varepsilon_{eff}$  = [ ] strain increment, in/in

$\Delta \varepsilon$  = [ ] strain increment, in/in

$Y$  = the summed  $\Delta \varepsilon_{eff}$  in the [ ] regimes, in/in

$M$  = coefficient, dependent on temperature,  
[ ]

]

#### 4.4.2.2 Strain Criterion for Channel Blockage

The amount of channel blockage is limited to prevent degradation of the cooling of adjacent fuel rods as described in Reference 4-4. The strain criterion for channel blockage is based on geometric effects and coolant redistribution. Although the high temperature creep behavior and rupture of ZIRLO™ may impact the kinetics of the DNB propagation evaluation, ZIRLO™ will not impact the channel blockage criterion. Reference 4-4 provides an NRC approved blockage criterion of [ ] If blockage [ ] propagation to the adjacent fuel rods is assumed. This criterion on strain, which is engineering strain, is applied to ZIRLO™ cladding.

#### **4.4.2.3 DNB Propagation Methodology**

Although not necessarily true, DNB is considered to be a fuel failure mechanism. Consequently, if DNB is predicted to occur, fuel failure is assumed and the consequences of the radiological dose are considered. DNB is not allowed during normal operation, including anticipated operational occurrences (AOOs). Core power, flow rates, etc., are monitored to ensure that DNB does not occur. However, DNB may occur during less frequent events, in which case the extent of DNB and fuel failures are ascertained. The implementation of the NCLO maximum pressure criterion results in the potential for some portion of the fuel rods to achieve internal gas pressures that are in excess of the external RCS pressure. During a DNB transient the surface temperature increases significantly, resulting in a potentially significant increase in creep rate. If the fuel rod experiences both DNB and high internal pressure conditions, the potential exists for clad ballooning to occur, thereby degrading heat transfer from adjacent fuel rods. Under such conditions, the adjacent fuel rods may experience DNB as well and the DNB phenomenon may propagate through several rows of additional fuel rods. The mechanistic high temperature creep and rupture correlations described in Section 4.4.2.1 are used to determine total accumulated strain during a DNB transient. If the strain exceeds the strain criterion defined in Section 4.4.2.2, DNB propagation to the adjacent fuel rods is assumed to occur. Strains in the adjacent rods are then evaluated to determine if the propagation continues to yet further rows of fuel rods.

Evaluations of DNB for Zircaloy-4 cladding in CENP cores have demonstrated that strains are generally not sufficient to result in any propagation. A comparison of high temperature creep and rupture of ZIRLO™ with Zircaloy-4 indicate that ZIRLO™ is less likely than Zircaloy-4 to attain the strain necessary to propagate DNB. Thus, implementation of ZIRLO™ is expected to increase the margin to potential DNB propagation. However, high temperature creep and rupture properties have been incorporated into the INTEG computer code and evaluations are performed as needed.

#### **4.4.2.4 Discussion of Conservatism for DNB Propagation**

The CENP analysis of DNB propagation is extremely conservative. Reference 4-4 provides a detailed discussion of the propagation model conservatisms. The fuel rod maximum internal gas pressure is also conservatively bounded and the methodology for determining the allowable maximum pressure limit (i.e., the NCLO limit) is conservative.

In addition to these documented conservatisms, it has been concluded that DNB propagation is not a likely event because of the local thermal effects and deformation mechanisms associated with DNB and clad ballooning. Rod-to-rod gap closure from a ballooning fuel rod experiencing DNB clearly degrades the surface heat transfer of an adjacent rod only at a local area on the circumference. Thus, occurrence of DNB on an adjacent rod will be highly circumferentially oriented and high temperature deformation would likely occur only on the surface of the adjacent fuel rod facing the original fuel rod experiencing DNB. Consequently, DNB propagation and fuel rod failure are construed to involve at most only one additional row of adjacent fuel rods. However, if a worst case scenario is envisioned (i.e., where the ballooning occurs symmetrically), the resulting fuel-clad internal void volume within the ballooning region of the fuel rod acts to rapidly reduce the internal pressure and, thereby, halt DNB propagation. This is the case even if the bulk of the fission gases present in the fuel matrix is released due to local temperature increases. A clad strain less than the strain level required for DNB propagation equalizes internal pressure with external pressure, and terminates the clad ballooning. Therefore, while DNB propagation is conservatively assumed, the physical mechanisms involved do not actually support the occurrence of DNB propagation.

#### **4.4.2.5 Hydrides and Hydride Reorientation in ZIRLO™**

The presence of hydrides and the potential for hydride reorientation due to operation with internal pressure in excess of external pressure (i.e., NCLO) was evaluated in Reference 4-4. Tensile stresses and temperatures are the controlling parameters for adverse hydride orientation. The tensile stresses and peak temperatures for operation at NCLO conditions were concluded to be [ ] that might result in adverse hydride reorientation. Similar observations were made by Westinghouse in Reference 4-24 for operation at higher than RCS pressure. Therefore, operation with ZIRLO™ will be similar to operation with Zircaloy-

4 (see Section 4.6). In addition, as indicated in References 4-4 and 4-24, texture of the cladding is appropriately controlled to resist the formation of adverse hydride orientation. Consequently, the potential for stress induced hydride reorientation is not affected by operation at fuel rod internal pressures limited by NCLO for ZIRLO™.

#### **4.5 Waterside Corrosion Limits**

Acceptable operation for CENP PWR designed fuel to high burnups requires that waterside corrosion not result in thermal or mechanical conditions which compromise cladding integrity. High burnup exposure of fuel rod cladding is of interest because the combination of neutron flux exposure with waterside corrosion can result in a loss of cladding wall material, a possible loss of cladding ductility, and, because of the oxide layer, a temperature increase in the fuel rod.

##### **4.5.1 OPTIN Waterside Corrosion Analysis**

It was demonstrated in References 4-13 through 4-18 that CENP Zircaloy-4 cladding integrity is not compromised due to neutron irradiation and corrosion to a burnup of 60 MWd/kgU. This was accomplished through an assessment of the oxide thermal effects and mechanical performance effects of wall thinning.

The maximum measured oxide thickness presented in NRC-approved References 4-13 through 4-16 was generally typical of high burnup, non-optimized Zircaloy-4 fuel employed in the 1980s. The maximum oxide thickness was [ ] at 60 MWd/kgU. Both thermal and mechanical effects were evaluated, and it was concluded in Reference 4-14 that a maximum oxide thickness of [ ] was acceptable. Changes in thermal and mechanical performance were acceptable and the clad wall integrity was not compromised. Similar conclusions were reached in Reference 4-15 and 4-16.

Oxide thickness measured for more modern CENP PWR fuel cladding (i.e., OPTIN), was presented in Reference 4-17 to support continued applicability of CENP high burnup methodology to rod average burnups of 60 MWd/kgU. All CENP PWR fuel rods have been fabricated using OPTIN cladding since the early 1990's. Improved corrosion performance relative to the earlier non-optimized cladding is clearly evident in the data presented. As

concluded in Reference 4-17, the OPTIN data is clearly bounded by Reference 4-14 (and 4-15 and 4-16) and additional margin to limits provided by References 4-14, 4-15, and 4-16 exists. CENP therefore currently supports use of OPTIN cladding through NRC approval of References 4-13 through 4-16.

CENP submitted Reference 4-18 to the NRC for the purposes of extending the fuel rod average burnup limit above 60 MWd/kgU for OPTIN cladding. Measured oxide thickness data on OPTIN cladding was provided in Reference 4-18 to fuel rod average burnups [

.] These data followed the well-behaved trends for improved corrosion performance of OPTIN cladding identified in Reference 4-17. In Reference 4-18, CENP also proposed an oxide thickness limit and presented a waterside corrosion model benchmarked to the OPTIN data that would be used to calculate the uniform oxide thickness for comparison to the proposed oxide thickness limit for high burnup fuel. CENP further proposed to use the corrosion model to predict maximum oxide thickness to be used in design verification according to Standard Review Plan (SRP) 4.2 for 1-pin peak burnups of up to the extended burnup limit. As applicable, CENP will apply approved corrosion models to verify acceptable behavior of OPTIN cladding per requirements to approved oxide thickness limits for extended burnups.

#### **4.5.2 ZIRLO™ Waterside Corrosion Analysis**

Waterside corrosion of ZIRLO™ cladding material is well understood. A significant amount of ZIRLO™ experience (large numbers of fuel rods operating with a variety of power histories to high burnup levels) has been accumulated to-date in cores operating with Westinghouse designed fuel. ZIRLO™ corrosion performance is significantly improved over that of Zircaloy-4. Maximum oxide thicknesses for ZIRLO™ clad fuel rods are shown as a function of rod average burnup in Figure 4.5.2-1. The robustness of ZIRLO™ can be seen by comparing Figure 4.5.2-1 with Figure 3.4-2, which shows the ZIRLO™ oxide thicknesses plotted as a function of fuel duty index. Oxide thicknesses [ ,] which do not exhibit any evidence of spallation, have been attained at high burnup. Of most importance is the observation that such thicknesses are concomitant only with a high fuel duty index. The lower the fuel duty index, the lower the oxide thickness at high burnup. Consequently, it can be concluded that the maximum oxide thickness that will be experienced by ZIRLO™ clad fuel rods in CENP fuel designs will be

bounded by the data in Figure 4.5.2-1. The approach licensed by CENP for OPTIN for a peak rod average burnup of up to 60 MWd/kgU will be applied to ZIRLO™.

When extended burnup is approved for rod average burnups in excess of 60 MWd/kgU (up to 62 MWd/kgU) ZIRLO™ corrosion will be evaluated to determine the maximum oxide thickness that will be used in design verification according to Standard Review Plan (SRP) 4.2. The corrosion model for ZIRLO™ cladding will be used to ensure that maximum expected oxide thickness will not exceed the required design limit for CENP nuclear fuel designs for fuel rod average burnups of up to 62 MWd/kgU. It is expected that high power and high burnup fuel rods will be surveyed and analyzed as part of the reload analysis process to assure that the maximum oxide thickness will not be exceeded for a given reactor cycle.

#### **4.6 Impact of ZIRLO™ on Fuel Performance**

The purpose of this section is to provide fuel performance comparisons of ZIRLO™ clad fuel rods with OPTIN clad fuel rods for CENP supplied reloads. A CENP typical 14x14 fuel design (represented by the Calvert Cliffs fuel design) and a typical 16x16 fuel design (represented by the Palo Verde fuel design) are presented. This comparison is based on recent reload evaluations for these fuel designs as reference cases. The core operating limits and fuel designs are identical to that of recent reloads with the exception that ZIRLO™ cladding material is substituted for OPTIN cladding material. Design and licensing application methods are, of course, identical. It is shown that the resulting fuel performance parameters do not change significantly because of the use of the ZIRLO™ cladding. The only significant difference in reload performance using ZIRLO™ cladding is the beneficial reduction in the amount of cladding oxidation.

##### **4.6.1 ZIRLO™ Impact on Thermal Performance**

This section describes the impact of ZIRLO™ cladding on fuel rod thermal performance. The parameters that are most significant and meaningful to characterize the relative fuel thermal performance behavior are fuel centerline temperatures, power-to-centerline melt, and hot internal gas pressure. Fuel rod mechanical performance is discussed in Section 5.0.

A description of the CENP typical reload analysis methodology is given in Reference 4-8 and is summarized here. An erbia bearing fuel rod is used as the reference design basis for the analysis of each fuel type (14x14 and 16x16). [

]

[

.] The burnup dependent radial peaking factor used herein, normalized to 1.0, for the 14x14 design and the 16x16 design are shown in Figures 4.6.1-1 and 4.6.1-2, respectively. Axial power distributions in terms of LHR's are shown in Figures 4.6.1-3 and 4.6.1-4. The LHR history of the fuel rod is, therefore, the axial LHR distribution multiplied by the radial peaking factor as a function of burnup. In this case, the radial peaking factor has been determined to be that which results in a maximum internal hot gas pressure that is just under the NCLO pressure limit. Consequently, this type of radial fall-off curve may typically be used to guide fuel management.

#### **4.6.1.1 Fuel Temperatures**

The only cladding properties or correlations which required modification to enable FATES3B to model ZIRLO™ cladding were circumferential creep and irradiation induced axial growth. Creep and growth are time dependent deformation. Consequently, conditions in the OPTIN clad fuel rod and the ZIRLO™ clad fuel rod will be identical near beginning of life. Fuel temperatures remain quite similar and differ a small amount during gap closure due to feedback effects of the deformations of the cladding. The fuel centerline temperatures differ between the OPTIN design and the ZIRLO™ design by [ ] at a fuel rod average burnup of 30 MWd/kgU when gap closure has occurred. The differences in temperatures are considered to be insignificant.



#### **4.6.1.2 Power-to-Centerline Melt (PTM)**

The power-to-centerline melt for the 14x14 fuel rod design and the 16x16 fuel rod design are shown in Figures 4.6.1.2-1 and 4.6.1.2-2, respectively. It can be seen that centerline melt is predicted to occur at [ ] LHRs for OPTIN clad fuel rods and ZIRLO™ clad fuel rods. [ ]

[ ] Reactivity decreases precludes higher burnup fuel rods from attaining LHR's that would cause melting.

#### **4.6.1.3 Internal Hot Gas Pressure**

Internal hot gas pressure for the 14x14 fuel rod design and the 16x16 fuel rod design are shown in Figures 4.6.1.3-1 and 4.6.1.3-2, respectively. Internal pressure initially decreases from beginning of life due to fuel densification and then gradually increases as fission gas builds up in the fuel matrix and is released. The decrease in radial peaking factor (and, therefore, LHR) at burnups above about 40 MWd/kgU is sufficient to keep the internal pressure below the NCLO critical pressure. Identical power histories have been applied to the OPTIN clad fuel rod and the ZIRLO™ clad fuel rod as described in Section 4.6.1. It can be seen that the pressure in the ZIRLO™ clad fuel rod gradually increases to end of life (EOL) values that are slightly higher than the OPTIN clad fuel rod. This increased pressure is primarily due to the reduced axial growth experienced by the ZIRLO™ clad fuel rod. [ ]

[ ] in the ZIRLO™ clad fuel rod relative to the OPTIN clad fuel rod. The difference, however, is considered to be insignificant. Note that although the ZIRLO™ clad fuel rod internal pressure would [ ] of the OPTIN clad fuel rod, it is [ ] of the ZIRLO™ clad fuel rod. Critical pressure limits are discussed in the next section.

#### **4.6.1.4 Critical Pressure Limit for NCLO**

Critical pressure limits are determined by the FATES3B fuel performance code based on the NCLO pressure criterion. That is, the critical pressure limit is the internal hot gas pressure where outward tensile creep of the cladding due to the differential pressure loads would just

equal the fuel pellet swelling. Thus, fuel-clad gap separation due to pressure induced creep does not occur at or below this critical pressure limit. It can be seen that the critical pressure for ZIRLO™ cladding is [ ] than for OPTIN cladding. This result is because the ZIRLO™ creep rate at the NCLO pressure conditions is [ ] than the creep rate of OPTIN. [ ] are applied as previously described for both ZIRLO™ and OPTIN.

#### **4.6.1.5 Other Design and Licensing Applications**

Minimum internal gas pressure follows the same trend as maximum internal pressure. Minimum internal pressure is [ ]

[ ] behavior evaluated in Section 5.0). The impact of ZIRLO™ cladding on other design and licensing applications (of the FATES3B fuel performance code) has been reviewed and found to be insignificant.

#### **4.6.2 ZIRLO™ Impact on DNB Propagation**

An evaluation of the ZIRLO™ cladding impact on the potential for DNB propagation was performed using the INTEG code described in Section 4.4.2. The most limiting DNB transient of Reference 4-4, the Calvert Cliffs Steam Line Rupture, was repeated for ZIRLO™ cladding. The predicted strains for this transient are shown in Figure 4.6.2-1. It can be seen that the ZIRLO™ cladding reaches a strain of [ ] than the OPTIN cladding which reached a strain [ ]. It is expected that this result will be typical of ZIRLO™ versus Zircaloy-4 for most, if not all, DNB transients.

Strain predictions for a small selection of high temperature creep tests reported in Reference 4-11 were made to demonstrate satisfactory performance of the INTEG code. [ ]

[ ] Although the measured strain is plotted versus time as a continuous curve in Reference 4-11, only a single representative point of strain and time was extracted from the graphs and shown here. This representative point is at the time to attain a strain of [ ], selected as a value reasonably near the DNB propagation limit. The results are shown in Figures 4.6.2-2 through 4.6.2-5. INTEG predictions are shown as

solid lines and the measured data is shown as single points in these figures. It is concluded that the INTEG code predictions are excellent.

#### **4.7 Conclusions**

NRC approved ZIRLO™ cladding properties and correlations have been evaluated and, as appropriate, successfully incorporated into the NRC approved CENP fuel performance analysis methodology. Application of ZIRLO™ properties and correlations have been found to be consistent with NRC approved CENP design and licensing models and methodology. Evaluations have been performed to demonstrate the effect of ZIRLO™ cladding on fuel performance for CENP nuclear fuel designs. It is concluded that the effect of ZIRLO™ cladding on the thermal performance of the fuel is insignificant. Thus, the beneficial effects of improved waterside corrosion makes the implementation of ZIRLO™ clad fuel in the CENP fuel designs a significant contributor to improved operational safety.

