



System Study: Isolation Condenser 1998–2022

December 2023

Zhegang Ma, Kellie Kvarfordt
Idaho National Laboratory

Thomas Wierman
Schroeder Incorporated



*INL is a U.S. Department of Energy National Laboratory
operated by Battelle Energy Alliance, LLC*

DISCLAIMER

This information was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the U.S. Government. Neither the U.S. Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, expressed 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. References herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trade mark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the U.S. Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the U.S. Government or any agency thereof.

**System Study:
Isolation Condenser
1998–2022**

**Zhegang Ma, Kellie Kvarfordt
Idaho National Laboratory**

**Thomas Wierman
Schroeder Incorporated**

December 2023

**Idaho National Laboratory
Idaho Falls, Idaho 83415**

<http://www.inl.gov>

**Prepared for the
Division of Risk Assessment
Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
NRC Agreement Number 31310019N0006
Task Order Number 31310019F0022**

Page intentionally left blank

ABSTRACT

This report presents an unreliability evaluation of the isolation condenser (ISO) system at three U.S. commercial operating boiling water reactors. New Standardized Plant Analysis Risk (SPAR) models with the most recent SPAR parameter update results were used in this report. Demand, run hour, and failure data from calendar year 1998–2022 for selected components were obtained from the Institute of Nuclear Power Operations (INPO) Industry Reporting and Information System (IRIS). The unreliability results are trended for the most recent 10-year period while yearly estimates for system unreliability are provided for the entire active period. No statistically significant increasing or decreasing trends were identified in the ISO results.

Page intentionally left blank

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ACRONYMS.....	vii
1. INTRODUCTION.....	9
2. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	11
3. INDUSTRY-WIDE UNRELIABILITY	12
4. INDUSTRY-WIDE TRENDS	13
5. BASIC EVENT GROUP IMPORTANCES	14
6. DATA TABLES.....	16
7. SYSTEM DESCRIPTION	22
8. REFERENCES.....	25

FIGURES

Figure 1. Trend of ISO system unreliability for Operate and Makeup.....	13
Figure 2. ISO basic event group importances.....	14
Figure 3. Simplified single train isolation condenser system schematic.....	24

TABLES

Table 1. BWR plants with an ISO system selected for the study.....	10
Table 2. Industry-wide unreliability values.....	12
Table 3. ISO model basic event importance group descriptions.....	15
Table 4. Plot data for Figure 1, ISO Operate and Makeup unreliability trend.....	16
Table 5. Basic event reliability trending data.....	17
Table 6. Failure mode acronyms.....	21
Table 7. BWR plants with a dedicated ISO system.....	22

Page intentionally left blank

ACRONYMS

AOV	air-operated valve
CCF	common-cause failure
EPIX	Equipment Performance and Information Exchange
FTOC	fail to open/close
FTOP	fail to operate
ICES	INPO Consolidated Events Database
INPO	Institute of Nuclear Power Operations
ISO	isolation condenser
IRIS	Industry Reporting and Information System
MOV	motor-operated valve
MSPI	Mitigating Systems Performance Index
NRC	Nuclear Regulatory Commission
PRA	probabilistic risk assessment
ROP	Reactor Oversight Process
SO	spurious operation
SPAR	standardized plant analysis risk
SSU	safety system unavailability

Page intentionally left blank

System Study: Isolation Condenser 1998–2022

1. INTRODUCTION

This report presents an unreliability evaluation of the isolation condenser (ISO) system at three U.S. commercial operating boiling water reactors listed in Table 1. For each reactor (or plant), the corresponding Standardized Plant Analysis Risk (SPAR) model was used in the yearly calculations. Demand, run hour, and failure data from calendar year 1998–2022 for selected components in the ISO were obtained from the Institute of Nuclear Power Operations (INPO) Industry Reporting and Information System (IRIS), formerly the INPO Consolidated Events Database (ICES) and the Equipment Performance and Information Exchange Database (EPIX). Train unavailability data (outages from test or maintenance) were obtained from the Reactor Oversight Process (ROP) Safety System Unavailability (SSU) database (1998–2001) and the Mitigating Systems Performance Index (MSPI) database (2002–2022). The system unreliability results are trended for the most recent 10-year period while yearly estimates for system unreliability are provided for the entire active period.

This report does not attempt to estimate basic event values for use in a probabilistic risk assessment (PRA). Suggested values for such use are presented in the 2020 SPAR parameter update including INL/EXT-21-65055, *Industry Average Performance for Components and Initiating Events at U.S. Commercial Nuclear Power Plants: 2020 Update* [1], which is the most recent update to NUREG/CR-6928 [2], and INL/EXT-21-62940, *CCF Parameter Estimations, 2020 Update* [3], for common-cause failure (CCF) parameters.

