

TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT

ECCS REPORTS (F-47)

TMI ACTION PLAN REQUIREMENTS

COMMONWEALTH EDISON COMPANY

QUAD CITIES NUCLEAR POWER STATION UNITS 1 AND 2

NRC DOCKET NO. 50-254, 50-265

FRC PROJECT C5506

FRC ASSIGNMENT 7

NRC CONTRACT NO. NRC-03-81-130

FRC TASKS 215, 216

Prepared by

Franklin Research Center
20th and Race Streets
Philadelphia, PA 19103

F. W. Vosbury

Author: G. J. Overbeck

B. W. Ludington

FRC Group Leader: G. J. Overbeck

Prepared for

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

Lead NRC Engineer: E. Chow

September 27, 1982

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, or any of their employees, makes any warranty, expressed or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for any third party's use, or the results of such use, of any information, apparatus, product or process disclosed in this report, or represents that its use by such third party would not infringe privately owned rights.

XA Copy Has Been Sent to PDR

XA



Franklin Research Center

A Division of The Franklin Institute

The Benjamin Franklin Parkway, Phila., Pa. 19103 (215) 448-1000

8209290079

TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT

ECCS REPORTS (F-47)

TMI ACTION PLAN REQUIREMENTS

COMMONWEALTH EDISON COMPANY

QUAD CITIES NUCLEAR POWER STATION UNITS 1 AND 2

NRC DOCKET NO. 50-254, 50-265

FRC PROJECT C5506

FRC ASSIGNMENT 7

NRC CONTRACT NO. NRC-03-81-130

FRC TASKS 215, 216

Prepared by

Franklin Research Center
20th and Race Streets
Philadelphia, PA 19103

F. W. Vosbury

Author: G. J. Overbeck

B. W. Ludington

FRC Group Leader: G. J. Overbeck

Prepared for

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Lead NRC Engineer: E. Chow

September 27, 1982

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, or any of their employees, makes any warranty, expressed or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for any third party's use, or the results of such use, of any information, apparatus, product or process disclosed in this report, or represents that its use by such third party would not infringe privately owned rights.

Prepared by:

F. W. Vosbury
Principal Author

Date: 9-24-82

Reviewed by:

G. J. Overbeck

Date: 9-24-82

Approved by:

D. P. Harpaz
Department Director

Date: 9-27-82



Franklin Research Center

A Division of The Franklin Institute

The Benjamin Franklin Parkway, Phila., Pa. 19103 (215) 448-1000

CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
1	INTRODUCTION	1
	1.1 Purpose of Review	1
	1.2 Generic Background.	1
	1.3 Plant-Specific Background	2
2	REVIEW CRITERIA.	3
3	TECHNICAL EVALUATION	4
	3.1 Review of Completeness of the Licensee's Report	4
	3.2 Comparison of ECC System Outages with Those of Other Plants	5
	3.3 Review of Proposed Changes to Improve the Availability of ECC Equipment	9
4	CONCLUSIONS.	10
5	REFERENCES	11

FOREWORD

This Technical Evaluation Report was prepared by Franklin Research Center under a contract with the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, Division of Operating Reactors) for technical assistance in support of NRC operating reactor licensing actions. The technical evaluation was conducted in accordance with criteria established by the NRC.

Mr. G. J. Overbeck, Mr. P. W. Vosbury, and Mr. B. W. Ludington contributed to the technical preparation of this report through a subcontract with WESTEC Services, Inc.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 PURPOSE OF REVIEW

This technical evaluation report (TER) documents an independent review of the outages of the emergency core cooling (ECC) systems at Commonwealth Edison Company's (CECO) Quad Cities Station Units 1 and 2. The purpose of this evaluation is to determine if the Licensee has submitted a report that is complete and satisfies the requirements of TMI Action Item II.K.3.17, "Report on Outages of Emergency Core-Cooling Systems Licensee Report and Proposed Technical Specification Changes."