## 4.8 References

- 4-1 CENPD-139-P-A, "Fuel Evaluation Model," July 1974.
- 4-2 CEN-161(B)-P-A, "Improvements to Fuel Evaluation Model," August 1989.
- 4-3 CEN-161(B)-P, Supplement 1-P-A, "Improvements to Fuel Evaluation Model," January 1992.
- 4-4 CEN-372-P-A, "Fuel Rod Maximum Allowable Gas Pressure," May 1990.
- 4-5 CENPD-382-P-A, "Methodology for Core Designs Containing Erbium Burnable Absorbers," August 1993.
- 4-6 CENPD-275-P, Revision 1-P-A, "C-E Methodology for Core Designs Containing Gadolinia-Urania Burnable Absorbers," May 1988.
- 4-7 CENPD-275-P, Revision 1-P, Supplement 1-P-A, "C-E Methodology for PWR Core Designs Containing Gadolinia-Urania Burnable Absorbers," April 1999.
- 4-8 CEN-193(B)-P, Supplement 2-P, "Partial Response to NRC Questions on CEN-161(B)-P, Improvements to Fuel Evaluation Model," March 21, 1982.
- 4-9 CEN-345(B)-P, "Responses to NRC Questions on FATES3B," October 17, 1986.
- 4-10 WCAP-15063-P-A Revision 1, with Errata, "Westinghouse Improved Performance Analysis and Design Model (PAD 4.0)," July 2000.
- 4-11 WCAP-12610-P-A, "VANTAGE+ Fuel Assembly Reference Core Report," April 1995.
- 4-12 WCAP-9179, "Properties of Fuel and Core Component Materials," July 1978. (Proprietary)
- 4-13 CENPD-269-P Revision 1-P, "Extended Burnup Operation of Combustion Engineering PWR Fuel," July 1984.
- 4-14 CEN-382(B)-P-A, "Verification of the Acceptability of a 1-Pin Burnup Limit of 60 MWD/kgU for Combustion Engineering 14x14 PWR Fuel," August 1993.
- 4-15 CEN-386-P-A, "Verification of the Acceptability of a 1-Pin Burnup Limit of 60 MWD/kgU for Combustion Engineering 16x16 PWR Fuel," August 1992.
- 4-16 CEN-396(L)-P, "Verification of the Acceptability of a 1-Pin Burnup Limit of 60 MWD/KG for St. Lucie Unit 2," November 1989.


- 4-17 CENPD-384-P, "Report on the Continued Applicability of 60 MWd/kgU for ABB Combustion Engineering PWR Fuel," September 1995.
- 4-18 CENPD-388-P, "Extension of the 1-Pin Burnup Limit to 65 MWd/kgU for ABB PWR Fuel with OPTIN Cladding," February 1998.
- 4-19 WCAP-10851-P-A, "Improved Fuel Performance Models for Westinghouse Fuel Rod Design and Safety Evaluations," August 1988.
- 4-20 CENPD-162-P-A, "C-E Critical Heat Flux, Critical Heat Flux Correlation for C-E Fuel Assemblies with Standard Spacer Grids, Part 1 Uniform Axial Power Distribution," September 1976.
- 4-21 CENPD-207-P-A, "C-E Critical Heat Flux, Critical Heat Flux Correlation for C-E Fuel Assemblies with Standard Spacer Grids, Part 2 Nonuniform Axial Power Distribution," December 1984.
- 4-22 CENPD-162-A Supplement 1-A, "C-E Critical Heat Flux, Critical Heat Flux Correlation for C-E Fuel Assemblies with Standard Spacer Grids, Part 1 Uniform Axial Power Distribution," February 1977.
- 4-23 CENPD-387-P-A Rev. 000, "ABB Critical Heat Flux Correlations for PWR Fuel", May 2000.
- 4-24 WCAP-8963-P-A, "Safety Analysis for the Revised Fuel Rod Internal Pressure Design Basis," August 1978.

**Table 4.2-1****CENP Zircaloy-4 Clad Property Correlations Used in Fuel Performance**

Property	Source Reference	Section
Creep (Normal Operation)	4-1	2.1.5
Creep (NCLO)	4-4	3.1.1
Axial Growth	4-2	7.0
Thermal Conductivity	4-1	2.1.2
Thermal Expansion (Radial)	4-1	2.1.3
Thermal Expansion (Axial)	4-1	-
Modulus of Elasticity	4-1	2.1.4
Poisson's Ratio	4-1	2.1.4
Hemispherical Emittance	4-1	2.5.4
Hardness (DPH)	4-1	2.5.4
Creep (High Temperature)	4-4	Appendix A
Rupture Stress	4-4	Appendix A

**Figure 4.3.6-1**  
**FATES3B ZIRLO™ Diametral Creepdown - North Anna 1**

**Figure 4.3.6-2**



**FATES3B ZIRLO™ Diametral Creepdown – North Anna 1 Assembly Rod Average**





**Figure 4.3.6-3**  
**FATES3B ZIRLO™ Diametral Creepdown**



**Figure 4.5.2-1**  
**Maximum ZIRLO™ Cladding Oxide Thickness versus Rod Average Burnup**



**Figure 4.6.1.1-1**  
**Radial Peaking Factor versus Burnup – 14x14 Design**



**Figure 4.6.1-2**  
**Radial Peaking Factor versus Burnup – 16x16 Design**



**Figure 4.6.1-3**  
**Axial Power Distributions – 14x14 Design**



**Figure 4.6.1-4**  
**Axial Power Distributions – 16x16 Design**



**Figure 4.6.1.2-1**  
**Power-to-Centerline Melt – 14x14 Design**



**Figure 4.6.1.2-2**  
**Power-to-Centerline Melt – 16x16 Design**





**Figure 4.6.1.3-1**  
**Maximum Internal Hot Gas Pressure – 14x14 Design**



**Figure 4.6.1.3-2**  
**Maximum Internal Hot Gas Pressure – 16x16 Design**




**Figure 4.6.2-1**  
**DNB Propagation Strain for Calvert Cliffs Steam Line Break**



**Figure 4.6.2-2**  
**Strain Prediction for ZIRLO™ at 71.72 MPa and 973 °K**



**Figure 4.6.2-3**  
**Strain Prediction for ZIRLO™ at 35 MPa and 1093 °K**



**Figure 4.6.2-4**  
**Strain Prediction for ZIRLO™ at 15 MPa and 1073 °K**



**Figure 4.6.2-5**  
**Strain Prediction for ZIRLO™ at 4.64 MPa and 1323 °K**



## **5.0 Fuel Mechanical Design**

### **5.1 Introduction**

The change to ZIRLO™ cladding material has been evaluated from a mechanical design perspective to insure that the introduction of this material in the CENP fuel reload designs is acceptable. The CENP mechanical design methodology has been outlined previously in Reference 5-1, including the relevant properties of the current OPTIN™ cladding material, and the information in that reference served as a starting point for the evaluation of the change to ZIRLO™ cladding.

The discussions below detail the mechanical design evaluation of the change for burnup levels up to 62 MWd/kgU, and demonstrate its acceptability for use in all CENP design applications.

### **5.2 Cladding Parameters Used in Fuel Mechanical Design Methodology**

Several mechanical design analyses are potentially affected by changes in cladding properties. The current versions of the CENP fuel mechanical design methods are described in Reference 5-1 and its various references.

Listed below are the cladding-related parameters that are utilized in the mechanical design models. For reload fuel batches in CENP plants where ZIRLO™ is used, the properties described in Section 5.3 of this report will be used for these parameters.

- Creep Rate
- Irradiation-Induced Axial Growth
- Thermal Conductivity
- Thermal Expansion
- Strain and Fatigue Capability
- Mechanical Strength
- Modulus of Elasticity
- Poisson's ratio



- Density

Table 5.2-1 lists the topical reports and NRC's Safety Evaluation Reports (SERs) associated with these models.

Each of the following subsections describes the overall fuel mechanical design models, and specifically addresses the particular OPTIN cladding models used by each computer code or computerized model. Table 5.2-2 summarizes the cladding models (equations, correlations, properties, etc.) that are affected due to the introduction of ZIRLO™.

### 5.2.1 CEPAN Model

References 5-8, 5-9, 5-10, and 5-11 describe a method which utilizes the CEPAN computer code to predict creep deformation and collapse time of OPTIN cladding containing an initial ovality. [

]

The method of selecting input to CEPAN resulted in a deterministic combination of the worst case cladding as-built dimensions and worst case operating conditions during the fuel lifetime. The NRC concluded that CEPAN provided an acceptable analytical procedure for determining the minimum time to collapse for CENP clad fuel. [

.]

A modification of the above method is described in Reference 5-11. This modification is applied to the normal CEPAN results to account for the support provided to the cladding by the pellets at the edges of the gap. The adjustment varies as a function of the length of the gap or unsupported cladding. As the gap considered becomes longer, the results approach the normal CEPAN results. In addition, CEPAN is applied in the plenum region where no support is assumed for the plenum spring. This method modification was utilized in NRC approved References 5-3 (for 16x16 designs) and 5-4 (for 14x14 designs).

The CEPAN model (References 5-8 and 5-9) employs OPTIN cladding parameters for initial ovality and yield strength as input conditions. Young's modulus (Modulus of Elasticity) and Poisson's ratio for OPTIN are modeled in the CEPAN computer code in data arrays corresponding to temperature values. Values for Young's modulus and Poisson's ratio values at a given temperature are ascertained by linear interpolation. Corresponding modifications have been incorporated for the ZIRLO™ cladding material properties.

Cladding collapse is a creep related phenomenon and a creep model is present in CEPAN. The CEPAN creep model is described in Reference 5-8 and is further discussed in Section 5.3.1.

### **5.2.2 SIGREEP Model**

The SIGREEP computer code (Reference 5-12) is used to predict the axial length change of the fuel assembly and the change in the gap between the fuel rods and upper end fitting (shoulder gap). Basically, SIGREEP [

]. The input constants and input variables define the fuel assembly geometry, its operating conditions and material properties of the fuel rod and guide tube. The input parameters that are [

].

A fuel rod axial growth model is included in SIGREEP evaluations that ensure adequate clearance (shoulder gap). Rather than account for the several contributors to fuel rod growth, it is empirically modeled as a function of rod average fast neutron fluence for design purposes as indicated in Reference 5-12]. The OPTIN fuel rod growth model of SIGREEP is discussed in further detail in Section 2.3.1.2 of Reference 5-1.

In addition to evaluations of fuel rod axial growth accommodation, the SIGREEP code is employed in performing the fuel assembly dimensional evaluations. These include axial assembly growth accommodation, holddown spring clearance to solid height, holddown force and margin, and fuel assembly engagement with reactor internals structures. These evaluations are controlled by the

axial length variation of the guide tubes, which are made of Zircaloy-4. The use of ZIRLO™ for the cladding will, therefore, not affect these quantities.

### **5.2.3 Rod Bow Model**

Rod bow models are based on empirical data which is particularly sensitive to geometric fuel assembly parameters such as spacer grid configuration, spacer grid axial spacing and fuel assembly and rod stiffness. Changes due to the implementation of ZIRLO™ are not directly related to the above geometric considerations and, as such, do not have any significant impact on existing rod bow models, as defined in Reference 5-13. The fuel rod creep characteristics associated with ZIRLO™ differs slightly from OPTIN but are not expected to have any significant effect on rod bow, as discussed in Section 5.4.6.

### **5.2.4 Seismic / LOCA Model**

The seismic and LOCA structural analysis models are not affected by the transition to ZIRLO™ and, therefore, do not affect the existing topical report (Reference 5-16). However, the increase in ZIRLO™ tensile strength allowables, as compared to OPTIN, will result in greater margins in meeting stress criteria defined in Reference 5-16. Implementation of ZIRLO™ into the new LOCA evaluation model is described in Section 6.

## **5.3 ZIRLO™ Mechanical Design Properties**

ZIRLO™ is a modification of Zircaloy-4 composition that has been achieved by reducing the tin and iron content, eliminating the chromium content, and adding 1% niobium. The following sections document the ZIRLO™ properties for those parameters that impact the fuel mechanical design evaluations.

### **5.3.1 ZIRLO™ Creep Considerations**

The methodology used to calculate stress, strain, and cumulative fatigue damage fraction for fuel rods utilize diametral creep rate models for the cladding, as discussed in Reference 5-1.

The creep correlations described in Section 4.3.1 of this report will be used in each of these evaluations for reloads that include ZIRLO™ cladding material.

Modifications to account for ZIRLO™ cladding properties have been implemented in the cladding collapse methodology as described below.

#### **5.3.1.1 Creep Correlations for Cladding Collapse Method**

The OPTIN stress-strain relationships for the CENP cladding collapse evaluation method (CEPAN) are described in References 5-8 , 5-9, 5-10, and 5-11. Also discussed in these references is the effective stress-effective strain rate creep law that is applicable to OPTIN cladding in a state of biaxial stress. A consistent set of equations is implemented which governs the radial, tangential, and axial creep deformation of the cladding.

The analysis presented in the above references yields a set of partial differential equations in terms of displacement components with creep effects included through the presence of force and moment arising from creep strains. Application of the generalized plane strain hypothesis eliminates the axial dependency in the governing system and enables the biaxial response of the shell to be determined.

The CENP OPTIN creep model is described in Section 5.6 of Reference 5-7. The model is intended to give a best estimate of in-reactor tangential creep rate for biaxially pressurized tubing for specific ranges of hoop stress, temperature, and neutron flux ( $E > 1\text{MeV}$ ). The specific form of the model equation is obtained by expressing the uniaxial hoop stress - hoop strain relation given in Reference 5-7 in terms of effective stress and strain.

The creep model in the CEPAN method (References 5-8, 5-9, 5-10, and 5-11) has been modified to include the ZIRLO™ creep correlation (Reference 5-6). The application of the model to ZIRLO™ is relatively straightforward. The fluence forms of the creep correlations will be used in CEPAN to be consistent with FATES3B (Reference 5-7).

In the existing CEPAN creep correlations, the relationship between the stress and strain components and effective stress and strain are based on the isotropic von Mises yield and Prandtl-Reuss equations. Reference 5-8 demonstrates this basis. Since the ZIRLO™ creep correlation provides the effective strain rate as a function of the effective stress and is already based on isotropic von Mises yield and Prandtl-Reuss equations, the ZIRLO™ creep correlation can be substituted directly for the CENP Zircaloy creep correlation.

### 5.3.2 Fuel Rod Axial Growth

Fuel rod axial growth is one of the parameters included in the mechanical design methodology to assess irradiation-induced dimensional changes of the fuel. It is well established that Zircaloy-clad fuel rods exhibit axial elongation when irradiated in a neutron flux. The overall elongation of fuel rods is due to several contributing mechanisms. These mechanisms include:

- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]

Due to the complex interactions among these mechanisms, empirical correlations have been utilized in the CENP methodology.

Fuel rod growth with ZIRLO™ cladding has been observed to be less than that of the Westinghouse Zircaloy-4 fuel rod growth. However, Reference 5-5 requires that the ZIRLO™ rod growth model be the same as the Westinghouse Zircaloy-4 growth model for evaluations of shoulder gap.

The functional form of the Westinghouse Zircaloy-4 rod growth model is the same as that currently used for CENP OPTIN fuel rods. Therefore, the application of the model in the CENP methodology to represent ZIRLO™ behavior is relatively straightforward.

The functional form of the fuel rod growth model is:

$$[ ]$$

where:

$$\left( \right)$$

The constants for the ZIRLO™ fuel rod growth equation are:

$$\left( \right)$$

### 5.3.3 Cladding Thermal Conductivity

Thermal conductivity for ZIRLO™ is provided in Reference 5-5 and is discussed in detail in Section 4.3.3. Conductivity used for FATES3B for OPTIN, Reference 5-7, is nearly identical to the ZIRLO™ conductivity over the range of interest for FATES3B and fuel mechanical design. Consequently, thermal conductivity for OPTIN is to be used for both ZIRLO™ and OPTIN.

### 5.3.4 Thermal Expansion

A discussion of thermal expansion coefficients for ZIRLO™ is provided in Section 4.3.4. For the reasons provided in Section 4.3.4 the FATES3B thermal expansion, Equation 4-7, will be used in modeling thermal expansion in all applicable mechanical design methods.

### 5.3.5 Strain Capability

Ductility is a function of irradiation and hydride formation in the cladding wall. The ductility of ZIRLO™ [ ] Waterside corrosion for ZIRLO™ is [ ] and will result in [ ] Total strain capability of ZIRLO™ is projected to be in excess of 1% at burnups of [ ].

Thus, a 1% strain limit will continue to be applied by CENP as a strain criterion in fuel mechanical design analysis.