New SPAR models (versions of 8.80 or above, as indicated in Table 1) that utilize the 2020 SPAR parameter update results [1, 3] were used in this report. In previous system studies, which can be found at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) Reactor Operational Experience Results and Databases web page (<https://nrcoe.inl.gov>), older SPAR models (versions of 8.1 to 8.2) with the *2010 Component Reliability Update* [4] for basic event data were used for the 2011 through 2020 system study updates. For comparison purposes, it is necessary to use the same set of SPAR models and basic event data in the analysis while the only variables subject to change are yearly demand, run hour, failure, and unavailability data for selected components in the system. However, more recent SPAR models must be used to replace outdated models periodically so that the system study reflects the current plant and system configurations as well as the more representative baseline data for the industry performance. With the 2020 SPAR parameter and model updates concluded in 2022, it was a good time to revamp the system study with the more current models for the 2022 update.

The ISO fault tree in the SPAR model is evaluated using the loss-of-offsite-power flag set in the SPAR model. The loss-of-offsite-power flag set assumes no support systems or normal sources of makeup water are available and that the ISO system is required to perform to mitigate the effects of the station blackout initiating event. All models include failures due to unavailability while in test or maintenance. Human error and recovery events in the models are set to “Ignore” in the study for the results to represent the mechanical part of the system. An overview of the trending methods, glossary of terms, and abbreviations can be found in the *Overview and Reference* document [5] on the NRC web page (<https://nrcoe.inl.gov>).

One variation of the ISO system model is implemented and calculated. The Operate and Makeup model includes the initial opening of the condensate return valve and make-up capabilities to continue to operate for 8 hours.

Section 2 of this report summarizes the main findings from the study. Section 3 presents the baseline ISO unreliability results using basic event values from the 2020 SPAR parameter update. Section 4 shows the trend results for ISO unreliability using system-specific data as listed in Section 6. Section 5 provides the basic event group importance information using the baseline results from Section 3. Section 7 presents a high-level generic description of the ISO system.

Table 1. BWR plants with an ISO system selected for the study.

Plant	SPAR ID	SPAR Version
Dresden 2 & 3	DRES	8.81
Nine Mile Pt. 1	NMP1	8.80

2. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The results of this ISO system unreliability study are summarized in this section. Of particular interest is any statistically significant^a increasing trends. In this update, **no statistically significant increasing or decreasing trends** were identified in the **ISO unreliability trend results** for the most recent 10-year period.

The industry-wide ISO Operate and Makeup basic event group importances were evaluated. **The leading contributor to ISO system unreliability** is the **ISO Condenser** group of basic events followed by the **ISO Valve and Instrumentation Air** groups.

a Statistically significant is defined in terms of the “p-value.” A p-value is a probability indicating whether to accept or reject the null hypothesis that there is no trend in the data. P-values less than or equal to 0.05 indicate that we are 95% confident that there is a trend in the data (reject the null hypothesis of no trend.) By convention, we use the “Michelin Guide” scale: p-value < 0.05 (statistically significant); p-value < 0.01 (highly statistically significant); p-value < 0.001 (extremely statistically significant).

3. INDUSTRY-WIDE UNRELIABILITY

The ISO fault trees from the SPAR models were evaluated for each of the three U.S. commercial operating boiling water nuclear power plants with an ISO system.

The industry-wide unreliability of the ISO system has been estimated for one variation, the Operate and Makeup. The uncertainty distributions for ISO show both plant design variability and parameter uncertainty from the industry-wide component failure data as in the 2020 SPAR parameter update.^b

Table 2 shows the percentiles and mean of the aggregated sample data (Latin hypercube, 1,000 samples for each model) collected from the uncertainty calculations of the ISO fault trees in the SPAR models. The lower and upper bounds are based directly on the samples (Latin hypercube) from the uncertainty calculations in the SPAR models. For the industry-level results, the SPAR samples were combined into one large sample in order to determine the industry-level bounds, mean, and median.

Table 2. Industry-wide unreliability values.

Model	Lower (5%)	Median	Mean	Upper (95%)
Operate and Makeup	8.75E-06	7.69E-04	6.04E-03	2.92E-02

^b By using industry-wide component failure data, individual plant performance is not included in the distribution of results.

