

November 30, 2017

Docket No. PROJ0769

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
ATTN: Document Control Desk
One White Flint North
11555 Rockville Pike
Rockville, MD 20852-2738

SUBJECT: NuScale Power, LLC Submittal of Topical Report "Critical Heat Flux Correlations,"
TR-0116-21012, Revision 1

REFERENCES: 1. Letter from NuScale Power, LLC to U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
"NuScale Power, LLC Submittal of Topical Report TR-0116-21012 'NuScale Power
Critical Heat Flux Correlation NSP2,' Revision 0 (NRC Project No. 0769)", Dated
October 5, 2016 (ML16279A363)

2. Letter from NuScale Power, LLC to U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
"NuScale Power, LLC Submittal of "Critical Heat Flux (CHF), Topical Report TR-
0116-21012, Revision 0, Topical Update, Dated October 13, 2017 (ML17286A89)

NuScale Power, LLC (NuScale) submitted Revision 0 of the licensing topical report "Critical Heat Flux Correlation NSP2", TR-0116-21012 to the NRC for review and approval (Reference 1). The purpose of this letter is to submit Revision 1 of the licensing topical report for NRC review and approval, replacing Revision 0. Revision 1 of the topical report implements the NSP4 CHF correlation and corrects local condition data errors as discussed in Reference 2, and incorporates changes to the topical report associated with NRC requests for additional information.

Enclosure 1 is the proprietary version of the topical report entitled "Critical Heat Flux Correlations", TR-0116-21012, Revision 1. NuScale requests that the proprietary version be withheld from public disclosure in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR § 2.390. The enclosed affidavits (Enclosures 3 and 4) support this request. Enclosure 3 pertains to the NuScale proprietary information to be withheld from the public while Enclosure 4 pertains to the AREVA proprietary information to be withheld from the public. NuScale proprietary is denoted by double braces (i.e., "{{ }}") while AREVA proprietary is denoted by straight brackets (i.e., "[]"). Enclosure 2 is the nonproprietary version of the topical report entitled "Critical Heat Flux Correlations", TR-0116-21012, Revision 1.

The proprietary enclosures have been deemed to contain Export Controlled Information. This information must be protected from disclosure per the requirements of 10 CFR § 810.

This letter makes no regulatory commitments or revisions to any existing regulatory commitments.

Please feel free to contact Darrell Gardner at 980-349-4829 or at dgardner@nuscalepower.com if you have any questions.

Sincerely,



Thomas A. Bergman
Vice President, Regulatory Affairs
NuScale Power, LLC

Distribution: Gregory Cranston, NRC, OWFN-8G9A
Samuel Lee, NRC, OWFN-8G9A
Bruce Baval, NRC, OWFN-8G9A

Enclosure 1: "Critical Heat Flux Correlations", TR-0116-21012, Revision 1, proprietary version
Enclosure 2: "Critical Heat Flux Correlations", TR-0116-21012, Revision 1, nonproprietary version
Enclosure 3: Affidavit of Thomas A. Bergman, AF-1117-57385
Enclosure 4: Affidavit of Nathan E. Hottle, AREVA Inc.

Enclosure 1:

“Critical Heat Flux Correlations”, TR-0116-21012, Revision 1, proprietary version

Enclosure 2:

“Critical Heat Flux Correlations”, TR-0116-21012, Revision 1, nonproprietary version

NuScale Power Critical Heat Flux Correlations

November 2017

Revision 1

Docket: PROJ0769

NuScale Power, LLC

1100 NE Circle Blvd., Suite 200

Corvallis, Oregon 97330

www.nuscalepower.com

© Copyright 2017 by NuScale Power, LLC

COPYRIGHT NOTICE

This report has been prepared by NuScale Power, LLC and bears a NuScale Power, LLC, copyright notice. No right to disclose, use, or copy any of the information in this report, other than by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), is authorized without the express, written permission of NuScale Power, LLC.

The NRC is permitted to make the number of copies of the information contained in this report that is necessary for its internal use in connection with generic and plant-specific reviews and approvals, as well as the issuance, denial, amendment, transfer, renewal, modification, suspension, revocation, or violation of a license, permit, order, or regulation subject to the requirements of 10 CFR 2.390 regarding restrictions on public disclosure to the extent such information has been identified as proprietary by NuScale Power, LLC, copyright protection notwithstanding. Regarding nonproprietary versions of these reports, the NRC is permitted to make the number of copies necessary for public viewing in appropriate docket files in public document rooms in Washington, DC, and elsewhere as may be required by NRC regulations. Copies made by the NRC must include this copyright notice and contain the proprietary marking if the original was identified as proprietary.

Department of Energy Acknowledgement and Disclaimer

This material is based upon work supported by the Department of Energy under Award Number DE-NE0000633.

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

CONTENTS

Abstract	1
Executive Summary	2
1.0 Introduction	4
1.1 Purpose	4
1.2 Scope	4
1.3 Abbreviations.....	6
2.0 Background	9
2.1 Regulatory Requirements.....	10
2.2 NuScale Power Module Fuel Assembly Design	10
3.0 Analysis and Experimentation	14
3.1 Data Sources.....	14
3.1.1 Stern Laboratories	14
3.1.2 AREVA.....	28
3.2 Statistical Evaluation Methods.....	44
3.2.1 Treatment of Outliers	44
3.2.2 Critical Heat Flux Test Uncertainties.....	45
3.2.3 Tests for Normality.....	45
3.2.4 Comparisons of Data Sets	46
3.2.5 Correlation Limit	46
3.3 Local Conditions.....	48
3.3.1 VIPRE-01 Models.....	48
3.3.2 VIPRE-01 Data Reduction.....	50
4.0 NSP1 Critical Heat Flux Correlation Development.....	52
4.1 Correlating Technique.....	54
4.2 Correlation Form	54
4.3 Non-Uniform Flux Factor Development.....	56
4.4 Statistical Evaluation	58
4.5 Correlation Limit	62
4.6 Range of Applicability	63
4.7 NSP1 Correlation Performance	64

5.0	NSP2 Critical Heat Flux Correlation Development.....	66
5.1	Assessment of KATHY K8500 HMP™ Test with NSP1 Critical Heat Flux Correlation	66
5.2	NSPX factor.....	70
5.3	NSP2 Critical Heat Flux Correlation	71
6.0	Validation of NSP2 CHF Correlation	74
6.1	Comparison of Stern Preliminary Prototypic to KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ Test Data	74
6.1.1	KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ K9000 versus Stern Preliminary Prototypic U2	75
6.1.2	KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ K9100 versus Stern Preliminary Prototypic U1	77
6.1.3	KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ K9300 versus Stern Preliminary Prototypic C1	80
6.1.4	Summary of KATHY to Stern Laboratories Data Comparisons	82
6.2	NuFuel-HTP2™ Critical Heat Flux Predictions with NSP2 Critical Heat Flux Correlation	83
6.3	Correlation Limit for NSP2.....	84
6.4	Validation Conclusions	89
7.0	NSP4 CHF Correlation for NuFuel-HTP2™	90
7.1	NSP4 Correlating Technique	90
7.2	NSP4 VIPRE-01 Calculations	90
7.3	NSP4 Local Conditions	90
7.4	NSP4 Correlation Form	91
7.5	NSP4 Tong Non-uniform Flux Factor.....	92
7.6	NSP4 Statistical Evaluation	94
7.7	NSP4 Correlation Limit.....	99
7.8	NSP4 Range of Applicability.....	100
7.9	NSP4 Correlation Performance.....	100
8.0	Summary and Conclusions.....	103
8.1	The NSP2 CHF Correlation.....	103
8.2	The NSP4 CHF Correlation.....	106
9.0	References.....	109
9.1	Source Documents.....	109
9.2	Referenced Documents.....	109

Appendix A. Local Conditions 110**TABLES**

Table 1-1.	Abbreviations.....	6
Table 1-2.	Definitions.....	7
Table 2-1.	NuFuel-HTP2™ fuel assembly parameters.....	11
Table 3-1.	Stern preliminary prototypical test matrix	14
Table 3-2.	Stern Laboratories test section physical parameters.....	17
Table 3-3.	Stern Laboratories DAS variables and uncertainties.....	24
Table 3-4.	Test matrix for KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ testing.....	29
Table 3-5.	KATHY K8500 HMP™ test section physical parameters.....	30
Table 3-6.	KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ K9000 test section physical parameters	32
Table 3-7.	KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ K9100 test section physical parameters	34
Table 3-8.	KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ K9200 test section physical parameters	36
Table 3-9.	KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ K9200 axial power profile.....	37
Table 3-10.	KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ K9300 test section physical parameters	39
Table 3-11.	KATHY loop design conditions	41
Table 3-12.	KATHY DAS variables and estimated uncertainties	43
Table 3-13.	KATHY maximum deviations of CHF test parameters.....	44
Table 3-14.	Two-phase and heat transfer correlations	49
Table 3-15.	Turbulent mixing factors	50
Table 4-1.	NSP1 CHF correlation coefficients	56
Table 4-2.	NSP1 CHF correlation M/P mean and RMS error	59
Table 4-3.	Data subsets for Stern preliminary prototypic data.....	63
Table 4-4.	Tolerance limits for Stern preliminary prototypic data.....	63
Table 4-5.	Parameter ranges of applicability for NSP1 CHF correlation	63
Table 5-1.	Stern preliminary prototypic and KATHY K8500 HMP™ parameters.....	67
Table 6-1.	Data subsets for KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ data	85
Table 6-2.	Tolerance limits for subset groupings of KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ data	85
Table 8-1.	NSP2 CHF correlation coefficients	104
Table 8-2.	Parameter ranges of applicability for NSP2 CHF correlation	105

FIGURES

Figure 1-1.	NSP2 CHF correlation development flow chart.....	5
Figure 1-2.	NSP4 CHF correlation development flow chart.....	6
Figure 2-1.	NuFuel-HTP2™ fuel assembly	12
Figure 2-2.	HMP™ spacer grid (1/4 of grid shown).....	13
Figure 2-3.	HTP™ spacer grid (1/4 of grid shown).....	13
Figure 3-1.	Stern Laboratories test section axial schematic	18
Figure 3-2.	Stern Laboratories U1 and C1 grid spacer	19
Figure 3-3.	Stern Laboratories U2 grid spacer.....	19
Figure 3-4.	Stern Laboratories U1 and C1 test radial schematic.....	20
Figure 3-5.	Stern Laboratories U2 test radial schematic.....	20
Figure 3-6.	Stern Laboratories PWR test loop schematic.....	22

Figure 3-7.	Stern preliminary prototypic U1 and U2 test sections thermocouple layout	25
Figure 3-8.	Stern preliminary prototypic C1 test section thermocouple layout.....	26
Figure 3-9.	Stern preliminary prototypic U1 and C1 thermal mixing thermocouples.....	27
Figure 3-10.	Stern preliminary prototypic U2 thermal mixing thermocouples	27
Figure 3-11.	KATHY K8500 HMP™ test section schematic	31
Figure 3-12.	KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ K9000 test section schematic	33
Figure 3-13.	KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ K9100 test section schematic	35
Figure 3-14.	KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ K9200 test section schematic	38
Figure 3-15.	KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ K9300 test section schematic	40
Figure 3-16.	AREVA's KATHY facility layout.....	42
Figure 3-17.	Monitoring of loop stability during CHF testing	44
Figure 3-18.	Illustrative non-parametric probability distribution function.....	48
Figure 4-1.	Measured uniform CHF vs. pressure (Stern preliminary prototypic)	52
Figure 4-2.	Measured uniform CHF vs. local mass flux (Stern preliminary prototypic).....	53
Figure 4-3.	Measured uniform CHF vs. local quality (Stern preliminary prototypic).....	53
Figure 4-4.	Stern Preliminary Prototypic U1 and C1 CHF	58
Figure 4-5.	Predicted vs. measured CHF for Stern preliminary prototypic data	59
Figure 4-6.	M/P CHF vs. pressure for Stern preliminary prototypic data	60
Figure 4-7.	M/P CHF vs. local mass flux for Stern preliminary prototypic data.....	60
Figure 4-8.	M/P CHF vs. local equilibrium quality for Stern preliminary prototypic data	61
Figure 4-9.	M/P CHF vs. boiling length for Stern preliminary prototypic data	61
Figure 4-10.	M/P CHF vs. cold wall factor for Stern preliminary prototypic data	62
Figure 4-11.	Global sensitivity – predicted uniform CHF vs. pressure	64
Figure 4-12.	Global sensitivity – predicted uniform CHF vs. mass flux.....	65
Figure 4-13.	Global sensitivity – predicted uniform CHF vs. quality	65
Figure 5-1.	CHF vs. pressure for Stern preliminary prototypic and KATHY K8500 HMP™ ...	67
Figure 5-2.	CHF vs. mass flux for Stern preliminary prototypic and KATHY K8500 HMP™ ..	68
Figure 5-3.	CHF vs. quality for Stern preliminary prototypic and KATHY K8500 HMP™	68
Figure 5-4.	NSP1 P/M CHF for Stern preliminary prototypic and KATHY K8500 HMP™	69
Figure 5-5.	NSP1 CHF Correlation M/P CHF vs. pressure for KATHY K8500 HMP™	71
Figure 5-6.	NSP1 and NSP2 predicted vs. measured CHF for KATHY K8500 HMP™	73
Figure 6-1.	U2 vs. K9000 measured heat flux at 7.0 MPa	75
Figure 6-2.	U2 vs. K9000 measured heat flux at 10.0 MPa	76
Figure 6-3.	U2 vs. K9000 measured heat flux at 13.0 MPa	76
Figure 6-4.	U2 vs. K9000 measured heat flux at 16.0 MPa	77
Figure 6-5.	U1 vs. K9100 measured heat flux at 7.0 MPa	78
Figure 6-6.	U1 vs. K9100 measured heat flux at 10.0 MPa	78
Figure 6-7.	U1 vs. K9100 measured heat flux at 13.0 MPa	79
Figure 6-8.	U1 vs. K9100 measured heat flux at 16.0 MPa	79
Figure 6-9.	C1 vs. K9300 measured heat flux at 7.0 MPa	80
Figure 6-10.	C1 vs. K9300 measured heat flux at 10.0 MPa	81
Figure 6-11.	C1 vs. K9300 measured heat flux at 13.0 MPa	81
Figure 6-12.	C1 vs. K9300 measured heat flux at 16.0 MPa	82
Figure 6-13.	NSP2 P/M CHF for KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ tests	83
Figure 6-14.	NSP2 P/M CHF for KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ mass flux ranges.....	84
Figure 6-15.	M/P CHF versus pressure for NuFuel-HTP2™ with NSP2.....	86

Figure 6-16.	M/P CHF versus mass flux for NuFuel-HTP2™ with NSP2	86
Figure 6-17.	M/P CHF versus quality for NuFuel-HTP2™ with NSP2	87
Figure 6-18.	M/P CHF versus boiling length for NuFuel-HTP2™ with NSP2	87
Figure 6-19.	M/P CHF versus cold wall factor for NuFuel-HTP2™ with NSP2	88
Figure 6-20.	M/P CHF versus inlet enthalpy for NuFuel-HTP2™ with NSP2	88
Figure 7-1.	Predicted vs. measured uniform feat flux for Tong F-factor	94
Figure 7-2.	Predicted vs. measured CHF for NSP4	95
Figure 7-3.	P/M CHF vs. pressure for NuFuel-HTP2™ data with NSP4	96
Figure 7-4.	P/M CHF vs. mass flux for NuFuel-HTP2™ data with NSP4	96
Figure 7-5.	P/M CHF vs. quality for NuFuel-HTP2™ data with NSP4	97
Figure 7-6.	P/M CHF vs. boiling length for NuFuel-HTP2™ data with NSP4	97
Figure 7-7.	P/M CHF vs. cold wall factor for NuFuel-HTP2™ data with NSP4	98
Figure 7-8.	P/M CHF vs. inlet enthalpy for NuFuel-HTP2™ data with NSP4	98
Figure 7-9.	Axial flux shapes for NSP4 global sensitivity	100
Figure 7-10.	Global sensitivity – predicted uniform CHF vs. pressure for NSP4	101
Figure 7-11.	Global sensitivity – predicted uniform CHF vs. mass flux for NSP4	102
Figure 7-12.	Global sensitivity – predicted uniform CHF vs. quality for NSP4	102

Abstract

The purpose of this report is to provide the bases for Nuclear Regulatory Commission approval to use the NSP2 critical heat flux (CHF) correlation in VIPRE-01, within its range of applicability in Table 8-2, along with its associated correlation limit of 1.17, for the NuScale Power, LLC, Design Certification Application (DCA) and safety analysis of the NuScale Power Module (NPM) with NuFuel-HTP2™ fuel. This report also provides the bases for Nuclear Regulatory Commission approval to use the NSP4 CHF correlation in VIPRE-01, within its range of applicability in Table 8-4 along with its associated correlation limit of 1.21, for the NuScale DCA and safety analysis of the NPM with NuFuel-HTP2™ fuel.