### **5.3.6 Fatigue Capability**

The cyclic strain fatigue damage model applied to ZIRLO™ is identical to a conservative cyclic strain fatigue damage model applied to Westinghouse Zircaloy-4, and is based on a modified Langer-O'Donnell fatigue model (Reference 5-5). In both cases, the accumulated fatigue damage is limited to 1.0. The CENP fatigue damage evaluation for OPTIN cladding is also based on a conservative interpretation of the Langer-O'Donnell fatigue model. However, the CENP criterion limits the accumulated fatigue damage to [ ] (Reference 5-1).

Fatigue data obtained by Westinghouse for ZIRLO™ (number of cycles versus strain increment), although high cycle fatigue data, in the 30,000 to 100,000 cycle range, fall well above the CENP design curve. Furthermore, the data fall above the design curve at the more realistic range of 10,000 cycles, indicating significant margin. [

.]

Consequently, no change is required for calculation of fatigue for ZIRLO™ cladding in CENP fuel designs. The fatigue damage curve and accumulated damage fraction [ ] for OPTIN is also applied to ZIRLO™.

### **5.3.7 Mechanical Strength**

ZIRLO™ yield strength and ultimate strength are discussed in Reference 5-5. The following sections provide the correlations that are applicable for mechanical design evaluations.

#### **5.3.7.1 Yield Strength**

Best-estimate unirradiated yield strength of ZIRLO™, in psi, is given by

[ ]

[ ]

#### **5.3.7.2 Ultimate Strength**

Best-estimate unirradiated ultimate strength of ZIRLO™, in psi, is given by

[ ]

[ ]

#### **5.3.8 Modulus of Elasticity**

A discussion of ZIRLO™ modulus of elasticity is provided in Section 4.3.5.1. For the reasons provided in Section 4.3.5.1 the modulus of elasticity for OPTIN (Equation 4-30) is used in applicable mechanical design analysis.

#### **5.3.9 Poisson's Ratio**

A discussion of Poisson's ratio for ZIRLO™ is provided in Section 4.3.5.2. For the reasons provided in Section 4.3.5.2 the Poisson's ratio for OPTIN (Equation 4-32) is used in applicable mechanical design analysis.

#### **5.3.10 Oxide Buildup**

From a mechanical design standpoint, it is conservatively assumed that the maximum reduction in base-metal wall thickness due to oxidation is the same for the ZIRLO™ and OPTIN cladding materials. A corrosion allowance of [ ] is assumed for the maximum rod average burnup addressed in this report.



### **5.3.11 Density**

Density of ZIRLO™ is [     ] g/cc compared to [     ] g/cc for Zircaloy-4. CENP uses a density of [     ] g/cc for OPTIN extracted from similar zirconium alloys. The difference in Zircaloy-4 values is not significant but, where appropriate, the reported density for ZIRLO™ (Reference 5-5). is used. Recent data has shown that the difference in density conditions discussed above is reduced further, as such, the effects on the design evaluations should be negligible.

## **5.4 Fuel Mechanical Design Impact**

This section discusses the effect on fuel mechanical performance when ZIRLO™ cladding is substituted for OPTIN material in current CENP fuel rods. Areas of investigation include both individual fuel rods and the entire fuel assembly. The fuel rods are evaluated for differences in creep collapse, fuel rod stress, strain, fatigue damage, shoulder gap margin, rod bow and cladding wear/fretting. The fuel assembly is evaluated for differences in assembly bow, spacer grid growth and spring tab relaxation, hold down margin, spent fuel handling accident and seismic and LOCA loads.

### **5.4.1 Creep Collapse**

Since cladding collapse is a creep-related phenomenon, different creep properties of the cladding will result in different predicted collapse times for unsupported cladding. Also, cladding corrosion reduces the thickness of the cladding as a function of burnup, and this reduction in cladding thickness is accounted for in the analysis of cladding collapse.

CENP performs cladding collapse calculations in the fuel and plenum regions with the method described in Reference 5-8 and Reference 5-11. The assumed length of the axial gap in the fuel region bounds the largest hot axial gap in CENP fuel designs, and a limiting amount of oxide thickness is assumed. Also, no credit is taken for any additional support from the plenum spring in the plenum region. These calculations have historically shown that the predicted collapse

times exceed the longest residence time expected for CENP fuel that is operated to a maximum 1-pin burnup of 62 MWd/kgU.

#### **5.4.1.1 Conclusion Related to Creep Collapse**

Comparative runs were made using the 14x14 and 16x16 current CENP fuel rod designs with both OPTIN and ZIRLO™ materials. The ZIRLO™ properties discussed in Section 5.3 were included, as appropriate. The results of these comparative evaluations show that using ZIRLO™ cladding produces [ ] than the current OPTIN material. The use of ZIRLO™ cladding in the current CENP fuel bundle designs will therefore meet the required creep collapse criteria.

#### **5.4.2 Fuel Rod Stress**

The following design criteria are considered with regard to the cladding stresses:

- Under normal operating and upset conditions, the primary tensile and compressive stresses in the cladding shall not exceed 66 2/3% and 100% respectively of the minimum unirradiated yield strength at the applicable temperature. Under emergency and accident conditions, the stress allowables are as described in Reference 5-16.

The method used to perform the stress analysis of CENP fuel rod designs accounts for power dependent and time dependent changes (e.g., fuel rod void volume, fission gas release and gas temperature, differential cladding pressure, cladding creep and thermal expansion) that can affect stresses in the fuel rod cladding. As noted above, the allowable stress is based upon the material strength properties.

#### **5.4.2.1 Conclusion Related to Fuel Rod Stress**

Comparative analyses were performed using the current 14x14 and 16x16 CENP fuel rod designs with both OPTIN and ZIRLO™ materials. The ZIRLO™ properties discussed in Section

5.3 were included, as appropriate. The results of these comparative evaluations show that using ZIRLO™ cladding produces [ ] than the current OPTIN material. The introduction of ZIRLO™ cladding in the current CENP fuel bundle designs will therefore meet the required stress criteria.

### **5.4.3 Fuel Rod Strain**

The following design criterion is considered with regard to the cladding strain:

- At any time during the fuel rod lifetime, the net unrecoverable circumferential tensile clad strain shall not exceed 1%, based on the BOL clad dimensions. This condition is applicable to normal operating conditions, and following a single Condition 2 or 3 event.
- For fuel rod axial average burnups greater than 52 MWd/kgU, the total (elastic plus plastic) circumferential clad strain increment produced as a result of a single Condition 2 or 3 event, shall not exceed 1%.

The method used to evaluate the strain in CENP fuel rod designs accounts for power dependent and time dependent changes (e.g., fuel rod void volume, fission gas release and gas temperature, differential cladding pressure, cladding creep and thermal expansion) that can produce strain in the fuel rod cladding. As noted in Section 5.3.5, the strain capability of ZIRLO™ cladding remains at 1%.

#### **5.4.3.1 Conclusion Related to Fuel Rod Strain**

Comparative strain analyses were performed using the 14x14 and 16x16 current CENP fuel rod designs with both OPTIN and ZIRLO™ materials. The ZIRLO™ properties discussed in Section 5.3 were included, as appropriate. The results of these comparative evaluations show that using ZIRLO™ cladding [ ] than the current OPTIN material. The use of ZIRLO™ cladding in the current CENP fuel bundle designs therefore meets the required strain criteria.

#### **5.4.4 Fuel Rod Fatigue Damage**

The method used for fatigue analysis of CENP fuel rod designs accounts for power dependent and time dependent changes (e.g., rod void volume, fission gas release and gas temperature, cladding creep and thermal expansion, and pellet swelling and thermal expansion) that can produce cyclic straining of the fuel rod cladding. In this method, the cladding is assumed to conform to the predicted diameter of the pellet during periods of contact (i.e., elastic compression and hot pressing of the pellet are conservatively ignored).

In each specific design analysis, conservative assumptions are used to select the starting dimensions of the fuel rod. [

.]

The method for fatigue analysis results in a series of cladding strain ranges covering the fuel lifetime. The cumulative fatigue damage fraction is determined by summing the ratios of the number of cycles in a given strain range to the permitted number in that range. The permitted number of cycles in any strain range is the same for the two cladding materials, as discussed in Section 5.3.6.

##### **5.4.4.1 Conclusion Related to Fuel Rod Fatigue Damage**

Comparative fatigue damage calculations were performed for the 14x14 and 16x16 current CENP fuel rod designs using both OPTIN and ZIRLO™ materials. The ZIRLO™ properties discussed in Section 5.3 were included, as appropriate. The results of those comparative evaluations show that using ZIRLO™ cladding produces [comparable or lower cumulative fatigue damage] than the current OPTIN material. The use of ZIRLO™ cladding in the current CENP fuel bundle designs will therefore meet the required fatigue damage criterion.

#### **5.4.5 Shoulder Gap Margin**

The SIGREEP computer code is used to predict the shoulder gap as described in Reference 5-1 and Section 5.2.2 of the current report. The design criterion on shoulder gap change is that the gap must not close for the upper 95% probability prediction at the maximum rod discharge exposure in the assembly (an appropriate lower value is used in the shoulder gap analysis for the corresponding guide tube fluence).

The CENP guide tube material has not been changed from standard Zircaloy-4 requirements; therefore all fuel assembly length change SIGREEP predictions[ ] are relevant to designs containing ZIRLO™ fuel rods.

##### **5.4.5.1 Conclusion Related to Shoulder Gap Margin**

Section 5.3.2 documents the irradiation growth model for the ZIRLO™-clad fuel rods. Applying these growth characteristics to the shoulder gap calculation results in end-of-life gaps that are [ ] for CENP fuel bundles with OPTIN fuel rods. Specific reload batch evaluations will verify that adequate shoulder gap margins are maintained.

#### **5.4.6 Rod Bow**

The bowing of fuel rods results in [ ] of the rods. The primary mechanism causing this bowing is [ ]. The fuel rod behaves like a column with multiple supports at each grid location. The degree of bowing is a function of basic design features, the initial rod bow resulting during fabrication, and burnup. Bowing of fuel and poison rods affects local nuclear power peaking and the local heat transfer to the coolant. Rather than placing design limits on the amount of bowing that is permitted, the effects of bowing are included in the safety analysis. This is consistent with the NRC Standard Review Plan.

The CENP analysis methods used to account for the effect of fuel and poison rod bow in 14x14 and 16x16 fuel assemblies are presented in References 5-2 and 5-13, and the supplements to

Reference 5-13. These methods were initially approved by the NRC in References 5-2 and 5-14 for fuel rods and Type 3 poison rods. The further application of these methods to [ ] MWd/kgU was approved in References 5-3 and 5-4.

In summary, the primary design characteristics that affect rod bow are rod stiffness and spacer grid axial spacing. These characteristics do not change due to the introduction of ZIRLO™. Secondary effects due to the long term differences between ZIRLO™ and OPTIN creep and axial growth may result in slight differences of behavior in rod bow. Nevertheless, this potential difference in bow characteristics is not judged to significantly alter the rod bow as a function of burnup. To date, there have been no observations of increased bow as a result of Westinghouse adoption of ZIRLO™ cladding.

#### **5.4.6.1 Conclusions Related to Rod Bow**

No design changes have been introduced or will be introduced with the implementation of ZIRLO™ cladding that are projected to significantly increase either as-fabricated rod bow or rod bow with burnup relative to the measured rod bow reported in Reference 5-2.

#### **5.4.7 Grid-to-Rod Fretting Wear**

Grid-to-rod fretting wear is a concern because excessive wear between the fuel rod cladding tube and the spacer grid support features can result in a breach of the cladding wall. Reference 5-1 provided information on operating CENP fuel designs and fretting failure experience as of its date of publication. Tables 5.4.7-1 and 5.4.7-2 of this report are an update of that information.

[ ] of the fretting failures in Table 5.4.7-2 occurred at the bottom spacer grid, which is made from Inconel material. In all cases, the bottom grid designs for these fuel batches preceded the CENP GUARDIAN design. All future fuel deliveries will include the GUARDIAN bottom grid. There will be no effect of the change to ZIRLO™ cladding material on rod performance at the GUARDIAN spacer grid. [

].

The remaining fretting failures in Table 5.4.7-2 [

]. Evaluations of the experience at Zircaloy-4 spacer grid locations have identified a combination of factors [

]. As discussed below, the use of ZIRLO™ cladding is not expected to significantly affect the contributing factors [ ].

An assessment of the significance of grid-to-rod fretting wear failures was provided to the NRC for information in References 5-17 and 5-18. Reference 5-18 was issued following the[

], and concluded that the grid-to-rod fretting wear is not a reactor safety or fuel operability concern. The [ ] do not alter this conclusion.

#### **5.4.7.1 Grid-to-Rod Fretting Wear at Zircaloy Spacer Grids**

The grid-to-fuel rod fretting wear failures listed at the bottom of Table 5.4.7-2 [

]. Eddy current testing and/or visual examination of [

].

Evaluations of grid-to-rod fretting have concluded that [

].

#### 5.4.7.2 Evaluation of the Change to ZIRLO™ Cladding on Grid-to-Rod Fretting Wear

The factors that contribute to the grid-to-rod fretting wear were outlined in Section 5.4.7.1. The effect of using ZIRLO™ cladding material in the CENP fuel designs was first evaluated by assessing the difference, if any, that would be produced for each contributing factor. [

].

Table 5.4.7-3 summarizes the results. Based on the evaluation of the effects of ZIRLO™ cladding on the factors associated with grid-to-rod fretting, it is expected that there[

failures [ ]. Since most or all of the ], the potential for a significant increase in failure rate [ ] is small.

Likewise, the use of ZIRLO™ cladding is not expected to result in a significant increase in failures [ ]. However, Table 5.4.7-3 shows that the situation at these [

].



These interrelated effects, when combined with the range of operating conditions in a typical core, can produce [

]. In addition, the difference in oxide thickness between the two materials will increase as burnup increases, and the rate of axial growth of the rods will differ.

Because of these [ ], the best basis for comparisons of fretting behavior is the actual performance in reactors where the transition has already been made between cladding materials. The cases that are considered most relevant [ ]].

Table 5.4.7-4 lists the applicable experience [

].

The experience with [ ] is also relevant, since the fuel assembly designs were deployed in a [

]. Inspection results are shown in Table 5.4.7-5. Note that [ ] was made at the same time as the transition from low-tin Zircaloy-4 to ZIRLO™ cladding.

### **5.4.7.3 Conclusions Related to Grid-to-Rod Fretting Wear**

The effect of the change from OPTIN to ZIRLO™ cladding on grid-to-rod fretting will involve complex interactions among the various factors contributing to the fretting mechanism. Based on a review of the individual contributing factors, and on the available data from relevant reactor experience, the incidence of fretting failures in the CENP fuel designs is expected to remain small.

The initial applications of ZIRLO™ cladding in CENP fuel are expected to be in plants and designs with margin to fretting failures. This fuel will be carefully monitored to confirm the expected performance.

#### **5.4.8 Fuel Assembly Considerations**

The design effect of introducing ZIRLO™ cladding into CENP designed fuel rods associated with overall behavior of a fuel assembly and/or its structural components are discussed in this section. The topics include assembly bow, spacer grid irradiation growth and spring tab relaxation, assembly hold down margin, and assembly structural performance, including consideration of the spent fuel handling accident and seismic and LOCA loads.

##### **5.4.8.1 Fuel Assembly Bow**

Section 2.3.4 of Reference 5-1 evaluated the topic of fuel assembly bow for reactor cores with CENP OPTIN clad fuel. It was stated that assembly bow for CENP designed reactor cores in CENP designed NSSSs has been acceptable and that the effects of extending the 1-pin burnup limit from [ ] will be negligible relative to assembly bow.

Reference 5-1 and Reference 5-22 indicate that a major contributor to assembly bow is believed to be lateral flow forces on fuel rods and guide tubes associated with radial crossflows that result from center-peaked coolant mass flow distributions at the core inlet. Other mechanisms that may influence assembly bow are axial loads on the fuel assembly due to the difference between assembly hold down force and coolant uplift forces and differential guide tube creep and/or growth that occurs in the presence of a fast neutron flux. Secondary contributing mechanisms include moments exerted on the fuel assembly and differential thermal expansion of the guide tubes within the assembly. The moments may be exerted on the upper and lower end fittings by deflections of the core support and/or alignment plates.

The existence of fuel assembly bowing for 17x17 Westinghouse designs was attributed to the thimble tube design, and this has resulted in the incomplete control rod insertion issue. In

Reference 22 it was concluded that the robust interface between the CENP 14x14 and 16x16 guide tubes and control element assemblies (CEAs) is sufficient to preclude any similar issue for CENP reactors. Specifically, there is a factor of 30 on the critical buckling force that exists with CENP type guide tubes due to the larger geometric shape, as compared to Westinghouse 17x17 thimble tubes, to resist tube buckling induced distortions that may result from differential behavior of the guide tubes during irradiation or from variations in material properties.

The above discussion does not indicate a strong dependence on fuel rod behavior for the fuel assembly bow phenomena. However, the introduction of ZIRLO™ will alter the dynamics of the Zircaloy-4 creep rate early in life and these differences may produce small differences in the rod bow which may have a feed back effect on overall lateral fuel assembly stiffness and possible bow effects. These effects are judged to be relatively insignificant based on the Westinghouse observations that assembly bow has not increased with the introduction of ZIRLO™.