4. INDUSTRY-WIDE TRENDS

The yearly failure and demand or run-time data from 1998–2022 were obtained from IRIS for the ISO system. The component basic event uncertainty was calculated for the ISO system components using the trending methods described in Sections 1 and 2 of Reference [5]. Table 5 shows the yearly data values for each ISO system-specific component and failure mode combination that was varied in the model. These data were loaded into the ISO system fault tree in each SPAR model with an ISO system (see Table 1).

The trend chart shows the results of varying component reliability data over time and updating generic, relatively flat prior distributions (or constrained noninformative distributions, refer to Section 2 of Reference [5]) using data for each year. In addition, for comparison, the calculated industry-wide system reliability in Table 2 is shown as “SPAR/ ICES” in the chart for comparison. Section 1 of Reference [5] provides a more detailed discussion of the trending methods. The regression method is indicated in the lower left-hand corner of the trend figures.

The component that was varied in the ISO model is ISO condensate motor-operated valve (MOV) or air-operated valve (AOV) fail to open.

Figure 1 shows the trend in the ISO system unreliability for Operate and Makeup. Table 4 shows the data points for Figure 1. **No statistically significant trend** was identified in the industry-wide estimates of **ISO system unreliability** for the most recent 10-year period.




Figure 1. Trend of ISO system unreliability for Operate and Makeup.

5. BASIC EVENT GROUP IMPORTANCES

The ISO basic event group Fussell-Vesely importances were calculated for the ISO Operate and Makeup model for each plant using the industry-wide data from the 2020 SPAR parameter update. These basic event group importances were then averaged across all plants to represent an industry-wide basic event group importance.

The industry-wide ISO Operate and Makeup basic event group importances are shown in Figure 2. **The leading contributor to ISO system unreliability is the ISO Condenser group of basic events followed by the ISO Valves and Instrumentation Air groups.**

For more discussion on the ISO valves, see the MOV and AOV component reliability studies at the NRC Reactor Operational Experience Results and Databases web page (<https://nrcoe.inl.gov>). Table 3 shows the SPAR model ISO importance groups and their descriptions.




Figure 2. ISO basic event group importances.

Table 3. ISO model basic event importance group descriptions.

Group	Description
AC Power	The ac buses and circuit breakers that supply power to the makeup water source pumps and motor-operated valves if used
Alternate Source	The source of makeup water during a station blackout
Condensate	Normal source of cooling water to the isolation condenser including pumps and valves
Cooling	The pumps and strainers in the service water system
DC Power	The batteries and battery chargers that supply power to the ISO circuitry and valves
Instrument Air	Instrument air support to the ISO model
ISO Condenser	The isolation condenser heat exchanger
ISO Valves	AOVs or MOVs required for the isolation condenser function

6. DATA TABLES

Table 4. Plot data for Figure 1, ISO Operate and Makeup unreliability trend.

Year/Source	Regression Curve Data Points			Annual Estimate Data Points		
	Lower (5%)	Mean	Upper (95%)	Lower (5%)	Mean	Upper (95%)
SPAR/ICES	--	--	--	8.75E-06	6.04E-03	2.92E-02
1998	--	--	--	8.54E-06	6.02E-03	2.92E-02
1999	--	--	--	1.04E-05	6.28E-03	2.96E-02
2000	--	--	--	1.19E-05	6.53E-03	3.02E-02
2001	--	--	--	1.04E-05	6.28E-03	2.96E-02
2002	--	--	--	8.54E-06	6.02E-03	2.92E-02
2003	--	--	--	8.47E-06	6.02E-03	2.92E-02
2004	--	--	--	1.31E-05	6.78E-03	3.06E-02
2005	--	--	--	8.49E-06	6.02E-03	2.92E-02
2006	--	--	--	8.54E-06	6.02E-03	2.92E-02
2007	--	--	--	8.49E-06	6.02E-03	2.92E-02
2008	--	--	--	8.49E-06	6.02E-03	2.92E-02
2009	--	--	--	8.46E-06	6.01E-03	2.92E-02
2010	--	--	--	8.51E-06	6.02E-03	2.92E-02
2011	--	--	--	1.04E-05	6.28E-03	2.96E-02
2012	--	--	--	8.48E-06	6.01E-03	2.92E-02
2013	6.02E-03	6.02E-03	6.02E-03	8.49E-06	6.02E-03	2.92E-02
2014	6.02E-03	6.02E-03	6.02E-03	8.53E-06	6.02E-03	2.92E-02
2015	6.02E-03	6.02E-03	6.02E-03	8.49E-06	6.02E-03	2.92E-02
2016	6.02E-03	6.02E-03	6.02E-03	8.52E-06	6.02E-03	2.92E-02
2017	6.02E-03	6.02E-03	6.02E-03	8.49E-06	6.02E-03	2.92E-02
2018	6.02E-03	6.02E-03	6.02E-03	8.52E-06	6.02E-03	2.92E-02
2019	6.02E-03	6.02E-03	6.02E-03	8.49E-06	6.02E-03	2.92E-02
2020	6.02E-03	6.02E-03	6.02E-03	8.54E-06	6.02E-03	2.92E-02
2021	6.02E-03	6.02E-03	6.02E-03	8.49E-06	6.02E-03	2.92E-02
2022	6.02E-03	6.02E-03	6.02E-03	8.54E-06	6.02E-03	2.92E-02