These correlations conform to acceptance criteria given by the NuScale Design-Specific Review Standard (DSRS), Section 4.4 (Reference 9.1.3), and the requirements of 10 CFR 50, Appendix A, General Design Criterion (GDC) 10.

This topical report describes the development of the NuScale NSP2 and NSP4 CHF correlations for the NPM. The figure of merit for preventing the occurrence of CHF in the NPM is critical heat flux ratio (CHFR), rather than departure from nucleate boiling ratio that is traditionally used for pressurized water reactor (PWR) applications.

The CHF tests for a preliminary prototypical fuel assembly design for NuScale, performed at Stern Laboratories, Inc. in Ontario, Canada, are used to develop the NSP1 CHF correlation. This preliminary prototypical assembly design uses a different spacer grid design than that used on the NuFuel-HTP2™ fuel design referenced in the NuScale DCA. A set of CHF data from AREVA testing of an assembly design that includes the HMP™ spacer grids used in the NuFuel-HTP2™ design is used to develop an “NSPX factor” for the NSP1 correlation that conservatively predicts NuFuel-HTP2™ CHF performance. The NSP2 CHF correlation is based on the combination of the NSP1 CHF correlation and this NSPX factor and is validated with data from design specific CHF testing for the NuFuel-HTP2™ fuel design performed at AREVA’s Karlstein, Germany, thermal-hydraulic (KATHY) test facility. The NSP4 CHF correlation is developed from the design specific CHF testing for the NuFuel-HTP2™ fuel design performed at AREVA’s Karlstein, Germany, thermal-hydraulic (KATHY) test facility. This report describes the tests, test facilities, statistical methods, NSP1 CHF correlation development, NSPX factor development, and final validation for the NSP2 CHF correlation along with the NSP4 CHF correlation development and validation.

Executive Summary

The purpose of this report is to provide the bases for Nuclear Regulatory Commission approval to use the NSP2 CHF correlation in VIPRE-01, within its range of applicability in Table 8-2, along with its associated correlation limit of 1.17, for the NuScale Design Certification Application (DCA) and safety analysis of the NuScale Power Module (NPM) with NuFuel-HTP2™ fuel. This report also provides the bases for Nuclear Regulatory Commission approval to use the NSP4 CHF correlation in VIPRE-01, within its range of applicability in Table 8-4, along with its associated correlation limit 1.21, for the NuScale DCA and safety analysis of the NPM with NuFuel-HTP2™ fuel.

These correlations conform to acceptance criteria given by the NuScale Design-Specific Review Standard (DSRS) and the requirements of 10 CFR 50, Appendix A, General Design Criterion (GDC) 10.

This topical report presents the NSP2 and NSP4 critical heat flux (CHF) correlations developed by NuScale to assess CHF performance for normal operation and anticipated operational occurrences (AOOs) in the NPM with NuFuel-HTP2™ fuel. Described in this report are the tests, test facilities, statistical methods, correlation development process, and resultant NSP2 and NSP4 CHF correlations.

The NPM will use the NuFuel-HTP2™ fuel assembly design for the DCA. This fuel assembly is a half-height, standard 17x17 design that includes AREVA's HMP™ and HTP™ spacer grids. The NSP2 and NSP4 CHF correlations developed within this report are used with this fuel design.

The CHF tests for NuScale were performed at Stern Laboratories, Inc. in Ontario, Canada, and at AREVA's Karlstein, Germany, thermal-hydraulic (KATHY) test facility to obtain steady-state CHF data used in the derivation and validation of the NSP2 CHF correlation. The Stern tests were performed on a preliminary prototypical bundle geometrically comparable to the NuFuel-HTP2™ design, but with generic, simple non-mixing spacer grids rather than the HMP™ and HTP™ spacer grids. The Stern preliminary prototypical bundle tests provide data over wide parameter ranges, which encompass the NPM operating parameter values that are analyzed with the VIPRE-01 code, to develop a NSP1 CHF correlation. A set of existing CHF data for an HMP™ spacer grid (KATHY K8500 HMP™), which is utilized in the NuFuel-HTP2™ design, is used to develop an "NSPX factor" that conservatively predicts the NuFuel-HTP2™ CHF performance. The NSP2 CHF correlation combines the NSP1 CHF correlation and this NSPX factor.

The CHF tests of the reference NuFuel-HTP2™ design were conducted by AREVA at the KATHY test facility (KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™) to provide data used to validate the NSP2 CHF correlation and to develop the NSP4 CHF correlation for the NPM application. Overall, data were obtained from eight separate CHF tests including [

] along with both unit and guide tube layouts. A total of $\{\{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$ data points are used to develop the NSP1 CHF correlation form, coefficients and NSPX factor while $\{\{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$ data points are used to validate the NSP2 CHF correlation, and to develop the NSP4 CHF correlation, for NuFuel-HTP2™ fuel. The figure of merit for preventing the occurrence of

CHF in the NPM is critical heat flux ratio (CHFR), rather than departure from nucleate boiling ratio that is traditionally used for pressurized water reactor (PWR) applications. The CHFR is used for consistency in modeling the range of NuScale specific phenomena, and is defined as the ratio of CHF to local heat flux. The NSP2 and NSP4 CHF correlations are empirically based correlations that account for fuel geometry and local fluid conditions, properties, and heat flux. They include a non-uniform flux factor (F-factor) that accommodates variability in axial power profiles in the NPM. The NSP2 CHF correlation conservatively predicts CHF for the Stern preliminary prototypic test data and the KATHY HMP™ and KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ fuel. The NSP4 CHF correlation adequately predicts CHF for the KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ fuel. Therefore, the NSP2 and NSP 4 CHF correlations conservatively predict CHF for the NuFuel-HTP2™ application in the NPM, when used in conjunction with the applicable statistically derived correlation limit. Application of a CHFR limit determined with the NSP2 and NSP4 CHF correlations ensures with a 95 percent probability at the 95 percent confidence level (95/95 level), that the hot fuel rod in the core does not experience CHF during normal operation or AOOs in conformance with the acceptance criteria given by the NuScale DSRS, Section 4.4 (Reference 9.1.3). The application of these CHF correlations to safety analysis, including development of safety analysis design limits, application of uncertainties or fuel failure methods, is outside of the scope of this report.

The NSP2 and NSP4 CHF correlations are used in safety analysis evaluations of the NPM using the NuFuel-HTP2™ fuel design with local conditions calculated by the VIPRE-01 subchannel thermal-hydraulic code. Qualification of VIPRE-01 for use in NPM calculations is addressed in the NuScale Subchannel Analysis Methodology topical report (Reference 9.2.3).

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Purpose

This report presents the NSP2 and NSP4 critical heat flux (CHF) correlations that have been developed by NuScale to assess CHF performance for normal operation and anticipated operational occurrences (AOOs) in the NuScale Power Module (NPM) with NuFuel-HTP2™ fuel. This report describes the tests, test facilities, statistical methods, and CHF correlation development process. NuScale requests NRC approval of the NSP2 CHF correlation in VIPRE-01 for NuFuel-HTP2™ fuel, within its range of applicability in Table 8-2, along with its associated correlation limit of 1.17, for the NuScale DCA and safety analysis of the NPM with NuFuel-HTP2™ fuel. NuScale also requests NRC approval of the NSP4 CHF correlation in VIPRE-01, within its range of applicability in Table 8-4, along with its associated correlation limit 1.21, for the NuScale DCA and safety analysis of the NPM with NuFuel-HTP2™ fuel.

1.2 Scope

This report presents descriptions of the NuScale CHF testing, and the development and validation of the NSP2 and NSP4 CHF correlations. The overall process flow for developing the NSP2 CHF correlation is illustrated in Figure 1-1. The process for developing the NSP4 CHF correlation is simpler, relying only on the NuFuel-HTP2™ CHF test data, as illustrated in Figure 1-2. The facilities and test descriptions are provided in Section 3.1 along with methods for obtaining data. The development of the NSP1 CHF correlation and NSPX factor that make up the NSP2 CHF correlation are presented in Section 4.0 and 5.0, respectively. Development of a {{

}}^{2(a),(c)} is discussed in Section 4.3 for the NSP2 CHF correlation. Validation of the NSP2 CHF correlation with NuFuel-HTP2™ design specific CHF test data is presented in Section 6.0. The development and validation of the NSP4 CHF correlation is presented in Section 7.0

The application of these CHF correlations to safety analysis, including the development of safety analysis design limits, application of uncertainties or fuel failure survey methods, is outside of the scope of this report.

The CHF correlations are based upon local thermal-hydraulic conditions calculated with the VIPRE-01 subchannel thermal-hydraulic code. Qualification of VIPRE-01 for use in NPM calculations is outside of the scope of this report and is addressed in the NuScale Subchannel Analysis Methodology Topical Report (Reference 9.2.3). The two-phase and heat transfer correlations used for deriving local conditions (refer to Section 3.3.1) in this report are consistent with those in Reference 9.2.3. Use of the CHF correlation developed in this report requires consistency with the VIPRE-01 two-phase and heat transfer correlations in Section 3.3.1 of this report and Reference 9.2.3.

{{

Figure 1-1. NSP2 CHF correlation development flow chart

}}^{2(a),(c)}

{{

}}^{2(a),(c)}

Figure 1-2. NSP4 CHF correlation development flow chart

1.3 Abbreviations

Table 1-1. Abbreviations

Term	Definition
AOO	anticipated operational occurrence
BOHL	beginning of heated length
BWR	boiling water reactor
CHF	critical heat flux
CHFR	critical heat flux ratio

Term	Definition
DAS	data acquisition system
DCA	Design Certification Application
DSRS	Design Specific Review Standard
EOHL	end of heated length
F-factor (F_{Tong})	non-uniform flux factor
GDC	General Design Criterion
M/P	measured-to-predicted ratio
NRC	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
NPM	NuScale Power Module
P/M	predicted-to-measured ratio
PWR	pressurized water reactor
RTD	resistance temperature detectors

Table 1-2. Definitions

Term	Definition
95/95 Level	95% probability at the 95% confidence level
Bartlett Test	The <i>Bartlett test</i> is used for testing the homoscedasticity of several populations.
C1	CHF unit test with cosine axial power profile conducted at Stern Laboratories for preliminary prototypical bundle design
Boiling length	$\{ \{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$
$\{ \{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$	$\{ \{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$
D'Agostino (D') Test	The <i>D'Agostino test</i> , or D' test, tests whether the distribution from which a sample is taken is a normal distribution (Reference 9.2.1, Section 11.10). This test may be used for sample sizes of 50 or more.
Guide Tube Test	Test section where the four central subchannels are surrounded by 3 heated rods and 1 guide tube while the remaining subchannels are surrounded by 4 heated rods except the wall subchannels
K8500	CHF [] conducted by AREVA
K9000	CHF guide tube test with [] conducted by AREVA
K9100	CHF unit test with [] conducted by AREVA
K9200	CHF guide tube test with [] conducted by AREVA
K9300	CHF [] conducted by AREVA
KATHY	Areva's Karlstein thermal-hydraulic test facility

Term	Definition
Kruskal-Wallis Test	The <i>Kruskal-Wallis test</i> is a non-parametric method for testing whether two or more independent samples of equal or different sizes originate from the same distribution. This test has an underlying assumption of equal variances.
Level of Significance	Level of significance is the acceptable level of risk of rejecting the null hypothesis when the null hypothesis is actually correct.
Median Test	The <i>Median test</i> is a non-parametric method for testing whether two or more independent samples of equal or different sizes originate from the same distribution. This test has no assumption of equal variances.
Null Hypothesis	The null hypothesis is a statement describing a populations parameters that can be tested.
NuScale Power Module	The NPM is a self-contained nuclear steam supply system composed of a reactor core, a pressurizer, and two steam generators integrated within the reactor pressure vessel and housed in a compact steel containment vessel.
Parametric and Non-parametric	A distribution (Reference 9.2.1, Section 25.2) is considered parametric if the form of the distribution is known (e.g. belongs to a normal distribution or another with known parameters). If the form of the distribution is not known, and the central limit theorem is not applicable, then the distribution is considered non-parametric.
Population	A population (Reference 9.2.1, Section 1.6) is a collection of measurements made on items defined by some characteristic of the items. At least a single observation (e.g. pressure, mass flux, CHF) is associated with each item (or statistic).
Shapiro-Wilks (<i>W</i>) Test	The <i>Shapiro Wilk test</i> , or <i>W-test</i> , tests whether the distribution from which a sample is taken is a normal distribution (Reference 9.2.1, Section 11.9). This test may be used for sample sizes below 50.
Tolerance Limits	Statistical tolerance limits have the property that a specified percentage of the population is expected to fall within them (Reference 9.2.1, Section 9.12) with a specified confidence.
U1	CHF unit test with uniform axial power profile conducted at Stern Laboratories for preliminary prototypical bundle design.
U2	CHF guide tube test with uniform axial power profile conducted at Stern Laboratories for preliminary prototypical bundle design.
Unit Test	Test section where all of the subchannels are surrounded by four heated rods except the wall subchannels.

2.0 Background

In a pressurized water reactor (PWR), the majority of heat generated in the fuel pellets is conducted through the fuel rod materials to be removed by convective heat transfer to the water coolant. Reactors are designed to operate at a point where this heat transfer to the coolant occurs in either sub-cooled or nucleate boiling conditions, both of which provide efficient means of heat transfer. The condition of the coolant adjacent to the cladding surface may transition to a condition where a continuous vapor layer separates the fuel rod surfaces from the coolant in off-nominal conditions, such as AOOs and postulated accidents. Under these conditions, heat transfer to the coolant is degraded due to the decreased heat transfer coefficient. The rod surface heat flux corresponding to the point of transition to boiling crisis is referred to as the CHF. The reduction in heat transfer to the coolant at these conditions results in an increase in fuel rod temperatures that could challenge fuel rod cladding integrity. A design specific CHF correlation is developed for use in safety analyses of the NPM to assure that this will not occur.

The NPM is a self-contained nuclear steam supply system composed of an integral reactor core, two helical-coil steam generators and pressurizer within the reactor pressure vessel and housed in a compact steel containment. It is designed to operate under natural circulation to provide primary coolant flow, which eliminates the need for reactor coolant pumps. This reactor design results in significantly lower core coolant flow rates than conventional PWR designs, and also operates at a lower system pressure than conventional PWR designs. The NPM relies on the NuFuel-HTP2™ fuel design, which uses AREVA's HTP™ and HMP™ spacer grid technology. Development of a fuel assembly design specific CHF correlation is required to characterize these design and operating conditions and to provide a correlation for analyzing the thermal performance of the NPM.

A CHF correlation is dependent on the fuel assembly design: fuel and guide tube diameters, rod pitch, spacer grid design, spacer grid pitch, etc. It is also dependent on its application: pressures, mass fluxes, inlet subcooling, etc. The CHF is typically predicted with a correlation based on empirical data from design-specific CHF testing that addresses these dependencies. Such testing generally models the fuel designs in full axial scale with a scaled radial lattice (i.e. 5x5 in testing rather than 15x15 or 17x17 in production). The CHF testing is conducted over a wide range of operating conditions, generally encompassing the ranges experienced during normal reactor operation and AOOs.

Initial CHF testing for the NPM at Stern Laboratories was performed on a preliminary prototypical design that was geometrically similar to the NuFuel-HTP2™ design, but was equipped with generic, simple, non-mixing, spacer grids. These tests were performed at fluid conditions appropriate for the NPM and were used to develop the NSP1 CHF correlation. The “NSPX factor” is developed using data from an existing AREVA CHF test using HMP™ spacer grids at fluid conditions appropriate for the NPM, in order to apply the NSP1 correlation to the NuFuel-HTP2™ design while providing conservatism to the CHF predictions. The NSP1 correlation combined with the NSPX factor forms the basis

of the NSP2 CHF correlation. Adequacy of the NSP2 CHF correlation is assessed with NuFuel-HTP2™ design specific CHF test data from AREVA's KATHY test facility. The NSP2 CHF correlation is applicable to the NuFuel-HTP2™ fuel design.

A second correlation, the NSP4 CHF correlation, is developed directly from the NuFuel-HTP2™ CHF database and is directly applicable to the NuFuel-HTP2™ fuel design.

