

Materials Reliability Program: Functionality Analysis for Flexible Operations of Westinghouse-Design Representative PWR Internals (MRP-230, Revision 2—Supplement 2)

All or a portion of the requirements of the EPRI Nuclear
Quality Assurance Program apply to this product.

YES



EPRI Project Manager
K. Amberge

EPRI | ELECTRIC POWER
RESEARCH INSTITUTE

3420 Hillview Avenue
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1338
USA

PO Box 10412
Palo Alto, CA 94303-0813
USA

800.313.3774
650.855.2121

skepri@epri.com

www.epri.com

3002013070

Final Report, October 2019

DISCLAIMER OF WARRANTIES AND LIMITATION OF LIABILITIES

THIS DOCUMENT WAS PREPARED BY THE ORGANIZATION NAMED BELOW AS AN ACCOUNT OF WORK SPONSORED OR COSPONSORED BY THE ELECTRIC POWER RESEARCH INSTITUTE, INC. (EPRI). NEITHER EPRI, ANY MEMBER OF EPRI, ANY COSPONSOR, THE ORGANIZATION BELOW, NOR ANY PERSON ACTING ON BEHALF OF ANY OF THEM:

(A) MAKES ANY WARRANTY OR REPRESENTATION WHATSOEVER, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, (I) WITH RESPECT TO THE USE OF ANY INFORMATION, APPARATUS, METHOD, PROCESS, OR SIMILAR ITEM DISCLOSED IN THIS DOCUMENT, INCLUDING MERCHANTABILITY AND FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE, OR (II) THAT SUCH USE DOES NOT INFRINGE ON OR INTERFERE WITH PRIVATELY OWNED RIGHTS, INCLUDING ANY PARTY'S INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY, OR (III) THAT THIS DOCUMENT IS SUITABLE TO ANY PARTICULAR USER'S CIRCUMSTANCE; OR

(B) ASSUMES RESPONSIBILITY FOR ANY DAMAGES OR OTHER LIABILITY WHATSOEVER (INCLUDING ANY CONSEQUENTIAL DAMAGES, EVEN IF EPRI OR ANY EPRI REPRESENTATIVE HAS BEEN ADVISED OF THE POSSIBILITY OF SUCH DAMAGES) RESULTING FROM YOUR SELECTION OR USE OF THIS DOCUMENT OR ANY INFORMATION, APPARATUS, METHOD, PROCESS, OR SIMILAR ITEM DISCLOSED IN THIS DOCUMENT.

REFERENCE HEREIN TO ANY SPECIFIC COMMERCIAL PRODUCT, PROCESS, OR SERVICE BY ITS TRADE NAME, TRADEMARK, MANUFACTURER, OR OTHERWISE, DOES NOT NECESSARILY CONSTITUTE OR IMPLY ITS ENDORSEMENT, RECOMMENDATION, OR FAVORING BY EPRI.

THE FOLLOWING ORGANIZATION, UNDER CONTRACT TO EPRI, PREPARED THIS REPORT:

Westinghouse Electric Company, LLC

THE TECHNICAL CONTENTS OF THIS PRODUCT WERE **NOT** PREPARED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE EPRI QUALITY PROGRAM MANUAL THAT FULFILLS THE REQUIREMENTS OF 10 CFR 50, APPENDIX B. THIS PRODUCT IS **NOT** SUBJECT TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF 10 CFR PART 21.

NOTE

For further information about EPRI, call the EPRI Customer Assistance Center at 800.313.3774 or e-mail askepri@epri.com.

Electric Power Research Institute, EPRI, and TOGETHER...SHAPING THE FUTURE OF ELECTRICITY are registered service marks of the Electric Power Research Institute, Inc.

Copyright © 2019 Electric Power Research Institute, Inc. All rights reserved.

Acknowledgments

The following organization, under contract to the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI), prepared this report:

Westinghouse Electric Company, LLC
1000 Westinghouse Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066

Principal Investigators

J. McKinley

S. Speicher

This report describes research sponsored by EPRI.

This publication is a corporate document that should be cited in the literature in the following manner:

*Materials Reliability Program:
Functionality Analysis for Flexible
Operations of Westinghouse-Design
Representative PVVR Internals
(MRP 230, Revision 2—
Supplement 2).*
EPRI, Palo Alto, CA: 2019.
3002013070.

Product Description

This report supplement summarizes the functionality assessment of degradation for Westinghouse representative pressurized water reactor (PWR) internals under flexible operation conditions. The content is only applicable to plants that have switched from out-in fuel loading to low-leakage loading by the completion of seven fuel cycles, along with the limits provided in MRP-227-Revision 1-A, Appendix B. The evaluations in this report are also only applicable to plants conducting flexible operation within the rate and power reduction limits defined by the simulations performed.