Table 5. Basic event reliability trending data.

Failure Mode	Component	Year	Number of Failures	Demands/ Run Hours	Bayesian Update			
					Mean	Post A	Post B	Distribution
FTOC	AOV	1998	0	38	5.44E-04	0.83	1.53E+03	Beta
FTOC	AOV	1999	0	42	5.43E-04	0.83	1.53E+03	Beta
FTOC	AOV	2000	0	40	5.44E-04	0.83	1.53E+03	Beta
FTOC	AOV	2001	0	40	5.44E-04	0.83	1.53E+03	Beta
FTOC	AOV	2002	0	40	5.44E-04	0.83	1.53E+03	Beta
FTOC	AOV	2003	0	69	5.33E-04	0.83	1.56E+03	Beta
FTOC	AOV	2004	0	49	5.40E-04	0.83	1.54E+03	Beta
FTOC	AOV	2005	0	60	5.36E-04	0.83	1.55E+03	Beta
FTOC	AOV	2006	0	39	5.44E-04	0.83	1.53E+03	Beta
FTOC	AOV	2007	0	56	5.38E-04	0.83	1.55E+03	Beta
FTOC	AOV	2008	0	51	5.40E-04	0.83	1.54E+03	Beta
FTOC	AOV	2009	0	67	5.34E-04	0.83	1.56E+03	Beta
FTOC	AOV	2010	0	46	5.42E-04	0.83	1.54E+03	Beta
FTOC	AOV	2011	0	54	5.39E-04	0.83	1.54E+03	Beta
FTOC	AOV	2012	0	47	5.41E-04	0.83	1.54E+03	Beta
FTOC	AOV	2013	0	64	5.35E-04	0.83	1.55E+03	Beta
FTOC	AOV	2014	0	42	5.43E-04	0.83	1.53E+03	Beta
FTOC	AOV	2015	0	52	5.39E-04	0.83	1.54E+03	Beta
FTOC	AOV	2016	0	44	5.42E-04	0.83	1.53E+03	Beta
FTOC	AOV	2017	0	53	5.39E-04	0.83	1.54E+03	Beta
FTOC	AOV	2018	0	44	5.42E-04	0.83	1.53E+03	Beta
FTOC	AOV	2019	0	49	5.40E-04	0.83	1.54E+03	Beta
FTOC	AOV	2020	0	39	5.44E-04	0.83	1.53E+03	Beta
FTOC	AOV	2021	0	53	5.39E-04	0.83	1.54E+03	Beta
FTOC	AOV	2022	0	40	5.44E-04	0.83	1.53E+03	Beta
FTOP	AOV	1998	0	52,560	1.74E-07	1.26	7.22E+06	Gamma
FTOP	AOV	1999	0	52,560	1.74E-07	1.26	7.22E+06	Gamma
FTOP	AOV	2000	0	52,560	1.74E-07	1.26	7.22E+06	Gamma
FTOP	AOV	2001	0	52,560	1.74E-07	1.26	7.22E+06	Gamma
FTOP	AOV	2002	0	52,560	1.74E-07	1.26	7.22E+06	Gamma
FTOP	AOV	2003	0	52,560	1.74E-07	1.26	7.22E+06	Gamma
FTOP	AOV	2004	0	52,560	1.74E-07	1.26	7.22E+06	Gamma
FTOP	AOV	2005	0	52,560	1.74E-07	1.26	7.22E+06	Gamma
FTOP	AOV	2006	0	52,560	1.74E-07	1.26	7.22E+06	Gamma
FTOP	AOV	2007	0	52,560	1.74E-07	1.26	7.22E+06	Gamma
FTOP	AOV	2008	0	52,560	1.74E-07	1.26	7.22E+06	Gamma
FTOP	AOV	2009	0	52,560	1.74E-07	1.26	7.22E+06	Gamma

Table 5. (continued).