1.2 GENERIC BACKGROUND

Following the Three Mile Island Unit 2 accident, the Bulletins and Orders Task Force reviewed nuclear steam supply system (NSSS) vendors' small break loss-of-coolant accident (LOCA) analyses to ensure that an adequate basis existed for developing guidelines for small break LOCA emergency procedures. During these reviews, a concern developed about the assumption of the worst single failure. Typically, the small break LOCA analysis for boiling water reactors (BWRs) assumed a loss of the high pressure coolant injection (HPCI) system as the worst single failure. However, the technical specifications permitted plant operation for substantial periods with the HPCI system out of service with no limit on the accumulated outage time. There is concern not only about the HPCI system, but also about all ECC systems for which substantial outages might occur within the limits of the present technical specification. Therefore, to ensure that the small break LOCA analyses are consistent with the actual plant response, the Bulletin and Orders Task Force recommended in NUREG-0626 [1], "Generic Evaluation of Feedwater Transients and Small Break Loss-of-Coolant Accidents in GE-Designed Operating Plants and Near-Term Operating License Applications," that licensees of General Electric (GE)-designed NSSSs do the following:

"Submit a report detailing outage dates and lengths of the outages for all ECC systems. The report should also include the cause of the outage (e.g., controller failure or spurious isolation). The outage data for

ECC components should include all outages for the last five years of operation. The end result should be the quantification of historical unreliability due to test and maintenance outages. This will establish if a need exists for cumulative outage requirements in technical specifications."

Later, the recommendation was incorporated into NUREG-0660 [2], "NRC Action Plan Developed as a Result of the TMI-2 Accident," for all light water reactor plants as TMI Action Item II.K.3.17. In NUREG-0737 [3], "Clarification of TMI Action Plan Requirements," the NRC staff added a requirement that licensees propose changes that will improve and control availability of ECC systems and components. In addition, the contents of the reports to be submitted by the licensees were further clarified as follows:

"The report should contain (1) outage dates and duration of outages; (2) cause of the outage; (3) ECC systems or components involved in the outage; and (4) corrective action taken."

1.3 PLANT-SPECIFIC BACKGROUND

On December 31, 1980 [4], CECO submitted a report in response to NUREG-0737, Item II.K.3.17, "Report on Outages of Emergency Core-Cooling Systems Licensee Report and Proposed Technical Specification Changes." The Licensee provided additional information required to complete this review on May 20, 1982 [5]. The report submitted by CECO covered the period from January 1, 1975 to November 30, 1980 for Quad Cities Units 1 and 2.

2. REVIEW CRITERIA

The Licensee's response to NUREG-0737, Item II.K.3.17, was evaluated against criteria provided by the NRC in a letter dated July 21, 1981 [6] outlining Tentative Work Assignment F. Provided as review criteria in Reference 6, the NRC stated that the Licensee's response should contain the following information:

1. A report detailing outage dates, causes of outages, and lengths of outages for all ECC systems for the last 5 years of operation. This report was to include the ECC systems or components involved and corrective actions taken. Test and maintenance outages were to be included.
2. A quantification of the historical unavailability of the ECC systems and components due to test and maintenance outages.
3. Proposed changes to improve the availability of ECC systems, if necessary.

The type of information required to satisfy the review criteria was clarified by the NRC on August 12, 1981 [7]. Auxiliary systems such as component cooling water and plant service water systems were not to be considered in determining the unavailability of ECC systems. Only the outages of the diesel generators were to be included along with the primary ECC system outages. Finally, the "last five years of operation" was to be loosely interpreted as a continuous 5-year period of recent operation.

On July 26, 1982 [8], the NRC further clarified that the purpose of the review was to identify those licensees that have experienced higher ECC system outages than other licensees with similar NSSSs. The need for improved reliability of diesel generators is under review by the NRC. A Diesel Generator Interim Reliability Program has been proposed to effect improved performance at operating plants. As a consequence, a comparison of diesel generator outage information within this review is not required.