Background

In recent years, a number of domestic and foreign utilities operating nuclear power plants have considered operating their plants as flexible operation units, and several plants have already begun flexible operation. To support the first period of extended operation (PEO) the Electric Power Research Institute's (EPRI's) Materials Reliability Program (MRP) developed inspection and evaluation (I&E) guidelines for the reactor vessel internals in MRP-227-A and MRP-227, Revision 1. However, these two documents specifically limit their applicability to plants that have operated and continue to operate as baseload units (see Section 2.4 of either document). To use the I&E guidelines, the utility currently must either perform a plant-specific justification for why this applicability criterion has been met or develop its own plant-specific reactor vessel internals aging management program to meet the requirements of license renewal. The MRP has published interim guidance on flexible operation and the I&E guidelines in letter MRP 2019-002, which supports addressing the baseload applicability criterion.

Objective

- To document the work underlying the interim guidance in letter MRP 2019-002 in more detail, particularly the aging simulations

Approach

The first part of the work included evaluations of the existing fatigue calculations for two pilot plants—one 3-loop design plant and one 4-loop design plant. The second part of the work used simulations performed with the MRP-230 functionality analysis finite element model (FEM) of a Westinghouse-designed 3-loop downflow plant to determine the impact of several flexible operation scenarios on the baffle-former bolts (BFBs). Included in this analysis is the evaluation

of selected austenitic stainless steel components that are judged as susceptible to irradiation-induced degradation of mechanical and/or physical properties using an ANSYS®-based subroutine, IRADSS, developed by ANATECH Corporation. The data gathered from the FEM runs were then processed to evaluate the amount of fatigue damage the BFBs would accumulate during flexible operation.

A previous evaluation, published in EPRI report 3002008119, concluded that the BFBs are the component in the Westinghouse-designed reactor internals that is most susceptible to the fatigue effects of flexible operation. That report also concluded that the Combustion Engineering (CE)-designed reactor vessel would not be impacted by flexible operation as long as the CE unit operates within its design transient cycles. Based on this previous evaluation, the focus of the current work was directed at evaluating the Westinghouse-designed BFBs.

Results

The functionality analysis model of a 3-loop plant was modified to simulate three different flexible operation cases: 100% to 80% power, 100% to 70% power, and 100% to 30% power. Out-in and low-leakage core loading patterns and the presence or absence of baffle-edge bolts were considered among the various model simulations conducted. Fatigue damage for the BFBs was extracted from these runs and used to determine allowable numbers of fatigue cycles or effective full-power years (EFPY) for each of the flexible operation cases evaluated.

Applications, Value, and Use

The allowable fatigue cycles and EFPY calculated by this study can be used as screening criteria to indicate the potential for accelerated fatigue damage due to flexible operation. These screening criteria will allow a plant to determine if the baseload operation applicability assumption of MRP-227 is still valid. Note that the analyses performed here using a 3-loop plant model were assumed to be applicable to other Westinghouse plant designs based on the various conservatisms applied. However, it is recommended that future analyses using the 4-loop functionality analysis model under development by the Materials Reliability Program be performed to confirm this approach.

It should be noted that the understanding of the irradiation effects included in the IRADSS module is still growing within the industry and the scientific community. The analyses documented here were based on current understanding at the time the work was conducted.

Keywords

Degradation mechanism
Functionality analysis
Westinghouse design

Flexible operation
PWR internals
Fatigue

Deliverable Number: 3002013070

Product Type: Technical Report

Product Title: Materials Reliability Program: Functionality Analysis for Flexible Operations of Westinghouse-Design Representative PWR Internals (MRP-230, Revision 2—Supplement 2)

PRIMARY AUDIENCE: PWR utility program engineers

SECONDARY AUDIENCE: Utility inservice inspection engineers

KEY RESEARCH QUESTION

Penetration of wind and solar electric power generation into the electric grid of a number of domestic and foreign utilities operating nuclear power plants has occurred in recent years, to the extent that these utilities have considered operating their plants as flexible operation units. Several plants have already begun flexible operation, reducing power output in response to the needs of the local electric grid. This new operational characteristic accommodates the intermittent nature of electric power generation by renewable sources, such as wind and solar, without energy storage. Prior to this, most nuclear plants operated as baseloaded units—that is, they supplied electricity at a constant rate for a lengthy period of time (months to years).