#### **5.4.8.2            Spacer Grid Irradiation Growth and Spring Tab Relaxation**

The spacer grids will continue to be fabricated from Zircaloy-4 for CENP fuel assemblies with ZIRLO™ clad fuel rods. Therefore, growth and relaxation properties of the grids will not be affected.

#### **5.4.8.3            Fuel Assembly Hold Down Margin**

The only parameter in the hold down evaluation that would be influenced by the use of ZIRLO™ cladding in a CENP fuel assembly would be that related to the weight of the fuel bundle. Section 5.3.11 shows the density of ZIRLO™ to be conservatively predicted to be [            ] than that of OPTIN. When this [            ] fuel rod density is considered with all other key parameters in the analyses of record for 14x14 and 16x16 CENP current fuel bundle designs, the hold down margins calculated by the SIGREEP code continue to meet the required criterion. Thus, the use of ZIRLO™ cladding in current CENP fuel bundle designs is acceptable from a hold down margin standpoint.

#### **5.4.8.4 Assembly Structural Performance**

This section assesses the structural performance of the fuel assemblies with the addition of ZIRLO™ fuel rods during a spent fuel handling accident or under seismic and LOCA loads. The evaluations show that there will be either no effect caused by the addition of ZIRLO™ cladding or that the structural performance of the fuel assembly actually improves.

##### **5.4.8.4.1 Spent Fuel Handling**

The response of the Zircaloy-4 structural components and ZIRLO™ fuel rods to the loads produced by fuel handling is determined by conventional static stress analysis methods. No changes to the stress analysis methods are required as a result of the change in cladding material.

##### **5.4.8.4.2 Fuel Assembly Damage Under Seismic and LOCA Loads**

The methods and criteria used to evaluate fuel assembly structural performance under the deflections and loads induced by seismic and LOCA conditions are described in Reference 5-16. These methods are unaffected by the change to ZIRLO™ cladding material. However, certain properties and input to the method, and the allowable stress values resulting from the criteria, may be affected, as discussed below.

##### Full Core Analysis

The dynamic core analysis model covers one complete row of fuel assemblies across the core. In the actual case of an operating reactor with CENP designed fuel assemblies, there will be a mix of assemblies containing OPTIN or ZIRLO™ cladding due to the fuel management. Of the specific parameters that are modeled in the core analysis, the only ones that would be affected by the use of ZIRLO™ cladding [

.]

The weight difference between OPTIN and ZIRLO™ cladding amounts to a [ ] for the ZIRLO™ cladding. But the cladding weight is a very small fraction (about 6%) of the total weight of the fuel rods. The resulting [ ] of the fuel assembly is thus small enough to be considered negligible for dynamic core analysis considerations. In addition, as highlighted in Section 5.3.11, recent data has shown the difference in density conditions has been reduced and thus will further support the conclusion of negligible impact.

There is a contribution from the fuel rod properties (mass and stiffness) to the fuel assembly natural frequency. The weight of the fuel rods will be reduced by the [ ] density of the ZIRLO™ cladding, but the stiffness will [ ] because both the rod dimensions and cladding elastic modulus [ ]. As mentioned above, the weight change is a [ ] in the natural frequency of the fuel rods as well.

#### Detailed Fuel Assembly Analysis and Design Criteria

Based on the discussions above, it is concluded that the effects of using ZIRLO™ cladding in place of OPTIN material, for burnup levels of up to 60,000 MWd/MTU and above, are covered by the conservative input values that have been used historically in the two phases of the seismic/LOCA analysis, and in the determination of limiting values from the existing design criteria.

### **5.5 Overall Conclusion for Fuel Mechanical Design**

The impact of using ZIRLO™ in place of OPTIN for the fuel rods in current CENP fuel bundle designs has been assessed. Evaluation of the change examined the mechanical performance areas of creep collapse, stress, strain, fatigue damage, shoulder gap margin, rod bow, cladding wear/fretting, assembly bow, spacer grid growth and spring tab relaxation, and hold down margin.

The overall conclusion is that the use of ZIRLO™ in place of OPTIN cladding would result in CENP fuel assembly designs that are fully capable of meeting their current design criteria.

## 5.6 References

- 5-1 CENP-388-P, "Extension of the 1-Pin Burnup Limit to 65 MWd/kgU for ABB PWR Fuel with OPTIN™ Cladding," February 1998.
- 5-2 CENPD-269-P, "Revision 1-P, "Extended Burnup Operation of Combustion Engineering PWR Fuel," July 1984.
- 5-3 CEN-386-P-A, "Verification of the Acceptability of a 1-Pin Burnup Limit of 60 MWD/kgU for Combustion Engineering 16x16 PWR Fuel," August 1992.
- 5-4 CEN-382(B)-P-A, "Verification of the Acceptability of a 1-Pin Burnup Limit of 60 MWD/kgU for Combustion Engineering 14x14 PWR Fuel," August 1993.
- 5-5 WCAP-12610-P-A, "VANTAGE+ Fuel Assembly Reference Core Report," Westinghouse Electric Company LLC, April 1995.
- 5-6 WCAP-15063-P-A Revision 1, with Errata, "Westinghouse Improved Performance Analysis and Design Model (PAD 4.0)," Westinghouse Electric Company LLC Nuclear Fuel, July 2000.
- 5-7 CENPD-139-P-A, "Fuel Evaluation Model", July 1974.
- 5-8 CENPD-187-P-A, "CEPAN Method of Analyzing Creep Collapse of Oval Cladding," April 1976; Supplement 1-P-A, June 1977.
- 5-9 EPRI NP-3966 "CEPAN Method of Analyzing Creep Collapse of Oval Cladding – Volume 1: General Description," April 1985.
- 5-10 EPRI NP-3966-CCMP, "CEPAN Method of Analyzing Creep Collapse of Oval Cladding – Volume 4: Finite Axial-Length Version," April 1985.
- 5-11 EPRI NP-3966-CCM, "CEPAN Method of Analyzing Creep Collapse of Oval Cladding - Volume 5: Evaluation of Interpellet Gap Formation and Cladding Collapse in Modern PWR Fuel Rods," April 1985.
- 5-12 CEN-183(B)-P, "Application of CENPD-198 to Zircaloy Component Dimensional Changes," September 1981.
- 5-13 CENPD-225-P-A and Supplements 1, 2 and 3, "Fuel and Poison Rod Bowing," June 1983.
- 5-14 Letter from E. J. Butcher (USNRC) to A. E. Lundvall, Jr. (BGE) regarding Safety Evaluation Report for CENPD-269-P. October 10, 1985.
- 5-15 CEN-289(A)-P, "Revised Rod Bow Penalties for Arkansas Nuclear One Unit 2," December 1984.

- 5-16 CENPD-178-P, Rev. 1-P, "Structural Analysis of Fuel Assemblies for Seismic and Loss of Coolant Accident Loading," August 1981.
- 5-17 Letter S. A. Toelle (CENP) to T. E. Collins (NRC), LD-94-021, dated April 1, 1994, transmitting Combustion Engineering *TechNote* No. 94-03, "Grid-to-Fuel Rod Fretting Wear," April 1, 1994.
- 5-18 Letter I. C. Rickard (CENP) to T. E. Collins (NRC), LD-96-044, dated October 11, 1996, transmitting Combustion Engineering *TechNote* No. 94-03, Supplement 1, "Grid-to-Rod Fretting Wear," October 7, 1996.
- 5-19 O. D. Parr (NRC) to A. E. Scherer (CE), Untitled, February 10, 1976.
- 5-20 C. O. Thomas (NRC) to A. E. Scherer (CE), "Acceptance for Referencing of Topical Report CENPD-225-P," February 15, 1983.
- 5-21 H. Bernard (NRC) to A. E. Scherer (CE), "Acceptance for Referencing of Licensing Topical Report CENPD-178," August 6, 1982.
- 5-22 CE NPSD-1049-P, "Potential for Delayed CEA Insertion Times at C-E Designed Plants," Prepared for the C-E Owners Group, June 1986.

**Table 5.2-1****Topical Reports and Safety Evaluations for the Mechanical Design Models**

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Topical Report Reference</b>	<b>Safety Evaluation Report Reference</b>
CEPAN Model CENPD-187-P-A Supplement 1 Downgraded to Non-Proprietary	5-8 5-8	5-19 none <sup>(1)</sup>
SIGREEP Model CEN-183(B)-P	5-12	none <sup>(2)</sup>
Rod Bow Model CENPD-225-P-A Supplement 1 Supplement 2 Supplement 3	5-13	5-20 5-20 5-20 5-20
Seismic / LOCA Model CENPD-178-P	5-16	5-21

Note 1: Supplement 1 is only an abstract with two tables from which some proprietary information was removed. As such, no SER was required.

Note 2: No explicit SER has been identified for this application but acceptance of the SIGREEP model is inferred from the acceptance of References 5-2, 5-3, and 5-4.




**Table 5.2.2****Cladding Models Used in Mechanical Design Models**


Cladding Related Parameters	Fuel Mechanical Design Model	
	CEPAN	SIGREEP
Creep		
Thermal	Yes	Yes
Irradiation	Yes	Yes
Thermal Expansion	No	Yes
Yield Strength	Yes	No
Modulus of Elasticity	Yes	No
Poisson's Ratio	Yes	No
Initial Ovality	Yes	No
Rod Axial Growth	No	Yes
Uncertainties	No	Yes

Note: Analytical models for rod bow and seismic/LOCA evaluations, References 5-13 and 5-16, are not included in the above table since the introduction of ZIRLO™ will have no effect on these models. Sections 5.2.3 and 5.2.4 discuss the rationale associated with this no model impact conclusion.


**Table 5.4.7-1**  
**Implementation of Advanced Laser Welded Grids**


A large, empty rounded rectangular frame with a black border, occupying the central portion of the page. It appears to be a placeholder for a table or diagram.

**Table 5.4.7-2**  
**Grid-to-Rod Fretting Wear Induced Failures in**  
**CENP US PWR Fuel Supplied Since 1984**



**Table 5.4.7-3**  
**Effect of Cladding Material Change on Factors Contributing to Fretting Failures**

A large, empty rounded rectangular frame with a thin black border, occupying the central portion of the page. It appears to be a placeholder for a table or diagram.



A large, empty rounded rectangle frame, likely intended for a drawing or image.

## 6.0 ECCS Performance Analysis

### 6.1 Introduction

This section describes the implementation of ZIRLO™ cladding in the CE Nuclear Power (CENP) Large Break Loss-of-Coolant Accident (LBLOCA) and Small Break Loss-of-Coolant Accident (SBLOCA) Emergency Core Cooling System (ECCS) performance evaluation models. Section 6.2 describes the cladding related models for Zircaloy-4 used in the CENP LBLOCA and SBLOCA evaluation models. Section 6.3 describes the modifications that have been made to those models to represent ZIRLO™ cladding. It includes a description of the cladding model for ZIRLO™ for each parameter that requires a model different than that used for Zircaloy-4. It also identifies those parameters for which the Zircaloy-4 model is applicable to ZIRLO™ and provides a basis for the applicability of the Zircaloy-4 model to ZIRLO™. Section 6.4 discusses the maintenance of the interface between the fuel performance model, FATES3B, and the ECCS performance evaluation model for ZIRLO™ cladding. Section 6.5 presents the results of both a LBLOCA and SBLOCA ECCS performance analysis of ZIRLO™ cladding. The results are compared to the results of equivalent analyses of Zircaloy-4 cladding. The conclusions of the implementation of ZIRLO™ cladding in the CENP LBLOCA and SBLOCA ECCS performance evaluation models are presented in Section 6.6.

The implementation of ZIRLO™ cladding in the CENP evaluation models is based on the NRC-accepted implementation of ZIRLO™ cladding in the Westinghouse Appendix K evaluation models (Reference 6-45). As described in Reference 6-45, Westinghouse determined that many of the physical and mechanical properties of ZIRLO™ are similar to those of Zircaloy-4 when the two alloys are in the same metallurgical phase. Consequently, many of the material property models for Zircaloy-4 are applicable to ZIRLO™. However, the change from the alpha phase to the beta phase for ZIRLO™ occurs over a different temperature range than it does for Zircaloy-4. This requires that several material property models applicable to Zircaloy-4 be modified to represent ZIRLO™. In particular, the models for specific heat, cladding creep, cladding rupture temperature and strain, and assembly blockage following rupture were modified to represent ZIRLO™ in the Westinghouse Appendix K evaluation models. The

Westinghouse ZIRLO™ models are implemented in the CENP evaluation models as described herein.

Westinghouse also demonstrated that the use of the Baker-Just model for the calculation of the metal-water reaction rate, which is a required feature of Appendix K evaluation models, is suitably conservative for ZIRLO™ cladding. The CENP evaluation models retain the use of the Baker-Just model as described herein.

Lastly, it is noted that 10 CFR 50.46, which identifies the ECCS acceptance criteria for light-water nuclear power reactors, has been revised to extend the applicability of the criteria to fuel that is clad with ZIRLO™ cladding. Consequently, no exemptions to 10 CFR 50.46 or Appendix K to 10 CFR 50 are needed to apply the criteria to CENP designed fuel clad with ZIRLO™.

## **6.2 Summary of Cladding-Related Models in the CENP ECCS Performance Evaluation Models**

The current versions of the CENP ECCS performance evaluation models are the 1999 Evaluation Model (1999 EM) for LBLOCA and the S2M (Supplement 2 Evaluation Model) for SBLOCA. Table 6.2-1 lists the topical reports and the NRC's Safety Evaluation Reports (SERs) associated with the 1999 EM and the S2M.

The 1999 EM includes the following computer codes. CEFLASH-4A and COMPERC-II perform the blowdown and refill/reflood hydraulic analyses, respectively. In addition, COMPERC-II calculates the minimum containment pressure and FLECHT-based reflood heat transfer coefficients. PARCH and HCROSS calculate steam cooling heat transfer coefficients. STRIKIN-II performs the hot rod heatup analysis. COMZIRC, which is a derivative of the COMPERC-II code, calculates the core-wide cladding oxidation percentage.

The S2M uses the following computer codes. CEFLASH-4AS performs the hydraulic analysis prior to the time that the Safety Injection Tanks (SITs) begin to inject. After injection from the SITs begins, COMPERC-II is used to perform the hydraulic analysis. The hot rod heatup



analysis is performed by STRIKIN-II during the initial period of forced convection heat transfer and by PARCH during the subsequent period of pool boiling heat transfer.

The 1999 EM and S2M are NRC-accepted for ECCS performance analyses of CENP designed Pressurized Water Reactors (PWRs) fueled with Zircaloy-4 clad fuel assemblies. Table 6.2-2 lists the cladding related models that are used in the evaluation models and identifies the source document for each model. The following three references are the primary source documents for the models. Reference 6-38 is the source for the majority of the thermophysical and mechanical properties. It is also the source for the cladding rupture and swelling models used in the S2M. NUREG-0630 (Reference 6-39) is the source for the cladding rupture, swelling and blockage models used in the 1999 EM. As required by Appendix K to 10 CFR 50, the Baker-Just model (Reference 6-41) is the source document for the metal-water reaction rate model.

The following sections identify the topical report documentation associated with the specific Zircaloy-4 models used by each computer code. For ease of presentation of the information, the models are combined into four groups:

1. Thermophysical properties of specific heat, density and thermal conductivity
2. Thermal and mechanical properties used in the calculation of the fuel-to-cladding gap conductance and the inside diameter of the cladding. The properties in this group include thermal expansion, modulus of elasticity, Poisson's ratio, and diamond pyramid hardness. Also included in the group is thermal emissivity, which is used in the STRIKIN-II rod-to-rod thermal radiation model and the PARCH radiation heat transfer to steam model, as well as the gap conductance model.
3. Cladding rupture, swelling, and blockage models, including pre-rupture plastic strain
4. Metal-water reaction rate model

#### **6.2.1 CEFLASH-4A**

The Zircaloy-4 models for specific heat and thermal conductivity used in CEFLASH-4A are described in Section III.B.11 of Reference 6-9. The specific heat is used in conjunction with a constant value for density equal to 409 lbm/ft<sup>3</sup>.

Prior to the 1999 EM version of the CENP LBLOCA evaluation model (i.e., the 1985 EM (Reference 6-4) and earlier versions), the CEFLASH-4A fuel rod model represented the fuel-to-cladding gap with a constant gap conductance and internal pressure. Consequently, the code did not include cladding models for thermal emissivity, thermal expansion, modulus of elasticity, Poisson's ratio, and diamond pyramid hardness. The 1999 EM introduced a dynamic fuel rod internal pressure model. The model is described in Section 2.3 of Reference 6-5. The model represents cladding dimensional changes due to thermal and mechanical expansion and contraction using the model described in the PARCH topical report. In particular, it uses the Zircaloy-4 models for Poisson's ratio and modulus of elasticity described in Reference 6-22, Section 3.4.1 and the thermal expansion model described in Reference 6-24, Appendix B.