3. TECHNICAL EVALUATION

3.1 REVIEW OF COMPLETENESS OF THE LICENSEE'S REPORT

The ECC systems at CECO's Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station Units 1 and 2 consist of the following four separate systems:

- o high pressure coolant injection (HPCI) system
- o automatic depressurization system (ADS)
- o core spray (CS) system
- o low pressure coolant injection (LPCI) system.

In References 4 and 5, CECO also included systems and components that support the ECC systems in carrying out their design functions under various accident conditions. The support systems are:

- o residual heat removal system
- o residual heat removal system service water
- o emergency diesel generators
- o battery.

In addition to outage data on four ECC systems and the support systems, CECO also included data on the reactor coolant isolation cooling (RCIC) system. The RCIC system is a non-safety-related high pressure system available for high pressure injection. Although the RCIC system mitigates the consequences of a loss of normal feedwater, this system is not required to prevent core damage and therefore is not considered to be an ECC system.

In establishing the type of events that constitute an ECC system outage, CECO considered an outage to be any event that rendered an ECC system unable to respond during plant conditions for which technical specifications required ECC system operability.

For each ECC system outage event, CECO provided the outage dates, the duration, and the cause, plus sufficient description to discern the corrective action taken. Maintenance and surveillance testing activities were included in the ECC system outage data, unless these activities were performed during a

shutdown condition in which the affected ECC system was not required to be operational. The results of CECO's review were provided for the period from January 1, 1975 to November 30, 1980 for the Quad Cities Station Units 1 and 2.

Based on the preceding discussion, it has been established that CECO has submitted a report which fulfills the requirements of review criterion 1 without exception.

3.2 COMPARISON OF ECC SYSTEM OUTAGES WITH THOSE OF OTHER PLANTS

The outages of ECC systems can be categorized as (1) unplanned outages due to equipment failure or (2) planned outages due to surveillance testing or preventive maintenance. Unplanned outages are reportable as Licensee Event Reports (LERs) under the technical specifications. Planned outages for periodic maintenance and testing are not reportable as LERs. The technical specifications identify the type and quantity of ECC equipment required as well as the maximum allowable outage times. If an outage exceeds the maximum allowable time, then the plant operating mode is altered to a lower status consistent with the available ECC system components still operational. The purpose of the technical specification maximum allowable outage times is to prevent extended plant operation without sufficient ECC system protection. The maximum allowable outage time, specified per event, tends to limit the unavailability of an ECC system. However, there is no cumulative outage time limitation to prevent repeated planned and unplanned outages from accumulating extensive ECC system downtime.

Unavailability, as defined in general terms in WASH-1400 [9], is the probability of a system being in a failed state when required. However, for this review, a detailed unavailability analysis was not required. Instead, a preliminary estimate of the unavailability of an ECC system was made by calculating the ratio of the ECC system downtime to the number of days that the plant was in operation during the last 5 years. To simplify the tabulation of operating time, only the period when the plant was in operational Mode 1 was considered. This simplifying assumption is reasonable given that the period of time that a plant is starting up, shutting down, and cooling down is

small compared to the time it is operating at power. In addition, an ECC system was considered down whenever an ECC system component was unavailable due to any cause.

It should be noted that the ratio calculated in this manner is not a true measure of the ECC system unavailability, since outage events are included that appear to compromise system performance when, in fact, partial or full function of the system would be expected. Full function of an ECC system would be expected if the design capability of the system exceeded the capacity required for the system to fulfill its safety function. For example, if an ECC system consisting of two loops with multiple pumps in each loop is designed so that only one pump in each loop is required to satisfy core cooling requirements, then an outage of a single pump would not prevent the system from performing its safety function. In addition, the actual ECC system unavailability is a function of planned and unplanned outages of essential support systems as well as of planned and unplanned outages of primary ECC system components. In accordance with the clarification discussed in Section 2, only the effects of outages associated with primary ECC system components and emergency diesel generators are considered in this review. The inclusion of all outage events assumed to be true ECC system outages tends to overestimate the unavailability, while the exclusion of support system outages tends to underestimate the unavailability, of ECC systems and components. Only a detailed analysis of each ECC system for each plant could improve the confidence in the calculated result. Such an analysis is beyond the intended scope of this report.

