

WCAP-11902
Supplement 1

DERATED POWER AND REVISED
TEMPERATURE AND PRESSURE OPERATION
FOR
DONALD C. COOK NUCLEAR PLANT
UNITS 1 & 2
LICENSING REPORT

September 1989

WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC CORPORATION
Energy Systems Business Unit
P.O. BOX 355
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15230

9144e:1d/092189

9005250201 900514
PDR ADOCK 05000316
P PDR

TABLE S-2.1-1

COOK NUCLEAR PLANT UNITS 1 AND 2
DESIGN POWER CAPABILITY PARAMETERS FOR RERATING PROGRAM

<u>Parameter</u>	(Unit 1, Original) <u>Case 1</u>	(Unit 2, Current) <u>Case 2</u>
NSSS Power, MWt	3250	3423
Core Power, MWt	3250	3411
RCS Flow, (gpm/loop)*	88,500	***
Minimum Measured Flow, (total gpm)**	366,400	364,960
RCS Temperatures, °F		
Core Outlet	602.0	-
Vessel Outlet	599.3	-
Core Average	570.5	575.5
Vessel Average	567.8	574.1
Vessel/Core Inlet	536.3	-
Steam Generator Outlet	536.3	-
Zero Load	547.0	547.0
RCS Pressure, psia	2250	2250
Steam Pressure, psia	758	794.4
Steam Flow, (10 ⁶ lb/hr.tot.)	14.12	14.6
Feedwater Temperature, °F	434.8	423.4
% SG Tube Plugging	0	10% avg./ 15% peak

Flow Definitions:

*RCS Flow (Thermal Design Flow) - The conservatively low flow used for thermal/hydraulic design. The design parameters listed above are based on this flow.

**Minimum Measured Flow - The flow specified in the Tech. Specs. which must be confirmed or exceeded by the flow measurements obtained during plant startup and is the flow used in reactor core DNB analyses for plants applying the Improved Thermal Design Procedure.

***Flow values supplied in FSAR₆ for Unit 2 are 141.3×10^6 lb/hr for vessel coolant flow, and 134.9×10^6 lb/hr for active core flow.

Note: Dashes in Case 2 indicate information which was not contained in the FSAR, and is therefore information which is unavailable to Westinghouse.

TABLE S-2.1-1 (Cont'd)

COOK NUCLEAR PLANT UNITS 1 AND 2
DESIGN POWER CAPABILITY PARAMETERS FOR RERATING PROGRAM

<u>Parameter</u>	(Revised) <u>Case 3</u>	(Revised) <u>Case 4</u>	(Revised) <u>Case 5</u>	(Revised) <u>Case 6</u>
NSSS Power, MWt	3262	3425	3425	3425
Core Power, MWt	3250	3413	3413	3413
RCS Flow, (gpm/loop)*	88,500	88,500	88,500	88,500
Minimum Measured Flow, (total gpm)**	366,400	366,400	366,400	366,400
RCS Temperatures, °F				
Core Outlet	610.1	583.6	614.0	613.9
Vessel Outlet	607.5	580.7	611.2	611.2
Core Average	579.2	549.7	581.8	581.8
Vessel Average	576.3	547.0	578.7	578.7
Vessel/Core Inlet	545.2	513.3	546.2	546.2
Steam Generator Outlet	545.0	513.1	546.0	546.0
Zero Load	547.0	547.0	547.0	547.0
RCS Pressure, psia	2250 or 2100	2250 or 2100	2250 or 2100	2250 or 2100
Steam Pressure, psia	807	603	820	806
Steam Flow, (10 ⁶ lb/hr.tot.)	14.20	14.98	15.07	15.06
Feedwater Temperature, °F	434.8	442.0	442.0	442.0
% SG Tube Plugging (average)	15	10	10	15

Flow Definitions:

*RCS Flow (Thermal Design Flow) - The conservatively low flow used for thermal/hydraulic design. The design parameters listed above are based on this flow.

**Minimum Measured Flow - The flow specified in the Tech. Specs. which must be confirmed or exceeded by the flow measurements obtained during plant startup and is the flow used in reactor core DNB analyses for plants applying the Improved Thermal Design Procedure.