2.1 Regulatory Requirements

Failure of nuclear fuel rods must be precluded in accordance with 10 CFR 50, Appendix A, GDC 10 (Reference 9.1.1).

Specified acceptable fuel design limits based on CHF conditions are established to prevent degradation of heat transfer from the fuel rod surface, which could cause an increase in temperatures that may ultimately lead to the failure of the fuel rod cladding. As discussed above, the NPM design is required to assure that these limits are not exceeded during normal operation or AOOs.

The NuScale Design Specific Review Standard (DSRS) (Reference 9.1.3), Section 4.4, provides specific criteria necessary to meet the requirements of GDC 10. For CHF correlations, there should be a 95-percent probability at the 95-percent confidence level (95/95 level) that the hot rod in the core does not experience a boiling crisis during normal operation or AOOs.

2.2 NuScale Power Module Fuel Assembly Design

The NPM uses the NuFuel-HTP2™ fuel assembly, illustrated in Figure 2-1, which includes AREVA's HMP™ and HTP™ spacer grids. The spacer grids, illustrated in Figure 2-2 and Figure 2-3, are located axially at locations indicated in Table 2-1. Principle fuel assembly parameters are tabulated in Table 2-1.

Table 2-1. NuFuel-HTP2™ fuel assembly parameters

Parameter	Value
Fuel assembly layout	17 x 17
Fuel rod outer diameter	0.374 in.
Fuel rod pitch	0.496 in.
Guide tube outer diameter	0.482 in.
Number of fuel rods per bundle	264
Number of guide tubes per bundle	24
Number of instrument tubes per bundle	1
Length of total active fuel stack	78.74 in.
Grid spacer height	1.750 in.
Axial spacing from bottom of heated length to centerline of grid spacer	$\{\{ \} \}^{2(a),(c),ECI}$ $\{\{ \} \}^{2(a),(c),ECI}$ $\{\{ \} \}^{2(a),(c),ECI}$ $\{\{ \} \}^{2(a),(c),ECI}$ $\{\{ \} \}^{2(a),(c),ECI}$

¹ Note that $\{\{ \} \}^{2(a),(c)}$




Figure 2-1. NuFuel-HTP2™ fuel assembly




Figure 2-2. HMP™ spacer grid ($\frac{1}{4}$ of grid shown)




Figure 2-3. HTP™ spacer grid ($\frac{1}{4}$ of grid shown)

3.0 Analysis and Experimentation

3.1 Data Sources

3.1.1 Stern Laboratories

The CHF testing was performed on a preliminary prototypical design for NuScale by Stern Laboratories in Ontario, Canada, between September 2012 and March 2013. Three tests, referenced as U1, U2, and C1, were performed. The U1 test is a unit test with uniform axial power profile. The U2 test is a guide tube test with uniform axial power. The C1 test is a unit test with a symmetric cosine axial power profile. These tests are discussed in the NuScale Critical Heat Flux Test Program Technical Report (Reference 9.2.2). The following sections describe the test section, the test loop, and the instrumentation utilized in the test campaign. The test matrix corresponding to the tests performed at Stern Laboratories for the test campaign is tabulated in Table 3-1.

Table 3-1. Stern preliminary prototypical test matrix

{{

}}^{2(a),(c)}

{

3.1.1.1 Stern Preliminary Prototypic Test Section

}}^{2(a),(c)}

The test section, illustrated schematically in Figure 3-1, consists of pressure housing, flow channel of square cross section, the fuel simulation, and instrumentation. The fuel simulation is a 5x5 array of electrically heated rods with parameters described in Table 3-2. The pressure housing is designed for 20.8 MPa (3017 psia) and 371 degrees Celsius (700 degrees Fahrenheit). The pressure housing is 125.197 in. long and has re-entrant geometries at the inlet and outlet of the test section to provide calming regions to minimize potential flow maldistribution. The simulated fuel rods are fastened in a manner that allows for thermal expansion. The flow channel design allows for thermal expansion and reduces mixing of the main flow stream with the water in the annulus formed between the flow channel and the pressure housing.

The fuel simulation uses twenty-five fuel simulators (or twenty-four plus a central unheated tube in guide tube tests) assembled into a 5x5 square array with rods positioned using spacer grids. The spacer grids, illustrated in Figure 3-2 and Figure 3-3, are located axially at locations indicated in Table 3-2. The axial positioning of the grid spacers, illustrated in Figure 3-1, indicates that the distance between grid spacers varies between 20.0 and 20.5 in. The indirectly heated fuel simulators in the U1 and U2 test series have a uniform axial power distribution while those in the C1 test series have a symmetric cosine axial power distribution. The symmetric cosine power distribution is defined by:

$$\{ \{$$

$$\} \}^{2(a),(c)}$$

where,

$$\{ \{ \} \}^{2(a),(c)}$$

$$\{ \{ \} \}^{2(a),(c)}$$

$$\{ \{ \} \}^{2(a),(c)}$$

z = axial location relative to the beginning of the heated length, in.

HL = heated length, in.

The radial peaking distribution for the U1, C1, and U2 tests are illustrated in Figure 3-4 and Figure 3-5.

Table 3-2. Stern Laboratories test section physical parameters

Parameter	U1	U2	C1
Flow channel width	$\{\{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$		
Fuel simulator diameter	0.374 in.		
Guide tube diameter	-	0.482 in.	-
Grid heater rod pitch	0.496 in.		
Heated length	78.740 in.		
Axial power distribution	Uniform	Uniform	Cosine
Grid spacer height	2.500 in.		
Axial spacing from BOHL to bottom of grid spacer ²	Grid #1: $\{\{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$		
	Grid #2: $\{\{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$		
	Grid #3: $\{\{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$		
	Grid #4: $\{\{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$		
	Grid #5: $\{\{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$		
$\{\{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$	$\{\{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$		
	$\{\{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$		
	$\{\{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$		
	$\{\{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$		
	$\{\{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$		

Note: All dimensions are cold dimensions. Use of cold dimensions is consistent with subchannel analysis methods using VIPRE-01 in Reference 9.2.3.

² Note that $\{\{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$

{{

}}^{2(a),(c)}

Figure 3-1. Stern Laboratories test section axial schematic

{{

Figure 3-2. Stern Laboratories U1 and C1 grid spacer
{{

}}^{2(a),(c)}

Figure 3-3. Stern Laboratories U2 grid spacer

}}^{2(a),(c)}

{{

}}^{2(a),(c)}

Figure 3-4. Stern Laboratories U1 and C1 test radial schematic

{{

}}^{2(a),(c)}

Figure 3-5. Stern Laboratories U2 test radial schematic

3.1.1.2 Stern Laboratories Test Loop

The Stern Laboratories test facility is used for collecting thermal-hydraulic test data for pressurized water and boiling water reactors. The test loop schematic is illustrated in Figure 3-6.

The Stern Laboratories loop design pressure and temperature are 208 bar (3017 psia) and 371 degrees Celsius (700 degrees Fahrenheit), respectively. Loop coolant circulation flow is provided by a high-head, high-capacity pump with flow adjusted by control valves at the inlet to the test section. The pressure is maintained at the test section outlet (downstream end of heated length) using a pressurizer.

The Stern Laboratories test loop's electric power supply has a maximum power of approximately 16.75 MW (five 2500 kW, three 1000 kW, and five 250 kW power supplies). Three of the 2500 kW power supplies can be used in reversed polarity to minimize the magnetic forces due to electric current. The power supplies are low ripple, twelve pulse design and employ current feedback for stable control.

{{

}}^{2(a),(c)}

Note: Figure provided for illustration purposes only. Illegible text is not pertinent.

Figure 3-6. Stern Laboratories PWR test loop schematic

3.1.1.3 Stern Laboratories Instrumentation and Data Acquisition System

The test section and loop are instrumented to measure power, flow rates, absolute pressures, differential pressures, and coolant and fuel simulator temperatures during testing. Pressure transmitters are used to measure absolute and differential pressures. Pressure taps are installed {{

}}^{2(a),(c)}. Resistance temperature detectors (RTDs) are used to measure {{
}}^{2(a),(c)} of the test section. Thermal wells are installed into the piping for the RTDs to measure the coolant temperature. The flow rate is measured using {{
}}^{2(a),(c)}. The flow, pressure, differential pressure, and temperature measurement devices used during the experiments were in current calibration.

The fuel simulators are instrumented with {{

}}^{2(a),(c)}. The axial locations of the {{
}}^{2(a),(c)} are illustrated in Figure 3-1. The {{
}}^{2(a),(c)} for each test series are illustrated in Figure 3-7 and Figure 3-8.

{{

}}^{2(a),(c)} during the thermal mixing tests. The identification and location of the {{
}}^{2(a),(c)} for each test series are illustrated in Figure 3-9 and Figure 3-10.

Current and voltage transducers are used to measure the amperage and voltage {{

}}^{2(a),(c)}. These measurements are used to calculate the actual fuel simulator power and peaking factors.

The laboratory data acquisition system (DAS) is used to scan the instruments and convert the signals to engineering units and perform various calculations. A list of the DAS measurements and calculations and their associated uncertainties are tabulated in Table 3-3. The instrument signals are scanned continuously at the rate of 10 Hz per channel and selected channels are displayed on video monitors. For steady-state tests, signals are recorded for a period of 30 seconds and the averages are calculated in engineering units. For critical power tests, when the operator initiates a data recording event, a 20 second pre-event data buffer and a 20 second post-event data recording are stored. If the power control program initiates a power step down due to a {{
}}^{2(a),(c)} the data are automatically stored by the DAS in the same manner as the critical power data recording.

The data acquisition program continuously scans the $\{ \{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$ and utilizes various software algorithms and graphical techniques to ensure that the first occurrence of CHF is detected.

A calculated $\{ \{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$ is used for predicting the occurrence of CHF. Routinely during testing, a user-initiated software procedure (normalization) estimates $\{ \{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$

$\{ \{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$. Using the $\{ \{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$ ensures a discernible and consistent CHF criterion is applied. Following the normalization procedure described above just prior to CHF, the $\{ \{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$ throughout a given axial plane of the fuel simulation are all within $\{ \{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$ of each other. At the onset of CHF, when the heat transfer coefficient intermittently begins to deteriorate, small perturbations $\{ \{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$ are observed. As the power is increased $\{ \{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$ as the mechanism of heat transfer approaches film boiling. The CHF criterion is met when any of the $\{ \{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$, which experience has shown to be sufficient to differentiate from noise and still below the boiling crisis when rapid excursions occur.

Heat balance tests were performed to check the consistency of the primary measurements and assure that the test equipment was operating within the expected parameters. The heat balance is expressed in terms of heat loss and was typically less than $\{ \{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$. Therefore, for development of the NSP1 CHF correlation these heat losses are ignored.

Table 3-3. Stern Laboratories DAS variables and uncertainties

Measurement / Calculation	Units	Method	Uncertainty
Test section inlet temperature	°C	$\{ \{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$	$\{ \{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$
Test section outlet pressure	kPa	$\{ \{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$	$\{ \{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$
Test section mass flux	kg/s-m ²	$\{ \{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$	$\{ \{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$
Total measured power	kW	$\{ \{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$	$\{ \{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$

{{

Figure 3-7. Stern preliminary prototypic U1 and U2 test sections thermocouple layout

}}^{2(a),(c)}

{{

}}^{2(a),(c)}

Figure 3-8. Stern preliminary prototypic C1 test section thermocouple layout

{{

}}^{2(a),(c)}

Figure 3-9. Stern preliminary prototypic U1 and C1 thermal mixing thermocouples

{{

}}^{2(a),(c)}

Figure 3-10. Stern preliminary prototypic U2 thermal mixing thermocouples

3.1.2 AREVA

AREVA provided NuScale with CHF data from testing at the KATHY test facility in Karlstein, Germany. Data are provided for the HMP™ spacer grid design from the KATHY K8500 test [] conducted in December of 2014. The test assembly has similar geometry to that of the NuFuel-HTP2™ fuel design { }^{2(a),(c),ECI} and thermal-hydraulic conditions that fall within the range of pressure and mass flux tested for the Stern preliminary prototypical bundle. The KATHY K8500 HMP™ test provides representative data to assess the NSP1 CHF correlation for the NuFuel-HTP2™ fuel design and develop the NSPX factor (refer to Section 5.2). While the KATHY K8500 HMP™ test data are based on HMP™ spacer grids and the NuFuel-HTP2™ design relies on both HMP™ and HTP™ spacer grids, the data are considered applicable because at low flows, such as those of the NPM, any mixing benefits provided by the HTP™ design decrease.

Testing of the reference NuFuel-HTP2™ fuel design was performed by AREVA at the KATHY test facility between March and July of 2016. Four tests, referenced as K9000, K9100, K9200, and K9300, were performed during this campaign.

- K9000 is a guide tube test with []
- K9100 is a unit test with uniform []
- K9200 is a guide tube test with a []
- K9300 is a unit test with a symmetric []

The test matrix performed for the KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ tests is tabulated in Table 3-4. Unlike testing for the Stern preliminary prototypical design, data (refer to Table 3-1) are not taken at every statepoint in the test matrix for each of the tests. Instead, data points are spread out among the four tests. In the end each statepoint is covered by at least one test. The test matrix is designed so that there is overlap between [] tests, allowing for { }^{2(a),(c)}. There is also overlap between guide tube and unit tests.

Table 3-4. Test matrix for KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ testing

{{

}}^{2(a),(b),(c)}

3.1.2.1 KATHY K8500 HMP™ Test Section

The KATHY K8500 HMP™ test section is comprised of twenty-five fuel simulators assembled into a 5x5 square array with HMP™ spacer grids. The spacer grids are located axially at locations indicated in Table 3-5. {{

}}^{2(a),(c)}. The number and locations of the spacer grids are tabulated in Table 3-5 and illustrated in Figure 3-11. The fuel simulators in the KATHY K8500 HMP™ test have a []. The radial power distribution is illustrated in Figure 3-11. The number and location of the [] are also tabulated in Table 3-5 and illustrated in Figure 3-11.

Table 3-5. KATHY K8500 HMP™ test section physical parameters

Parameter	Value
Flow channel width	[]
Fuel simulator diameter	[]
Grid heater rod pitch	[]
Heated length	[]
Axial power distribution	[]
Grid spacer height	[]
Axial spacing from BOHL to bottom of HMP™ spacer grid ³	Grid #1: [] Grid #2: [] Grid #3: [] Grid #4: [] Grid #5: []
Axial spacing from BOHL to bottom of support grid	Grid #1: [] Grid #2: [] Grid #3: [] Grid #4: []
[]	[] [] [] [] [] [] []

³ Only spacer grids {{

}}^{2(a),(c)} are modeled in VIPRE-01

Figure 3-11. KATHY K8500 HMP™ test section schematic

3.1.2.2 KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ K9000 Test Section

The K9000 test section represents the NuFuel-HTP2™ fuel design and is comprised of twenty-four fuel simulators and a central guide tube assembled into a 5x5 square array with HMP™ and HTP™ spacer grids. The spacer grids are located axially at locations indicated in Table 3-6. {{

}}^{2(a),(c)}. The number and locations of the spacer grids are tabulated in Table 3-6 and illustrated in Figure 3-12. The fuel simulators in the K9000 test have a []. The radial power distribution is illustrated in Figure 3-12. The number and location of the [] are also tabulated in Table 3-6 and illustrated in Figure 3-12.

Table 3-6. KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ K9000 test section physical parameters

Parameter	Value
Flow channel width	[]
Fuel simulator diameter	0.374 in.
Guide tube diameter	0.482 in.
Grid heater rod pitch	0.496 in.
Heated length	78.740 in.
Axial power distribution	[]
HTP™ spacer grid height	1.750 in.
HMP™ spacer grid height	1.750 in.
{{ }} ^{2(a),(c)} ECI	[]
Axial spacing from BOHL to bottom of HTP™ grid spacer ⁴	Grid #1: {{ }} ^{2(a),(c)} Grid #2: {{ }} ^{2(a),(c)} Grid #3: {{ }} ^{2(a),(c)}
Axial spacing from BOHL to bottom of support grid	Grid #1: [] Grid #2: [] Grid #3: [] Grid #4: []
[]	[] [] [] []

⁴ Only spacer grids {{ }}^{2(a),(c)} are modeled in VIPRE-01

[

Figure 3-12. KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ K9000 test section schematic

]

3.1.2.3 KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ K9100 Test Section

The K9100 test section represents the NuFuel-HTP2™ fuel design and is comprised of twenty-five fuel simulators assembled into a 5x5 square array with HMP™ and HTP™ spacer grids. The spacer grids are located axially at locations indicated in Table 3-7. As with other KATHY tests, {{

}}^{2(a),(c)}. The number and locations of the spacer grids are tabulated in Table 3-7 and illustrated in Figure 3-13. The fuel simulators in the K9100 test have a []. The radial power distribution is illustrated in Figure 3-13. The number and location of the [] are also tabulated in Table 3-7 and illustrated in Figure 3-13.