However, the inspection and evaluation (I&E) guidelines developed by the Electric Power Research Institute's (EPRI's) Materials Reliability Program (MRP) to support extended operation of the reactor vessel internals (MRP-227-A and MRP-227, Revision 1) are only applicable to baseload operation plants. To use the I&E guidelines, the utility currently must either perform a plant-specific justification for why this applicability criterion has been met or develop its own plant-specific reactor vessel internals aging management program to meet the requirements of license renewal.

RESEARCH OVERVIEW

The MRP has published interim guidance on flexible operation and the I&E guidelines in the EPRI letter MRP 2019-002, which supports addressing the baseload applicability criterion. The first part of the work included evaluations of the existing fatigue calculations for two pilot plants—one 3-loop design plant and one 4-loop design plant. The second part of the work used simulations performed with the MRP-230 functionality analysis finite element model (FEM) of a Westinghouse-designed 3-loop downflow plant to determine the impact of several flexible operation scenarios on the baffle-former bolts (BFBs). Included in this analysis is the evaluation of selected austenitic stainless steel components that are judged as susceptible to irradiation-induced degradation of mechanical and/or physical properties using an ANSYS®-based subroutine, IRADSS, developed by ANATECH Corporation. The data gathered from the FEM runs were then processed to evaluate the amount of fatigue damage the BFBs would accumulate during flexible operation.

A previous evaluation concluded that the BFBs are the component in the Westinghouse-designed reactor internals that is most susceptible to the fatigue effects of flexible operation. The report also concluded that the Combustion Engineering (CE)-designed reactor vessel internals are substantially less susceptible to fatigue effects from flexible operation than the Westinghouse-designed internals and would not be impacted by flexible operation as long as the CE unit operates within its design transient cycles. Based on this previous evaluation, the focus of the current work was directed at evaluating the Westinghouse-designed BFBs.

The functionality analysis model of a 3-loop plant was modified to simulate three different flexible operation cases: 100% to 80% power, 100% to 70% power, and 100% to 30% power. Out-in and low-leakage core loading patterns and the presence or absence of baffle-edge bolts were considered among the various model simulations conducted.

KEY FINDINGS

- Fatigue damage for the BFBs was extracted from the simulation runs and used to determine allowable numbers of fatigue cycles or effective full-power years (EFPY) for each of the flexible operation cases evaluated.
- Flexible operation with power reduction to 80% of full power applied deflections to the BFBs that were below the endurance limit.
- Core loading type had a significant effect on the amount of deflection, with low-leakage core loading resulting in higher flexible operation screening values.
- The case without edge bolts installed resulted in slightly higher fatigue damage and lower numbers of allowable flexible operation events.
- The screening criteria for 30% of full-power flexible operation events were significantly lower than for the other cases evaluated—put another way, the fatigue damage increases with larger power reductions.
- The top former level was limiting for each of the flexible operation cases, as would be expected due to the low level of irradiation-induced stress relaxation and the larger impact of thermal growth.

WHY THIS MATTERS

The allowable fatigue cycles and EFPY calculated by this study can be used as screening criteria to indicate the potential for accelerated fatigue damage due to flexible operation. These screening criteria will allow a plant to determine if the baseload operation applicability assumption of MRP-227 is still valid.

HOW TO APPLY RESULTS

Revised recommendations for MRP-227 for Westinghouse-designed plants are provided in detail in Section 8 of the report. These are summarized as screening criteria for the number of flexible operation cycles a plant can undergo before requiring further actions to continue implementing the MRP-227 aging management program. Per earlier flexible operation evaluations, CE-designed reactor vessel internals are substantially less susceptible to flexible operation than Westinghouse-designed plants and would not be impacted by flexible operation as long as the CE unit operates within its design transient cycles.

LEARNING AND ENGAGEMENT OPPORTUNITIES

- MRP Assessment and Inspection Technical Advisory Committees (TACs)

EPRI CONTACT: Kyle Amberge, Principal Technical Leader, kamberge@epri.com

PROGRAMS: Flexible Operations, P41.11.01; Materials Reliability Program, P41.01.04

IMPLEMENTATION CATEGORY: Technical Basis Report, Reference

Together...Shaping the Future of Electricity®

Electric Power Research Institute

3420 Hillview Avenue, Palo Alto, California 94304-1338 • PO Box 10412, Palo Alto, California 94303-0813 USA

800.313.3774 • 650.855.2121 • askepri@epri.com • www.epri.com

© 2018 Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI), Inc. All rights reserved. Electric Power Research Institute, EPRI, and TOGETHER...SHAPING THE FUTURE OF ELECTRICITY are registered service marks of the Electric Power Research Institute, Inc.