TABLE S-2.1-1 (Cont'd)

COOK NUCLEAR PLANT UNITS 1 AND 2
DESIGN POWER CAPABILITY PARAMETERS FOR RERATING PROGRAM

<u>Parameter</u>	(Revised) <u>Case 7</u>	(Revised) <u>Case 8</u>	(Revised) <u>Case 9</u>	(Revised) <u>Case 10</u>
Power, MWt	3600	3600	3600	3600
Core Power, MWt	3588	3588	3588	3588
RCS Flow, (gpm/loop)*	88,500	88,500	88,500	88,500
Minimum Measured Flow, (total gpm)**	366,400	366,400	366,400	366,400
RCS Temperatures, °F				
Core Outlet	585.4	618.0	585.4	618.1
Vessel Outlet	582.3	615.2	582.3	615.2
Core Average	549.9	584.6	549.9	584.7
Vessel Average	547.0	581.3	547.0	581.3
Vessel/Core Inlet	511.7	547.3	511.7	547.4
Steam Generator Outlet	511.4	547.1	511.4	547.2
Zero Load	547.0	547.0	547.0	547.0
RCS Pressure, psia	2250	2250	2250	2250
	or	or	or	or
	2100	2100	2100	2100
Steam Pressure, psia	587	820	576	806
Steam Flow, (10 ⁶ lb/hr.tot.)	15.90	16.00	15.89	15.99
Feedwater Temperature, °F	449.0	449.0	449.0	449.0
% SG Tube Plugging (average)	10	10	15	15

Flow Definitions:

- *RCS Flow (Thermal Design Flow) - The conservatively low flow used for thermal/hydraulic design. The design parameters listed above are based on this flow.

**Minimum Measured Flow - The flow specified in the Tech. Specs. which must be confirmed or exceeded by the flow measurements obtained during plant startup and is the flow used in reactor core DNB analyses for plants applying the Improved Thermal Design Procedure.

S-3.3 NON-LOCA SAFETY EVALUATION

S-3.3.1 Introduction

This section evaluates the effects of the Cook Nuclear Plant Rerating Program on the non-LOCA transients. The non-LOCA safety evaluation provided within is applicable only for Unit 1, with the exception of the steamline break mass/energy releases (inside and outside containment). The effort performed is to support Unit 1 operation with an uprated core power of 3413 MWt in the range of reactor vessel average temperatures between 547°F and 578.7°F at primary pressure values of 2100 psia or 2250 psia. Table S-2.1-1 (Cases 4 and 5) presents the range of conditions possible for the rerating of Unit 1. The steamline break mass/energy release analyses are performed to support the potential future Unit 1 rerating as well as to bound a potential rerating of Unit 2. Table S-2.1-1 (Cases 7 and 8) presents the range of conditions possible for the future rerating of Unit 2. In addition, the evaluation performed is to support a maximum average steam generator tube plugging level of 10%, with a peak steam generator tube plugging level of 15%.

The following non-LOCA safety evaluation also supports the change and/or relaxation of certain plant parameters to provide Unit 1 with increased operating margin and flexibility. Included in the non-LOCA safety evaluation are:

- Increased Most Negative Moderator Temperature Coefficient (MTC)
(Tech Spec 3.1.1.4b)
- Degraded ECCS Charging Pump Flow (Tech Spec 4.5.2f)
- Increased Main Steamline Isolation Valve (MSIV) Closure Time
(Tech Spec 4.7.1.5b and Tech Spec Table 3.3-5 items 5h, 6h, & 7c)

The evaluation conservatively assumes 0 ppm boron concentration in the Boron Injection Tank (BIT).

The evaluation also supports a change to the steam generator water level program. The existing level program is a ramp function from 33% narrow range span (NRS) to 44% NRS from 0% power to 20% power and a constant level at 44% NRS between 20% power and 100% power. The proposed steam generator water level program is a constant level at 44% NRS between 0% power and 100% power.

S-3.3.4.1 Steamline Break Mass/Energy Releases

This section will discuss the analyses of the steamline break event to determine the mass and energy releases inside containment and the superheated mass and energy releases outside containment for the Cook Rerating Program. The analyses were performed to support the range of conditions possible for the rerating of Unit 1 as well as to position Unit 2 for a potential rerating. The analyses also consider the relaxation of certain plant parameters (Section S-3.3-1).

Steamline Break Mass/Energy Releases Inside Containment

The current mass/energy releases for the inside containment analysis is based on work performed for Unit 2, which is applicable for Unit 1. The calculation of the mass/energy release following a steamline break is described in the Cook Unit 2 FSAR Section 14.1.5. The steamline break mass/energy releases were recalculated to address the rerating of both Units and the relaxation of the plant parameters described in Section S-3.3.1.

Steamline ruptures occurring inside a reactor containment structure may result in significant releases of high energy fluid to the containment environment, possibly resulting in high containment temperatures and pressures. The quantitative nature of the releases following a steamline rupture is dependent upon the many possible configurations of the plant steam system and containment designs as well as the plant operating conditions and the size of the rupture. These variations make it difficult to reasonably determine the single "worst case" for both containment pressure and temperature evaluations following a steambreak. The FSAR analysis determined that the limiting scenario of the steambreak cases analyzed for the containment response evaluation were a break size of 0.942 ft^2 occurring at 30% power for the split rupture scenario and a break size of 4.6 ft^2 occurring at full power for the double-ended rupture scenario. (The 30% power split break case was slightly more limiting.) However, it is difficult to conclude if these FSAR cases remain bounding for the range of conditions possible for the reratings of both Units.