Table 3-7. KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ K9100 test section physical parameters

Parameter	Nominal Value
Flow channel width	[]
Fuel simulator diameter	0.374 in.
Grid heater rod pitch	0.496 in.
Heated length	78.740 in.
Axial power distribution	[]
HTP™ spacer grid height	1.750 in.
HMP™ spacer grid height	1.750 in. ¹
{{ }} ^{2(a),(c),ECI}	[]
Axial spacing from BOHL to bottom of HTP™ grid spacer ⁵	Grid #1: {{ }} ^{2(a),(c)} Grid #2: {{ }} ^{2(a),(c)} Grid #3: {{ }} ^{2(a),(c)}
Axial spacing from BOHL to bottom of support grid	Grid #1: [] Grid #2: [] Grid #3: [] Grid #4: []
[]	[] [] [] []

⁵ Only spacer grids {{ }}^{2(a),(c)} are modeled in VIPRE-01

[

Figure 3-13. KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ K9100 test section schematic

3.1.2.4 KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ K9200 Test Section

The K9200 test section represents the NuFuel-HTP2™ fuel design and is comprised of twenty-four fuel simulators and a central guide tube assembled into a 5x5 square array with HMP™ and HTP™ spacer grids. The spacer grids are located axially at locations indicated in Table 3-8. As with other KATHY tests, {{

}}^{2(a),(c)}. The number and locations of the spacer grids are tabulated in Table 3-8 and illustrated in Figure 3-14. The fuel simulators in the K9200 test have a [], which is described in Table 3-9. The radial power distribution is illustrated in Figure 3-14. The number and location of the [] are also tabulated in Table 3-8 and illustrated in Figure 3-14.

Table 3-8. KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ K9200 test section physical parameters

Parameter	Value
Flow channel width	[]
Fuel simulator diameter	0.374 in.
Guide tube diameter	0.482 in.
Grid heater rod pitch	0.496 in.
Heated length	78.740 in.
Axial power distribution	[]
HTP™ spacer grid height	1.750 in.
HMP™ spacer grid height	1.750 in.
{{ }} ^{2(a),(c)} ECI	[]
Axial spacing from BOHL to bottom of HTP™ grid spacer ⁶	Grid #1: {{ }} ^{2(a),(c)} Grid #2: {{ }} ^{2(a),(c)} Grid #3: {{ }} ^{2(a),(c)} Grid #4: {{ }} ^{2(a),(c)}
Axial spacing from BOHL to bottom of support grid	Grid #1: [] Grid #2: [] Grid #3: [] Grid #4: []
[]	[] [] [] [] [] []

⁶ Only spacer grids {{ }}^{2(a),(c)} are modeled in VIPRE-01

Table 3-9. KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ K9200 axial power profile

[

Figure 3-14. KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ K9200 test section schematic

3.1.2.5 KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ K9300 Test Section

The K9300 test section represents the NuFuel-HTP2™ fuel design and is comprised of twenty-five fuel simulators assembled into a 5x5 square array with HMP™ and HTP™ spacer grids. The spacer grids are located axially at locations indicated in Table 3-10. As with other KATHY tests, {{

}}^{2(a),(c)}. The number and locations of the spacer grids are tabulated in Table 3-10 and illustrated in Figure 3-15. The fuel simulators in the K9300 test have a [], which is described in Table 3-9. The radial power distribution is illustrated in Figure 3-15. The number and location of the [] are also tabulated in Table 3-10 and illustrated in Figure 3-15.

Table 3-10. KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ K9300 test section physical parameters

Parameter	Value
Flow channel width	[]
Fuel simulator diameter	0.374 in.
Grid heater rod pitch	0.496 in.
Heated length	78.740 in.
Axial power distribution	[]
HTP™ spacer grid height	1.750 in.
HMP™ spacer grid height	1.750 in.
{{ }} ^{2(a),(c),ECI}	[]
Axial spacing from BOHL to bottom of HTP™ grid spacer ⁷	Grid #1: {{ }} ^{2(a),(c)} Grid #2: {{ }} ^{2(a),(c)} Grid #3: {{ }} ^{2(a),(c)} Grid #4: {{ }} ^{2(a),(c)}
Axial spacing from BOHL to bottom of support grid	Grid #1: [] Grid #2: [] Grid #3: [] Grid #4: []
[]	[] [] [] [] [] []

⁷ Only spacer grids {{

}}^{2(a),(c)} are modeled in VIPRE-01

[

Figure 3-15. KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ K9300 test section schematic

]

3.1.2.6 AREVA Test Loop

The AREVA KATHY test facility, has been in operation since 1986 and can be used for a variety of thermal-hydraulic tests for pressurized water and boiling water reactors. The KATHY test loop is illustrated in Figure 3-16 and its design conditions are tabulated in Table 3-11. The PWR test loop is utilized for the NuFuel-HTP2™ CHF tests.

The KATHY loop's 300 kW pressurizer has a volume of 1.0 m³ and a design pressure and temperature consistent with the test vessel. The circulation pump has a design maximum pressure of 210 bar (3046 psia) and a design maximum temperature of 370 degrees Celsius (698 degrees Fahrenheit). The loop's electric power supply has a maximum (gross) power of 20 MW and a maximum current of 80 kA at 230V.

[

].

Table 3-11. KATHY loop design conditions

Parameter	Value
Design pressure	185 bar (2683 psia)
Design temperature	360 °C (680 °F)




Figure 3-16. AREVA's KATHY facility layout

3.1.2.7 AREVA Instrumentation and Data Acquisition System

The test section and loop are instrumented to measure power, flow rates, absolute pressures, and coolant and fuel simulator temperatures during testing. System pressure is measured by two pressure transducers at the outlet of the test section (flow channel). The inlet temperature is measured at the test vessel inlet by two independent, calibrated RTDs. The outlet temperature is measured by three RTDs. The flow is determined using the measured pressure drop across the orifices using a pressure transducer. All measurement devices used during the experiments were in current calibration.

[

]. The installed heater rod thermocouples are checked for acceptable operation prior to the heater rod installation into the test bundle.

Two independent and diverse methods are applied to measure the electric current through the test bundle: the first is based on the Faraday effect and, the second is based on four high precision fast response shunts. At least one heater rod is equipped with voltage taps across the heated length. This measurement is used to determine the electric power to the test bundle. The voltage between the busbars is also measured as

a backup measurement. The measured current and voltage is used to calculate the total bundle power.

The DAS is used to scan the instrumentation and convert the signals to engineering units and perform calculations. A list of the primary DAS variables and their associated uncertainties are tabulated in Table 3-12. Analog signals of the loop instrumentation are sampled by digital converter and stored to hard disk at a sampling rate per channel of 20 Hz. All data from the test run are retained and available for engineering assessment. Select data channels are displayed on a bank of three displays with particular attention paid to visualization of the []. The evaluation software transfers the measured values into physical values (e.g., pressure, temperature and mass flow rate).

During testing, power is slowly ramped when approaching CHF. A CHF event is characterized by an increase in the measured temperatures of thermocouples positioned inside the heater rods. [] are used to check for the occurrence of onset of CHF: []

[]. Two “reference points” are selected to allow a more efficient transition from anywhere in the testing range to a nearby “reference point” to determine if the measured performance level is maintained for the test bundle and loop operation. Periodically the test loop is taken back to one of the “reference points” to verify integrity of the test bundle. A check is repeated during the test series each day or if there are any indications of abnormalities in testing. The test repeatability at these “reference points” is acceptable and is within past testing experience.

During CHF testing, loop stability is controlled by monitoring the pressure, inlet flow and inlet temperature. Nominal values for these three parameters for each statepoint are prescribed and the values are not allowed to deviate from the nominal values beyond the ranges specified in Table 3-13. During the test run the parameter values are not allowed [] specified in Table 3-13. During the last [] prior to CHF the [] specified in Table 3-13. This graded approach to assuring loop stability is illustrated in Figure 3-17.

The test loop heat loss is the amount of energy lost from the test vessel that does not contribute to the enthalpy increase of the fluid flowing through the test channel. Heat losses have been characterized at KATHY and concluded to be []. This value is accounted for in the validation of the NSP2 CHF correlation.

Table 3-12. KATHY DAS variables and estimated uncertainties

Variable	Uncertainty
System pressure	[]
Mass flux	[] []
Inlet temperature	[]
Bundle Power	[]

Table 3-13. KATHY maximum deviations of CHF test parameters

Parameter	Pressure	Inlet Mass Flux	Inlet Temperature
Max. deviation from nominal value	[]	[]	[]
Max. deviation from []	[]	[]	[]
Max. deviation from []	[]	[]	[]

[

]

Figure 3-17. Monitoring of loop stability during CHF testing

3.2 Statistical Evaluation Methods

The following sections describe the statistical methods employed in the development of the NuScale NSP2 and NSP4 CHF correlations. In order to meet the regulatory criteria outlined in Section 2.1 CHF must be avoided at the 95/95 level, which implies a required level of significance, α , of 0.05. Therefore, the level of significance is considered to be 0.05 for all statistical processes involved in the development of the CHF correlations.

3.2.1 Treatment of Outliers

An outlier is considered to be an “apparently erroneous observation that has been identified by some statistical procedure as due to error or some cause rather than

randomness in the data” (refer to Reference 9.2.1, Section 26.2). In the traditional sense, an outlier would tend to be measured data, such as a test measurement, that could be affected by unknown outside influences. When this concept is applied to a correlation of data, which is a mathematical rather than physical process, external factors that are spurious in nature are excluded. While it is possible to justify the removal of outliers from a correlation in this manner, this is not the approach employed in the development or assessment of the CHF correlations. The methodology encompasses the complete population of constituent data and the uncertainty of the correlation in its entirety in deriving the correlation limit.

3.2.2 Critical Heat Flux Test Uncertainties

The measured test values of bundle inlet temperature, average mass flux, pressure, and power are used as boundary conditions for determining $\{ \{ \} \}^{2(a),(c)}$ for each CHF statepoint tested. The overall test uncertainty, including measurement and repeatability uncertainties, is included in this measured test data based on the premise that sufficient test data are taken such that the standard deviation or cumulative distribution function of the measured-to-predicted ratio (M/P) values encompass these uncertainties. Therefore, the CHF correlation limit accounts for these uncertainties. Furthermore, system biases and uncertainties are applied in the subchannel methodology to conservatively account for plant uncertainties associated with these same parameters, which are of the same order of magnitude as the CHF test uncertainties.

3.2.3 Tests for Normality

It is important to establish whether a particular population may be considered to be from a normal distribution, because this test determines whether to employ parametric or non-parametric statistical methods. One of two statistical normality tests is applied to test whether a population belongs to a normal distribution:

1. Shapiro-Wilks' W -test if there are fifty (50) or less data (Reference 9.2.1, Section 11.9), or
2. D'Agostino's D' test if there are more than fifty (50) data (Reference 9.2.1, Section 11.10).

3.2.4 Comparisons of Data Sets

The complete data set is $\{ \{$

$$\} \}^{2(a),(c)}.$$

For parametric data, the Bartlett test of homoscedasticity (Reference 9.2.1, Section 14.7) is performed on data subsets to test whether the variances are considered equal. For non-parametric data, the k-Sample Squared Ranks test (Reference 9.2.1, Section 25.14) is performed to test equality of variances. If the null hypothesis that the variances are equal is rejected, then the median test of locations (Reference 9.2.1, Section 25.9) is used to determine whether data subsets can be combined. Otherwise, the Kruskal-Wallis test of locations (Reference 9.2.1, Section 25.10) is used because the Kruskal-Wallis test assumes that variances are equal. If it can be statistically shown that data subsets have equal means then they are combined into larger data groups. When combining data into groups it is possible that some data subsets can belong to multiple groups. For example, consider a simple case with three subsets: α , β , and γ ; it is possible that α can be combined with β , and γ , but that β cannot be combined with γ . In this case α , β , and γ cannot be combined into a single group, but α can be combined with β to make one group and α can be combined with γ to make a second group.

3.2.5 Correlation Limit

The CHF correlation limit is equivalent to a one-sided tolerance limit of the predicted-to-measured ratio (P/M) CHF values. If the P/M sample can be shown to belong to a normal distribution then a parametric statistical tolerance limit method (Reference 9.2.1; Section 9.12) is used. If the sample cannot be shown to belong to the normal distribution then a non-parametric statistical tolerance limit method using order statistics is used. If a random sample n is taken from a population having a continuous distribution function $F(x)$ the samples are ordered ascendingly as $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_i, \dots, x_n$, as illustrated in Figure 3-18. The fraction β of the population that lie between the i^{th} and j^{th} values (i.e., x_i and x_j) in the sample is $F(x_j) - F(x_i)$. This quantity is referred to as the population coverage of the interval (x_i, x_j) and has the probability element:

$$\frac{\Gamma(n+1)}{\Gamma(k)\Gamma(n-k+1)} u^{k-1}(1-u)^{n-k} du \quad \text{Eq. 3-2}$$

where u is the probability of the statistic falling in the interval. The probability α that the coverage is at least β is given as:

$$\alpha = \int_{\beta}^1 \frac{\Gamma(n+1)}{\Gamma(k)\Gamma(n-k+1)} u^{k-1}(1-u)^{n-k} du \quad \text{Eq. 3-3}$$

where $k = n - j + i$ and α is referred to as the tolerance level. The above equation is simplified and the value of k is maximized so that:

$$\alpha \leq 1 - I_{\beta}(n - k + 1, k) \quad \text{Eq. 3-4}$$

Where $I_x(A, B)$ is the incomplete beta distribution:

$$I_x(A, B) = \frac{\Gamma(A+B)}{\Gamma(A)\Gamma(B)} \int_0^x z^{A-1}(1-z)^{B-1} dz, \quad \text{Eq. 3-5}$$

For all variations of A and B the following equality holds:

$$I_{1-\beta}(k, n - k + 1) = 1 - I_{\beta}(n - k + 1, k) \quad \text{Eq. 3-6}$$

Therefore, Eq. 3-3 can be expressed as:

$$\alpha \leq I_{1-\beta}(k, n - k + 1) \quad \text{Eq. 3-7}$$

Tolerance limits are calculated for each data subset grouping discussed in Section 3.2.4. The maximum tolerance limit for all of the groups is adopted as the correlation limit, because this limit conservatively bounds all of the groups.




Figure 3-18. Illustrative non-parametric probability distribution function

3.3 Local Conditions

The CHF test data provide global parameter values such as system pressure, inlet temperature, and total bundle power. The NSP2 and NSP4 CHF correlations, however, are based on thermal-hydraulic conditions $\{\{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$. These parameters include, but are not limited to, local mass flux, local equilibrium quality, and local heat flux. The local thermal-hydraulic conditions are calculated with the VIPRE-01 subchannel code (Reference 9.2.3). The following sections describe the generic and test specific modeling options selected.

3.3.1 VIPRE-01 Models

The radial geometry of the Stern preliminary prototypic U1, U2, and C1 tests is represented by a 36-channel model of the test assembly in full radial detail, as illustrated in Figure 3-4 for the U1 and C1 tests and Figure 3-5 for the U2 test. The model represents the heated length of the test section with grid spacers represented with discrete nodes to capture the diversion crossflow at appropriate locations. Maximum axial node size is $\{\{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$. The axial power distribution is uniform for the U1 and U2 tests and symmetric cosine for the C1 test, as discussed in Section 3.1.1.1. The cosine axial power shape of C1 is defined by Eq. 3-1. Operating conditions are based on the measured exit pressure, inlet temperature, inlet mass flux, and average linear heat generation rate, which vary for each test point.

The radial geometry of the KATHY K8500 HMP™ and KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ K9000, K9100, K9200, and K9300 tests are also represented by similar 36-channel models of the test assembly in full radial detail. The models cover the heated length of the test section with spacer grids represented with discrete nodes. Maximum axial node size for any of the KATHY models is $\{ \{ \} \}^{2(a),(c)}$. The [] for the [] tests, and [] for the [] tests. Operating conditions are based on the measured exit pressure, inlet temperature, inlet mass flux, and average linear heat generation rate, which vary for each test point.