Failure Mode	Component	Year	Number of Failures	Demands/Run Hours	Bayesian Update			
					Mean	Post A	Post B	Distribution
FTOP	AOV	2010	0	52,560	1.74E-07	1.26	7.22E+06	Gamma
FTOP	AOV	2011	0	52,560	1.74E-07	1.26	7.22E+06	Gamma
FTOP	AOV	2012	0	52,560	1.74E-07	1.26	7.22E+06	Gamma
FTOP	AOV	2013	0	52,560	1.74E-07	1.26	7.22E+06	Gamma
FTOP	AOV	2014	0	52,560	1.74E-07	1.26	7.22E+06	Gamma
FTOP	AOV	2015	0	52,560	1.74E-07	1.26	7.22E+06	Gamma
FTOP	AOV	2016	0	52,560	1.74E-07	1.26	7.22E+06	Gamma
FTOP	AOV	2017	0	52,560	1.74E-07	1.26	7.22E+06	Gamma
FTOP	AOV	2018	0	52,560	1.74E-07	1.26	7.22E+06	Gamma
FTOP	AOV	2019	0	52,560	1.74E-07	1.26	7.22E+06	Gamma
FTOP	AOV	2020	0	52,560	1.74E-07	1.26	7.22E+06	Gamma
FTOP	AOV	2021	0	52,560	1.74E-07	1.26	7.22E+06	Gamma
FTOP	AOV	2022	0	52,560	1.74E-07	1.26	7.22E+06	Gamma
SO	AOV	1998	0	52,560	5.82E-08	0.86	1.48E+07	Gamma
SO	AOV	1999	0	52,560	5.82E-08	0.86	1.48E+07	Gamma
SO	AOV	2000	0	52,560	5.82E-08	0.86	1.48E+07	Gamma
SO	AOV	2001	0	52,560	5.82E-08	0.86	1.48E+07	Gamma
SO	AOV	2002	0	52,560	5.82E-08	0.86	1.48E+07	Gamma
SO	AOV	2003	0	52,560	5.82E-08	0.86	1.48E+07	Gamma
SO	AOV	2004	0	52,560	5.82E-08	0.86	1.48E+07	Gamma
SO	AOV	2005	0	52,560	5.82E-08	0.86	1.48E+07	Gamma
SO	AOV	2006	0	52,560	5.82E-08	0.86	1.48E+07	Gamma
SO	AOV	2007	0	52,560	5.82E-08	0.86	1.48E+07	Gamma
SO	AOV	2008	0	52,560	5.82E-08	0.86	1.48E+07	Gamma
SO	AOV	2009	0	52,560	5.82E-08	0.86	1.48E+07	Gamma
SO	AOV	2010	0	52,560	5.82E-08	0.86	1.48E+07	Gamma
SO	AOV	2011	0	52,560	5.82E-08	0.86	1.48E+07	Gamma
SO	AOV	2012	0	52,560	5.82E-08	0.86	1.48E+07	Gamma
SO	AOV	2013	0	52,560	5.82E-08	0.86	1.48E+07	Gamma
SO	AOV	2014	0	52,560	5.82E-08	0.86	1.48E+07	Gamma
SO	AOV	2015	0	52,560	5.82E-08	0.86	1.48E+07	Gamma
SO	AOV	2016	0	52,560	5.82E-08	0.86	1.48E+07	Gamma
SO	AOV	2017	0	52,560	5.82E-08	0.86	1.48E+07	Gamma
SO	AOV	2018	0	52,560	5.82E-08	0.86	1.48E+07	Gamma
SO	AOV	2019	0	52,560	5.82E-08	0.86	1.48E+07	Gamma
SO	AOV	2020	0	52,560	5.82E-08	0.86	1.48E+07	Gamma
SO	AOV	2021	0	52,560	5.82E-08	0.86	1.48E+07	Gamma
SO	AOV	2022	0	52,560	5.82E-08	0.86	1.48E+07	Gamma

Table 5. (continued).