Adding to the difficulty in determining the effect of the rerating conditions are the plant parameters changes incorporated into the Cook Rerating Program. The potential changes of certain plant parameters (i.e., relaxed most negative MTC limit, degraded ECCS performance, increased MSIV closure time, and 0 ppm BIT boron concentration requirement) are penalties in the calculation of mass/energy releases. It is not readily apparent as to the total impact of the combination of these changes. As such, a series of steamline breaks, consistent with the cases presented in the FSAR, were analyzed to determine the containment response to a variety of postulated pipe breaks encompassing wide variations in plant operation, safety system performance, and break sizes.

Method of Analysis

The LOFTRAN computer code (Reference 2) was used to calculate the break flows and enthalpies of the release through the steambreak. Blowdown mass/energy releases determined using LOFTRAN include the effects of core power generation, main and auxiliary feedwater additions, engineered safeguards systems, reactor coolant thick metal heat storage, and reverse steam generator heat transfer.

A bounding analysis was performed to address the range of conditions possible for the potential Unit 1 rerating and the potential Unit 2 rerating. The assumptions on the initial conditions are taken to maximize the mass and total energy released. The higher primary temperatures along with the higher uprated power level associated with the Unit 2 rerating parameters are conservative for the mass/energy release calculations. The upper bound temperature of Table S-2.1-1, Case 8 was used. Since the mass blowdown rate is dependent on steam pressure and the steam pressure is less for the lower bound temperature case, the steam pressure of the upper bound temperature case is limiting for the range of operating conditions possible for the reratings of Unit 1 and Unit 2.

The functions which actuate safety injection and steamline isolation during a steamline rupture event are commonly referred to as the Steamline Break Protection System. A plant's steamline break protection system design can have a large effect on steamline break results. The steamline break protection system designs for Unit 1 and Unit 2 are different. Unit 1's design is referred to as an "OLD" steamline break protection system design. Unit 2's design is referred to as a "HYBRID" steamline break protection system design. The two systems have the following characteristics:

Unit 1 - "OLD" Steamline Break Protection

Safety Injection Signals

1. High-high steam flow coincident with low steamline pressure (two out of four lines)
2. High-high steam flow coincident with low-low Tavg (two out of four lines)
3. Two out of three differential pressure signals between a steam line and the remaining steam lines
4. Two out of three low pressurizer pressure signals
5. Two out of three hi containment pressure signals

Steamline Isolation Signals

1. High-high steam flow coincident with low steamline pressure (two out of four lines)
2. High-high steam flow coincident with low-low Tavg (two out of four lines)
3. Two out of four hi-hi containment pressure signals

Unit 2 - "HYBRID" Steamline Break Protection

Safety Injection Signals

1. Low steamline pressure (two out of four lines)
2. Two out of three differential pressure signals between a steam line and the remaining steam lines

3. Two out of three low pressurizer pressure signals

4. Two out of three hi containment pressure signals

Steamline Isolation Signals

1. Low steamline pressure (two out of four lines)

2. High-high steam flow coincident with low-low Tav_g (two out of four lines)

3. Two out of four hi-hi containment pressure signals

The only differences between the Unit 1 and Unit 2 designs is the actuations from a high-high steam flow and low-low Tav_g signal and the logic associated with the low steamline pressure signal required to actuate safety injection and steamline isolation. For Unit 1, a high-high steam flow coincident with low-low Tav_g signal actuates both safety injection and steamline isolation. For Unit 2, a high-high steam flow coincident with low-low Tav_g signal actuates only steamline isolation. However, the difference is not significant for the calculation of the mass/energy releases since the analysis does not take credit for any ESF actuations on a high-high steam flow coincident with low-low Tav_g signal.

Unit 1's design requires a coincidence between the low steamline pressure and high-high steam flow for protection actuation. Unit 2's design only requires the low steamline pressure signal for protection actuation; no coincidence with steam flow is required.

The coincidence logic required for safety injection initiation and steamline isolation on high-high steam flow and low steam pressure for Unit 1 is more limiting for the calculation of mass/energy releases inside containment than Unit 2's design. Actuation of safety injection and steamline isolation will limit the mass/energy released to the containment. Delaying the safeguards initiation will result in a conservative calculation of the mass/energy

releases for the containment pressure and temperature evaluation. The coincidence requirement for high-high steam flow with low steam pressure of the Unit 1 design increases the likelihood that safeguards initiation might be delayed compared to Unit 2's design where only a low steam pressure signal is required. In the case where the coincidence logic prohibits safety injection and steamline isolation on high-high steam flow with low steam pressure, one of the other signals must be received before the safeguards are initiated. As such, the Unit 1 steamline break protection system design was assumed in this bounding analysis for the calculation of the mass/energy releases inside containment.