Each of the VIPRE-01 models, for the Stern preliminary prototypic, KATHY K8500 HMP™ and KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ tests for development and validation of the NSP2 CHF correlation, use the same VIPRE-01 two-phase, heat transfer and mixing correlation inputs. For the NSP4 CHF correlation, the turbulent mixing (β) value is increased from $\{ \{ \} \}^{2(a),(c),ECI}$ consistent with improved mixing with the HTP2™ grid as demonstrated by the NuFuel-HTP2™ thermal mixing test data. The two-phase and heat transfer correlation models are tabulated in Table 3-14 and the mixing models are tabulated in Table 3-15. The models in these two tables are identical to those identified for safety analysis of the NPM per the subchannel analysis methodology topical report (Reference 9.2.3). Justification for the selection of these models is discussed in the subchannel analysis methodology topical report (Reference 9.2.3). Therefore, the two-phase and heat transfer correlations listed in Table 3-14 and Table 3-15 must be used in any safety analysis of the NPM that uses the NSP2 or NSP4 CHF correlations.

Table 3-14. Two-phase and heat transfer correlations

Correlation	VIPRE-01 Model	Notes
Two-phase friction multiplier	EPRI	The EPRI correlations are recommend in the guidelines for two-phase models because they provided the best overall benchmark to data. (VIPRE-01 default option)
Two-phase subcooled void	EPRI	
Two-phase bulk void	EPRI	
Hot wall friction correction	NONE	
Single-phase forced convection heat transfer	EPRI	The EPRI correlation is the Dittus-Boelter correlation with the leading coefficients defined to correspond to the EPRI void models (VIPRE-01 default option)
Subcooled boiling heat transfer	THSP	The Thom correlation (VIPRE-01 default option)
Saturated boiling heat transfer	THSP	The Thom correlation (VIPRE-01 default option)
Transition boiling heat transfer	COND	The Condie-Bengtson correlation (VIPRE-01 default option)
Film boiling heat transfer	G5.7	The Groeneveld 5.7 correlation (VIPRE-01 default option)

Table 3-15. Turbulent mixing factors

Correlation	Value	Notes
Turbulent momentum factor	0.8	This is the default recommended value for VIPRE-01 and it has been determined that the sensitivity of this parameter ranging from 0 to 1 is negligible
Single-phase mixing coefficient correlation	$w' = \beta S \bar{G}$	Use a standard Rowe & Angle type model
β value for NSP2 CHF correlation	$\{\{\}\}^{2(a),(c),ECI}$	Based on single-phase data from Stern Laboratories thermal mixing tests
β value for NSP4 CHF correlation	$\{\{\}\}^{2(a),(c),ECI}$	Based on single-phase data from NuFuel-HTP2™ thermal mixing tests
Two-phase mixing coefficient correlation	-	Treated the same as single-phase mixing, which has been found to be conservative

3.3.2 VIPRE-01 Data Reduction

VIPRE-01 $\{\{\}\}^{2(a),(c)}$. For the Stern preliminary prototypic tests, $\{\{\}\}^{2(a),(c)}$.

$\{\{\}\}^{2(a),(c)}$. The [

]. Local conditions

for KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ K9000 through K9300 are $\{\{\}\}^{2(a),(c)}$. These data are used to validate the NSP2 CHF correlation. Using the highest predicted CHF in the P/M CHF value calculation increases the P/M values. Higher P/M values are more challenging relative to validating that the NSP2 CHF correlation can conservatively predict NuFuel-HTP2™ fuel CHF. Therefore, the NSP2 CHF correlation can be shown to provide conservative predictions of CHF for the KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ data without concerns that there are other more challenging local thermal-hydraulic conditions. For the NSP4 CHF correlation local conditions are taken from the $\{\{\}\}^{2(a),(c)}$.

The local conditions obtained from VIPRE-01 include:

- local mass flux, 10^6 lbm/hr-ft²
- local enthalpy, Btu/lbm

Global parameters obtained from VIPRE-01 include:

- boiling length, in.

- saturated liquid enthalpy, Btu/lbm
- saturated vapor enthalpy, Btu/lbm

Other parameters considered for the CHF development include:

- exit pressure, psia (CHF test boundary condition)
- $\{ \{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$
- local equilibrium quality (calculated from local enthalpy)
- $\{ \{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$
- $\{ \{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$
- $\{ \{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$
- $\{ \{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$
- $\{ \{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$
- $\{ \{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$
- $\{ \{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$

All of these parameters are considered in one way or another for the NSP1 CHF correlation. For reference, the primary parameters common to most CHF correlations are pressure, local mass flux, and local quality.

4.0 NSP1 Critical Heat Flux Correlation Development

The NSP1 CHF correlation is based upon Stern preliminary prototypical CHF test data. This data meets general behavioral expectations. The measured uniform CHF is found to {{

}}^{2(a),(b),(c)}. Therefore, the trends in Figure 4-1 are consistent with expectations considering the combined effect of {{}}^{2(a),(c)}. This trend is consistent with that of the KATHY K8500 HMP™ data in Figure 5-1. The linear fit of the data demonstrates a trend of {{}}^{2(a),(b),(c)}, as illustrated in Figure 4-2. This trend meets expectations, as the {{}}^{2(a),(c)} aid in the removal of heat from the heater rods. Also, the linear fit of the data demonstrate a trend of {{}}^{2(a),(b),(c)}, as illustrated in Figure 4-3. This trend meets expectations, as the increased quality signifies a greater level of overall vapor in the channels that inhibits heat removal from the heater rods.

{{

}}^{2(a),(b),(c)}

Figure 4-1. Measured uniform CHF vs. pressure (Stern preliminary prototypic)

{{

}}^{2(a),(b),(c)}

}}^{2(a),(b),(c)}

Figure 4-2. Measured uniform CHF vs. local mass flux (Stern preliminary prototypic)

{{

}}^{2(a),(b),(c)}

Figure 4-3. Measured uniform CHF vs. local quality (Stern preliminary prototypic)

4.1 Correlating Technique

The ultimate goal of the CHF correlation is to provide a tool to predict CHF for safety analysis and provide a correlation limit that assures the guidance given by acceptance criterion 1 of Reference 9.1.3 is met. The Stern preliminary prototypic tests encompass a range of thermal-hydraulic conditions necessary to establish the CHF-based safety analysis protection measures for the NPM, but do not provide a continuous database where all applicable operating conditions are included. A cross-validation process is employed to optimize and validate the final correlation. A five-fold cross-validation is employed in evaluating the NSP1 CHF correlation. Cross-validation is a technique for assessing how accurately a predictive model performs in its actual application. This process minimizes “over-fitting” of the correlation to data along with other undesirable biases. The complete data population (all local condition data) is randomly partitioned into five equal-sized sub-populations, or subsets. Of these five subsets, one is held aside for validation testing, while the other four are used to train the correlation. This process is repeated five times (five-fold) until all five subsets have been used for validation testing. The correlation coefficients derived from $\{ \{ \} \}^{2(a),(c)}$ to produce the final correlation coefficients. The coefficients and statistical results of validation testing are compared between the five-folds to assure that each predicts similar values. The coefficients and statistical results are also determined for the full data set and compared to the results of the five-fold cross-validation.

4.2 Correlation Form

The NSP1 CHF correlation is determined using an additive linear least squares regression. The linear terms include the following:

- pressure
- local mass flux
- local equilibrium quality
- $\{ \{ \} \}^{2(a),(c)}$
- cold wall factor
- boiling length

The $\{ \{ \} \}^{2(a),(c)}$ is defined by:

$\{ \{ \}$

$\} \}^{2(a),(c)}$

where,

$$\left\{ \left\{ \frac{q''_{C,u}}{q''_{L,u}} \right\}^{2(a),(c)} \right\}^{2(a),(c)}$$

The cold wall factor is defined as $\left\{ \left\{ \frac{q''_{C,u}}{q''_{L,u}} \right\}^{2(a),(c)} \right\}^{2(a),(c)}$.

The boiling length is defined as $\left\{ \left\{ \frac{q''_{C,u}}{q''_{L,u}} \right\}^{2(a),(c)} \right\}^{2(a),(c)}$.

$\left\{ \left\{ \frac{q''_{C,u}}{q''_{L,u}} \right\}^{2(a),(c)} \right\}^{2(a),(c)}$

$\left\{ \left\{ \frac{q''_{C,u}}{q''_{L,u}} \right\}^{2(a),(c)} \right\}^{2(a),(c)}$. Once the form is set, the five-fold cross-validation from Section 4.1 is employed to determine the final coefficients. Through this process, the NSP1 CHF correlation is found to have the form:

$\left\{ \left\{ \frac{q''_{C,u}}{q''_{L,u}} \right\}^{2(a),(c)} \right\}^{2(a),(c)}$

$\left\{ \left\{ \frac{q''_{C,u}}{q''_{L,u}} \right\}^{2(a),(c)} \right\}^{2(a),(c)}$

The critical heat flux ratio (CHFR) is defined as:

$$CHFR = q''_{C,u} / (q''_{L,u} \times F_{Tong}) \quad \text{Eq. 4-3}$$

where,

$$\left\{ \left\{ \frac{q''_{C,u}}{q''_{L,u}} \right\}^{2(a),(c)} \right\}^{2(a),(c)}$$

$$B = 1/G$$

$$C = X$$

$$\left\{ \left\{ \frac{q''_{C,u}}{q''_{L,u}} \right\}^{2(a),(c)} \right\}^{2(a),(c)}$$

$$\left\{ \left\{ \frac{q''_{C,u}}{q''_{L,u}} \right\}^{2(a),(c)} \right\}^{2(a),(c)} \text{ (cold wall factor)}$$

$$\left\{ \left\{ \frac{q''_{C,u}}{q''_{L,u}} \right\}^{2(a),(c)} \right\}^{2(a),(c)}$$

$$q''_{C,u} = \text{uniform CHF, } 10^6 \text{ Btu/hr-ft}^2$$

$$q''_{L,u} = \text{local heat flux, } 10^6 \text{ Btu/hr-ft}^2$$

$$P = \text{pressure, psia}$$

P_{crit} = critical pressure: 3204 psia

G = local mass flux, 10^6 lbm/hr-ft²

X = local equilibrium quality

$\{\{\}^{2(a),(c)}$

$\{\{\}^{2(a),(c)}$

$\{\{\}^{2(a),(c)}$

Z_{boil} = boiling length, in.

$\{\{\}^{2(a),(c)}$

F_{Tong} = non-uniform flux factor (F-Factor) discussed in Section 4.3

c_x = CHF correlation coefficients (see Table 4-1)

Table 4-1. NSP1 CHF correlation coefficients

Coefficient	Value	Coefficient	Value
c_0	$\{\{\}^{2(a),(c)}$	c_8	$\{\{\}^{2(a),(c)}$
c_1	$\{\{\}^{2(a),(c)}$	c_9	$\{\{\}^{2(a),(c)}$
c_2	$\{\{\}^{2(a),(c)}$	c_{10}	$\{\{\}^{2(a),(c)}$
c_3	$\{\{\}^{2(a),(c)}$	c_{11}	$\{\{\}^{2(a),(c)}$
c_4	$\{\{\}^{2(a),(c)}$	c_{12}	$\{\{\}^{2(a),(c)}$
c_5	$\{\{\}^{2(a),(c)}$	c_{13}	$\{\{\}^{2(a),(c)}$
c_6	$\{\{\}^{2(a),(c)}$	c_{14}	$\{\{\}^{2(a),(c)}$
c_7	$\{\{\}^{2(a),(c)}$	c_{15}	$\{\{\}^{2(a),(c)}$

4.3 Non-Uniform Flux Factor Development

An F-factor, Tong (Reference 9.2.4), is used to adjust CHF predictions for the effect of variations of axial power profiles. The Tong F-factor is based on a wide variety of axial power shapes and has been previously employed to account for axial power shape variations. The Tong F-factor is given as:

$$F_{Tong} = \frac{C \int_0^{l_{CHF}} q''(z) e^{-C(l_{CHF}-z)} dz}{q''(l_{CHF}) \times (1 - e^{-C \cdot l_{CHF}})} \quad \text{Eq. 4-4}$$

where,

$\{\{\}^{2(a),(c)}$

G = mass flux at CHF location, 10^6 Btu/hr-ft²

l_{CHF} = elevation of CHF from bottom of heated length

$q''(z)$ = heat flux at elevation z , 10^6 Btu/hr-ft²

$q''_{(l_{CHF})}$ = heat flux at CHF location, 10^6 Btu/hr-ft²

X = equilibrium quality at CHF location

This factor is applied to capture the effect of non-uniform axial power profiles as follows:

$$q''_{C,n} = q''_{C,u} / F_{Tong} \quad \text{Eq. 4-5}$$

where,

$q''_{C,u}$ = uniform CHF, 10^6 Btu/hr-ft²

$q''_{C,n}$ = non-uniform heat flux, 10^6 Btu/hr-ft²

F_{Tong} = Tong non-uniform flux factor

When the {{

}}^{2(a),(c)} is necessary. By

comparing the {{

}}^{2(a),(c)}, a multiplicative factor of 1.11 adequately adjusts the Tong F-factor, as depicted by Figure 4-4. Thus the F-factor term is finally expressed as:

{{

}}^{2(a),(c)}

The effect of applying this multiplier is illustrated in Figure 4-4.

{

}}^{2(a),(b),(c)}

Figure 4-4. Stern Preliminary Prototypic U1 and C1 CHF

4.4 Statistical Evaluation

The mean and root mean square error of the M/P CHF values for the five-fold cross validation and the final coefficients are tabulated in Table 4-2. For the five-folds of the cross-validation, the mean M/P is within $\{\{\}}^{2(a),(c)}$ of unity, and using the $\{\{\}}^{2(a),(c)}$ results in a mean M/P of $\{\{\}}^{2(a),(c)}$, which represents a negligible bias. The root mean square error values fall within a range of $\{\{\}}^{2(a),(c)}$. The predicted versus measured heat flux values are illustrated in Figure 4-5. The majority of data falls along the ideal 45 degree line and $\{\{\}}^{2(a),(c)}$ of this ideal line. Biases with respect to the correlating parameters are evaluated by examining plots of M/P CHF versus each parameter. There is no distinct bias for any of the correlating parameters as illustrated in Figure 4-6 for pressure, Figure 4-7 for mass flux, Figure 4-8 for quality, Figure 4-9 for boiling length, and Figure 4-10 for the cold wall factor $\{\{\}}^{2(a),(c)}$. With no distinct bias in M/P CHF values or with regards to the correlating parameters, the NSP1 CHF correlation predicts the Stern Laboratories test data in an acceptable manner.

Table 4-2. NSP1 CHF correlation M/P mean and RMS error

Coefficient	Mean M/P CHF	M/P CHF Root Mean Square Error
Cross-validation 1 coefficient	$\{\{ \}^{2(a),(b),(c)}$	$\{\{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$
Cross-validation 2 coefficient	$\{\{ \}^{2(a),(b),(c)}$	$\{\{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$
Cross-validation 3 coefficient	$\{\{ \}^{2(a),(b),(c)}$	$\{\{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$
Cross-validation 4 coefficient	$\{\{ \}^{2(a),(b),(c)}$	$\{\{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$
Cross-validation 5 coefficient	$\{\{ \}^{2(a),(b),(c)}$	$\{\{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$
$\{\{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$	$\{\{ \}^{2(a),(b),(c)}$	$\{\{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$
Coefficients based on full data	$\{\{ \}^{2(a),(b),(c)}$	$\{\{ \}^{2(a),(c)}$

$\{\{$

$\}^{2(a),(b),(c)}$

Figure 4-5. Predicted vs. measured CHF for Stern preliminary prototypic data

{{

}}^{2(a),(b),(c)}

Figure 4-6. M/P CHF vs. pressure for Stern preliminary prototypic data

{{

}}^{2(a),(b),(c)}

Figure 4-7. M/P CHF vs. local mass flux for Stern preliminary prototypic data

{{

}}^{2(a),(b),(c)}

Figure 4-8. M/P CHF vs. local equilibrium quality for Stern preliminary prototypic data

{{

}}^{2(a),(b),(c)}

Figure 4-9. M/P CHF vs. boiling length for Stern preliminary prototypic data

{{

}}^{2(a),(b),(c)}

Figure 4-10. M/P CHF vs. cold wall factor for Stern preliminary prototypic data

4.5 Correlation Limit

While many discussions in this report are based on the M/P, when it comes to determining the correlation limit, the P/M is more appropriate. When considering the definition of CHF, the CHF calculated with the correlation is the same whether being compared to test data or applied to safety analyses and the local heat flux in operation can be considered analogous to the measured heat flux from the CHF test. Thus:

$$CHFR = \frac{q''_{CHF}}{q''_L} \approx \frac{PREDICTED}{MEASURED} \quad \text{Eq. 4-7}$$

The Stern preliminary prototypic data is {{

}}^{2(a),(c)} as tabulated in Table 4-3. These
 {{
 }}^{2(a),(c)} from the Stern preliminary
 prototypic CHF test matrix (see Table 3-1) for {{
 }}^{2(a),(c)}. For {{

}}^{2(a),(c)}. Tolerance limits, at the 95/95 level, for {{
 }}^{2(a),(c)} in Table 4-3 are calculated and tabulated in Table 4-4. The
 maximum tolerance limit is {{
 }}^{2(a),(c)}. Therefore, the NSP1 CHF
 correlation limit is found to be 1.17 to prevent CHF at the 95/95 level.