Failure Mode	Component	Year	Number of Failures	Demands/Run Hours	Bayesian Update			
					Mean	Post A	Post B	Distribution
FTOC	MOV	1998	0	87	6.25E-04	2.43	3.89E+03	Beta
FTOC	MOV	1999	1	84	8.83E-04	3.43	3.88E+03	Beta
FTOC	MOV	2000	2	88	1.14E-03	4.43	3.89E+03	Beta
FTOC	MOV	2001	1	77	8.84E-04	3.43	3.88E+03	Beta
FTOC	MOV	2002	0	83	6.25E-04	2.43	3.88E+03	Beta
FTOC	MOV	2003	0	125	6.19E-04	2.43	3.92E+03	Beta
FTOC	MOV	2004	3	110	1.39E-03	5.43	3.91E+03	Beta
FTOC	MOV	2005	0	77	6.26E-04	2.43	3.88E+03	Beta
FTOC	MOV	2006	0	84	6.25E-04	2.43	3.88E+03	Beta
FTOC	MOV	2007	0	97	6.23E-04	2.43	3.90E+03	Beta
FTOC	MOV	2008	0	80	6.26E-04	2.43	3.88E+03	Beta
FTOC	MOV	2009	0	160	6.13E-04	2.43	3.96E+03	Beta
FTOC	MOV	2010	0	80	6.26E-04	2.43	3.88E+03	Beta
FTOC	MOV	2011	1	78	8.84E-04	3.43	3.88E+03	Beta
FTOC	MOV	2012	0	156	6.14E-04	2.43	3.96E+03	Beta
FTOC	MOV	2013	0	79	6.26E-04	2.43	3.88E+03	Beta
FTOC	MOV	2014	0	80	6.26E-04	2.43	3.88E+03	Beta
FTOC	MOV	2015	0	81	6.26E-04	2.43	3.88E+03	Beta
FTOC	MOV	2016	0	92	6.24E-04	2.43	3.89E+03	Beta
FTOC	MOV	2017	0	84	6.25E-04	2.43	3.88E+03	Beta
FTOC	MOV	2018	0	85	6.25E-04	2.43	3.88E+03	Beta
FTOC	MOV	2019	0	92	6.24E-04	2.43	3.89E+03	Beta
FTOC	MOV	2020	0	82	6.26E-04	2.43	3.88E+03	Beta
FTOC	MOV	2021	0	104	6.22E-04	2.43	3.90E+03	Beta
FTOC	MOV	2022	0	82	6.26E-04	2.43	3.88E+03	Beta
FTOP	MOV	1998	0	122,640	3.45E-08	0.8	2.31E+07	Gamma
FTOP	MOV	1999	0	122,640	3.45E-08	0.8	2.31E+07	Gamma
FTOP	MOV	2000	0	122,640	3.45E-08	0.8	2.31E+07	Gamma
FTOP	MOV	2001	0	122,640	3.45E-08	0.8	2.31E+07	Gamma
FTOP	MOV	2002	0	122,640	3.45E-08	0.8	2.31E+07	Gamma
FTOP	MOV	2003	0	122,640	3.45E-08	0.8	2.31E+07	Gamma
FTOP	MOV	2004	0	122,640	3.45E-08	0.8	2.31E+07	Gamma
FTOP	MOV	2005	0	122,640	3.45E-08	0.8	2.31E+07	Gamma
FTOP	MOV	2006	0	122,640	3.45E-08	0.8	2.31E+07	Gamma
FTOP	MOV	2007	0	122,640	3.45E-08	0.8	2.31E+07	Gamma
FTOP	MOV	2008	0	122,640	3.45E-08	0.8	2.31E+07	Gamma
FTOP	MOV	2009	0	122,640	3.45E-08	0.8	2.31E+07	Gamma
FTOP	MOV	2010	0	122,640	3.45E-08	0.8	2.31E+07	Gamma

Table 5. (continued).