Acronyms and Abbreviations

| | |
|------|---|
| BFB | baffle-former bolt |
| BMI | bottom-mounted instrumentation |
| BOC | beginning of cycle |
| Btu | British thermal unit |
| CE | Combustion Engineering |
| CFD | computational fluid dynamics |
| CRGT | control rod guide tube |
| CUF | cumulative usage factor |
| dpa | displacements per atom |
| EAF | environmentally assisted fatigue |
| EPFY | effective full-power years |
| EOC | end of cycle |
| EPRI | Electric Power Research Institute |
| FEM | finite element model |
| I&E | inspection and evaluation |
| in | inch |
| MOC | middle of cycle |
| MRP | Materials Reliability Program |
| NRC | United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission |
| PEO | period of extended operation |
| psi | pounds per square inch |
| PWR | pressurized water reactor |
| s | second |
| SV | state variable |
| TAC | Technical Advisory Committee |
| UT | ultrasonic test |

Unit Conversion Factors

$$1 \text{ inch} = 0.0254 \text{ m} = 2.54 \text{ cm} = 25.4 \text{ mm}$$

$$1 \text{ }^{\circ}\text{F} = 1.8 \text{ }^{\circ}\text{C} + 32$$

$$1 \text{ }^{\circ}\text{F}\Delta = 1.8 \text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}\Delta$$

$$1 \text{ psi} = 6,895 \text{ Pa} = 6.895 \times 10^{-3} \text{ MPa}$$

$$1 \text{ Btu} = 1,055 \text{ J}$$

$$1 \text{ Btu/s-in}^3 = 6.438 \times 10^7 \text{ W/m}^3$$

$$1 \text{ Btu/s-in}^2\text{-}^{\circ}\text{F} = 2.944 \times 10^6 \text{ W/m}^2\text{-}^{\circ}\text{C}$$

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-------------|
| Acknowledgements | iii |
| Product Description | v |
| Executive Summary | vii |
| Acronyms and Abbreviations..... | xi |
| Unit Conversion Factors | xiii |
| Section 1: Introduction..... | 1-1 |
| Section 2: Project Purpose and Analysis | |
| Framework | 2-1 |
| 2.1 Purpose | 2-1 |
| 2.2 Analysis Framework..... | 2-1 |
| 2.2.1 Analytical Parameters | 2-1 |
| 2.2.2 Validation and Verification | 2-2 |
| 2.2.3 IRADSS | 2-2 |
| 2.2.4 Core Loading: Neutron Exposure (DPA) | |
| and Nuclear Heat Generation Rates | 2-3 |
| 2.2.5 Structural Results – Aging Results | 2-4 |
| 2.2.6 Flexible Operation Cases Evaluated | 2-6 |
| Section 3: Functionality Analysis Procedure..... | 3-1 |
| 3.1 Westinghouse 3-Loop Baffle-Former-Barrel | |
| Analysis..... | 3-1 |
| 3.2 Baffle-Former-Barrel Global FEM..... | 3-3 |
| 3.2.1 ANSYS Element Types..... | 3-7 |
| 3.2.2 Boundary Conditions and Node | |
| Coupling | 3-7 |
| 3.2.3 Contact Element Locations | 3-8 |
| 3.3 Thermal Analysis Procedure | 3-9 |
| 3.3.1 Heat Transfer Coefficients..... | 3-9 |
| 3.3.2 Heat Generation Rates | 3-11 |
| 3.3.3 Thermal Contact Resistance for Bolt | |
| Shank Water Annulus | 3-12 |
| 3.3.4 Thermal Analysis | 3-13 |

| | | |
|---|---|-------------|
| 3.4 | Structural Analysis Procedure | 3-16 |
| 3.4.1 | Material Properties | 3-16 |
| 3.4.2 | Preload: Bolt Pretension | 3-16 |
| 3.4.3 | Preload: Pressure | 3-17 |
| 3.4.4 | Preload: Core Barrel Weld Prestress | 3-17 |
| 3.4.5 | Fuel Cycle Load: Irradiation Loading | 3-17 |
| 3.4.6 | Fuel Cycle Load: Temperature Loading | 3-18 |
| 3.4.7 | Load Sequence for the Baffle-Former- Barrel Assembly | 3-19 |
| 3.5 | Simulation of Flexible Operation Using the 3-Loop FEM | 3-19 |
| 3.5.1 | Finite Element Analysis Methodology for Flexible Operation | 3-20 |
| 3.5.2 | Fatigue Analysis Methodology | 3-23 |
| Section 4: Baseline Results Comparison..... | | 4-1 |
| Section 5: Flexible Operation Finite Element Simulation Results | | 5-1 |
| Section 6: Development of a Fatigue Damage Screening Criterion for Flexible Operation..... | | 6-1 |
| Section 7: Effect of Flexible Operation Cases on the BFBs | | 7-1 |
| Section 8: Application of Flexible Operation Study Results to MRP-227 | | 8-1 |
| 8.1 | Changes to the Inspection Timing due to Flexible Operation | 8-2 |
| 8.2 | Re-Inspection Interval Requirements | 8-5 |
| 8.3 | Expansion Inspection Requirements | 8-5 |
| Section 9: Conclusions and Recommendations..... | | 9-1 |
| Section 10:References..... | | 10-1 |