Assumptions

A series of steamline breaks were analyzed to determine the most severe break condition for the containment temperature and pressure response. The following assumptions were used in the analysis:

- a. Double-ended pipe breaks were assumed to occur at the nozzle of one steam generator and also downstream of the flow restrictor. Split ruptures were assumed to occur at the nozzle of one steam generator.
- b. The blowdown is assumed to be dry saturated steam.
- c. As discussed above, the Unit 1 steamline break protection system design is assumed. However, credit was not taken for safeguards actuation on high steam line differential pressure or high-high steam flow coincident with low-low T_{avg} .
- d. Steamline isolation is assumed complete 11 seconds after the setpoint is reached for either high-high steam flow coincident with low steam pressure or hi-hi containment pressure. The isolation time allows 8 seconds for valve closure plus 3 seconds for electronic delays and signal processing. The total delay time for steamline isolation of 11 seconds is assumed to support the relaxation of the main steam isolation valve (MSIV) closure time.

- e. 4.6 ft² and 1.4 ft² double-ended pipe breaks were evaluated at 102, 70, 30, and zero percent power levels.
- f. Split pipe ruptures were evaluated at 0.86 ft², 102% power; 0.908 ft², 70% power; 0.942 ft², 30% power; and 0.4 ft², hot shutdown.

These split break sizes for each power level were modeled because they reflect the largest breaks for which ESF actuations (i.e., steamline isolation, feedwater isolation, and safety injection) must be generated by high containment pressure trips. The high-high steam flow coincident with low steam pressure is not reached for these break sizes or smaller break sizes. (Reference 5)

- g. Failure of a main steam isolation valve, failure of a feedwater isolation valve or main feed pump trip, and failure of auxiliary feedwater runout control were considered. Two cases for each break size and power level scenario were evaluated with one case modeling the MSIV failure and the other case modeling the AFW runout control failure. Each case assumed conservative main feedwater addition to bound the feedwater isolation valve or main feed pump trip failure.
- h. The auxiliary feedwater system is manually re-aligned by the operator after 10 minutes.
- i. A shutdown margin of 1.3% $\Delta k/k$ is assumed. This assumption includes added conservatism with respect to the Unit 1 end-of-life shutdown margin requirement of 1.6% $\Delta k/k$ at no load, equilibrium xenon conditions, and the most reactive RCCA stuck in its fully withdrawn position. The Unit 1 end-of-life shutdown margin requirement was used as the basis for this assumption since it is more limiting than the existing Unit 2 shutdown margin requirement.
- j. A moderator density coefficient of 0.54 $\Delta k/gm/cc$ is assumed to support the relaxation of the most negative moderator temperature coefficient limit.

- k. Minimum capability for injection of boric acid (2400 ppm) solution corresponding to the most restrictive single failure in the safety injection system. The Emergency Core Cooling System (ECCS) consists of the following systems: 1) the passive accumulators, 2) the low head safety injection (residual heat removal) system, 3) the high head (intermediate head) safety injection system, and 4) the charging safety injection system. Only the charging safety injection system and the passive accumulators are modeled for the steam line break accident analysis.

The modeling of the safety injection system in LOFTRAN is described in Reference 2. Figure 3.3-52 of WCAP-11902 presents the safety injection flow rates as a function of RCS pressure assumed in the analysis. The flow corresponds to that delivered by one charging pump delivering its full flow to the cold legs. The safety injection flows assumed in this analysis take into account the degradation of the ECCS charging pump performance. No credit has been taken for any borated water that might exist in the injection lines, which must be swept from the lines downstream of the boron injection tank isolation valves prior to the delivery of boric acid to the reactor coolant loops. For this analysis, a boron concentration of 0 ppm for the boron injection tank is assumed.

After the generation of the safety injection signal (appropriate delays for instrumentation, logic, and signal transport included), the appropriate valves begin to operate and the safety injection charging pump starts. In 27 seconds, the valves are assumed to be in their final position (VCT charging pump suction valve has closed following opening of RWST charging pump suction valve) and the pump is assumed to be at full speed and to draw suction from the RWST. The volume containing the low concentration borated water is swept into the core before the 2400 ppm borated water reaches the core. This delay, described above, is inherently included in the modeling.

1. For the at-power cases, reactor trip is available by safety injection signal, overpower protection signal (high neutron flux reactor trip or OPΔT reactor trip), and low pressurizer pressure reactor trip signal.