Failure Mode	Component	Year	Number of Failures	Demands/Run Hours	Bayesian Update			
					Mean	Post A	Post B	Distribution
FTOP	MOV	2011	0	122,640	3.45E-08	0.8	2.31E+07	Gamma
FTOP	MOV	2012	0	122,640	3.45E-08	0.8	2.31E+07	Gamma
FTOP	MOV	2013	0	122,640	3.45E-08	0.8	2.31E+07	Gamma
FTOP	MOV	2014	0	122,640	3.45E-08	0.8	2.31E+07	Gamma
FTOP	MOV	2015	0	122,640	3.45E-08	0.8	2.31E+07	Gamma
FTOP	MOV	2016	0	122,640	3.45E-08	0.8	2.31E+07	Gamma
FTOP	MOV	2017	0	122,640	3.45E-08	0.8	2.31E+07	Gamma
FTOP	MOV	2018	0	122,640	3.45E-08	0.8	2.31E+07	Gamma
FTOP	MOV	2019	0	122,640	3.45E-08	0.8	2.31E+07	Gamma
FTOP	MOV	2020	0	122,640	3.45E-08	0.8	2.31E+07	Gamma
FTOP	MOV	2021	0	122,640	3.45E-08	0.8	2.31E+07	Gamma
FTOP	MOV	2022	0	122,640	3.45E-08	0.8	2.31E+07	Gamma
SO	MOV	1998	0	122,640	2.55E-08	41.5	1.63E+09	Gamma
SO	MOV	1999	0	122,640	2.55E-08	41.5	1.63E+09	Gamma
SO	MOV	2000	0	122,640	2.55E-08	41.5	1.63E+09	Gamma
SO	MOV	2001	0	122,640	2.55E-08	41.5	1.63E+09	Gamma
SO	MOV	2002	0	122,640	2.55E-08	41.5	1.63E+09	Gamma
SO	MOV	2003	0	122,640	2.55E-08	41.5	1.63E+09	Gamma
SO	MOV	2004	0	122,640	2.55E-08	41.5	1.63E+09	Gamma
SO	MOV	2005	0	122,640	2.55E-08	41.5	1.63E+09	Gamma
SO	MOV	2006	0	122,640	2.55E-08	41.5	1.63E+09	Gamma
SO	MOV	2007	0	122,640	2.55E-08	41.5	1.63E+09	Gamma
SO	MOV	2008	0	122,640	2.55E-08	41.5	1.63E+09	Gamma
SO	MOV	2009	0	122,640	2.55E-08	41.5	1.63E+09	Gamma
SO	MOV	2010	0	122,640	2.55E-08	41.5	1.63E+09	Gamma
SO	MOV	2011	0	122,640	2.55E-08	41.5	1.63E+09	Gamma
SO	MOV	2012	0	122,640	2.55E-08	41.5	1.63E+09	Gamma
SO	MOV	2013	0	122,640	2.55E-08	41.5	1.63E+09	Gamma
SO	MOV	2014	0	122,640	2.55E-08	41.5	1.63E+09	Gamma
SO	MOV	2015	0	122,640	2.55E-08	41.5	1.63E+09	Gamma
SO	MOV	2016	0	122,640	2.55E-08	41.5	1.63E+09	Gamma
SO	MOV	2017	0	122,640	2.55E-08	41.5	1.63E+09	Gamma
SO	MOV	2018	0	122,640	2.55E-08	41.5	1.63E+09	Gamma
SO	MOV	2019	0	122,640	2.55E-08	41.5	1.63E+09	Gamma
SO	MOV	2020	0	122,640	2.55E-08	41.5	1.63E+09	Gamma
SO	MOV	2021	0	122,640	2.55E-08	41.5	1.63E+09	Gamma
SO	MOV	2022	0	122,640	2.55E-08	41.5	1.63E+09	Gamma

Table 6. Failure mode acronyms.

Failure Mode	Failure Mode Description
FTOC	Fail to open/close
FTOP	Fail to operate
SO	Spurious operation

7. SYSTEM DESCRIPTION

This analysis focused on the ability of the ISO system to start and provide design-rated core cooling for its required mission time.

The models used in this report are limited to the models that represent the set of plants listed in Table 1. This analysis focused only on the isolation condenser's emergency core cooling system function to reduce reactor pressure and remove fission product decay heat. The containment isolation function of the system was not evaluated in this study.

Table 7. BWR plants with a dedicated ISO system.

Plant Name	Docket	Trains	Total Number of ISO Condensers	Number of Condensers per Train	Condenser Design	Time Before Makeup is Required (min)
Dresden 2	237	1	1	1	Dual-pass	20
Dresden 3	249	1	1	1	Dual-pass	20
Nine Mile Pt. 1	220	2	4	2	Single-pass	90

The ISO system is a standby high-pressure system that removes residual and decay heat from the reactor vessel in the event of a scram in which the reactor becomes isolated from the main condenser, or if any other high-pressure condition exists. Also, at most plants, the ISO system aids in reactor vessel depressurization in the event that either (depending on plant design) the feedwater coolant injection or high-pressure coolant injection system fails. Because of its role in emergency core cooling, the ISO system is designated as an emergency core cooling system. The ISO system is a single-train system in three plants and dual-train system in the other two plants.

Figure 3 provides a simplified single-train ISO system diagram. This configuration is typical of the single-train plants and is effectively doubled for the dual-train plants. Two Dresden plants have a single dual-pass isolation condenser per train, while the other plant (Nine Mile Pt. 1) has two single-pass isolation condensers per train.