List of Figures

| | |
|---|------|
| Figure 2-1 Single quadrant radial power distributions for out-in and low-leakage core loadings | 2-4 |
| Figure 3-1 Illustrative Category "C" core surrounding components | 3-2 |
| Figure 3-2 Baffle-former-barrel region illustration | 3-3 |
| Figure 3-3 ANSYS global model – baffle-former-barrel – full view, elements | 3-4 |
| Figure 3-4 ANSYS global model – baffle-former-barrel region – zoomed-in view, elements | 3-5 |
| Figure 3-5 ANSYS global model – baffle-former-barrel region – former Types 1 through 4, volumes | 3-5 |
| Figure 3-6 ANSYS global model – baffle-former-barrel region – detail of BFB | 3-6 |
| Figure 3-7 ANSYS global model – baffle-former-barrel region – detail of barrel-former bolt | 3-6 |
| Figure 3-8 Example of standard contact surfaces showing contact pairs | 3-8 |
| Figure 3-9 Model of entire baffle-former-barrel flow region | 3-10 |
| Figure 3-10 Baffle-former-barrel bypass region heat transfer coefficients ($\text{Btu/s-in}^2\text{-}^\circ\text{F}$) | 3-10 |
| Figure 3-11 Heat generation – out-in, BOC (Btu/s-in^3) | 3-11 |
| Figure 3-12 Heat generation – low-leakage, BOC (Btu/s-in^3) | 3-12 |
| Figure 3-13 Temperature results – out-in loading pattern, BOC ($^\circ\text{F}$) | 3-13 |
| Figure 3-14 Temperature results – low-leakage loading pattern, BOC ($^\circ\text{F}$) | 3-14 |
| Figure 3-15 Location of peak temperature on baffle-former-barrel assembly | 3-15 |

| | |
|---|------|
| Figure 3-16 Temperature results – out-in, EOC peak temperature in mid-section of former 2 (°F) | 3-15 |
| Figure 3-17 Dose rates – out-in loading pattern, BOC (dpa/s) | 3-17 |
| Figure 3-18 Dose rates – low-leakage loading pattern, BOC (dpa/s) | 3-18 |
| Figure 3-19 Plot demonstrating the reduction in fluence rate imposed to simulate flexible operation (out-in BOC conditions, 30% flexible operation) (dpa/s) | 3-22 |
| Figure 3-20 Plot demonstrating the reduction in temperature relative to the cold leg temperature imposed to simulate flexible operation (out-in BOC conditions, 30% flexible operation) (°F) | 3-22 |
| Figure 3-21 Flexible operation event sequence | 3-23 |
| Figure 4-1 Bolt identification | 4-1 |
| Figure 4-2 Total effective strain (in/in) – Level 1 (previous analysis) | 4-2 |
| Figure 4-3 Total effective strain (in/in) – Level 1 (ANSYS 17.1) | 4-2 |
| Figure 4-4 Total effective strain (in/in) – Level 2 (previous analysis) | 4-3 |
| Figure 4-5 Total effective strain (in/in) – Level 2 (ANSYS 17.1) | 4-3 |
| Figure 4-6 Total effective strain (in/in) – Level 3 (previous analysis) | 4-4 |
| Figure 4-7 Total effective strain (in/in) – Level 3 (ANSYS 17.1) | 4-4 |
| Figure 4-8 Total effective strain (in/in) – Level 4 (previous analysis) | 4-5 |
| Figure 4-9 Total effective strain (in/in) – Level 4 (ANSYS 17.1) | 4-5 |
| Figure 4-10 Total effective strain (in/in) – Level 5 (previous analysis) | 4-6 |
| Figure 4-11 Total effective strain (in/in) – Level 5 (ANSYS 17.1) | 4-6 |
| Figure 4-12 Total effective strain (in/in) – Level 6 (previous analysis) | 4-7 |