The planned and unplanned (forced) outage times for the four ECC systems (HPCI, ADS, CS, and LPCI) and the emergency diesel generators were identified from the outage information in References 4 and 5 and are shown in number of days and as percentage of plant operating time per year in Tables 1 and 2 for the Quad Cities Units 1 and 2, respectively. Outages that occurred during nonoperational periods were eliminated as were as those caused by failures or test and maintenance of support systems. Data on plant operating conditions were obtained from the annual reports, "Nuclear Power Plant Operating

Table 1. Planned and Unplanned (Forced) Outage Times for Quad Cities Unit 1

Year	Days of Plant Operation	ADS Outage in Days Forced Planned	HPCI Outage in Days Forced Planned	Core Spray Outage in Days Forced Planned	LPCI Outage in Days Forced Planned	KIC Outage in Days Forced Planned	Diesel Generator Outage in Days Forced Planned
1976	237.54	0.0 (0.0)	0.5 (0.21%)	0.0 (0.0)	0.9 (0.38%)	6.5 (2.74%)	0.0 (1.43%)
1977	257.63	0.0 (0.0)	1.0 (0.39%)	0.54 (0.21%)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.70 (0.27%)
1978	346.54	0.0 (0.0)	4.32 (1.25%)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.77 (0.22%)	0.36 (0.10%)
1979	296.25	1.0 (0.34%)	1.0 (0.34%)	0.0 (0.0)	16.0 (5.4%)	0.76 (0.26%)	1.61 (0.54%)
1980	249.68	0.5 (0.20%)	0.0 (0.0)	0.5 (0.20%)	1.1 (0.44%)	1.0 (0.40%)	0.76 (0.30%)
Total	1387.64	1.5 (0.11%)	6.82 (0.49%)	1.04 (0.07%)	18.0 (1.30%)	9.03 (0.65%)	3.43 (0.25%)

*Numbers in parentheses indicate system outage time as a percentage of total plant operating time.

Table 2. Planned and Unplanned (Forced) Outage Times for Quad Cities Unit 2

Year	Days of Plant Operation	ADS		HPCI		Core Spray		LPCI		RCIC		Diesel Generator	
		Outage in Days Forced	Planned	Outage in Days Forced	Planned	Outage in Days Forced	Planned	Outage in Days Forced	Planned	Outage in Days Forced	Planned	Outage in Days Forced	Planned
1976	297.63	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.25	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.04	2.00
						(0.20%)		(0.08%)				(0.01%)	(0.67%)
1977	296.71	1.54	0.0	0.83	0.0	2.67	0.0	0.003	1.00	0.87	0.0	1.20	2.04
		(0.52%)		(0.28%)		(0.50%)		(<0.01%)	(0.34%)	(0.29%)		(0.40%)	(0.69%)
1978	292.71	1.50	0.0	0.81	0.0	0.30	0.0	1.00	0.25	2.00	4.00	0.28	2.28
		(0.51%)		(0.28%)		(0.10%)		(0.34%)	(0.09%)	(0.68%)	(1.37%)	(0.10%)	(0.78%)
1979	320.33	0.0	0.0	0.30	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.0	0.50	0.0	0.0	11.53	2.12
				(0.09%)				(3.43%)	(0.16%)			(3.60%)	(0.66%)
1980	237.66	0.0	0.0	0.08	1.30	0.0	0.0	0.49	0.16	0.40	0.0	1.12	2.00
				(0.03%)	(0.55%)			(0.21%)	(0.07%)	(0.17%)		(0.47%)	(0.84%)
Total	1445.04	3.04	0.0	2.02	1.30	3.57	0.0	12.74	1.91	3.27	4.0	14.17	10.44
		(0.21%)		(0.14%)	(0.09%)	(0.25%)		(0.88%)	(0.13%)	(0.23%)	(0.28%)	(0.98%)	(0.72%)

*Numbers in parentheses indicate system outage time as a percentage of total plant operating time.