The ISO system transfers residual and decay heat from the reactor coolant to the water in the shell side of the isolation condenser resulting in steam generation. The steam generated in the shell side of the isolation condenser is then vented to the outside atmosphere. The system employs natural circulation as the driving head from the reactor steam side, through the isolation condenser tubes, and back to the reactor.

A typical ISO system is designed to handle 3 percent reactor power, which means that 5 minutes after a scram and initiation of the ISO system, the heat removal capacity of the system equals the decay heat production rate of the shutdown reactor. Therefore, reactor water inventory will only be lost through the safety relief valves to the suppression pool for 5 minutes following a scram and isolation. This represents a minor loss relative to the vessel inventory.

The ISO system is typically required to be operable when there is fuel in the reactor vessel and steam is being produced. During normal operation the isolation condensers are in standby and are placed in service automatically when needed to provide heat transfer to the environment. In the standby condition, the steam isolation valves are open so that the condenser tube bundles are at reactor pressure. Condensate builds up in the condenser and condensate return piping; the condensate is prevented from returning to the reactor by having one of the condensate return valves for that train closed. The steam lines contain vent valves, which are open to vent air and non-condensable to the main steam system. Collection of air or non-condensable gases in the ISO system could prevent natural circulation flow. The initiation signal

places the ISO system into operation by opening the condensate return isolation valve. This valve can also be remotely operated from the control room.

The ISO system operates in a closed loop mode. Steam rises from the reactor vessel to the condenser where it is condensed by boiling the water in the condenser shell. As the reactor steam condenses, it returns by gravity flow through the condensate return valve to the suction of a reactor recirculation pump and thus to the reactor vessel. The water inventory on the shell side of the condenser will provide heat removal for between 20 and 90 minutes depending on the plant design, at which time makeup water must be provided to prevent uncovering the condenser tubes. The sources of makeup water are a combination of condensate water, demineralized water, or the fire water system depending on individual plant design. One plant (Nine Mile Pt. 1) has gravity fed makeup water tanks, which can supply enough water for 8 hours of operation before additional makeup is required.

The ISO system instrumentation and control consists of initiation and containment isolation circuitry. These circuits provide different functions, both of which are important to system reliability. The initiation circuitry provides for automatic and manual start of the system. The purpose of the containment isolation circuitry is to initiate the closure of appropriate primary containment isolation valves to limit fission product release should a steam line rupture occur.

The ISO system is automatically initiated if a high reactor pressure condition is sustained for 15 seconds. The time delay prevents unnecessary system initiation during turbine trips. Also, at most plants, the ISO system automatically initiates on a low vessel water level to aid in reducing reactor pressure for small line breaks. The isolation condenser system can be operated manually by opening the condensate return valve. The ISO system is designed to provide core cooling regardless of whether electrical power is available.

The ISO system is automatically isolated if high ISO steam flow or condensate return flow is sensed indicating a line break (Group V isolation). This isolation shuts all the steam and condensate isolation valves and the steam line vent valves, rendering the ISO system inoperable. The steam line vent valves will also automatically shut on a low vessel water level condition (Group I isolation). Isolation of the vent valves for a prolonged period could render the heat exchanger inoperable due to the buildup of non-condensable gases. However, failure of this circuit to close the vent valves would not preclude operation of the system.




Figure 3. Simplified single-train isolation condenser system schematic.

8. REFERENCES

1. Z. Ma, T. E. Wierman, and K. J. Kvarfordt. 2021. “Industry-Average Performance for Components and Initiating Events at U.S. Commercial Nuclear Power Plants: 2020 Update,” INL/EXT-21-65055, Idaho National Laboratory.
2. S. A. Eide, T. E. Wierman, C. D. Gentillon, D. M. Rasmuson, and C. L. Atwood. 2007. “Industry-Average Performance for Components and Initiating Events at U.S. Commercial Nuclear Power Plants,” NUREG/CR-6928, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
3. Z. Ma and K. J. Kvarfordt. 2022. “CCF Parameter Estimations, 2020 Update,” INL/EXT-21-62940, Revision 1, Idaho National Laboratory.
4. United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission. 2010. “Component Reliability Data Sheets Update 2010,” online. Available: <https://nrcoe.inl.gov/resultsdb/publicdocs/AvgPerf/ComponentUR2010.pdf>.
5. C. D. Gentillon. 2016. “Overview and Reference Document for Operational Experience Results and Databases Trending,”online. Available: <https://nrcoe.inl.gov/resultsdb/publicdocs/Overview-and-Reference.pdf>.