| | |
|---|------|
| Figure 4-13 Total effective strain (in/in) – Level 6 (ANSYS 17.1) | 4-7 |
| Figure 4-14 Total effective strain (in/in) – Level 7 (previous analysis) | 4-8 |
| Figure 4-15 Total effective strain (in/in) – Level 7 (ANSYS 17.1) | 4-8 |
| Figure 4-16 Total effective strain (in/in) – Level 8 (previous analysis) | 4-9 |
| Figure 4-17 Total effective strain (in/in) – Level 8 (ANSYS 17.1) | 4-9 |
| Figure 4-18 Effective stress (psi) – Level 1 (previous analysis) | 4-10 |
| Figure 4-19 Effective stress (psi) – Level 1 (ANSYS 17.1) ... | 4-10 |
| Figure 4-20 Effective stress (psi) – Level 2 (previous analysis) | 4-11 |
| Figure 4-21 Effective stress (psi) – Level 2 (ANSYS 17.1) ... | 4-11 |
| Figure 4-22 Effective stress (psi) – Level 3 (previous analysis) | 4-12 |
| Figure 4-23 Effective stress (psi) – Level 3 (ANSYS 17.1) ... | 4-12 |
| Figure 4-24 Effective stress (psi) – Level 4 (previous analysis) | 4-13 |
| Figure 4-25 Effective stress (psi) – Level 4 (ANSYS 17.1) ... | 4-13 |
| Figure 4-26 Effective stress (psi) – Level 5 (previous analysis) | 4-14 |
| Figure 4-27 Effective stress (psi) – Level 5 (ANSYS 17.1) ... | 4-14 |
| Figure 4-28 Effective stress (psi) – Level 6 (previous analysis) | 4-15 |
| Figure 4-29 Effective stress (psi) – Level 6 (ANSYS 17.1) ... | 4-15 |
| Figure 4-30 Effective stress (psi) – Level 7 (previous analysis) | 4-16 |
| Figure 4-31 Effective stress (psi) – Level 7 (ANSYS 17.1) ... | 4-16 |
| Figure 4-32 Effective stress (psi) – Level 8 (previous analysis) | 4-17 |
| Figure 4-33 Effective stress (psi) – Level 8 (ANSYS 17.1) ... | 4-17 |
| Figure 5-1 Effective stress (psi) – Level 1 | 5-4 |

| | |
|--|------|
| Figure 5-2 Effective stress (psi) – Level 2 | 5-4 |
| Figure 5-3 Effective stress (psi) – Level 3 | 5-5 |
| Figure 5-4 Effective stress (psi) – Level 4 | 5-5 |
| Figure 5-5 Effective stress (psi) – Level 5 | 5-6 |
| Figure 5-6 Effective stress (psi) – Level 6 | 5-6 |
| Figure 5-7 Effective stress (psi) – Level 7 | 5-7 |
| Figure 5-8 Effective stress (psi) – Level 8 | 5-7 |
| Figure 5-9 BFB displacement (in): 100% to 30% monthly FO with edge bolts – Level 1 | 5-8 |
| Figure 5-10 BFB displacement (in): 100% to 30% monthly FO with edge bolts – Level 2 | 5-8 |
| Figure 5-11 BFB displacement (in): 100% to 30% monthly FO with edge bolts – Level 3 | 5-9 |
| Figure 5-12 BFB displacement (in): 100% to 30% monthly FO with edge bolts – Level 4 | 5-9 |
| Figure 5-13 BFB displacement (in): 100% to 30% monthly FO with edge bolts – Level 5 | 5-10 |
| Figure 5-14 BFB displacement (in): 100% to 30% monthly FO with edge bolts – Level 6 | 5-10 |
| Figure 5-15 BFB displacement (in): 100% to 30% monthly FO with edge bolts – Level 7 | 5-11 |
| Figure 5-16 BFB displacement (in): 100% to 30% monthly FO with edge bolts – Level 8 | 5-11 |
| Figure 5-17 BFB displacement (in): 100% to 30% daily with edge bolts – Level 1 | 5-12 |
| Figure 5-18 BFB displacement (in): 100% to 30% daily with edge bolts – Level 2 | 5-12 |
| Figure 5-19 BFB displacement (in): 100% to 30% daily with edge bolts – Level 4 | 5-13 |
| Figure 5-20 BFB displacement (in): 100% to 30% daily with edge bolts – Level 8 | 5-13 |
| Figure 5-21 BFB displacement (in): 100% to 30% FO/6-mos. with edge bolts – Level 1 | 5-14 |
| Figure 5-22 BFB displacement (in): 100% to 30% FO/6-mos. NO edge bolts – Level 1 | 5-14 |