Table 4-3. Data subsets for Stern preliminary prototypic data

{

Table 4-4. Tolerance limits for Stern preliminary prototypic data

 $\}}^{2(a),(b),(c)}$

{

 $\}}^{2(a),(c)}$

4.6 Range of Applicability

The range of applicability in Table 4-5 is determined from the data points used in the development of the NSP1 CHF correlation. The values for the most significant parameters are tabulated in Table 4-5. The range of data listed covers the data at the 95/95 level (using non-parametric two-sided tolerance limit methods). There is no lower limit on local quality because the trends with regards to quality indicate reasonable and predictable behavior at low qualities.

Table 4-5. Parameter ranges of applicability for NSP1 CHF correlation

Parameter	Range of Applicability
pressure, psia	300 to 2300
local mass flux, 10^6 lbm/hr-ft ²	0.110 to 0.700
local equilibrium quality, %	$\leq 90.0\%$
inlet equilibrium quality, %	$\leq 0.0\%$

4.7 NSP1 Correlation Performance

The performance of the NSP1 uniform CHF correlation is assessed with a global sensitivity analysis. A large set of statepoints $\{\{ \}^{2(a),(c)}\}$ is generated randomly within the ranges of the correlating parameters describing bundle boundary conditions. Pressure, mass flux, inlet subcooling, and boiling length corresponding to these statepoints are randomly selected. The $\{\{$

$\}^{2(a),(c)}\}$. The predicted CHF $\{\{$
 $\}^{2(a),(b),(c)}\}$, as illustrated in Figure 4-11, is consistent with the data trend established in Figure 4-1. The predicted CHF $\{\{$
 $\}^{2(a),(b),(c)}\}$, as illustrated in Figure 4-12, is consistent with the data trend established in Figure 4-2. The predicted CHF $\{\{$
 $\}^{2(a),(b),(c)}\}$, as illustrated in Figure 4-13, is consistent with the data trend established in Figure 4-3. Therefore, the NSP1 CHF correlation predicts CHF values in a manner that is consistent with the measured Stern preliminary prototypic data.

$\{\{$

$\}^{2(a),(b),(c)}\}$

Figure 4-11. Global sensitivity – predicted uniform CHF vs. pressure

{{

}}^{2(a),(b),(c)}

Figure 4-12. Global sensitivity – predicted uniform CHF vs. mass flux

{{

}}^{2(a),(b),(c)}

Figure 4-13. Global sensitivity – predicted uniform CHF vs. quality

5.0 NSP2 Critical Heat Flux Correlation Development

5.1 Assessment of KATHY K8500 HMP™ Test with NSP1 Critical Heat Flux Correlation

Stern preliminary prototypic CHF tests are designed specifically for the operating conditions needed to support the CHF-based safety analysis protection for the NPM using the VIPRE-01 code. The Stern preliminary prototypic tests use a generic, simple, non-mixing spacer grid design, while the NuFuel-HTP2™ fuel design includes AREVA's HTP™ and HMP™ spacer grid technology. Data are obtained for fluid conditions similar to the Stern preliminary prototypic tests for a bundle of comparable geometry with HMP™ spacer grids from the KATHY K8500 HMP™ test. Comparisons of significant test parameters from the Stern preliminary prototypic and KATHY K8500 HMP™ tests are tabulated in Table 5-1. [

]. The grid spacers {{

}}^{2(a),(c)}. Therefore, the HTP™ grid spacer employed in the NuFuel-HTP2™ fuel design produces [] than either the Stern preliminary prototypic or KATHY K8500 HMP™ tests as it is designed to [

]. This conclusion is validated with testing of the NuFuel-HTP2™ fuel design as discussed in Section 6.0. The KATHY K8500 HMP™ local conditions fall within the Stern preliminary prototypic test local condition ranges for pressure, mass flux, and equilibrium quality, as illustrated in Figure 5-1 through Figure 5-3. [

].

The NSP1 correlation predictions of CHF values for KATHY K8500 HMP™ data are illustrated in Figure 5-4. [

].

Table 5-1. Stern preliminary prototypic and KATHY K8500 HMP™ parameters

Parameter	Stern Preliminary Prototypic	KATHY K8500 HMP™
Heater rod diameter, in.	0.374	[]
Heater rod pitch, in.	0.496	[]
Channel width, in.	{{ }} ^{2(a),(c)}	[]
Heated length, in.	78.740	[]
Grid spacer design	Simple non-mixing	HMP™
Distance between grid spacers, in.	20.5	[]
Radial powers (max/min)	{{ }} ^{2(a),(c)}	[]
Axial power profile	uniform & cosine	[]
Average mass flux, 10 ⁶ lbm/hr-ft ²	{{ }} ^{2(a),(c)}	[]
Pressure, psia	{{ }} ^{2(a),(c)}	[]
Local quality	{{ }} ^{2(a),(c)}	[]

[

]

Figure 5-1. CHF vs. pressure for Stern preliminary prototypic and KATHY K8500 HMP™

[

]

Figure 5-2. CHF vs. mass flux for Stern preliminary prototypic and KATHY K8500 HMP™

[

]

Figure 5-3. CHF vs. quality for Stern preliminary prototypic and KATHY K8500 HMP™

[

]

Figure 5-4. NSP1 P/M CHF for Stern preliminary prototypic and KATHY K8500 HMP™

5.2 NSPX factor

The NSPX factor is used to adjust CHF predictions using the NSP1 CHF correlation to provide conservative predictions of the KATHY K8500 HMP™ data. [

form:

{{

]. The NSPX factor has the

}}^{2(a),(c)}

where,

P = pressure, psia

P_{crit} = critical pressure (3204 psia)

[

]

Figure 5-5. NSP1 CHF Correlation M/P CHF vs. pressure for KATHY K8500 HMP™

5.3 NSP2 Critical Heat Flux Correlation

The NSP2 CHF correlation combines the CHF prediction of the NSP1 CHF correlation with the NSPX factor:

$$\{ \{$$

$$\} \}^{2(a),(c)}$$

where,

$q''_{C,u}$ = uniform CHF from NSP1 correlation, 10^6 Btu/hr-ft²

F_{NSPX} = NSPX factor

$$\{ \{ \} \}^{2(a),(c)}$$

$B = 1/G$

[

]

Figure 5-6. NSP1 and NSP2 predicted vs. measured CHF for KATHY K8500 HMP™

6.0 Validation of NSP2 CHF Correlation

The NSP2 correlation is developed using test data from test bundles that are geometrically comparable, but have different spacer grids than the NuFuel-HTP2™ design used for the NuScale DCA. Therefore, it is imperative to validate that the correlation adequately predicts CHF performance for the NuFuel-HTP2™ design used in the NPM. In order to validate the correlation, the following are considered:

- Compare raw test data between Stern preliminary prototypic and KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ tests.
- Predict CHF for KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ test data with the NSP2 correlation and verify that it is conservatively predicted.
- Determine the applicable tolerance limit for the KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ P/M data, assuring that the correlation limit determined for the NSP1 CHF correlation (Section 4.5) remains conservative, or determining a more conservative limit specific to the KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ data.

The KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ data are from a test bundle design consistent with the NuFuel-HTP2™ fuel bundle considered in the NuScale DCA. The KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ data were obtained using HTP™ and HMP™ spacer grids and the grid spacing is consistent with the NuFuel-HTP2™ design considered in the NuScale DCA.

6.1 Comparison of Stern Preliminary Prototypic to KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ Test Data

The test matrix for KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ testing is designed to have some direct overlap with the conditions tested with the Stern preliminary prototypic bundle design so that comparisons can be made between data from the two designs. This approach accounts for {{

}}^{2(a),(c)}. Overlap with regards to
 {{ }}^{2(a),(c)} and with regards to {{
 }}^{2(a),(c)} (refer to Table 3-1 and Table
 3-4). Comparisons for the K9000, K9100, and K9300 tests are addressed in the following sections.

6.1.1 KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ K9000 versus Stern Preliminary Prototypic U2

Data from KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ K9000 and Stern preliminary prototypical U2 tests are compared qualitatively by plotting the measured hot rod average heat flux as a function of test matrix mass flux for the corresponding levels of test matrix inlet subcooling in Figure 6-1 through Figure 6-4. [

] as described in Section 5.1.

Note: The y-axis values are omitted in Figure 6-1 through Figure 6-4 due to NuScale requirements for the handling of proprietary test data. All four plots use an identical y-axis range.

[

]

Figure 6-1. U2 vs. K9000 measured heat flux at 7.0 MPa

[

]

Figure 6-2. U2 vs. K9000 measured heat flux at 10.0 MPa

[

]

Figure 6-3. U2 vs. K9000 measured heat flux at 13.0 MPa

[

]

Figure 6-4. U2 vs. K9000 measured heat flux at 16.0 MPa

6.1.2 KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ K9100 versus Stern Preliminary Prototypic U1

Data from KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ K9100 and Stern preliminary prototypic U1 tests are compared qualitatively by plotting the measured hot rod average heat flux as a function of test matrix mass flux for corresponding levels of test matrix inlet subcooling in Figure 6-5 through Figure 6-8. [

].

Note: The y-axis values are omitted in Figure 6-5 through Figure 6-8 due to NuScale requirements for the handling of proprietary test data. All four plots use an identical y-axis range.

[

]

Figure 6-5. U1 vs. K9100 measured heat flux at 7.0 MPa

[

]

Figure 6-6. U1 vs. K9100 measured heat flux at 10.0 MPa

[

]

Figure 6-7. U1 vs. K9100 measured heat flux at 13.0 MPa

[

]

Figure 6-8. U1 vs. K9100 measured heat flux at 16.0 MPa

6.1.3 KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ K9300 versus Stern Preliminary Prototypic C1

Data from KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ K9300 and Stern preliminary prototypical C1 tests are compared qualitatively by plotting the hot rod average heat flux as a function of test matrix mass flux for corresponding levels of test matrix inlet subcooling in Figure 6-9 through Figure 6-12. [

]

Note: The y-axis values are omitted in Figure 6-9 through Figure 6-12 due to NuScale requirements for the handling of proprietary test data. All four plots use an identical y-axis range.

[

]

Figure 6-9. C1 vs. K9300 measured heat flux at 7.0 MPa

[

]

Figure 6-10. C1 vs. K9300 measured heat flux at 10.0 MPa

[

]

Figure 6-11. C1 vs. K9300 measured heat flux at 13.0 MPa

Figure 6-12. C1 vs. K9300 measured heat flux at 16.0 MPa

6.1.4 Summary of KATHY to Stern Laboratories Data Comparisons

Comparisons between Stern preliminary prototypic and KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ data demonstrate that the NuFuel-HTP2™ assembly design performs [] with regards to CHF. The measured CHF for the KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ test is, []

[]. The trend demonstrated by Figure 6-1 through Figure 6-12 is expected because the HTP™ spacer grid []. Overall, the [] and supports the use of the KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ data as a validation set for the NSP2 CHF correlation.

6.2 NuFuel-HTP2™ Critical Heat Flux Predictions with NSP2 Critical Heat Flux Correlation

The NSP2 CHF correlation predicts conservative CHF values for the NuFuel-HTP2™ design as demonstrated [

]. This conclusion is also demonstrated by the statistical mean values of P/M CHF for the four tests, which are []. In Figure 6-14 the P/M CHF values are broken out by mass flux range. This figure illustrates that the NSP2 CHF correlation is [

]. These results do not diminish the overall conservatism of the method, because the P/M CHF values that are above 1.0 are addressed by the final CHF correlation limit. [

].

[

]

Figure 6-13. NSP2 P/M CHF for KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ tests

[

]

Figure 6-14. NSP2 P/M CHF for KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ mass flux ranges

6.3 Correlation Limit for NSP2

In order to develop a CHF correlation limit that meets regulatory requirements across the correlation applicability range, the CHF data is {{

}}^{2(a),(c)}. Tolerance limits, at the 95/95 level, for {{

}}^{2(a),(c)}. Furthermore, {{

}}^{2(a),(c)}. Therefore, the NSP2 CHF correlation limit is 1.17, which is conservative, to prevent CHF at the 95/95 level. Bias plots for pressure, mass flux, quality, boiling length, cold wall factor, and inlet enthalpy are illustrated in Figure 6-15 through Figure 6-20, respectively. From these figures it is evident that there is distinct conservative bias (i.e. under-predicting data) and the vast majority of M/P data lies above the correlation limit. The M/P limit is calculated from the correlation limit with:

$$LIMIT_{M/P} = \frac{1}{LIMIT_{P/M}} = \frac{1}{LIMIT_{correlation}}$$

The trends of a linear fit to the data are not flat (flat is preferable) but this is expected because neither the NSP1 CHF correlation nor the NSPX factor were directly correlated to the NuFuel-HTP2™ CHF data. Overall, the NSP2 CHF correlation provides generally conservative predictions of CHF for the NuFuel-HTP2™ design.

Table 6-1. Data subsets for KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ data

{{

}}^{2(a),(b),(c)}

Table 6-2. Tolerance limits for subset groupings of KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ data

{{

}}^{2(a),(c)}

[

]

Figure 6-15. M/P CHF versus pressure for NuFuel-HTP2™ with NSP2

[

]

Figure 6-16. M/P CHF versus mass flux for NuFuel-HTP2™ with NSP2

[

]

Figure 6-17. M/P CHF versus quality for NuFuel-HTP2™ with NSP2

[

]

Figure 6-18. M/P CHF versus boiling length for NuFuel-HTP2™ with NSP2

[

]

Figure 6-19. M/P CHF versus cold wall factor for NuFuel-HTP2™ with NSP2

[

]

Figure 6-20. M/P CHF versus inlet enthalpy for NuFuel-HTP2™ with NSP2

6.4 Validation Conclusions

Comparison between KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ and Stern preliminary prototypic test data demonstrates that the NuFuel-HTP2™ design has []. For the majority of points the KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ measured CHF values [] comparable Stern preliminary prototypic values. []

[]. All non-conservative predictions are conservatively addressed by appropriately setting the CHF correlation limit, which ensures that CHF will not be experienced by the limiting fuel rod at the 95/95 level. The correlation limit determined for sub-regions of the KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ test data (refer to Section 6.3) is { }^{2(a),(c)} determined for the NSP1 CHF correlation. Therefore, the NSP2 CHF correlation is found to conservatively predict CHF for the NuFuel-HTP2™ fuel design and the correlation limit determined for the NSP1 CHF correlation (1.17) is applicable.

7.0 NSP4 CHF Correlation for NuFuel-HTP2™

7.1 NSP4 Correlating Technique

A cross-validation process is employed to optimize and validate the NSP4 CHF correlation using the NuFuel-HTP2™ CHF test data. A three-fold cross-validation is employed in evaluating the NSP4 CHF correlation rather than the five-fold used for the NSP1 CHF correlation in Section 4.1, consistent with the quantity of data available. It has been demonstrated, with the Stern Laboratories data, that the difference between using a five-fold and three-fold cross-validation is small. The correlation coefficients derived from the three results are $\{ \{ \}^{2(a),(c)} \}$ NSP4 correlation coefficients. The coefficients and statistical results of validation testing are compared between the three-folds to assure that each predicts similar values.

7.2 NSP4 VIPRE-01 Calculations

Local thermal hydraulic conditions for NSP4 are calculated using VIPRE-01 with boundary conditions from the NuFuel-HTP2™ CHF data. VIPRE-01 inputs are generally identical to those used to validate the NSP2 CHF correlation in Section 6.0, except that the turbulent mixing term in the single-phase thermal mixing coefficient correlation is increased from $\{ \{ \}^{2(a),(c), ECI} \}$. This increased value is based on an assessment of the NuFuel-HTP2™ thermal mixing data from the K9200 and K9300 CHF tests. The increase in turbulent mixing is consistent with improved thermal mixing produced by the HTP™ grids and provides better thermal mixing between channels.