CEFLASH-4A uses the NUREG-0630 (Reference 6-39) models for cladding rupture temperature, cladding rupture strain, and assembly blockage. The models are described in Sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 and Appendix C.3 of Reference 6-25 and in Section 2.1.2 of Reference 6-5. With the introduction of the dynamic fuel rod internal pressure model in the 1999 EM, the NRC plastic strain model, which is the plastic strain model used in STRIKIN-II, was added to CEFLASH-4A (Reference 6-5, Section 2.3). The model is described in Reference 6-19, Section II.B.

CEFLASH-4A uses the Baker-Just metal-water reaction rate model. It is described in Section III.B.10 of Reference 6-9.

### **6.2.2 CEFLASH-4AS**

CEFLASH-4AS uses the same models for specific heat and density for Zircaloy-4 as are used in CEFLASH-4A. The Zircaloy-4 model for thermal conductivity used in CEFLASH-4AS is described in Section I (page 3) of Reference 6-13.

Similar to the pre-1999 EM versions of CEFLASH-4A, CEFLASH-4AS represents the fuel-to-cladding gap with a constant gap conductance. Consequently, it does not contain cladding models for thermal emissivity, thermal expansion, modulus of elasticity, Poisson's ratio, and diamond pyramid hardness.

Because the CEFLASH-4AS core model represents the average rod in the core, it does not model cladding rupture and assembly blockage. Likewise, it does not model pre-rupture plastic strain.

CEFLASH-4AS uses the Baker-Just metal-water reaction rate model. It is described in Section III.B.10 of Reference 6-9.

### **6.2.3 COMPERC-II**

The Zircaloy-4 models for specific heat and thermal conductivity used in COMPERC-II are described in Appendix C of Reference 6-15. They are the same models that are used by CEFLASH-4A, STRIKIN-II, and PARCH. The specific heat is used in conjunction with a constant input value for cladding mass per foot of fuel rod (i.e., the product of the cladding density and cross-sectional area). A value of 409 lbm/ft<sup>3</sup> is typically used for the density of Zircaloy-4 in the calculation of the cladding mass per foot.

COMPERC-II uses a constant value for the gap conductance. The value, which is a code input, is obtained from CEFLASH-4A. Therefore, COMPERC-II does not model cladding thermal emissivity, thermal expansion, modulus of elasticity, Poisson's ratio, or diamond pyramid hardness.

COMPERC-II does not model cladding rupture, assembly blockage, or pre-rupture plastic strain.

COMPERC-II uses the Baker-Just metal-water reaction rate model. The model is described in Appendix D of Reference 6-15.

### **6.2.4 STRIKIN-II**

The Zircaloy-4 models for specific heat and thermal conductivity used in STRIKIN-II are described in Appendix I of Reference 6-18. They are the same models that are used by CEFLASH-4A, COMPERC-II, and PARCH. Also like those codes, it uses a constant value of 409 lbm/ft<sup>3</sup> for the density of Zircaloy-4.

Appendix I of Reference 6-18 also documents the Zircaloy-4 models for thermal emissivity, thermal expansion, modulus of elasticity, Poisson's ratio, and diamond pyramid hardness that STRIKIN-II uses.

STRIKIN-II uses the NUREG-0630 (Reference 6-39) models for cladding rupture temperature, rupture strain, and assembly blockage. The models are described in Sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 and Appendix C.2 of Reference 6-25 and in Section 2.1.2 of Reference 6-5. The pre-rupture plastic strain model used by STRIKIN-II is the NRC model described in Section II.B and Appendix A of Reference 6-19.

STRIKIN-II uses the Baker-Just metal-water reaction rate model. The model is described in Section II.9 of Reference 6-18.

#### **6.2.5 PARCH**

The Zircaloy-4 models for specific heat and thermal conductivity used in PARCH are described in Section 3.4.4 of Reference 6-22. They are the same models that are used by CEFLASH-4A, COMPERC-II, and STRIKIN-II. Also like those codes, it uses a constant value of 409 lbm/ft<sup>3</sup> for the density of Zircaloy-4.

Section 3.4.1 of Reference 6-22 documents the Zircaloy-4 models for thermal emissivity, modulus of elasticity, Poisson's ratio, and diamond pyramid hardness that are used by PARCH. The model for the modulus of elasticity described in Section 3.4.1 is an equation for the linear portion of the curve for the modulus of elasticity plotted in Figure 2 of Reference 6-38. The model was modified as described in Reference 6-42 to better represent the non-linear portion of the curve. The model for thermal expansion is documented in Section II.b and Appendix B of Reference 6-24. It consists of a functional fit of the graphical representation of thermal expansion in Reference 6-38.

The Zircaloy-4 models for cladding rupture temperature and rupture strain used in PARCH for SBLOCA analyses are described in Section 3.4.2 of Reference 6-22. PARCH uses the [ ] curve for rupture temperature versus differential pressure and the [ ] curve for

rupture strain versus differential pressure described in Reference 6-38. (Note: the SBLOCA evaluation model does not use the NUREG-0630 cladding rupture and swelling models as described in Section 1.2.2 of Reference 6-25.) Applicability of the models described in Reference 6-38 to CENP's 16x16 fuel assemblies is documented in Reference 6-43. Reference 6-44 is the SER for Reference 6-43. PARCH does not model assembly blockage or pre-rupture plastic strain.

The preceding discussion of the PARCH cladding rupture and strain models is applicable to the SBLOCA evaluation model. In the LBLOCA evaluation model, PARCH is used to calculate steam cooling heat transfer coefficients that are applied at and above the elevation of cladding rupture, i.e., it is used after STRIKIN-II has calculated the time of cladding rupture and the amount of rupture strain and assembly blockage. Consequently, the PARCH cladding rupture temperature and rupture strain models are not used in LBLOCA applications.

PARCH uses the Baker-Just metal-water reaction rate model. The model is described in Section 3.4.3 of Reference 6-22.

#### **6.2.6 COMZIRC**

The cladding models used by COMZIRC are the same as those described in Section 6.2.3 for COMPERC-II.

#### **6.2.7 HCROSS**

HCROSS does not use any of the cladding models listed in Table 6.2-2. HCROSS calculates normalized blocked channel steam flow fractions, which are used by PARCH to calculate the steam cooling heat transfer coefficients used by STRIKIN-II. The amount of assembly blockage, which is determined by STRIKIN-II, is an input to HCROSS.

## **6.3 ZIRLO™ Properties and Correlations in the CENP ECCS Performance Evaluation Models**

### **6.3.1 Specific Heat**

The specific heat of ZIRLO™ used in the Westinghouse Appendix K and Best Estimate evaluation models is given by the values listed in Tables 6.3.1-1 and 6.3.1-2, respectively. The values include the heat of transformation associated with the alpha-to-beta phase change that occurs between 1382°F and 1724°F. The specific heat of ZIRLO™ is different from that of Zircaloy-4 primarily because of the difference in the temperature range over which the alpha-to-beta phase change occurs for the two alloys.

In the CENP evaluation models, the specific heat of Zircaloy-4, which is obtained from Reference 6-37, is represented by the values listed in Table 6.3.1-3. It is compared to the two ZIRLO™ models for specific heat in Figure 6.3.1-1. The comparison shows that both the Westinghouse Best Estimate model for ZIRLO™ and the CENP model for Zircaloy-4 represent the alpha-to-beta phase change heat of transformation with more detail than is used in the Westinghouse Appendix K model for ZIRLO™. Therefore, in order to maintain the same level of detail as is currently used in the CENP evaluation models to represent the specific heat of Zircaloy-4, the CENP evaluation models use the Westinghouse Best Estimate model for the specific heat of ZIRLO™.

### **6.3.2 Density**

The Westinghouse Appendix K evaluation models represent the density ( $\rho$ , lbm/ft<sup>3</sup>) of ZIRLO™ with the same equation used for Zircaloy-4. The equation is as follows:

$$\rho = 410 / (1 + 9.66 \times 10^{-6} T)$$

where T is the cladding temperature (°F). The CENP evaluation models use a constant value of 409 lbm/ft<sup>3</sup> for the density of Zircaloy-4.

In comparison, for cladding temperatures  $\leq 2200^{\circ}\text{F}$ , the Westinghouse equation that is used for both Zircaloy-4 and ZIRLO™ gives a density that is less than 2% different than the constant value that is used for Zircaloy-4 in the CENP evaluation models. On the basis that this is an insignificant difference, the CENP evaluation models use the same constant value of density (i.e., 409 lbm/ft<sup>3</sup>) for ZIRLO™ as used for Zircaloy-4.

### 6.3.3 Thermal Conductivity

The thermal conductivity of Zircaloy-4 is used for ZIRLO™ in the Westinghouse Appendix K evaluation models. In the Westinghouse Appendix K evaluation models, the thermal conductivity ( $k$ , BTU/hr-ft-°F) is the maximum of the two values obtained from the following equations:

$$k = 7.404 + 2.9 \times 10^{-3}T$$

$$k = 5.621 + 5.3 \times 10^{-3}T$$

where  $T$  is cladding temperature (°F).

The equation for thermal conductivity for Zircaloy-4 used in the CENP evaluation models, with the exception of CEFLASH-4AS, is the following equation, which is taken from Reference 6-38:

$$k = 7.404 + 2.9 \times 10^{-3}T$$

CEFLASH-4AS uses the following equation given on page 3 of Reference 6-13:

$$k = 5.621 + 5.3 \times 10^{-3}T$$

The three models are compared in Figure 6.3.3-1. The thermal conductivity calculated using the Westinghouse model ranges from -5% to +7% different from that calculated using the CENP model over the temperature range of interest. The CENP model also compares favorably with the data for ZIRLO™ and Zircaloy-4 presented in Reference 6-45 (page 62 of Section G). Therefore, consistent with the approach used in the Westinghouse Appendix K evaluation

models, the CENP evaluation models use the same equations for thermal conductivity for ZIRLO™ as used for Zircaloy-4.

#### 6.3.4 Thermal Emissivity

The thermal emissivity of Zircaloy-4 is used for ZIRLO™ in the Westinghouse Appendix K evaluation models. Consistent with the Westinghouse approach, the CENP evaluation models also use the thermal emissivity of Zircaloy-4 for ZIRLO™.

In the CENP evaluation models, the following equation from Reference 6-38 is used to represent the hemispherical emissivity ( $\epsilon$ ) of oxidized Zircaloy-4 and ZIRLO™ :

$$\epsilon = -6.006 \times 10^{-2} + 1.367 \times 10^{-3}T - 5.579 \times 10^{-7}T^2$$

where T is the cladding temperature (°C). Figure 6.3.4-1 presents the equation in graphical form. Note that in STRIKIN-II, the value for the emissivity is set to a minimum value of 0.25 below 253°C (487°F).

Application of the CENP model for the thermal emissivity of oxidized Zircaloy-4 to ZIRLO™ is acceptable on the following basis. As stated in Appendix A of Reference 6-45, since ZIRLO™ and Zircaloy-4 are both approximately 98% zirconium, their properties are expected to be insignificantly different except to the extent that they are affected by the differences in the temperature range over which the alpha-to-beta phase change occurs. As shown in Figure 6.3.4-1, the emissivity of Zircaloy-4 is not dependent on its alpha-to-beta transition temperature range (i.e., there are no inflections, discontinuities, etc., in the behavior of the emissivity over the transition temperature range). Consequently, it is expected that the emissivity of ZIRLO™ is also not dependent on its alpha-to-beta transition temperature range and, therefore, its emissivity would be similar to that of Zircaloy-4. Furthermore, the model is for oxidized cladding and, as noted above, Zircaloy-4 and ZIRLO™ are both approximately 98% zirconium. Therefore, it is concluded that the Zircaloy-4 model is applicable to ZIRLO™.



### 6.3.5 Thermal Expansion

The thermal expansion for Zircaloy-4 is used for ZIRLO™ in the Westinghouse Appendix K evaluation models for both radial and axial expansion. The model for thermal expansion in the radial direction ( $\Delta r/r$ ) is given by the following equation:

$$\left[ \frac{\Delta r}{r} \right] = \frac{1}{1000} \left[ \frac{T - T_0}{T_0} \right] \left[ \frac{T - T_0}{T_0} \right]$$

where T is cladding temperature (°F).

The CENP evaluation models use the thermal expansion model described in Reference 6-38. Note that in the CENP evaluation models, only the radial thermal expansion model is used. In Reference 6-38, the model is presented as a graph of thermal expansion versus temperature. As coded in STRIKIN-II, the model consists of a table of values for thermal expansion versus temperature (Reference 6-18, Appendix I). In PARCH, the model consists of a functional fit of the graphical information (Reference 6-24, Section II.b and Appendix B). As stated in Section 6.2.1, CEFLASH-4A uses the same model as used in PARCH.

The Westinghouse and CENP models are compared in Figure 6.3.5-1. As seen in the comparison, the change in thermal expansion that occurs as a result of the transformation from the alpha to the beta phase is reflected in the CENP model for Zircaloy-4. However, the Westinghouse model, which is applied to both Zircaloy-4 and ZIRLO™ , [

. ] Therefore, in the case of the CENP evaluation models, consistency with the Westinghouse Appendix K evaluation model approach (i.e., using the Zircaloy-4 model for ZIRLO™ ) would mean [

. ] A sensitivity study has shown that cladding temperature is not sensitive to changes in the cladding thermal expansion model that would result from modifying the Zircaloy-4 model to reflect the alpha-to-beta phase transformation temperatures for ZIRLO™. For example, use of the Westinghouse model for thermal expansion in the CENP LBLOCA evaluation model resulted in less than a [ ] change in the PCT for a typical case. Based on this lack of sensitivity of the PCT to changes in the

cladding thermal expansion model, the CENP evaluation models use the CENP Zircaloy-4 thermal expansion model for ZIRLO™.

6.3.6 Modulus of Elasticity

The modulus of elasticity for Zircaloy-4 is used for ZIRLO™ in the Westinghouse Appendix K evaluation models. Consistent with the Westinghouse approach, the CENP evaluation models also use the modulus of elasticity of Zircaloy-4 for ZIRLO™.

The model for the modulus of elasticity (E, kpsi) for Zircaloy-4 used in the CENP evaluation models is described in Reference 6-38. As coded in STRIKIN-II and PARCH, the model uses an equation for temperatures less than or equal to [ ] and linear interpolation from a table of values for temperatures above [ ]. The equation used in PARCH is as follows:

[ ]

where T is cladding temperature (°F). The same equation, but with more significant figures for the constants, is used in STRIKIN-II. The following table of values is used for temperatures above [ ].

Temperature, °F	Modulus of Elasticity, kpsi

The model is depicted in Figure 6.3.6-1.

Any actual difference between the modulus of elasticity of Zircaloy-4 and ZIRLO™ will have an insignificant impact on PCT for the following reasons. The modulus of elasticity, in conjunction with Poisson's ratio, is used in the calculation of the change in the cladding inside diameter due to mechanical expansion/contraction of the cladding. This change, together with the change

due to thermal expansion and plastic strain, is used to calculate the cladding inside diameter that is used in the calculation of the gap conductance in STRIKIN-II and PARCH. The mechanical component of the change in cladding diameter is small in comparison to the change due to thermal expansion and, when it occurs, plastic strain. Also, after the cladding ruptures, there is no differential pressure across the cladding and, consequently, there is no longer a mechanical component to the change in cladding diameter.

The cladding inside diameter is also used in the calculation of the gap pressure. In particular, it is used to calculate the volume of the gap between the fuel and the cladding. This volume is combined with the plenum volume at the top of the fuel rod and the fuel dish and porosity volumes to give the total gas volume used in the calculation of the gap pressure. For the same reason as described above, variations in the modulus of elasticity will have an insignificant impact on the gas volume and gap pressure.

Lastly, the modulus of elasticity is used in the calculation of the mechanical interface pressure between the fuel and the cladding, which is used in the calculation of the gap conductance when the fuel and cladding are in contact with each other. As described in Section 6.3.8, for a given transient, the fuel and cladding are either never in contact or are in contact for a short length of time. Consequently, variations in the modulus of elasticity will not have a significant impact on the transient gap conductance.

### 6.3.7 Poisson's Ratio

Poisson's ratio for Zircaloy-4 is used for ZIRLO™ in the Westinghouse Appendix K evaluation models. Consistent with the Westinghouse approach, the CENP evaluation models also use Poisson's ratio for Zircaloy-4 for ZIRLO™.

The equation for Poisson's ratio ( $\mu$ ) for Zircaloy-4 used in the CENP evaluation models is the following equation from Reference 6-38:

$$\mu = 0.301 - 7.03 \times 10^{-5} T \quad [ \quad ]$$

where  $T$  is cladding temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{F}$ ). [ ] is used for Poisson's ratio. The model is depicted in Figure 6.3.7-1.

As described in Section 6.3.6, Poisson's ratio, in conjunction with the modulus of elasticity, is used in the calculation of the inside diameter of the cladding, which is used in the calculation of the gap conductance and the gap pressure. For the same reasons described in Section 6.3.6, variations in Poisson's ratio will have an insignificant impact on the transient gap conductance and gap pressure and, hence, on the cladding temperature.