| | |
|---|------|
| Figure 5-23 BFB displacement (in): 100% to 30% FO/6-mos. with edge bolts – Level 2 | 5-15 |
| Figure 5-24 BFB displacement (in): 100% to 30% FO/6-mos. NO edge bolts – Level 2 | 5-15 |
| Figure 5-25 BFB displacement (in): 100% to 30% FO/6-mos. with edge bolts – Level 4 | 5-16 |
| Figure 5-26 BFB displacement (in): 100% to 30% FO/6-mos. NO edge bolts – Level 4 | 5-16 |
| Figure 5-27 BFB displacement (in): 100% to 30% FO/6-mos. with edge bolts – Level 8 | 5-17 |
| Figure 5-28 BFB displacement (in): 100% to 30% FO/6-mos. NO edge bolts – Level 8 | 5-17 |
| Figure 5-29 BFB displacement (in): 100% to 70% FO/6-mos. NO edge bolts – Level 1 | 5-18 |
| Figure 5-30 BFB displacement (in): 100% to 70% FO/6-mos. NO edge bolts – Level 2 | 5-18 |
| Figure 5-31 BFB displacement (in): 100% to 70% FO/6-mos. NO edge bolts – Level 4 | 5-19 |
| Figure 5-32 BFB displacement (in): 100% to 70% FO/6-mos. NO edge bolts – Level 8 | 5-19 |
| Figure 5-33 BFB displacement (in): 100% to 80% FO/6-mos. NO edge bolts – Level 1 | 5-20 |
| Figure 5-34 BFB displacement (in): 100% to 80% FO/6-mos. NO edge bolts – Level 2 | 5-20 |
| Figure 5-35 BFB displacement (in): 100% to 80% FO/6-mos. NO edge bolts – Level 4 | 5-21 |
| Figure 5-36 BFB displacement (in): 100% to 80% FO/6-mos. NO edge bolts – Level 8 | 5-21 |

List of Tables

| | |
|---|------|
| Table 2-1 ANSYS/IRADSS state variables | 2-5 |
| Table 3-1 Heat generation results – baffle-former-barrel | 3-12 |
| Table 3-2 Temperature results – baffle-former-barrel | 3-14 |
| Table 3-3 Dose rates – baffle-former-barrel | 3-18 |
| Table 6-1 Cumulative fatigue usage for pilot 3-loop Plant A for 40 years | 6-2 |
| Table 6-2 Cumulative fatigue usage for pilot 3-loop Plant B for 40 years and including an extended power uprate for select components | 6-5 |
| Table 6-3 Cumulative fatigue usage for a pilot 4-loop plant – 60-year values based on projected cycles | 6-6 |
| Table 6-4 Components with CUF greater than or equal to 0.1 and corresponding MRP-227, Revision 1 component and category | 6-7 |
| Table 6-5 4-loop plant relative impact of flexible operation on CUF values as compared to baseload usage projected to 60 years | 6-9 |
| Table 6-6 3-loop plant relative impact of flexible operation on CUF values as compared to baseload usage projected to 60 years | 6-10 |
| Table 7-1 Fatigue operational limits for cases with edge bolts installed | 7-2 |
| Table 7-2 Fatigue operational limits for cases with no edge bolts installed | 7-3 |
| Table 8-1 Westinghouse internals components screened in for fatigue | 8-6 |

Section 1: Introduction

Penetration of wind and solar electric power generation into the electric grid of a number of domestic and foreign utilities operating nuclear power plants has occurred in recent years, to the extent that these utilities have considered operating their plants as flexible operation units. Several plants have already begun flexible operation, reducing power output in response to the needs of the local electric grid. This new operational characteristic accommodates the intermittent nature of electric power generation by renewable sources, such as wind and solar, without energy storage. Prior to this, most nuclear power plants operated as baseload units—that is, they supplied electricity at a constant rate for a lengthy period of time (months to years).

Even though domestic nuclear power plants were originally designed to be flexible operation units, this was assuming a 40-year design life for the plants. Now, most plants will be operated up to 60 years, and some utilities are considering operating selected plants to 80 years. To support the first period of extended operation (PEO) the Electric Power Research Institute's (EPRI's) Materials Reliability Program (MRP) developed inspection and evaluation (I&E) guidelines for the reactor vessel internals. These I&E guidelines exist as both a Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) approved version (MRP-227-A [1]) and an updated MRP-227, Revision 1 [2]. These two documents specifically limit their applicability to plants that have operated and continue to operate as baseload units (see Section 2.4 of either document).

This limitation has a direct impact on a plant where flexible operation is currently implemented or is planned for the future. To use the I&E guidelines, the utility must either perform a plant-specific justification for why the baseload applicability criterion has been met or develop its own plant-specific reactor vessel internals aging management program to meet the requirements of license renewal.