- m. For reactor coolant pump (RCP) operation, offsite power is assumed available. Continued operation of the reactor coolant pumps maximizes the energy transferred from the reactor coolant system to the steam generators.
- n. No steam generator tube plugging is assumed to maximize the heat transfer characteristics.

Single Failure Effects

- a. Failure of a main steam isolation valve (MSIV) increases the volume of steam piping which is not isolated from the break. When all valves operate, the piping volume capable of blowing down is located between the steam generator and the first isolation valve. If this valve fails, the volume between the break and the isolation valves in the other steamlines, including safety and relief valve headers and other connecting lines, will feed the break. For the cases which modeled a failure of a MSIV, the steamline volumes associated with Unit 2 were assumed since the volume available for blowdown for this scenario is greater than Unit 1. For the cases which did not model a failure of a MSIV, the steamline volumes associated with Unit 1 were assumed since the volume available for blowdown for this scenario is greater than Unit 2.
- b. Failure of a diesel generator would result in the loss of one containment safeguards train resulting in minimum heat removal capability.
- c. Failure of a feedwater isolation valve would result in additional inventory in the feedwater line which would not be isolated from the steam generator. The mass in this volume can flash into steam and exit through the break. For consistency with the FSAR steamline break mass/energy release analysis, all cases conservatively assumed failure of the feedwater isolation valve, which resulted in the additional inventory available for release through the steambreak and in higher than normal main feedwater flows.

- d. Failure of the auxiliary feedwater runout control equipment would result in higher auxiliary feedwater flows entering the steam generator prior to re-alignment of the AFW system. For cases where the runout control operates properly, a bounding constant AFW flow of 670 gpm to the faulted steam generator was assumed. This value was increased to 1325 gpm to simulate a failure of the runout control.

Results

The steamline break mass/energy releases inside containment were calculated to account for the range of conditions possible for the potential reratings of Unit 1 and Unit 2 and for the relaxation of certain plant parameters. One set of mass/energy releases were calculated to bound the reratings for both Units incorporating the limiting steamline break protection design of Unit 1. The analysis assumptions support relaxation of the most negative moderator temperature coefficient limit, degradation of the charging pump performance of the Emergency Core Cooling System, extension of the main steam isolation valve closure time, and relaxation of the minimum BIT boron concentration requirement.

Section S-3.4.2.1 presents the containment integrity evaluation for a main steamline break using the mass/energy releases calculated here. As discussed in Section S-3.4.2.1, the limiting scenarios of the steambreak cases analyzed for the containment response evaluation were a break size of 4.6 ft^2 occurring at 102% power with a main steamline isolation failure for the double-ended rupture scenario and a break size of 0.86 ft^2 occurring at 102% power with an auxiliary feedwater runout protection failure for the split rupture scenario. Table S-3.3-4 presents the mass/energy releases for these limiting steambreak cases of the containment response evaluation.



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100

101

S-3.3.6 REFERENCES

1. Augustine, D. B., and Cacchett, D. L., "Reduced Temperature and Pressure Operation for Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant Unit 1 Licensing Report," WCAP-11902, October 1988.
2. Burnett, T. W. T., et al., "LOFTRAN Code Description," WCAP-7907-A, April 1, 1984.
3. Butler, J. C., and Love, D. S., "Steamline Break Mass/Energy Releases for Equipment Qualification Outside Containment," WCAP-10961, Rev. 1 (proprietary) and WCAP-11184 (nonproprietary), October, 1985.
4. Hollingsworth, S. D., and Wood, D. C., "Reactor Core Response To Excessive Secondary Steam Releases," WCAP-9227, January 1978.
5. Land, R. E., "Mass and Energy Releases Following a Steam Line Rupture;" WCAP-8860, September 1976.
6. "American Electric Power Service Corporation Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant Unit 1: Safety Evaluation for Including Uncertainty Due to Operator Readability of Pressurizer Pressure Instrumentation," AEP-89-216, Letter from J. C. Hoebe (W) to R. B. Bennett (AEPSC), September 1989.