7.3 NSP4 Local Conditions

VIPRE-01 local conditions are extracted from locations $\{ \{ \}^{2(a),(c)} \}$. [

]. Local conditions for KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ K9000 through K9300 are $\{ \{ \}^{2(a),(c)} \}$.

Local conditions obtained from VIPRE-01 for NSP4 include:

- local mass flux, 10^6 lbm/hr-ft²
- local enthalpy, Btu/lbm

Global parameters obtained from VIPRE-01 include:

- exit pressure, psia (CHF test boundary condition)
- boiling length, in.
- saturated liquid enthalpy, Btu/lbm
- saturated vapor enthalpy, Btu/lbm

- $\{\{ \dots \} \}^{2(a),(c)}$
- local equilibrium quality (calculated from local enthalpy)
- $\{\{ \dots \} \}^{2(a),(c)}$
- $\{\{ \dots \} \}^{2(a),(c)}$
- $\{\{ \dots \} \}^{2(a),(c)}$
- $\{\{ \dots \} \}^{2(a),(c)}$

7.4 NSP4 Correlation Form

- pressure
- local mass flux
- local equilibrium quality
- cold wall factor
- boiling length

The boiling length is defined as $\{\{ \}$
 $\}^{2(a),(c)}$.

$\}}^{2(a),(c)}$. Once the form is set, the three-fold cross-validation is employed to determine the final coefficients. Through this process, the NSP4 CHF correlation is found to have the form:

$$\{ \{$$

$$\} \}^{2(a),(c)}$$

where,

q''_u is the uniform CHF calculated in 10^6 Btu/hr-ft²

g is the local mass flux in 10^6 lb/hr-ft²

x is the local equilibrium quality

p is the system pressure in psia

p_c is critical pressure in psia: 3,204 psia

z_b is the boiling length $\{ \{$

$$\} \}^{2(a),(c)} \text{ in inches}$$

$$\{ \{$$

$$\} \}^{2(a),(c)}$$

$$\{ \{$$

$$\} \}^{2(a),(c)}$$

$$\{ \{$$

$$\} \}^{2(a),(c)}$$

c_x are the correlation coefficients from regression in Table 8-1

A non-uniform CHF value is calculated with the uniform NSP4 CHF and the Tong F-factor with Eq. 4-5.

Table 7-1. NSP4 CHF correlation coefficients

Coefficient	Value	Coefficient	Value
c_0	$\{ \{ \} \}^{2(a),(c)}$	c_7	$\{ \{ \} \}^{2(a),(c)}$
c_1	$\{ \{ \} \}^{2(a),(c)}$	c_8	$\{ \{ \} \}^{2(a),(c)}$
c_2	$\{ \{ \} \}^{2(a),(c)}$	c_9	$\{ \{ \} \}^{2(a),(c)}$
c_3	$\{ \{ \} \}^{2(a),(c)}$	c_{10}	$\{ \{ \} \}^{2(a),(c)}$
c_4	$\{ \{ \} \}^{2(a),(c)}$	c_{11}	$\{ \{ \} \}^{2(a),(c)}$
c_5	$\{ \{ \} \}^{2(a),(c)}$	c_{12}	$\{ \{ \} \}^{2(a),(c)}$
c_6	$\{ \{ \} \}^{2(a),(c)}$		

7.5 NSP4 Tong Non-uniform Flux Factor

A new, non-uniform flux factor is developed for the NSP4 CHF correlation, based on the NuFuel-HTP2™ CHF data, using the Tong F-Factor formulation (Eq. 4-4). Rather than apply a simple multiplicative factor to the F-factor, as in Eq. 4-6, the coefficients of the C term are adjusted to better fit the NuFuel-HTP2™ CHF data for the NSP4 CHF correlation.

The NuFuel-HTP2™ CHF data is based on []. The [] tests can be used to determine the coefficients for the F-factor using the uniform tests as a baseline. The [] tests are related by:

$$q''_u \cong F_{Tong} \cdot q''_n \quad \text{Eq. 7-2}$$

where q''_u is uniform CHF,
 q''_n is non-uniform CHF, and
 F_{Tong} is the Tong F-factor

This equation requires that the local conditions at CHF be the same and that the inlet temperatures be comparable []. The local mass flux, quality, and corresponding inlet temperature for each data point in K9200 is compared to the conditions for all of the test points in K9000. The same procedure is also performed with K9300 and K9100. Using this approach, 144 points are found to correlate the C term coefficients. The C term is: {

}^{2(a)(c)}

The Tong F-factor for the NSP4 CHF correlation is:

$$FNU = \frac{C \int_0^{l_{CHF}} q''(z) e^{-C(l_{CHF}-z)} dz}{q''(l_{CHF}) \cdot (1 - e^{-C \cdot l_{CHF}})} \quad \text{Eq. 7-4}$$

where,

$$C = \{ \{ \quad \} \}^{2(a)(c)}$$

G = local mass flux, 10⁶ lbm/hr-ft²

X = local equilibrium quality

l_{CHF} = elevation of the CHF location, in,

$q''(z)$ = heat flux at elevation z in MBtu/hr-ft², and

$q''(l_{CHF})$ = heat flux at the CHF location in MBtu/hr-ft²

In Figure 7-1, the predicted uniform CHF is plotted versus the measured uniform CHF for NSP4 F-factor form. The data fall along the ideal 45° line with minimal scatter.

{

 $\}}^{2(a),(b),(c)}$

Figure 7-1. Predicted vs. measured uniform heat flux for Tong F-factor

7.6 NSP4 Statistical Evaluation

The mean and standard deviation of the CHF P/M values for the three-fold cross validation and the final coefficients are tabulated in Table 7-2. For the three-folds of the cross-validation, the mean M/P is within $\{\{\}}^{2(a),(c)}$ of unity, and using the $\{\{\}}^{2(a),(c)}$ results in a mean P/M of $\{\{\}}^{2(a),(c)}$, which represents a negligible bias. The standard deviation values are less than $\{\{\}}^{2(a),(c)}$. The predicted versus measured heat flux values are illustrated in Figure 7-2. The majority of data falls along the ideal 45 degree line and $\{\{\}}^{2(a),(c)}$ of this ideal line. Biases with respect to the correlating parameters are evaluated by examining plots of P/M CHF versus each parameter. There is no distinct bias for any of the correlating parameters as illustrated in Figure 7-3 for pressure, Figure 7-4 for mass flux, Figure 7-5 for quality, Figure 7-6 for boiling length, and Figure 7-7 for the cold wall factor $\{\{\}}^{2(a),(c)}$. The bias with regards to inlet enthalpy, illustrated in Figure 7-8, is consistent with inlet enthalpy not being a correlating parameter. Nevertheless, the slope of a line fit to the P/M data is fairly small, and the extremes of the inlet enthalpy are not expected to be reached. With no distinct bias in P/M CHF values or with regards to the correlating

parameters, the NSP4 CHF correlation predicts the NuFuel-HTP2™ test data in an acceptable manner.

Table 7-2. NSP4 CHF correlation P/M mean and standard deviation

Coefficient	CHF P/M Mean	CHF P/M Standard Deviation
Cross-validation 1 coefficients	$\{\{ \} \}^{2(a),(c)}$	$\{\{ \} \}^{2(a),(c)}$
Cross-validation 2 coefficients	$\{\{ \} \}^{2(a),(c)}$	$\{\{ \} \}^{2(a),(c)}$
Cross-validation 3 coefficients	$\{\{ \} \}^{2(a),(c)}$	$\{\{ \} \}^{2(a),(c)}$
$\{\{ \} \}^{2(a),(c)}$	$\{\{ \} \}^{2(a),(c)}$	$\{\{ \} \}^{2(a),(c)}$

$\{\{$

$\} \}^{2(a),(b),(c)}$

Figure 7-2. Predicted vs. measured CHF for NSP4

{{

}}^{2(a),(b),(c)}

Figure 7-3. P/M CHF vs. pressure for NuFuel-HTP2™ data with NSP4

{{

}}^{2(a),(b),(c)}

Figure 7-4. P/M CHF vs. mass flux for NuFuel-HTP2™ data with NSP4

{{

}}^{2(a),(b),(c)}

Figure 7-5. P/M CHF vs. quality for NuFuel-HTP2™ data with NSP4

{{

}}^{2(a),(b),(c)}

Figure 7-6. P/M CHF vs. boiling length for NuFuel-HTP2™ data with NSP4

{{

}}^{2(a),(b),(c)}

Figure 7-7. P/M CHF vs. cold wall factor for NuFuel-HTP2™ data with NSP4

{{

}}^{2(a),(b),(c)}

Figure 7-8. P/M CHF vs. inlet enthalpy for NuFuel-HTP2™ data with NSP4

7.7 NSP4 Correlation Limit

The NuFuel-HTP2™ CHF data is {{

}}^{2(a),(c)} as tabulated in Table 7-3. The {{
}}^{2(a),(c)} from the NuFuel-HTP2™ CHF test matrix (see Table 3-4) for
{{
}}^{2(a),(c)}. For {{
}}^{2(a),(c)}. {{

}}^{2(a),(c)}. The former are randomly chosen validation data while the
latter are tied to the NuFuel-HTP2™ CHF test matrix. Tolerance limits at the 95/95 level,
for {{
}}^{2(a),(c)} in Table 7-3, are calculated and tabulated in Table
7-4. The maximum tolerance limit is {{
}}^{2(a),(c)}. Therefore,
the base CHF correlation limit is found to be 1.21 to prevent CHF at the 95/95 level.

Table 7-3. Subsets of NuFuel-HTP2™ data for NSP4

{{

}}^{2(a),(b),(c)}

Table 7-4. Tolerance limits for NuFuel-HTP2™ data with NSP4

{{

}}^{2(a),(c)}

7.8 NSP4 Range of Applicability

The range of applicability in Table 7-5 is determined from the data points used in the development of the NSP4 CHF correlation. The range of applicability listed covers the data at the 95/95 level (using non-parametric, two-sided tolerance limit methods). There is no lower limit on local quality because the trends with regards to quality indicate reasonable and predictable behavior at low qualities.

Table 7-5. Parameter ranges of applicability for NSP4 CHF correlation

Parameter	Range of Applicability
Pressure	500 to 2,300 psia
Mass flux	0.110 to 0.635 MLb/hr-ft ²
Local quality	< 95%
Inlet quality	≤ 0%

7.9 NSP4 Correlation Performance

The performance of the NSP4 CHF correlation is assessed with a global sensitivity analysis that is performed by randomly selecting 2,500 values for the parameters pressure, mass flux, inlet subcooling, and power. Nodal conditions and boiling length are calculated with a one-dimensional heat balance calculation, using the axial power shapes in Figure 7-9.




Figure 7-9. Axial flux shapes for NSP4 global sensitivity

The trends of CHF relative to pressure, mass flux, and quality are illustrated in Figure 7-10 through Figure 7-12, respectively, for both the global sensitivity and the underlying NuFuel-HTP2™ data. The CHF demonstrates a $\propto \frac{1}{P^2}$ in Figure 7-10. The CHF demonstrates a $\propto \frac{1}{G^2}$ in Figure 7-11. The CHF demonstrates a $\propto \frac{1}{x^2}$ in Figure 7-12. All of these trends are expected from previous experience and from the trends of the underlying NuFuel-HTP2™ CHF test data.

[

]

Figure 7-10. Global sensitivity – predicted uniform CHF vs. pressure for NSP4

[

]

Figure 7-11. Global sensitivity – predicted uniform CHF vs. mass flux for NSP4

[

]

Figure 7-12. Global sensitivity – predicted uniform CHF vs. quality for NSP4

8.0 Summary and Conclusions

The CHF tests for NuScale were conducted at Stern Laboratories and at AREVA's KATHY test facility to obtain steady-state CHF data used in the derivation and validation of the NSP2 and NSP4 CHF correlations used for NPM safety analysis involving the NuFuel-HTP2™ fuel design.

8.1 The NSP2 CHF Correlation

The NSP2 CHF correlation is developed in two parts. The NSP1 CHF correlation is developed using the data from Stern Laboratories for a preliminary prototypical assembly design that is similar, but not identical to, the NuFuel-HTP2™ design. These data encompass the operating range of the NPM to be analyzed with the VIPRE-01 code for the NuScale DCA. An NSPX factor is separately developed from data obtained from existing KATHY testing {{

}}^{2(a),(c)}. The NSPX factor conservatively adjusts the NSP1 correlation such that it conservatively predicts the Stern preliminary prototypic and KATHY K8500 HMP™ test data. The combination of the NSP1 CHF correlation and the NSPX factor forms the basis for the NSP2 CHF correlation that is used for safety analysis performed in support of the NuScale DCA. The NSP2 CHF correlation has the form:

{{

}}^{2(a),(c)}

where,

$$A = P/P_{crit}$$

$$B = 1/G$$

$$C = X$$

$$\{\{ \hspace{15em} \}}^{{2(a),(c)}}$$

$$\{\{ \hspace{4em} \}}^{{2(a),(c)}} \text{ (cold wall factor)}$$

$$\{\{ \hspace{15em} \}}^{{2(a),(c)}}$$

$$P = \text{pressure, psia}$$

$$P_{crit} = \text{critical pressure: 3204 psia}$$

$$G = \text{local mass flux, } 10^6 \text{ lbm/hr-ft}^2$$

X = local equilibrium quality

$\{\{\}^{2(a),(c)}$

$\{\{\}^{2(a),(c)}$

$\{\{\}^{2(a),(c)}$

Z_{boil} = boiling length, in.

$\{\{\}^{2(a),(c)}$

c_x = CHF correlation coefficients from regression (see Table 8-1)

Table 8-1. NSP2 CHF correlation coefficients

Coefficient	Value	Coefficient	Value
c_0	$\{\{\}^{2(a),(c)}$	c_8	$\{\{\}^{2(a),(c)}$
c_1	$\{\{\}^{2(a),(c)}$	c_9	$\{\{\}^{2(a),(c)}$
c_2	$\{\{\}^{2(a),(c)}$	c_{10}	$\{\{\}^{2(a),(c)}$
c_3	$\{\{\}^{2(a),(c)}$	c_{11}	$\{\{\}^{2(a),(c)}$
c_4	$\{\{\}^{2(a),(c)}$	c_{12}	$\{\{\}^{2(a),(c)}$
c_5	$\{\{\}^{2(a),(c)}$	c_{13}	$\{\{\}^{2(a),(c)}$
c_6	$\{\{\}^{2(a),(c)}$	c_{14}	$\{\{\}^{2(a),(c)}$
c_7	$\{\{\}^{2(a),(c)}$	c_{15}	$\{\{\}^{2(a),(c)}$

An F-factor is used to account for the effect of non-uniform axial power profiles, and is defined as:

$$F_{Tong} = \frac{1.11 \times C \int_0^{l_{CHF}} q''(z) e^{-C(l_{CHF}-z)} dz}{q''(l_{CHF}) \times (1 - e^{-C \cdot l_{CHF}})} \quad \text{Eq. 8-2}$$

where,

$\{\{\}^{2(a),(c)}$

G = mass flux at CHF location, 10^6 Btu/hr-ft²

l_{CHF} = elevation of CHF

$q''(z)$ = heat flux at elevation z , 10^6 Btu/hr-ft²

$q''(l_{CHF})$ = heat flux at CHF location, 10^6 Btu/hr-ft²

X = equilibrium quality at CHF location

The F-factor is applied to convert the uniform NSP2 CHF to a non-uniform CHF with:

$$q''_{NSP2,n} = q''_{NSP2} / F_{Tong} \quad \text{Eq. 8-3}$$

where,

q''_{NSP2} = uniform CHF, 10^6 Btu/hr-ft²

$q''_{NSP2,n}$ = non-uniform heat flux, 10^6 Btu/hr-ft²

F_{Tong} = Tong non-uniform flux factor

The NSP2 CHF correlation is validated against NuFuel-HTP2™ design-specific CHF data obtained for NuScale at AREVA's KATHY test facility. The validation demonstrates that measured CHF values for KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ data [

] the Stern preliminary prototypic design for comparable operating conditions.

Evaluation of the NSP2 CHF correlation indicates that the correlation provides a conservative prediction [] KATHY NuFuel-HTP2™ test data. A correlation limit of 1.17 ensures at the 95/95 level that CHF will not be experienced on a rod demonstrating a limiting value, which meets acceptance criterion 1 of Reference 9.1.3, demonstrating compliance with the requirements of 10 CFR 50, GDC 10. The NSP2 CHF correlation must be used in conjunction with local condition calculations from the VIPRE-01 subchannel code (Reference 9.2.3). Qualification of VIPRE-01 for use in NPM calculations is outside of the scope of this report and is addressed in the NuScale Subchannel Analysis Methodology topical report (Reference 9.2.3). The ranges of applicability for the NSP2 CHF correlation are tabulated in Table 8-2.