Experience" [10-13], and from monthly reports, "Licensed Operating Reactors Status Summary Reports" [14]. The remaining outages were segregated into planned and unplanned outages based on an interpretation of CECO's description of the causes. The outage periods for each category were calculated by summing the individual outage durations. Included for informational purposes are the RCIC system outage data.

Observed outage times of various ECC systems at Quad Cities Units 1 and 2 were compared with those of other BWRs. Based on this comparison, it was concluded that the historical unavailability of the ADS, HPCI, LPCI, and core spray systems has been consistent with the performance of those systems throughout the industry. The observed unavailability was less than the industrial mean for Units 1 and 2 ADS, HPCI, and core spray and less than about one standard deviation above the industrial mean for Units 1 and 2 LPCI, assuming that the underlying unavailability is distributed lognormally. The outage times were also consistent with existing technical specifications. The outages of the emergency diesel generators and RCIC system were not included in this comparison.

3.3 REVIEW OF PROPOSED CHANGES TO IMPROVE THE AVAILABILITY OF ECC EQUIPMENT

In References 4 and 5, CECO did not propose any changes to improve the availability of ECC systems and components.

4. CONCLUSIONS

Commonwealth Edison Company (CECO) has submitted a report for Quad Cities Station Units 1 and 2 that contains (1) outage dates and durations (2) causes of the outages, (3) ECC systems or components involved in the outages, and (4) corrective actions taken. It is concluded that CECO has fulfilled the requirements of NUREG-0737, Item II.F.3.17. In addition, the historical unavailability of the ADS, HPCI, LPCI, and core spray systems has been consistent with the performance of those systems throughout the industry. The observed unavailability was less than the industrial mean for Units 1 and 2 ADS, HPCI, and core spray and less than about one standard deviation above the industrial mean for Units 1 and 2 LPCI. The outage times were also consistent with existing technical specifications.

5. REFERENCES

1. NUREG-0626
"Generic Evaluation of Feedwater Transients and Small Break
Loss-of-Coolant Accidents in GE-Designed Operating Plants and
Near-Term Operating License Applications"
NRC, January 1980
2. NUREG-0660
"NRC Action Plan Developed as a Result of the TMI-2 Accident"
NRC, March 1980
3. NUREG-0737
"Clarification of TMI Action Plan Requirements"
NRC, October 1980
4. J. S. Abel (CECO)
Letter to D. G. Eisenhower (NRR)
Subject: Response to NUREG-0737
December 31, 1980
5. E. D. Swartz (CECO)
Letter to D. G. Eisenhower (NRR)
Subject: NUREG-0737 Item II.K.3.17 Additional Information
May 20, 1982
6. J. N. Donohew, Jr. (NRC)
Letter to Dr. S. P. Carfagno (FRC). Subject: Contract No.
NRC-03-81-130, Tentative Assignment F
July 21, 1981
7. NRC
Meeting between NRC and FRC. Subject: C5506 Tentative Work
Assignment F, Operating Reactor PORV and ECCS Outage Reports
August 12, 1981
8. NRC
Meeting between NRC and FRC. Subject: Resolution of Review Criteria
and Scope of Work
July 26, 1982
9. WASH-1400
"Reactor Safety Study"
NRC, October 1975
10. NUREG-0366
"Nuclear Power Plant Operating Experience 1976"
NRC, December 1977

11. NUREG-0483
"Nuclear Power Plant Operating Experience 1977"
NRC, February 1979
12. NUREG-0618
"Nuclear Power Plant Operating Experience 1978"
NRC, December 1979
13. NUREG/CR-1496
"Nuclear Power Plant Operating Experience 1979"
NRC, May 1981
14. NUREG-0020
"Licensed Operating Reactors Status Summary Report"
Volume 4, Nos. 1 through 12, and Volume 5, No. 1
NRC, December 1980 through January 1981