TABLE S-3.3-4

STEAMLINE BREAK
MASS/ENERGY RELEASES INSIDE CONTAINMENT
102% POWER DER (4.6 FT²) BREAK
FAILURE - MSIV

<u>TIME</u> <u>(SEC)</u>	<u>MASS</u> <u>(LBM/SEC)</u>	<u>ENERGY</u> <u>(BTU x 10⁶/SEC)</u>
0.00	0.00	0.0
0.20	10430.00	1.250
3.60	6552.00	7.883
6.60	5612.00	6.748
12.80	4978.00	5.974
13.00	4913.00	5.895
13.20	4847.00	5.816
13.40	4781.00	5.737
13.60	4716.00	5.660
14.00	4587.00	5.504
14.40	4458.00	5.350
14.80	4332.00	5.198
15.00	4269.00	5.123
15.20	4206.00	5.047
15.60	4083.00	4.899
15.80	4022.00	4.826
16.00	3961.00	4.753
16.60	3782.00	4.538
17.20	3606.00	4.328
17.60	3492.00	4.190
17.80	3435.00	4.122
18.40	3268.00	3.921
18.60	3213.00	3.856
18.80	3158.00	3.790
19.20	3050.00	3.660
23.80	1876.00	2.251
28.80	1623.00	1.421
30.40	1575.00	1.883
36.40	1461.00	1.746
39.20	1431.00	1.708
50.70	1369.00	1.634
57.20	1356.00	1.618
106.20	1331.00	1.588
109.20	1331.00	1.587
111.20	1184.00	1.409
118.20	308.70	0.358
125.20	188.10	0.217
136.20	98.97	0.114
602.70	93.24	0.107

TABLE S-3.3-4 (Cont'd)

STEAMLINE BREAK
 MASS/ENERGY RELEASES INSIDE CONTAINMENT
 102% POWER SPLIT (0.86 FT²) BREAK
 FAILURE - AUXILIARY FEEDWATER RUNOUT PROTECTION

<u>TIME</u> <u>(SEC)</u>	<u>MASS</u> <u>(LBM/SEC)</u>	<u>ENERGY</u> <u>(BTU x 10⁶/SEC)</u>
0.00	0.00	0.0000
0.20	1394.00	1.6690
1.60	1366.00	1.6370
2.00	1358.00	1.6270
2.40	1350.00	1.6170
2.80	1342.00	1.6080
4.20	1316.00	1.5770
4.40	1312.00	1.5730
8.60	1550.00	1.8540
9.40	1575.00	1.8840
12.00	1632.00	1.9500
12.60	1638.00	1.9570
15.80	1635.00	1.9530
18.00	1618.00	1.9340
21.40	1458.00	1.7460
22.60	1400.00	1.6790
23.60	1357.00	1.6280
23.80	1349.00	1.6180
25.00	1302.00	1.5630
32.00	1103.00	1.3260
32.20	1098.00	1.3210
33.80	1064.00	1.2810
42.00	928.70	1.1180
42.60	920.80	1.1090
43.20	913.10	1.1000
43.80	905.70	1.0910
44.40	898.40	1.0820
55.20	799.10	0.9625
67.20	732.60	0.8823
80.20	691.30	0.8325
82.20	686.60	0.8269
96.20	662.50	0.7977
98.70	659.50	0.7941
118.20	645.70	0.7775
124.20	643.60	0.7749
282.70	633.20	0.7623
285.20	633.10	0.7622
290.20	615.00	0.7402
292.70	579.70	0.6977
297.70	556.60	0.6695
302.70	490.40	0.5896
320.20	304.70	0.3643

TABLE S-3.3-4 (Cont'd)


STEAMLINE BREAK
MASS/ENERGY RELEASES INSIDE CONTAINMENT
102% POWER SPLIT (0.86 FT²) BREAK
FAILURE - AUXILIARY FEEDWATER RUNOUT PROTECTION

<u>TIME</u> <u>(SEC)</u>	<u>MASS</u> <u>(LBM/SEC)</u>	<u>ENERGY</u> <u>(BTU x 10⁶/SEC)</u>
330.20	238.70	0.2845
340.20	206.50	0.2456
352.70	190.20	0.2259
525.20	181.90	0.2160
535.20	182.00	0.2160
600.20	182.10	0.2162
605.20	190.70	0.2258

S-3.4.2.1 Main Steamline Break (MSLB) Containment Integrity

Introduction and Background

An evaluation was performed to determine the impact of reduced temperature and pressure operation on the Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant Unit 1 Long-Term Main Steamline Break Containment Integrity analysis. This evaluation is documented



22
23

24
25
26
27
28

29
30
31
32
33

34
35

in Section 3.4.2 of WCAP-11902, "REDUCED TEMPERATURE AND PRESSURE OPERATION FOR DONALD C. COOK NUCLEAR PLANT UNIT 1 LICENSING REPORT," and it was concluded that reduced temperature and pressure operation did not have an adverse impact on the analysis results and conclusions. This Section documents the analysis performed for both Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant Units 1 & 2 to determine the impact of the rerated conditions described in Section S-2.1 on Containment Integrity following a Main Steamline Break.

A series of main steamline split and double-ended breaks were analyzed as a part of the original licensing basis for Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant Unit 2 to determine the most severe break condition for containment temperature and pressure response for this design basis event. The analysis and evaluation are discussed in Reference 1. These results documented in the FSAR show that the most limiting double-ended break was the 4.6 square foot break, occurring at 102% power with main steam isolation valve failure. The most limiting split break was the 0.942 square foot break, occurring at 30% power with the failure of auxiliary feedwater runout protection. The calculated peak temperatures for these cases were 319.1°F and 328.1°F respectively. Additional generic sensitivities discussed in Reference 2, illustrate that other smaller breaks were not limiting.