The MRP published interim guidance on flexible operation and the I&E guidelines in letter MRP 2019-002 [3]. The interim guidance permits a PWR to implement flexible operation while in the first PEO under the I&E guidelines. This is accomplished by monitoring the number and size of the flexible operation cycles used by the plant. These flexible operation cycle counts are then compared to screening criteria to allow application of MRP-227.

Letter MRP 2019-002 provides an overview of the evaluations, calculations, and simulations performed to develop the interim guidance. The objective of the current report is to document the work underlying the interim guidance in more detail, particularly the aging simulations that were conducted. The first part of the work included evaluations of the existing fatigue calculations for two pilot plants—one 3-loop design plant and one 4-loop design plant. The second part of the work used simulations performed with the MRP-230 functionality analysis finite element model (FEM) of a Westinghouse-designed 3-loop downflow plant [4] [5] to determine the impact of several flexible operation scenarios on the baffle-former bolts (BFBs). Included in this analysis is the evaluation of selected austenitic stainless steel components that are judged as susceptible to irradiation-induced degradation of mechanical and/or physical properties using an ANSYS¹-based subroutine, IRADSS, developed by ANATECH Corporation [6] [7]. The data gathered from the FEM runs were then processed to evaluate the amount of fatigue damage the BFBs would accumulate during flexible operation.

A previous evaluation [8] concluded that the BFBs are the component in the Westinghouse-designed reactor internals that is most susceptible to the fatigue effects of flexible operation. The report also concluded that the CE-designed reactor vessel internals are substantially less susceptible to flexible operation than the Westinghouse-designed internals and would not be impacted by flexible operation as long as the CE unit operates within its design transient cycles. Based on this previous evaluation, the focus of the current work was directed at evaluating the Westinghouse-designed BFBs.

In the United States, even though the nuclear power plants were designed for flexible operation, most have operated at 100% rated thermal power for the majority of the plant operating life. Based on a 40-year plant life and depending on the vintage of the plant, either 18,300 (Westinghouse fleet), 15,000 (CE fleet), or 13,200 (Westinghouse fleet) flexible operation cycles were typically accounted for in the design basis structural stress and fatigue analyses. Because the plants in the U.S. have operated as baseload units, very little of this cycle allowance has been used. Even in cases where major components such as the steam generators have been replaced or where a power uprate was performed, the plant design basis was updated to maintain the flexible operation capability.

¹ ANSYS, ANSYS Workbench, CFX, AUTODYN, and any and all ANSYS, Inc. product and service names are registered trademarks or trademarks of ANSYS, Inc. or its subsidiaries located in the United States or other countries.

Section 9: Conclusions and Recommendations

MRP-227-A/Revision 1 [1] [2] originally limited the applicability of the I&E guidelines for license renewal to plants operating as baseload units. The interim guidance in letter MRP 2019-002 [3] provided a set of screening criteria that could be used as an alternative for plants that have implemented both the MRP-227 guidance and flexible operation. The work documented in the current report provides additional detail on the technical basis for the summary and conclusions contained in letter MRP 2019-002.

A fatigue study was performed for 3-loop and 4-loop pilot plants. The data from these plants are indicative of the general fatigue behavior (though not necessarily bounding) of the reactor vessel internals components and were used to develop a flexible operation fatigue damage screening criterion. The pilot plant fatigue usage data provided in this report should not be used directly in a plant-specific cumulative usage factor evaluation. The results from the pilot plant and previous studies showed that the BFBs would be the lead indicator for fatigue degradation in plants that are using or have used flexible operation. The evaluation also provided an indication of the relative impact of flexible operation as compared to baseload operation. Additional conservatism was applied to this relative ratio, and it was used to develop flexible operation event screening criteria.

The functionality analysis model of a 3-loop plant was modified to simulate three different flexible operation cases: 100% to 80% power, 100% to 70% power, and 100% to 30% power. Out-in and low-leakage core loading patterns and the presence or absence of baffle-edge bolts were considered among the various model simulations conducted. Fatigue damage for the BFBs was extracted from these runs and used to determine allowable numbers of fatigue cycles or EFPY for each of the flexible operation cases evaluated. These allowable fatigue cycles and EFPY can be used as screening criteria to indicate the potential for accelerated fatigue damage due to flexible operation. These screening criteria will allow a plant to determine if the baseload operation applicability assumption of MRP-227 is still valid. Note that the analyses performed using a 3-loop plant model were assumed to be applicable to other Westinghouse plant designs based on the various conservatisms applied. However, it is recommended that future analyses using the 4-loop functionality analysis model under development by the MRP be performed to confirm this approach.

[REMAINDER OF DOCUMENT REDACTED]