NuScale requests NRC approval to use the NSP2 CHF correlation in VIPRE-01, within its range of applicability in Table 8-2, along with its associated correlation limit of 1.17, for the NuScale DCA and safety analysis of the NPM with NuFuel-HTP2™ fuel. This correlation conforms to acceptance criteria given by the NuScale DSRS, Section 4.4, and the requirements of 10 CFR 50, Appendix A, GDC 10.

Table 8-2. Parameter ranges of applicability for NSP2 CHF correlation

Parameter	Range of Applicability
pressure, psia	300 to 2300
local mass flux, 10^6 lbm/hr-ft ²	0.110 to 0.700
local equilibrium quality, %	≤ 90.0%
inlet equilibrium quality, %	≤ 0.0%

8.2 The NSP4 CHF Correlation

The NSP4 CHF correlation is developed using NuFuel-HTP2™ CHF test data. These data encompass the operating range of the NPM to be analyzed with the VIPRE-01 code for the NuScale DCA. The NSP4 CHF correlation has the form:

{{

}}^{2(a),(c)}

where,

q_u'' is the uniform CHF calculated in 10^6 Btu/hr-ft²

g is the local mass flux in 10^6 lb/hr-ft²

x is the local equilibrium quality

p is the system pressure in psia

p_c is critical pressure in psia: 3,204 psia

z_b is the boiling length {{

}}^{2(a),(c)} in inches

{{

}}^{2(a),(c)}

{{

}}^{2(a),(c)}

{{

}}^{2(a),(c)}

c_x are the correlation coefficients from regression in Table 8-3

Table 8-3. NSP4 CHF correlation coefficients

Coefficient	Value	Coefficient	Value
c_0	{{ }} ^{2(a),(c)}	c_7	{{ }} ^{2(a),(c)}
c_1	{{ }} ^{2(a),(c)}	c_8	{{ }} ^{2(a),(c)}
c_2	{{ }} ^{2(a),(c)}	c_9	{{ }} ^{2(a),(c)}
c_3	{{ }} ^{2(a),(c)}	c_{10}	{{ }} ^{2(a),(c)}
c_4	{{ }} ^{2(a),(c)}	c_{11}	{{ }} ^{2(a),(c)}
c_5	{{ }} ^{2(a),(c)}	c_{12}	{{ }} ^{2(a),(c)}
c_6	{{ }} ^{2(a),(c)}		

A non-uniform flux factor is used to account for the effect of non-uniform axial power profiles, and is defined as:

$$F_{Tong} = \frac{C \int_0^{l_{CHF}} q''(z) e^{-C(l_{CHF}-z)} dz}{q''(l_{CHF}) \times (1 - e^{-C \cdot l_{CHF}})} \quad \text{Eq. 8-5}$$

where,

$$\{ \{ \dots \} \}^{2(a),(c)}$$

G = mass flux at CHF location, 10^6 Btu/hr-ft²

l_{CHF} = elevation of CHF

$q''(z)$ = heat flux at elevation z , 10^6 Btu/hr-ft²

$q''(l_{CHF})$ = heat flux at CHF location, 10^6 Btu/hr-ft²

X = equilibrium quality at CHF location

The F-factor is applied to convert the uniform NSP4 CHF to a non-uniform CHF with:

$$q''_{NSP4,n} = q''_{NSP4,u} / F_{Tong} \quad \text{Eq. 8-6}$$

where,

$q''_{NSP4,u}$ = uniform CHF, 10^6 Btu/hr-ft²

$q''_{NSP4,n}$ = non-uniform heat flux, 10^6 Btu/hr-ft²

F_{Tong} = non-uniform flux factor

Evaluation of the NSP4 CHF correlation indicates that on the average the correlation provides an accurate prediction of NuFuel-HTP2™ test data. A correlation limit of 1.21 ensures at the 95/95 level that CHF will not be experienced on a rod demonstrating a limiting value, which meets Acceptance Criterion 1 of Reference 9.1.3, demonstrating compliance with the requirements of 10 CFR 50, General Design Requirement 10. The NSP4 CHF correlation must be used in conjunction with local condition calculations from the VIPRE-01 subchannel code (Reference 9.2.3). Qualification of VIPRE-01 for use in NPM calculations is outside of the scope of this report and is addressed in the NuScale Subchannel Analysis Methodology topical report (Reference 9.2.3). The ranges of applicability for the NSP4 CHF correlation are tabulated in Table 8-4.

NuScale requests NRC approval to use the NSP4 CHF correlation in VIPRE-01, within its range of applicability in Table 8-4, along with its associated correlation limit of 1.21, for the NuScale DCA and safety analysis of the NPM with NuFuel-HTP2™ fuel downstream of HTP™ spacer grids. This correlation conforms to acceptance criteria given by the NuScale DSRS, Section 4.4, and the requirements of 10 CFR 50, Appendix A, GDC 10.

Table 8-4. Parameter ranges of applicability for NSP4 CHF correlation

Parameter	Range of Applicability
pressure, psia	500 to 2300
local mass flux, 10^6 lbm/hr-ft ²	0.116 to 0.635
local equilibrium quality, %	$\leq 95\%$
Inlet equilibrium quality, %	$\leq 0\%$

9.0 References

9.1 Source Documents

- 9.1.1 *U.S. Code of Federal Regulations*, "Appendix A to Part 50 – General Design Criteria for Nuclear Power Plants," (10 CFR 50, Appendix A).
- 9.1.2 *U.S. Code of Federal Regulations*, "Part 50 – Domestic Licensing of Production and Utilization Facilities," (10 CFR 50).
- 9.1.3 U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, "Design-Specific Review Standard for NuScale SMR Design," Section 4.4, June 2016.
- 9.1.4 NuScale Power, LLC, "Quality Assurance Program Description for the NuScale Power Plant," NP-TR-1010-859-NP-A, Rev. 3, December 2016, ML16347A405.

9.2 Referenced Documents

- 9.2.1 U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, "Applying Statistics," NUREG-1475, Rev.1, March 2011.
- 9.2.2 NuScale Power, LLC, "Critical Heat Flux Test Program Technical Report," TR-1113-5374, January 2014, Rev. 0, ML14024A452.
- 9.2.3 NuScale Power, LLC, "Subchannel Analysis Methodology," TR-0915-17564, Rev. 1, February 2017.
- 9.2.4 Tong, L.S., et al., "Influence of Axially Non-uniform Heat Flux on DNB," AIChE Chemical Engineering Progress Symposium, Series 62, (1966), 64:35-40.

Appendix A. Local ConditionsDefinitions:

TEST	Test identifier
POINT	Test point
Z	Elevation of CHF detection from bottom of heated length, in.
P	Pressure, psia
G_{in}	Approximate inlet mass flux (test matrix value), kg/s-m ²
ΔT_{sub}	Approximate inlet subcooling (test matrix value), °C
G	Local mass flux, MI/hr-ft ²
X	Local equilibrium quality
Z_{boil}	Boiling length {{ $\}}^{2(a),(c)}$, in.
{{ $\}}^{2(a),(c)}$	
{{ $\}}^{2(a),(c)}$	
$q''(l_{CHF})$	Measured CHF, MBtu/hr-ft ²
F-factor	Modified Tong F-factor
M/P	Measured-to-predicted CHF ratio

Notes:

- 1) Stern and K8500 M/P values are for NSP1 correlation while NuFuel includes the NSPX factor

Table A-1. Local Conditions for Stern U1, U2 and C1 Tests

{{

}}^{2(a),(b),(c), ECI}

{{

}}^{2(a),(b),(c), ECI}

{{

}}^{2(a),(b),(c), ECI}

{

}2(a),(b),(c), ECI

{{

}}^{2(a),(b),(c), ECI}

{{

}}^{2(a),(b),(c), ECI}

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{

}2(a),(b),(c), ECI

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{{

}}2(a),(b),(c), ECI

{{

}}^{2(a),(b),(c), ECI}

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{{

}}^{2(a),(b),(c), ECI}

{{

}}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{{

}}^{2(a),(b),(c), ECI}

{

}2(a),(b),(c), ECI

{{

}}^{2(a),(b),(c), ECI}

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{{

}}^{2(a),(b),(c), ECI}

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{{

}}^{2(a),(b),(c), ECI}

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{{

}}^{2(a),(b),(c), ECI}

Table A-2. Local Conditions for AREVA K8500 Test
{

}2(a),(b),(c), ECI

{{

}}^{2(a),(p),(c), ECI}

{{

}}2(a),(b),(c), ECI

Table A-3. Local Conditions for AREVA K9000, K9100, K9200 and K9300 Tests (NSP2)

{{

}}^{2(a),(p),(c), ECI}

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{{

}}^{2(a),(p),(c), ECI}

{{

}}^{2(a),(p),(c), ECI}

{{

}}^{2(a),(p),(c), ECI}

{{

}}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{{

}}^{2(a),(p),(c), ECI}

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{{

}}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{{

}}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{

}2(a),(b),(c), ECI

{{ Table A-4. Local Conditions for AREVA K9000, K9100, K9200 and K9300 Tests (NSP4)

}}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{

}2(a),(p),(c), ECI

{{

}}2(a),(b),(c), ECI

Enclosure 3:

Affidavit of Thomas A. Bergman, AF-1117-57385

NuScale Power, LLC

AFFIDAVIT of Thomas A. Bergman

I, Thomas A. Bergman, state as follows:

- (1) I am the Vice President of Regulatory Affairs of NuScale Power, LLC (NuScale), and as such, I have been specifically delegated the function of reviewing the information described in this Affidavit that NuScale seeks to have withheld from public disclosure, and am authorized to apply for its withholding on behalf of NuScale
- (2) I am knowledgeable of the criteria and procedures used by NuScale in designating information as a trade secret, privileged, or as confidential commercial or financial information. This request to withhold information from public disclosure is driven by one or more of the following:
 - (a) The information requested to be withheld reveals distinguishing aspects of a process (or component, structure, tool, method, etc.) whose use by NuScale competitors, without a license from NuScale, would constitute a competitive economic disadvantage to NuScale.
 - (b) The information requested to be withheld consists of supporting data, including test data, relative to a process (or component, structure, tool, method, etc.), and the application of the data secures a competitive economic advantage, as described more fully in paragraph 3 of this Affidavit.
 - (c) Use by a competitor of the information requested to be withheld would reduce the competitor's expenditure of resources, or improve its competitive position, in the design, manufacture, shipment, installation, assurance of quality, or licensing of a similar product.
 - (d) The information requested to be withheld reveals cost or price information, production capabilities, budget levels, or commercial strategies of NuScale.
 - (e) The information requested to be withheld consists of patentable ideas.
- (3) Public disclosure of the information sought to be withheld is likely to cause substantial harm to NuScale's competitive position and foreclose or reduce the availability of profit-making opportunities. The accompanying report reveals distinguishing aspects about the method by which NuScale develops its NuScale Power Critical Heat Flux Correlations.


NuScale has performed significant research and evaluation to develop a basis for this method and has invested significant resources, including the expenditure of a considerable sum of money.

The precise financial value of the information is difficult to quantify, but it is a key element of the design basis for a NuScale plant and, therefore, has substantial value to NuScale.

If the information were disclosed to the public, NuScale's competitors would have access to the information without purchasing the right to use it or having been required to undertake a similar expenditure of resources. Such disclosure would constitute a misappropriation of NuScale's intellectual property, and would deprive NuScale of the opportunity to exercise its competitive advantage to seek an adequate return on its investment.
- (4) The information sought to be withheld is in the enclosed report entitled "NuScale Power Critical Heat Flux Correlations," TR-0116-21012, Revision 1. The enclosure contains the designation "Proprietary" at the top of each page containing proprietary information. The information considered by NuScale to be proprietary is identified within double braces, "{{ }}" in the document.

- (5) The basis for proposing that the information be withheld is that NuScale treats the information as a trade secret, privileged, or as confidential commercial or financial information. NuScale relies upon the exemption from disclosure set forth in the Freedom of Information Act ("FOIA"), 5 USC § 552(b)(4), as well as exemptions applicable to the NRC under 10 CFR §§ 2.390(a)(4) and 9.17(a)(4).
- (6) Pursuant to the provisions set forth in 10 CFR § 2.390(b)(4), the following is provided for consideration by the Commission in determining whether the information sought to be withheld from public disclosure should be withheld:
- (a) The information sought to be withheld is owned and has been held in confidence by NuScale.
 - (b) The information is of a sort customarily held in confidence by NuScale and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, consistently has been held in confidence by NuScale. The procedure for approval of external release of such information typically requires review by the staff manager, project manager, chief technology officer or other equivalent authority, or the manager of the cognizant marketing function (or his delegate), for technical content, competitive effect, and determination of the accuracy of the proprietary designation. Disclosures outside NuScale are limited to regulatory bodies, customers and potential customers and their agents, suppliers, licensees, and others with a legitimate need for the information, and then only in accordance with appropriate regulatory provisions or contractual agreements to maintain confidentiality.
 - (c) The information is being transmitted to and received by the NRC in confidence.
 - (d) No public disclosure of the information has been made, and it is not available in public sources. All disclosures to third parties, including any required transmittals to NRC, have been made, or must be made, pursuant to regulatory provisions or contractual agreements that provide for maintenance of the information in confidence.
 - (e) Public disclosure of the information is likely to cause substantial harm to the competitive position of NuScale, taking into account the value of the information to NuScale, the amount of effort and money expended by NuScale in developing the information, and the difficulty others would have in acquiring or duplicating the information. The information sought to be withheld is part of NuScale's technology that provides NuScale with a competitive advantage over other firms in the industry. NuScale has invested significant human and financial capital in developing this technology and NuScale believes it would be difficult for others to duplicate the technology without access to the information sought to be withheld.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on November 30, 2017.



Thomas A. Bergman

Enclosure 4:

Affidavit of Nathan E. Hottle, AREVA Inc.

AFFIDAVIT

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA)
) ss.
CITY OF LYNCHBURG)

1. My name is Nathan E. Hottle. I am Manager, Product Licensing, for AREVA Inc. (AREVA) and as such I am authorized to execute this Affidavit.

2. I am familiar with the criteria applied by AREVA to determine whether certain AREVA information is proprietary. I am familiar with the policies established by AREVA to ensure the proper application of these criteria.

3. I am familiar with the AREVA information contained in the following document: TR-0116-21012-P Revision 1, "NuScale Power Critical Heat Flux Correlations," referred to herein as "Document." Information contained in this Document has been classified by AREVA as proprietary in accordance with the policies established by AREVA Inc. for the control and protection of proprietary and confidential information.

4. This Document contains information of a proprietary and confidential nature and is of the type customarily held in confidence by AREVA and not made available to the public. Based on my experience, I am aware that other companies regard information of the kind contained in this Document as proprietary and confidential.

5. This Document has been made available to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission in confidence with the request that the information contained in this Document be withheld from public disclosure. The request for withholding of proprietary information is made in accordance with 10 CFR 2.390. The information for which withholding from disclosure is

requested qualifies under 10 CFR 2.390(a)(4) "Trade secrets and commercial or financial information."

6. The following criteria are customarily applied by AREVA to determine whether information should be classified as proprietary:

- (a) The information reveals details of AREVA's research and development plans and programs or their results.
- (b) Use of the information by a competitor would permit the competitor to significantly reduce its expenditures, in time or resources, to design, produce, or market a similar product or service.
- (c) The information includes test data or analytical techniques concerning a process, methodology, or component, the application of which results in a competitive advantage for AREVA.
- (d) The information reveals certain distinguishing aspects of a process, methodology, or component, the exclusive use of which provides a competitive advantage for AREVA in product optimization or marketability.
- (e) The information is vital to a competitive advantage held by AREVA, would be helpful to competitors to AREVA, and would likely cause substantial harm to the competitive position of AREVA.

The information in this Document is considered proprietary for the reasons set forth in paragraphs 6(b), 6(c) and 6(d) above.

7. In accordance with AREVA's policies governing the protection and control of information, proprietary information contained in this Document has been made available, on a limited basis, to others outside AREVA only as required and under suitable agreement providing for nondisclosure and limited use of the information.

8. AREVA policy requires that proprietary information be kept in a secured file or area and distributed on a need-to-know basis.

9. The foregoing statements are true and correct to the best of my knowledge,
information, and belief.

Mark E. Keith

SUBSCRIBED before me this 29th
day of November, 2017.

Sherry L. McFaden

Sherry L. McFaden
NOTARY PUBLIC, COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: 10/31/18
Reg. # 7079129