Purpose

The purpose of the analysis documented in the following paragraphs is to demonstrate that the peak containment temperature resulting from a design basis main steamline break will not exceed the equipment qualification temperature criterion for Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plants Units 1 and 2, at the rerated conditions. The containment pressure response generated for the LOCA Containment Integrity analysis for the double-ended pump suction RCS break case (Reference 3) bounds the Main Steamline Break containment pressure response, and therefore is not a concern here. This analysis assumes reduced safety injection flow, due to degradation of ECCS performance, closure of the RHR crosstie valves and the current containment heat sink information.

Analytical Assumptions

The analysis performed for the Rerating Program is consistent with the Reference 1 analysis except for assumptions directly related to the rerating parameters. The analytical effort provides bounding system calculations for both Units 1 & 2 at the rerated plant conditions described in Section S-2.1.

A spectrum of split breaks is analyzed at 0.86 ft^2 , 102% power; 0.908 ft^2 , 70% power; 0.942 ft^2 , 30% power and 0.4 ft^2 , hot shutdown. Double-ended breaks of 1.4 ft^2 and 4.6 ft^2 are analyzed at power levels of 102%, 70%, 30% and zero power levels.

The break sizes analyzed in the present analysis are based on the current FSAR analysis. As in the FSAR analysis, loss of one containment safeguards train was also assumed for all the cases in addition to the single failure assumed in the mass and energy release calculations.

The following cases were analyzed for containment response:

A. Split break cases

- 1) 0.86 ft^2 , 102% power, MSIV failure
- 2) 0.86 ft^2 , 102% power, AFRP failure
- 3) 0.908 ft^2 , 70% power, MSIV failure
- 4) 0.908 ft^2 , 70% power, AFRP failure
- 5) 0.942 ft^2 , 30% power, MSIV failure
- 6) 0.942 ft^2 , 30% power, AFRP failure
- 7) 0.40 ft^2 , hot shutdown, MSIV failure
- 8) 0.40 ft^2 , hot shutdown, AFRP failure

Note: MSIV - Main Steam Isolation Valve
AFRP - Auxiliary Feedwater Runout Protection

8. Double-ended rupture cases*

- 1) 4.6 ft², 102% power, MSIV failure
- 2) 4.6 ft², 102% power, AFRP failure
- 3) 4.6 ft², 70% power, MSIV failure
- 4) 4.6 ft², 70% power, AFRP failure
- 5) 4.6 ft², 30% power, MSIV failure
- 6) 4.6 ft², hot shutdown, MSIV failure
- 7) 1.4 ft², 102% power, MSIV failure
- 8) 1.4 ft², 102% power, AFRP failure
- 9) 1.4 ft², 70% power, MSIV failure
- 10) 1.4 ft², 30% power, MSIV failure
- 11) 1.4 ft², hot shutdown, MSIV failure

Note: *The limiting 4.6 ft² double-ended failure cases (102% and 70% power), with MSIV failure were analyzed with AFRP failure and found to be less limiting than the corresponding MSIV failure cases. Therefore only the most limiting 1.4 ft² (102% power) was analyzed with AFRP failure.

The mass and energy releases to the containment as a result of the postulated accident are calculated using the LOFTRAN computer code (Reference 4). The mass and energy releases are calculated using two different failures for each case namely, 1) failure of the auxiliary feedwater runout protection and 2) failure of the main steam isolation valve. As in Reference 1, no credit is taken for entrainment. Section S-3.3.4.1 presents additional details regarding the calculation of the inside containment steamline break mass and energy releases.

The LOTIC-III computer code (Reference 5) is used to calculate the consequence of these releases, in particular the peak containment temperature.

The main steam line break containment integrity calculations are performed with an additional failure of one of the containment safeguards trains, which results in minimum spray flow (this includes a 10% degradation in the spray pump flow). Where applicable, input data consistent with that of the LOCA containment integrity analysis (Reference 3) is used.

The total initial ice mass assumed is 2.11×10^6 lbs.

The initial conditions in the containment are a temperature of 120°F in the lower and dead ended compartments, a temperature of 27°F in the ice condenser, and a temperature of 57°F in the upper compartment. All volumes are at a pressure of 0.3 psig and a relative humidity of 15%.

The refueling water storage tank (RWST) temperature is assumed to be 100°F.

A spray pump flow of 1900 gpm to the upper compartment and 900 gpm to the lower compartment is assumed, at a temperature of 100°F.