### 6.3.8 Diamond Pyramid Hardness

Cladding hardness is not used in the Westinghouse Appendix K evaluation models. However, it is used in the CENP evaluation models. In particular, the diamond pyramid hardness is used in the calculation of the fuel-to-cladding gap conductance in the STRIKIN-II and PARCH computer codes when the fuel and cladding are in contact with each other.

Figure 6.3.8-1 depicts the model for the diamond pyramid hardness used in the CENP evaluation models for Zircaloy-4. The model is described in Reference 6-38. It is based on data obtained for temperatures ranging from room temperature to  $1600^{\circ}\text{F}$ . Above  $1600^{\circ}\text{F}$  Zircaloy-4 becomes soft and hardness measurements are difficult. Consequently, above  $1600^{\circ}\text{F}$  the model consists of [

.]

Since the Westinghouse Appendix K evaluation models do not use a cladding hardness model, Reference 6-45 does not provide any specific information regarding the hardness of ZIRLO™. However, as described in Reference 6-45, the material properties of ZIRLO™ are similar to those of Zircaloy-4, except as they may be impacted by the difference in the temperature range over which the alpha-to-beta phase change occurs. As shown in Figure 6.3.8-1, there is no significant change in the behavior of the hardness of Zircaloy-4 as a result of the alpha-to-beta phase change. Therefore, it is expected that the hardness of ZIRLO™ is not significantly different from that of Zircaloy-4 even given the different temperature range over which the alpha-to-beta phase change occurs for the two alloys.

In addition, the cladding hardness is used in the calculation of the gap conductance only when the fuel and cladding are in contact. They are not initially in contact at lowburnup, including the burnup (typically ~1000 MWD/MTU) that produces the minimum initial gap conductance and maximum initial fuel average temperature. Also, at higher burnup, when the fuel and cladding may initially be in contact, they will remain in contact for only a short period of time during the LOCA transient as a result of the thermal and mechanical expansion of the cladding. Therefore, any differences in the diamond pyramid hardness between Zircaloy-4 and ZIRLO™ will have an insignificant impact on the transient gap conductance and, hence, on the cladding temperature.

For these reasons, the CENP evaluation models use the Zircaloy-4 model for diamond pyramid hardness for ZIRLO™.

### **6.3.9 Cladding Rupture Temperature**

#### **6.3.9.1 CENP Large Break LOCA Evaluation Model**

NUREG-0630 (Reference 6-39) describes the cladding rupture temperature, rupture strain, and assembly blockage models that were developed by the NRC for use in Appendix K evaluation models. The NUREG-0630 models for cladding rupture temperature, rupture strain, and assembly blockage are used in the Westinghouse Appendix K LBLOCA evaluation model and in the CENP LBLOCA evaluation model. However, because of the change in the temperature range over which the alpha-to-beta phase change occurs for ZIRLO™ versus Zircaloy-4, the models are not applicable to ZIRLO™ cladding. Consequently, Westinghouse conducted a rod burst test program for ZIRLO™ cladding and, following the methodology of NUREG-0630, developed rupture and blockage models for ZIRLO™ cladding that are used in the Westinghouse Appendix K evaluation models.

The ZIRLO™ cladding rupture temperature model is described in Reference 6-45 (pages 31-32 and Appendix D). The model is compared to the NUREG-0630 model in Figure 6.3.9.1-1. As described in Reference 6-45, unlike the NUREG-0630 model for Zircaloy-4, the ZIRLO™

model is not [ . ]

In implementing the rupture temperature versus engineering hoop stress model depicted in Figure 6.3.9.1-1, the Westinghouse LBLOCA Appendix K evaluation model includes a second criterion for predicting the occurrence of cladding rupture, namely, that [ . ]

The CENP LBLOCA evaluation model uses the Westinghouse model for the rupture temperature of ZIRLO™ cladding depicted in Figure 6.3.9.1-1. The model is presented in tabular form in Table 6.3.9.1-1 for the cladding dimensions of the CENP 14x14 and 16x16 fuel assemblies. The CENP LBLOCA evaluation model does not employ the second criterion[ . ] This results in earlier cladding rupture for any case in which the rupture temperature is reached before [ . ] Calculating early cladding rupture is consistent with Appendix K, which requires that the incidence of cladding rupture shall not be underestimated.

### **6.3.9.2 CENP Small Break LOCA Evaluation Model**

The CENP SBLOCA evaluation model uses the Westinghouse model for the rupture temperature of ZIRLO™ cladding [ . ] The model is presented in tabular form in Table 6.3.9.1-1 for the cladding dimensions of the CENP 14x14 and 16x16 fuel assemblies.

As described in Section 6.2.5, the CENP SBLOCA evaluation model does not use the NUREG-0630 cladding rupture temperature model for Zircaloy-4 cladding. Rather, it uses the [ . ] curve for rupture temperature versus differential pressure described in Reference 6-38. The curve is compared to the Westinghouse ZIRLO™ model in Figure 6.3.9.2-1 for the cladding dimensions of the CENP 14x14 and 16x16 fuel assemblies that are identified in Table 6.3.9.1-1.

## 6.3.10 Cladding Rupture Strain

### 6.3.10.1 CENP Large Break LOCA Evaluation Model

The ZIRLO™ model for circumferential strain at the burst elevation developed by Westinghouse is described in Reference 6-45 (page 32 and Appendix D). The model is a correlation of rupture strain as a function of rupture temperature that conservatively bounds the ZIRLO™ test data. The model is compared to the NUREG-0630 model in Figure 6.3.10.1-1. Similar to the ZIRLO™ cladding rupture temperature model, [ . ]

The CENP LBLOCA evaluation model uses the Westinghouse ZIRLO™ model for circumferential rupture strain described above. The model is presented in tabular form in Table 6.3.10.1-1.

Note that the Westinghouse rupture strain model, for both Zircaloy-4 and ZIRLO™ , [

]

This revision to the rupture strain model, which is applicable to both the LBLOCA and SBLOCA evaluation models, is described in Reference 6-46. It was reviewed and accepted by the NRC in Reference 6-47.

The CENP evaluation model for Zircaloy-4 does not include [ . ] Consequently, the ZIRLO™ rupture strain model described above is applied [ ] in the CENP LBLOCA evaluation model.

### **6.3.10.2 CENP Small Break LOCA Evaluation Model**

The CENP SBLOCA evaluation model uses the Westinghouse ZIRLO™ model for circumferential rupture strain as a function of rupture temperature. The model is presented in tabular form in Table 6.3.10.1-1. The model does not include the [ ] described in Section 6.3.10.1.

As described in Section 6.2.5, the CENP SBLOCA evaluation model does not use the NUREG-0630 cladding rupture strain model for Zircaloy-4 cladding. Rather, it uses the [ ] curve for rupture strain versus differential pressure described in Reference 6-38. The [ ] curves for both the CENP 14x14 and 16x16 fuel assembly dimensions are compared to the Westinghouse ZIRLO™ model in Figure 6.3.10.2-1.

### **6.3.11 Assembly Blockage versus Rupture Temperature**

The ZIRLO™ model for assembly blockage is described in Reference 6-45 (pages 32-33). It was developed from [ ]. The model is compared to the NUREG-0630 model in Figure 6.3.11-1.

The CENP LBLOCA evaluation model uses the Westinghouse ZIRLO™ model for assembly blockage. The model is presented in tabular form in Table 6.3.11-1. The CENP SBLOCA evaluation model does not use an assembly blockage model.

### **6.3.12 Pre-Rupture Plastic Strain**

The pre-rupture plastic strain model used in the CENP LBLOCA evaluation model calculates plastic strain as a function of the cladding temperature and the cladding rupture temperature and rupture strain. The model is used in STRIKIN-II to determine the inside diameter of the cladding that is used in the calculation of the fuel-to-cladding gap conductance and in the calculation of the fuel rod internal pressure. The model is also used in the CEFLASH-4A dynamic fuel rod internal pressure model. Because the results of SBLOCA analyses are less sensitive to the



fuel-to-cladding gap conductance, the CENP SBLOCA evaluation model does not use the plastic strain model.

The plastic strain model used in the LBLOCA evaluation model is the NRC model described in Reference 6-19 (Section II.B and Appendix A). It uses the following equation to calculate the amount of plastic strain:

$$\varepsilon_p = 0.2 * \varepsilon_R * \text{EXP}(0.0153 * (T - T_R))$$

where:

$\varepsilon_p$  = cladding plastic strain, %

$\varepsilon_R$  = cladding rupture strain, %

$T$  = cladding temperature, °F

$T_R$  = cladding rupture temperature, °F

As described in Section C.2 of Reference 6-25, the amount of plastic strain prior to cladding rupture is limited to a maximum of 10% in STRIKIN-II.

In applying the plastic strain model to ZIRLO™ cladding, the ZIRLO™ models for cladding rupture temperature and rupture strain, which are described in Sections 6.3.9.1 and 6.3.10.1, are used to specify the cladding rupture temperature and rupture strain. No other changes to the plastic strain model are required in order for it to be applicable to ZIRLO™.

In summary, the LBLOCA evaluation model uses the pre-rupture plastic strain model, described above, for ZIRLO™ with the rupture temperature and rupture strain calculated as described in Sections 6.3.9.1 and 6.3.10.1.

### **6.3.13 Metal-Water Reaction Rate**

Appendix E (Section H) to Reference 6-45 describes the ZIRLO™ metal-water reaction rate model. The model is based on data obtained from high temperature oxidation tests that were performed for twenty-four ZIRLO™ tubing samples. The parabolic rate constant,  $K$ , was

determined for each sample. An equation for K was then obtained by linear regression analysis of the logarithmic transform of the Arrhenius equation:

$$K = A * \text{EXP}(-Q/RT)$$

where:

K = parabolic rate constant, (gm/cm<sup>2</sup>)<sup>2</sup>/sec

A = constant, (gm/cm<sup>2</sup>)<sup>2</sup>/sec

Q = activation energy, cal/mole

R = gas constant, 1.987 cal/mole-°K

T = cladding temperature, °K

This yielded the following equation for the parabolic rate constant for ZIRLO™, at the upper 90% confidence level:

$$[ \hspace{10em} ]$$

where:

K = parabolic rate constant, (gm O/cm<sup>2</sup>)<sup>2</sup>/sec

T = cladding temperature, °K

Figure 6.3.13-1 compares the equation for the ZIRLO™ parabolic rate constant with the Baker-Just model equation (Reference 6-41). The comparison shows that the Baker-Just model predicts higher reaction rate constants than the ZIRLO™ model for temperatures above approximately 1800°F.

In compliance with Appendix K to 10 CFR 50, the CENP evaluation models use the Baker-Just metal-water reaction rate model for ZIRLO™ cladding. Since the Baker-Just model predicts higher reaction rates than the upper 90% confidence level fit to the ZIRLO™ oxidation test data, it provides a conservative prediction of the metal-water reaction rate for ZIRLO™ cladding.

## **6.4 Interface with Fuel Performance Model, FATES3B**

Section 6.3 describes the implementation of cladding models for ZIRLO™ in the CENP LBLOCA and SBLOCA ECCS performance evaluation models. Section 4 describes the implementation of cladding models for ZIRLO™ in the CENP fuel performance model, FATES3B. FATES3B provides the initial fuel centerline temperatures used by CEFLASH-4A and CEFLASH-4AS and the initial cladding dimensions, as well as other inputs, used by STRIKIN-II. This section compares the implementation of ZIRLO™ in the ECCS performance evaluation models and the fuel performance model. The purpose of the comparison is to demonstrate that the interface between the models is maintained and that, consequently, the STRIKIN-II initial fuel average temperatures continue to equal or exceed those calculated by FATES3B.

As described in Section 6.3, most of the Zircaloy-4 cladding models used in the CENP LBLOCA and SBLOCA ECCS performance evaluation models are applicable to ZIRLO™. However, ZIRLO™-specific models were implemented for specific heat and the cladding rupture temperature, rupture strain, and assembly blockage models. The models for these parameters were modified primarily because these parameters are dependent on the temperature range of the alpha-to-beta phase change, which is different for ZIRLO™ as compared to Zircaloy-4. Cladding specific heat is not used in FATES3B. Likewise, cladding rupture models are not used in FATES3B since FATES3B analyzes steady state fuel performance whereas cladding rupture models are required for transient analyses. Thus, none of the cladding models that were changed in the CENP ECCS performance evaluation models for ZIRLO™ are used in the fuel evaluation model.

As described in Section 4, ZIRLO™-specific models were implemented for thermal and irradiation induced creep and fuel rod axial growth in the fuel performance model. Neither the creep nor the axial growth models are used in the CENP ECCS performance evaluation models.

As further described in Section 6.3 and Section 4, none of the Zircaloy-4 cladding models used in the calculation of gap conductance (i.e., thermal emissivity, thermal expansion, modulus of elasticity, Poisson's ratio, and diamond pyramid hardness) were changed for ZIRLO™ in either STRIKIN-II or FATES3B.

Based on the above, it is seen that FATES3B continues to provide cold, crept-down cladding dimensions to STRIKIN-II and STRIKIN-II continues to calculate initial hot cladding dimensions from those dimensions using the same thermal expansion models as previously used. Likewise, both codes continue to use the same models for the cladding parameters that are used in the calculation of gap conductance that were previously used for Zircaloy-4. Therefore, no changes have been made to either STRIKIN-II or FATES3B that impact the interface between the two codes. Consequently, the STRIKIN-II initial fuel average temperatures will continue to equal or exceed those calculated by FATES3B for ZIRLO™ as they do for Zircaloy-4.

## **6.5 Impact of ZIRLO™ on ECCS Performance**

This section presents the results of an ECCS performance analysis for a typical CENP designed PWR fueled with ZIRLO™ clad CENP fuel assemblies. Results are provided for both a typical limiting LBLOCA (Section 6.5.1) and SBLOCA (Section 6.5.2). The results are compared to the results of equivalent analyses of Zircaloy-4 clad CENP fuel assemblies.

The analyses are presented as samples that are indicative of the transient behavior of ZIRLO™ cladding versus Zircaloy-4 cladding as calculated by the CENP LBLOCA and SBLOCA evaluation models. They are not intended to be referenced by licensees whose ECCS performance analyses use the CENP evaluation models when implementing ZIRLO™ cladding. The effect of implementing ZIRLO™ on PCT will be reported to the NRC in accordance with 10 CFR 50.46(a)(3)(ii) for each plant-specific implementation of ZIRLO™ cladding in CENP designed PWRs licensed with CENP ECCS performance evaluation models.

### **6.5.1 LBLOCA ECCS Performance**

#### **6.5.1.1 Method of Analysis**

The LBLOCA ECCS performance analysis described in this section uses the 1999 EM version of the CENP LBLOCA evaluation model (Reference 6-5) in conjunction with the ZIRLO™ cladding models described in Section 6.3 of this topical report. The computer codes that

comprise the 1999 EM are briefly described in Section 6.2. Table 6.2-1 provides a complete listing of the topical reports (excluding this topical report) that comprise the 1999 EM.

The analysis was performed for a 0.6 Double-Ended Guillotine break in the Reactor Coolant Pump Discharge Leg (0.6 DEG/PD), which is a typical limiting break size in the LBLOCA analyses of CENP designed PWRs using the CENP LBLOCA evaluation model. In the context of this analysis, analyzing a typical limiting break size is sufficient since the purpose of the analysis is to demonstrate the behavior of ZIRLO™ cladding under typical licensing analysis conditions and to compare the behavior to that of Zircaloy-4 cladding.

Hot rod heatup calculations were performed at the burnup with the maximum initial fuel stored energy and at the burnup with the highest initial rod internal pressure at the Peak Linear Heat Generation Rate (PLHGR) for both ZIRLO™ and Zircaloy-4 cladding. These two times-in-life were selected to provide examples of the impact of ZIRLO™ at two extremes in the burnup range of a reload cycle.

#### **6.5.1.2 Plant Design Data**

The sample LBLOCA analysis described in this section was performed for a typical CENP designed PWR. In particular, the plant has a rated core power of 2700Mwt (2754 Mwt including 2% power measurement uncertainty) and is fueled with 14x14 Guardian™ grid fuel assemblies with erbia burnable absorber fuel rods. Values for Reactor Coolant System (RCS), steam generator, safety injection system, and containment parameters that are typical of those used in LBLOCA analyses were used in the sample analysis. The plant design data used in the sample LBLOCA analysis for several important core and RCS parameters are listed in Table 6.5.1.2-1. Analyses are performed for both ZIRLO™ and Zircaloy-4 clad fuel rods.

#### **6.5.1.3 Results**

Tables 6.5.1.3-1 through 6.5.1.3-3 present important results for the sample LBLOCA analysis. Tables 6.5.1.3-1 and 6.5.1.3-2 compare the results for the cases run at the maximum stored energy burnup and the maximum rod internal pressure burnup, respectively. Table 6.5.1.3-3

compares the maximum cladding temperatures below, at, and above the elevation of cladding rupture for ZIRLO™ and Zircaloy-4 for the cases run at the maximum stored energy burnup and the maximum rod internal pressure burnup. Figures 6.5.1.3-1 through 6.5.1.3-3 compare the transient response of the cladding temperature, gap conductance, and cladding surface heat transfer coefficient at the location of the PCT for the ZIRLO™ and Zircaloy-4 cases run at the maximum stored energy burnup. The cladding oxidation percentage for the elevations with the maximum percentages are compared in Figure 6.5.1.3-4.