The spray flow is initiated 45.0 seconds after the containment reaches the hi-hi pressure signal of 3.5 psig. This setpoint includes instrument uncertainties.

Results

The results of the analysis show that the maximum calculated containment temperature is 324.9°F for the 4.6 ft² double ended rupture at 102% of the full power. The mass and energy calculations for this case are based on the main steam isolation valve failure.

The maximum containment temperature calculated for the limiting small split break (0.86 ft² at 102% of full power) is 324.4°F. The auxiliary feedwater runout protection failure is assumed for this case. Table S-3.4-1 and Figures S-3.4-1 through S-3.4-4 show the results for the two limiting cases.

Comparison of these results to the current FSAR results with respect to the peak containment temperature indicates that the FSAR result was more limiting. This is due to the lower mass and energy releases inside containment, calculated for the present analysis. The peak temperature shown in the FSAR for the limiting split break case (0.86 ft² at 102% of full power, with auxiliary feedwater runout protection failure) is higher than the

present case. However, the FSAR results for the limiting double-ended rupture case (4.6 ft^2 at 102% power, with main steam isolation valve failure) is lower than the present double-ended results. A detailed study of the results shows that even though the mass and energy releases within containment are lower in both the present cases, the double-ended break results in a higher temperature due to reduced flows from the lower compartment into the ice-condenser.

The peak occurs very early in the transient (within the first ten seconds). At this early time the only heat removal systems that exist are the containment wall heat sinks and the heat flow between the compartments. In the present case, heat removal by the walls is better (due to more detailed modeling of the walls), but the heat flow from the lower compartment into the ice-condenser is lower (due to the lower initial temperature assumed in the ice-condenser and the upper compartment, which affects the driving force through the ice-condenser).

Conclusions

The main steamline break containment integrity analysis has been performed consistent with the current licensing basis analysis and Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant Units 1 & 2 rerating program, considering the present plant operating conditions. The results of this analysis are bounded by the current FSAR results. This analysis therefore demonstrates that the containment heat removal systems function to rapidly reduce the containment pressure and temperature in the event of a main steamline break accident.

S-3.4.3 References

1. Westinghouse letter # NS-TMA-1946, 9/20/78, " American Electric Power Projects Donald C. Cook Unit 2 (Docket 50-316) Response to Question 022.9".
2. Westinghouse letter #AEP-80-525, 3/10/80, "Response to NRC Question 022.17 - AMP's steamline break analysis".
3. WCAP-11908," Containment Integrity Analysis for Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant Units 1 and 2", July 1988.
4. WCAP-7907-P-A (Proprietary), "LOFTRAN Code Description", April 1984.
5. WCAP-8354-P-A (Proprietary), Supplement 2, "Long Term Ice Condenser Containment Code - LOTIC-3 Code", February 1979.

TABLE S-3.4-1

MAIN STEAMLINE BREAKS

Type of Break	Double-Ended Rupture	Split Break
Break Size (FT ²)	4.6	0.86
Type of Failure	MSIV	AFRP
T _{max} (°F)	324.9	324.4
Time of T _{max} (sec)	6.39	50.72
P _{max} (psig)	8.62	7.24
Time of P _{max} (sec)	14.01	50.72

Note: MSIV - Main Steam Isolation Valve
AFRP - Auxiliary Feedwater Runout Protection


100

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100

100


100

100



COMPARTMENT TEMPERATURE

Figure S-3.4-1 - 4.6 ft² Double-Ended Rupture, 102% Power, MSIV Failure



COMPARTMENT PRESSURE

Figure S-3.4-2 - 4.6 ft² Double-Ended Rupture, 102% Power, MSIV Failure

10/1/71

Dear Mr. [illegible]

I am writing to you regarding the [illegible]

which you have been [illegible]

and the [illegible]

of the [illegible]

and the [illegible]

and the [illegible]

and the [illegible]

and the [illegible]

and the [illegible]

and the [illegible]

and the [illegible]

and the [illegible]


and the [illegible]

and the [illegible]

and the [illegible]


and the [illegible]

and the [illegible]



COMPARTMENT TEMPERATURE

Figure S-3.4-3 - 0.86 ft² Split Break, 102% Power, AFRP Failure



COMPARTMENT PRESSURE

Figure S-3.4-4 - 0.86 ft² Split Break, 102% Power, AFRP Failure

WCAP-11902

REDUCED TEMPERATURE AND PRESSURE OPERATION
FOR DONALD C. COOK NUCLEAR PLANT UNIT 1
LICENSING REPORT

D. L. Cacchett
D. B. Augustine

October 1988

WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC CORPORATION
Energy Systems Business Unit
P.O. Box 355
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15230




Figure 3.3-52 Safety Injection Flow Supplied by One Charging Pump