The sample analyses demonstrate that the impact of implementing ZIRLO™ on ECCS performance is seen primarily in the hot rod heatup analysis. Implementation of ZIRLO™ has only a minor impact on the blowdown and refill/reflood hydraulic transients. As shown in Tables 6.5.1.3-1 and 6.5.1.3-2, there are no significant differences in the timing of the hydraulic transients between the ZIRLO™ and Zircaloy-4 cases. Also, there is less than a 0.1% difference in the reflood rates between the ZIRLO™ and Zircaloy-4 cases.

As shown in the tables, the hot rod heatup transient is impacted by the implementation of ZIRLO™. In particular, as shown in Table 6.5.1.3-3, the impact on the local maximum cladding temperature depends on the location relative to the elevation of cladding rupture. The following paragraphs compare the behavior of cladding temperature for ZIRLO™ and Zircaloy-4 above, at, and below the elevation of cladding rupture.

The PCT is calculated to occur above the elevation of cladding rupture for both ZIRLO™ and Zircaloy-4 for both the maximum stored energy and maximum rod internal pressure cases. The PCT for ZIRLO™ is lower than that for Zircaloy-4 because the amount of assembly flow blockage is less for ZIRLO™ than for Zircaloy-4. As shown in Table 6.5.1.3-3, the difference in the PCT between ZIRLO™ and Zircaloy-4 is greater for the maximum stored energy case ( $2009^{\circ}\text{F} - 1951^{\circ}\text{F} = 58^{\circ}\text{F}$ ) than it is for the maximum rod internal pressure case ( $1971^{\circ}\text{F} - 1958^{\circ}\text{F} = 13^{\circ}\text{F}$ ). This is because the difference in the amount of assembly blockage is greater between ZIRLO™ and Zircaloy-4 for the maximum stored energy case than for the maximum rod internal pressure case. Also, the PCT for ZIRLO™ is greater for the maximum rod internal pressure case than it is for the maximum stored energy case because of the higher assembly blockage that occurs for the maximum rod internal pressure case.

A higher cladding temperature is calculated at the elevation of cladding rupture for ZIRLO™ than for Zircaloy-4 for the maximum stored energy case. This is because of the higher rupture strain calculated for the Zircaloy-4 case. With the higher rupture strain and, consequently, a larger cladding surface area, there is an increase in the energy removal from the cladding for the Zircaloy-4 case versus the ZIRLO™ case. This causes less of a heatup of the cladding at the rupture elevation after rupture for the Zircaloy-4 case than for the ZIRLO™ case. This results in a lower maximum cladding temperature for the Zircaloy-4 case at the rupture elevation. In particular, the maximum cladding temperature at the rupture elevation occurs less than 10 seconds after rupture for the Zircaloy-4 case in comparison to more than 200 seconds after rupture for the ZIRLO™ case.

In contrast to the maximum stored energy case, a lower cladding temperature is calculated at the elevation of cladding rupture for ZIRLO™ than for Zircaloy-4 for the maximum rod internal pressure case. This is a result of two factors. First, because of an earlier time of cladding rupture, the rupture elevation reaches a higher temperature for the Zircaloy-4 maximum rod internal pressure case relative to the maximum stored energy case (1825°F versus 1664°F). Secondly, for ZIRLO™, the amount of rupture strain is greater for the maximum rod internal pressure case versus the maximum stored energy case (53.0% versus 33.2%). Consequently, the rupture elevation reaches a lower temperature for the maximum rod internal pressure case versus the maximum stored energy case (1720°F versus 1845°F) as a result of the surface area effect described in the preceding paragraph. The net effect of these two factors is that the maximum cladding temperature at the rupture elevation for the ZIRLO™ case is less than that for the Zircaloy-4 case (1720°F versus 1825°F).

Below the elevation of cladding rupture, the maximum cladding temperature for ZIRLO™ is calculated to be greater than that of Zircaloy-4 for the maximum stored energy case but less than that for Zircaloy-4 for the maximum pin pressure case. This is the same trend that is seen for the rupture elevation. However, the magnitude of the differences between the maximum cladding temperatures for ZIRLO™ and Zircaloy-4 below the rupture elevation is smaller than that calculated at the rupture elevation. Below the rupture elevation, the cladding is cooled by FLECHT-based reflood heat transfer coefficients. Since the reflood rates are essentially

identical for the ZIRLO™ and Zircaloy-4 cases, the reflood heat transfer coefficients are also essentially identical. Consequently, only small differences in maximum cladding temperature between ZIRLO™ and Zircaloy-4 are expected. The small differences in the cladding temperatures that are observed below the rupture elevation are due to differences in the amount of plastic strain calculated for ZIRLO™ and Zircaloy-4.

With respect to maximum cladding oxidation, a higher value is calculated for ZIRLO™ than for Zircaloy-4 for both the maximum stored energy case and the maximum rod internal case. For ZIRLO™, the maximum cladding oxidation is calculated to occur at the elevation of cladding rupture, whereas for Zircaloy-4, it is calculated to occur at the elevation of PCT, which is above the elevation of cladding rupture. The differences in the location and magnitude of the maximum cladding oxidation between ZIRLO™ and Zircaloy-4 is a direct consequence of the differences in the cladding temperatures at and above the elevation of cladding rupture described above.

In summary, the sample cases demonstrate that the implementation of ZIRLO™ cladding has a very small impact on the blowdown and refill/reflood hydraulic transients of a LBLOCA. However, the implementation of ZIRLO™ does have an impact on the hot rod heatup transient, primarily as a result of the differences in the cladding rupture and blockage characteristics of ZIRLO™ relative to Zircaloy-4. The differences in the cladding rupture and blockage characteristics for ZIRLO™ result in a lower cladding temperature above the elevation of cladding rupture. At and below the cladding rupture elevation, the relative behavior of the cladding temperature is a function of burnup. For the sample LBLOCA analysis, the PCT occurred above the elevation of cladding rupture and, consequently, the PCTs for the two ZIRLO™ cases are lower than for the two Zircaloy-4 cases.

The impact on PCT of implementing ZIRLO™ cladding will be determined for each plant-specific implementation of ZIRLO™ cladding in a CENP designed PWR. Depending on whether the PCT is calculated to occur above or below the elevation of cladding rupture, the impact may be determined to be positive or negative. The impact will be reported to the NRC in accordance with 10 CFR 50.46(a)(3)(ii).



## **6.5.2 SBLOCA ECCS Performance**

### **6.5.2.1 Method of Analysis**

The SBLOCA ECCS performance analysis of ZIRLO™ cladding described in this section uses the S2M version of the CENP SBLOCA evaluation model (Reference 6-8) in conjunction with the ZIRLO™ cladding models described in Section 6.3 of this topical report. The computer codes that comprise the S2M evaluation model are briefly described in Section 6.2. Table 6.2-1 provides a complete listing of the topical reports (excluding this topical report) that comprise the S2M evaluation model.

The hot rod heatup portion of the analysis was performed using only the PARCH computer code and not STRIKIN-II. As described in Section 6.2, STRIKIN-II is used in a SBLOCA analysis to perform the initial portion of the hot rod heatup calculation, i.e., when the Reactor Coolant Pumps (RCPs) are maintaining forced convection heat transfer conditions in the core. PARCH is then used after the RCPs have coasted down and the mode of core heat transfer has changed to pool boiling. The PCT, which occurs during the pool boiling period of the transient (when the core is partially uncovered), is not sensitive to the specific cladding conditions calculated during the forced convection period provided that the PARCH node, in which the PCT is calculated to occur, is initialized in a post-DNB heat transfer regime.

The analysis was performed for a 0.1 ft<sup>2</sup> break in the RCP discharge leg (0.1 ft<sup>2</sup>/PD). The 0.1 ft<sup>2</sup>/PD break is a typical limiting SBLOCA for the 2700 Mwt class of CENP designed PWRs equipped with 200 psi SITs. As noted in Section 6.5.1.1 for the LBLOCA analysis, analyzing a typical limiting break size is sufficient for the purpose of the analysis.

The analysis was performed at the burnup with the maximum initial fuel stored energy.

### **6.5.2.2 Plant Design Data**

The sample SBLOCA analysis was performed for the same typical CENP designed PWR that was used in the LBLOCA analysis described in Section 6.5.1. The plant has a rated core power

of 2700 Mwt (2754 Mwt including 2% power measurement uncertainty) and is fueled with 14x14 Guardian™ grid fuel assemblies with erbia burnable absorber fuel rods. Values for RCS, steam generator, and safety injection system parameters that are typical of those used in SBLOCA analyses were used in the sample analysis. The plant design data used in the sample SBLOCA analysis for important core and RCS parameters are listed in Table 6.5.2.2-1. Analyses are performed for both ZIRLO™ and Zircaloy-4 clad fuel rods.

### **6.5.2.3 Results**

Table 6.5.2.3-1 lists the important results of the sample SBLOCA analysis of ZIRLO™ clad fuel assemblies. The results are compared to the results for Zircaloy-4 clad fuel assemblies in the same table. Figures 6.5.2.3-1 through 6.5.2.3-3 compare the transient response of the cladding temperature, coolant temperature and cladding surface heat transfer coefficient at the location of the PCT for ZIRLO™ and Zircaloy-4 cladding.

The implementation of ZIRLO™ has an insignificant impact on the RCS hydraulic transient response of a SBLOCA. In particular, the transient response of parameters such as core power, RCS pressure, break flow rate, and inner vessel inlet flow and two-phase level (which are the parameters typically presented in SBLOCA ECCS performance analysis licensing submittals of CENP designed PWRs) showed no significant differences for ZIRLO™ in comparison to Zircaloy-4. As shown in Figures 6.5.2.3-1 through 6.5.2.3-3, there is also very little difference in the transient behavior of the hot rod at the elevation of PCT. In particular, there is only a 4°F difference in the PCT between ZIRLO™ cladding and Zircaloy-4 cladding in the sample SBLOCA analysis. Because of the difference in the cladding rupture models, there is a difference in the time of cladding rupture and the maximum cladding temperature of the rupture elevation. As shown in Table 6.5.2.3-1, cladding rupture occurred 25 seconds earlier for the ZIRLO™ cladding (1038 seconds versus 1063 seconds). The maximum cladding temperature at the rupture elevation is 26°F higher for the ZIRLO™ cladding (1678°F versus 1652°F).

In summary, the sample SBLOCA analysis shows that the implementation of ZIRLO™ cladding has a very small impact on the hydraulic transient of a SBLOCA and on the hot rod heatup transient for elevations other than the elevation of cladding rupture. At the elevation of cladding

rupture, differences are seen in the cladding temperature due to the differences between the ZIRLO™ and Zircaloy-4 cladding rupture temperature and rupture strain models. In the sample SBLOCA analysis, the ZIRLO™ case has a higher maximum cladding temperature at the elevation of cladding rupture than the Zircaloy-4 case. In general, however, depending on the time of rupture and the rupture strain, either ZIRLO™ cladding or Zircaloy-4 cladding may have the higher maximum cladding temperature at the rupture elevation. Also, for a given hydraulic transient, the PCT may occur at the rupture elevation.

## **6.6 Conclusions**

Section 6 describes the implementation of ZIRLO™ cladding in the 1999 EM and S2M versions of the CENP LBLOCA and SBLOCA ECCS performance evaluation models. ZIRLO™-specific models for specific heat, cladding rupture temperature, rupture strain and assembly blockage are incorporated in the evaluation models. The Zircaloy-4 models for all other cladding parameters are used without any changes for ZIRLO™ cladding. With the implementation of the ZIRLO™ models as described in Section 6.3, the 1999 EM version of the LBLOCA evaluation model and the S2M version of the SBLOCA evaluation model are applicable to ECCS performance analyses of CENP designed PWRs fueled with ZIRLO™ clad fuel assemblies.

Sample LBLOCA and SBLOCA analyses for a typical CENP designed PWR show that the transient behavior of ZIRLO™ cladding is similar to that of Zircaloy-4 cladding. The major difference in behavior occurs in the hot rod heatup transient as a result of differences between the ZIRLO™ and Zircaloy-4 cladding rupture models.

The implementation of ZIRLO™ impacts the PCT. Consequently, the effect on PCT will be reported to the NRC in accordance with 10 CFR 50.46(a)(3)(ii) for each plant-specific implementation of ZIRLO™ cladding in a CENP designed PWR.

## 6.7 References

- 6-1 CENPD-132P, "Calculative Methods for the C-E Large Break LOCA Evaluation Model," August 1974.
- 6-2 CENPD-132P, Supplement 1, "Calculational Methods for the C-E Large Break LOCA Evaluation Model," February 1975.
- 6-3 CENPD-132-P, Supplement 2-P, "Calculational Methods for the C-E Large Break LOCA Evaluation Model," July 1975.
- 6-4 CENPD-132, Supplement 3-P-A, "Calculative Methods for the C-E Large Break LOCA Evaluation Model for the Analysis of C-E and W Designed NSSS," June 1985.
- 6-5 CENPD-132, Supplement 4-P, Revision 1, "Calculative Methods for the CE Nuclear Power Large Break LOCA Evaluation Model," August 2000.
- 6-6 CENPD-137P, "Calculative Methods for the C-E Small Break LOCA Evaluation Model," August 1974.
- 6-7 CENPD-137, Supplement 1-P, "Calculative Methods for the C-E Small Break LOCA Evaluation Model," January 1977.
- 6-8 CENPD-137, Supplement 2-P-A, "Calculative Methods for the ABB CE Small Break LOCA Evaluation Model," April 1998.
- 6-9 CENPD-133P, "CEFLASH-4A, A FORTRAN-IV Digital Computer Program for Reactor Blowdown Analysis," August 1974.
- 6-10 CENPD-133P, Supplement 2, "CEFLASH-4A, A FORTRAN-IV Digital Computer Program for Reactor Blowdown Analysis (Modifications)," February 1975.
- 6-11 CENPD-133, Supplement 4-P, "CEFLASH-4A, A FORTRAN-IV Digital Computer Program for Reactor Blowdown Analysis," April 1977.
- 6-12 CENPD-133, Supplement 5-A, "CEFLASH-4A, A FORTRAN77 Digital Computer Program for Reactor Blowdown Analysis," June 1985.
- 6-13 CENPD-133P, Supplement 1, "CEFLASH-4AS, A Computer Program for the Reactor Blowdown Analysis of the Small Break Loss of Coolant Accident," August 1974.
- 6-14 CENPD-133, Supplement 3-P, "CEFLASH-4AS, A Computer Program for the Reactor Blowdown Analysis of the Small Break Loss of Coolant Accident," January 1977.
- 6-15 CENPD-134P, "COMPERC-II, A Program for Emergency Refill-Reflood of the Core," August 1974.
- 6-16 CENPD-134P, Supplement 1, "COMPERC-II, A Program for Emergency Refill-Reflood of the Core (Modifications)," February 1975.
- 6-17 CENPD-134, Supplement 2-A, "COMPERC-II, Program for Emergency Refill-Reflood of the Core," June 1985.
- 6-18 CENPD-135P, "STRIKIN-II, A Cylindrical Geometry Fuel Rod Heat Transfer Program," August 1974.

- 6-19 CENPD-135P Supplement 2, "STRIKIN-II, A Cylindrical Geometry Fuel Rod Heat Transfer Program (Modifications)," February 1975.
- 6-20 CENPD-135, Supplement 4-P, "STRIKIN-II, A Cylindrical Geometry Fuel Rod Heat Transfer Program," August 1976.
- 6-21 CENPD-135-P, Supplement 5, "STRIKIN-II, A Cylindrical Geometry Fuel Rod Heat Transfer Program," April 1977.
- 6-22 CENPD-138P, "PARCH, A FORTRAN-IV Digital Program to Evaluate Pool Boiling, Axial Rod and Coolant Heatup," August 1974.
- 6-23 CENPD-138P, Supplement 1, "PARCH, A FORTRAN-IV Digital Program to Evaluate Pool Boiling, Axial Rod and Coolant Heatup (Modifications)," February 1975.
- 6-24 CENPD-138, Supplement 2-P, "PARCH, A FORTRAN-IV Digital Program to Evaluate Pool Boiling, Axial Rod and Coolant Heatup," January 1977.
- 6-25 LD-81-095, Enclosure 1-P-A, "C-E ECCS Evaluation Model, Flow Blockage Analysis," December 1981.
- 6-26 CENPD-213-P, "Reflood Heat Transfer, Application of FLECHT Reflood Heat Transfer Coefficients to C-E's 16x16 Fuel Bundles," January 1976.
- 6-27 O. D. Parr (NRC) to F. M. Stern (C-E), June 13, 1975.
- 6-28 O. D. Parr (NRC) to A. E. Scherer (C-E), December 9, 1975.
- 6-29 D. M. Crutchfield (NRC) to A. E. Scherer (C-E), "Safety Evaluation of Combustion Engineering ECCS Large Break Evaluation Model and Acceptance for Referencing of Related Licensing Topical Reports," July 31, 1986.
- 6-30 S. A. Richards (NRC) to P. W. Richardson (Westinghouse CENP), "Safety Evaluation of Topical Report CENPD-132, Supplement 4, Revision 1, 'Calculative Methods for the CE Nuclear Power Large Break LOCA Evaluation Model' (TAC No. MA5660)," December 15, 2000.
- 6-31 K. Kniel (NRC) to A. E. Scherer (C-E), "Evaluation of Topical Reports CENPD-133, Supplement 3-P and CENPD-137, Supplement 1-P," September 27, 1977.
- 6-32 T. H. Essig (NRC) to I. C. Rickard (ABB CENP), "Acceptance for Referencing of the Topical Report CENPD-137(P), Supplement 2, 'Calculative Methods for the C-E Small Break LOCA Evaluation Model' (TAC No. M95687)," December 16, 1997.
- 6-33 K. Kniel (NRC) to A. E. Scherer (C-E), "Combustion Engineering Emergency Core Cooling System Evaluation Model," November 12, 1976.
- 6-34 R. L. Baer (NRC) to A. E. Scherer (C-E), "Evaluation of Topical Report CENPD-135, Supplement No. 5," September 6, 1978.
- 6-35 K. Kniel (NRC) to A. E. Scherer (C-E), "Evaluation of Topical Report CENPD-138, Supplement 2-P," April 10, 1978.
- 6-36 K. Kniel (NRC) to A. E. Scherer (C-E), August 2, 1976.
- 6-37 BMI-1803, "Specific Heats and Heats of Transformation of Zircaloy-2 and Low Nickel Zircaloy-2," E. A. Eldridge and H. W. Deem, May 31, 1967.

- 6-38 CENPD-136, "High Temperature Properties of Zircaloy and  $\text{UO}_2$  for Use in LOCA Evaluation Models," July 1974.
- 6-39 NUREG-0630, "Cladding Swelling and Rupture Models for LOCA Analysis," D. A. Powers and R. O. Meyer, April 1980.
- 6-40 "WREM: Water Reactor Evaluation Model," Regulatory Staff, Technical Review, United States Atomic Energy Commission, October 1974.
- 6-41 ANL-6548, "Studies of Metal-Water Reactions at High Temperatures, III. Experimental and Theoretical Studies of the Zirconium-Water Reaction," L. Baker and L. C. Just, May 1962.
- 6-42 CENPD-279, Supplement 6, "Annual Report on ABB CE ECCS Performance Evaluation Models," February 1995.
- 6-43 CENPD-185-P-A, "Clad Rupture Behavior, LOCA Rupture Behavior of 16x16 Zircaloy Cladding," May 1975.
- 6-44 O. D. Parr (NRC) to A. E. Scherer (C-E), October 30, 1975.
- 6-45 WCAP-12610-P-A, "VANTAGE+ Fuel Assembly Reference Core Report," April 1995.
- 6-46 NSD-NRC-98-5575, H. A. Sepp (Westinghouse) to Document Control Desk (NRC), "1997 Annual Notification of Changes to the Westinghouse Small Break LOCA and Large Break LOCA ECCS Evaluation Models, Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.46 (a)(3)(ii)," April 8, 1998.
- 6-47 A. C. Thadani (NRC) to W. J. Johnson (Westinghouse), "Acceptance for Referencing of Licensing Topical Report WCAP-10924, Volume 1, Addendum 4," February 8, 1991.

**Table 6.2-1**

**Topical Reports and Safety Evaluation Reports for the 1999 EM and the S2M**

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Topical Report Reference</b>	<b>Safety Evaluation Report Reference</b>
LBLOCA Evaluation Model (CENPD-132)	6-1	6-27
Supplement 1	6-2	6-27
Supplement 2	6-3	6-28
Supplement 3	6-4	6-29
Supplement 4	6-5	6-30
SBLOCA Evaluation Model (CENPD-137)	6-6	6-27
Supplement 1	6-7	6-31
Supplement 2	6-8	6-32
CEFLASH-4A (CENPD-133)	6-9	6-27
Supplement 2	6-10	6-27
Supplement 4	6-11	6-30
Supplement 5	6-12	6-29
CEFLASH-4AS		
Supplement 1 to CENPD-133	6-13	6-27
Supplement 3 to CENPD-133	6-14	6-31
COMPERC-II (CENPD-134)	6-15	6-27
Supplement 1	6-16	6-27
Supplement 2	6-17	6-29
STRIKIN-II (CENPD-135)	6-18	6-27
Supplement 2	6-19	6-27
Supplement 4	6-20	6-33
Supplement 5	6-21	6-34
PARCH (CENPD-138)	6-22	6-27
Supplement 1	6-23	6-27
Supplement 2	6-24	6-35
HCROSS		
Appendix A to Enclosure 1 to LD-81-095	6-25	6-29
COMZIRC		
Appendix C to Supplement 1 to CENPD-134	6-16	6-27
Application of FLECHT Correlation to 16x16 Fuel Assemblies (CENPD-213)	6-26	6-36
Application of NUREG-0630 Cladding Rupture and Swelling Models (Enclosure 1 to LD-81-095)	6-25	6-29

**Table 6.2-2**

**Cladding Models Used in the 1999 EM and S2M Evaluation Models**

<b>Cladding Model</b>	<b>Source Document Reference</b>
Specific Heat	6-37
Density	6-37
Thermal Conductivity	6-38
Thermal Emissivity	6-38
Thermal Expansion	6-38
Modulus of Elasticity	6-38
Poisson's Ratio	6-38
Diamond Pyramid Hardness	6-38
Rupture Temperature	6-39 (LBLOCA) 6-38 (SBLOCA)
Rupture Strain	6-39 (LBLOCA) 6-38 (SBLOCA)
Assembly Blockage following Rupture	6-39 (LBLOCA)
Pre-Rupture Plastic Strain	6-40 (LBLOCA)
Metal-Water Reaction Rate	6-41



**Table 6.3.1-1**

**ZIRLO™ Specific Heat  
Used in Westinghouse Appendix K Evaluation Models**

[

]

**Table 6.3.1-2**

**ZIRLO™ Specific Heat  
Used in Westinghouse Best Estimate Evaluation Model**

**[**

**]**

**Table 6.3.1-3**

**Zircaloy-4 Specific Heat  
Used in CENP ECCS Performance Evaluation Models**

<b>Temperature, °F</b>	<b>Specific Heat, BTU/lbm-°F</b>
68	0.070098
1067	0.082103
1112	0.086112
1468	0.086112
1535	0.136186
1580	0.148191
1661	0.197262
1679	0.197262
1787	0.085110
10000	0.085232

**Table 6.3.9.1-1**

**ZIRLO™ Cladding Rupture Temperature Model**

[

]

**Table 6.3.10.1-1**

**ZIRLO™ Cladding Rupture Strain Model**

[

]

**Table 6.3.11-1**

**ZIRLO™ Cladding Assembly Blockage Model**

**[**

**]**

**Table 6.5.1.2-1****Important Plant Design Data Used in the  
LBLOCA ECCS Performance Analysis of ZIRLO™ Cladding**

Parameter	ZIRLO™ Cladding	Zr-4 Cladding
Core power (102% of rated), Mwt	2754	2754
Peak linear heat generation rate (PLHGR) of the hot rod, kw/ft	14.3	14.3
PLHGR of the average rod in assembly with hot rod, kw/ft	13.48	13.48
RCS flow rate, lbm/hr	128.4x10 <sup>6</sup>	128.4x10 <sup>6</sup>
Core flow rate, lbm/hr	123.6x10 <sup>6</sup>	123.6x10 <sup>6</sup>
RCS pressure, psia	2250	2250
Cold leg temperature, °F	546	546
Gap conductance at the PLHGR, BTU/hr-ft <sup>2</sup> -°F <sup>(1)</sup>	2389 / 2940	2156 / 2946
Fuel centerline temperature at the PLHGR, °F <sup>(1)</sup>	3381 / 3316	3417 / 3315
Fuel average temperature at the PLHGR, °F <sup>(1)</sup>	2065 / 1999	2095 / 1996
Hot rod gas pressure, psia <sup>(1)</sup>	1092 / 2351	1093 / 2304
Burnable absorber	Erbia	Erbia

Note:

- (1) Values are for the maximum initial fuel stored energy and maximum initial rod internal pressure cases, respectively.

**Table 6.5.1.3-1**

**Important Results of the LBLOCA ECCS Performance Analysis of ZIRLO™ Cladding  
for the Maximum Initial Fuel Stored Energy Cases**

<b>Parameter</b>	<b>ZIRLO™ Cladding</b>	<b>Zr-4 Cladding</b>
Peak cladding temperature (PCT), °F	1951	2009
Time of PCT, sec	264	264
Elevation of PCT, ft	7.97	7.97
Maximum cladding oxidation, %	6.80	5.04
Elevation of maximum cladding oxidation, ft	7.40	7.97
Core-wide cladding oxidation, %	0.34	0.25
Time of cladding rupture, sec	35.82	36.56
Elevation of cladding rupture, ft	7.40	7.40
Cladding rupture temperature, °F	1569	1589
Cladding differential pressure at rupture, psi	702	575
Cladding rupture strain, %	33.2	73.2
Assembly blockage, %	24.1	58.0
Time SIT flow begins, sec	17.5	17.4
Time of annulus downflow, sec	21.2	21.2
Time of beginning of reflood, sec	36.1	36.1
Time safety injection pump flow begins, sec	35.8	35.8
Time SIT flow ends, sec	68.7	68.7
Reflood rates, in./sec		
First	1.714	1.713
Second	1.129	1.129
Third	0.6818	0.6817



**Table 6.5.1.3-2**

**Important Results of the LBLOCA ECCS Performance Analysis of ZIRLO™ Cladding  
for the Maximum Initial Rod Internal Pressure Cases**

<b>Parameter</b>	<b>ZIRLO™ Cladding</b>	<b>Zr-4 Cladding</b>
Peak cladding temperature (PCT), °F	1958	1971
Time of PCT, sec	264	264
Elevation of PCT, ft	7.97	7.97
Maximum cladding oxidation, %	5.11	4.56
Elevation of maximum cladding oxidation, ft	7.40	7.97
Core-wide cladding oxidation, %	0.26	0.22
Time of cladding rupture, sec	28.46	29.04
Elevation of cladding rupture, ft	7.40	7.40
Cladding rupture temperature, °F	1454	1515
Cladding differential pressure at rupture, psi	1237	1183
Cladding rupture strain, %	53.0	65.1
Assembly blockage, %	40.2	50.4
Time SIT flow begins, sec	17.4	17.4
Time of annulus downflow, sec	21.2	21.2
Time of beginning of reflood, sec	36.1	36.1
Time safety injection pump flow begins, sec	35.8	35.8
Time SIT flow ends, sec	68.7	68.7
Reflood rates, in./sec		
First	1.713	1.714
Second	1.128	1.130
Third	0.6816	0.6818

**Table 6.5.1.3-3**

**Comparison of ZIRLO™ and Zircaloy-4 Maximum Cladding Temperatures  
for the LBLOCA ECCS Performance Analysis**

Location on Hot Rod	Maximum Cladding Temperature, °F / Time of Max. Cladding Temp., sec	
	ZIRLO™	Zircaloy-4
Burnup with Maximum Initial Fuel Stored Energy		
Below Rupture Elevation	1881 / 188	1869 / 189
At Rupture Elevation	1845 / 265	1664 / 43
Above Rupture Elevation	1951 / 264	2009 / 264
Burnup with Maximum Initial Rod Internal Pressure		
Below Rupture Elevation	1882 / 187	1889 / 186
At Rupture Elevation	1720 / 306	1825 / 44
Above Rupture Elevation	1958 / 264	1971 / 264

**Note:** In each case, the cladding ruptured at the elevation of the PLHGR and the maximum cladding temperatures above and below rupture occurred in the STRIKIN-II nodes immediately above and below the rupture node.

**Table 6.5.2.2-1**

**Important Plant Design Data Used in the  
SBLOCA ECCS Performance Analysis of ZIRLO™ Cladding**

<b>Parameter</b>	<b>ZIRLO™ Cladding</b>	<b>Zr-4 Cladding</b>
Core power (102% of rated), Mwt	2754	2754
Peak linear heat generation rate of the hot rod, kw/ft	14.5	14.5
RCS flow rate, lbm/hr	$128.4 \times 10^6$	$128.4 \times 10^6$
RCS pressure, psia	2250	2250
Cold leg temperature, °F	546	546
Burnable absorber	Erbia	Erbia

**Table 6.5.2.3-1****Important Results of the SBLOCA ECCS Performance Analysis of ZIRLO™ Cladding**

<b>Parameter</b>	<b>ZIRLO™ Cladding</b>	<b>Zr-4 Cladding</b>
Peak cladding temperature (PCT), °F	1712	1716
Time of PCT, sec	1225	1235
Elevation of PCT, ft	11.39	11.39
Maximum cladding oxidation, %	3.36	3.51
Elevation of maximum cladding oxidation, ft	10.82	10.82
Core-wide cladding oxidation, %	0.35	0.36
Time of cladding rupture, sec	1038	1063
Elevation of cladding rupture, ft	10.82	10.82
Maximum cladding temperature at elevation of cladding rupture, °F	1678	1652

**Figure 6.3.1-1**

**Comparison of the Westinghouse EM Specific Heat Models for ZIRLO™  
to the CENP EM Specific Heat Model for Zircaloy-4**

**[**

**]**

**Figure 6.3.3-1**

**Comparison of the Westinghouse EM Thermal Conductivity Model for ZIRLO™  
to the CENP EM Thermal Conductivity Models for Zircaloy-4**

**[**

**]**

**Figure 6.3.4-1**

**CENP EM Thermal Emissivity Model for Zircaloy-4**

**[**

**]**

**Figure 6.3.5-1**

**Comparison of the Westinghouse EM Thermal Expansion Model for ZIRLO™  
to the CENP EM Thermal Expansion Models for Zircaloy-4**

**[**

**]**



**Figure 6.3.6-1**

**CENP EM Modulus of Elasticity Model for Zircaloy-4**

[

]

**Figure 6.3.7-1**

**CENP EM Poisson's Ratio Model for Zircaloy-4**

[

]

**Figure 6.3.8-1**

**CENP EM Diamond Pyramid Hardness Model for Zircaloy-4**

**[**

**]**

**Figure 6.3.9.1-1**

**Comparison of the ZIRLO™ and NUREG-0630  
Cladding Rupture Temperature Models**

[

]

**Figure 6.3.9.2-1**

**Comparison of the ZIRLO™ and CENP SBLOCA EM  
Cladding Rupture Temperature Models**

[

]

**Figure 6.3.10.1-1**

**Comparison of the ZIRLO™ and NUREG-0630  
Cladding Rupture Strain Models**

[

]

**Figure 6.3.10.2-1**

**Comparison of the ZIRLO™ and CENP SBLOCA EM  
Cladding Rupture Strain Models**

**[**

**]**

**Figure 6.3.11-1**

**Comparison of the ZIRLO™ and NUREG-0630  
Assembly Blockage Models**

[

]



**Figure 6.3.13-1**

**Comparison of the ZIRLO™ and Baker-Just Model Parabolic Rate Correlations**

[

]

**Figure 6.5.1.3-1**

**Peak Cladding Temperature  
for the LBLOCA ECCS Performance Analysis of ZIRLO™ Cladding  
(0.6 DEG/PD Break, Maximum Stored Energy Case)**

[

1

**Figure 6.5.1.3-2**

**Hot Spot Gap Conductance  
for the LBLOCA ECCS Performance Analysis of ZIRLO™ Cladding  
(0.6 DEG/PD Break, Maximum Stored Energy Case)**

**[**

**]**

**Figure 6.5.1.3-3**

**Hot Spot Heat Transfer Coefficient  
for the LBLOCA ECCS Performance Analysis of ZIRLO™ Cladding  
(0.6 DEG/PD Break, Maximum Stored Energy Case)**

[

]

**Figure 6.5.1.3-4**

**Maximum Cladding Oxidation Percentage  
for the LBLOCA ECCS Performance Analysis of ZIRLO™ Cladding  
(0.6 DEG/PD Break, Maximum Stored Energy Case)**

**[**

**]**

**Figure 6.5.2.3-1**

**Peak Cladding Temperature  
for the SBLOCA ECCS Performance Analysis of ZIRLO™ Cladding  
(0.1 ft<sup>2</sup>/PD Break)**

[

]

**Figure 6.5.2.3-2**

**Coolant Temperature at the Elevation of the PCT  
for the SBLOCA ECCS Performance Analysis of ZIRLO™ Cladding  
(0.1 ft<sup>2</sup>/PD Break)**

[

]

**Figure 6.5.2.3-3**

**Heat Transfer Coefficient at the Elevation of the PCT  
for the SBLOCA ECCS Performance Analysis of ZIRLO™ Cladding  
(0.1 ft<sup>2</sup>/PD Break)**

[

]