

## **2.3 SYSTEM SCOPING AND SCREENING RESULTS: MECHANICAL**

### **Review Responsibilities**

**Primary** - Branches responsible for systems

**Secondary** - None

### **2.3.1 Areas of Review**

This review plan section addresses the mechanical systems scoping and screening results for license renewal. Typical mechanical systems consist of the following:

Reactor Coolant System (such as reactor vessel and internals, coolant pressure boundary, coolant system and connected lines, and steam generators).

Engineered Safety Features (such as containment spray and isolation systems, standby gas treatment system, emergency core cooling system, and fan cooler system).

Auxiliary Systems (such as new and spent fuel storage, spent fuel cooling and cleanup, suppression pool cleanup, load handling, open and closed cycle cooling water, ultimate heat sink, compressed air system, chemical and volume control system, standby liquid control system, reactor water cleanup, coolant storage/refueling water, shutdown water, ventilation, diesel generator, fire protection, and liquid waste disposal).

Steam and Power Conversion System (such as turbines, main and extraction steam, feedwater, condensate, steam generator blowdown, and auxiliary feedwater).

An applicant is required by 10 CFR 54.21(a)(1) to identify and list structures and components subject to an aging management review. These are “passive,” “long-lived” structures and components that are within the scope of license renewal. In addition, an applicant is required by 10 CFR 54.21(a)(2) to describe and justify methods used to identify these structures and components. The staff reviews the applicant’s methodology separately following the guidance in Section 2.1 of this standard review plan. To verify that the applicant had properly implemented its methodology, the staff focuses its review on the implementation results to confirm that there is no omission of mechanical system components that are subject to an aging management review.

An applicant would list all plant level systems and structures. Based on the Design Basis Events (DBEs) in the plant’s current licensing basis (CLB) and other CLB information relating to non-safety-related systems and structures and certain regulated events, the applicant would identify those plant level systems and structures within the scope of license renewal, as defined in 10 CFR 54.4(a). This is “scoping” of the plant level systems and structures for license renewal. The staff reviews the applicant’s plant level “scoping” results separately following the guidance in Section 2.2 of this standard review plan.

For a mechanical system that is within the scope of license renewal, an applicant would identify the portion of the system that performs intended function(s), as defined in 10 CFR 54.4(b). The applicant identifies this particular portion of the system in marked-up piping and instrument

diagrams (P&IDs). This is “scoping” of mechanical components in a system to identify those that are within the scope of license renewal for a system.

For the mechanical components within this particular portion of the system, an applicant would identify those that are “passive” and “long-lived” in accordance with 10 CFR 54.21(a)(1)(i) and (ii). These “passive,” “long-lived” mechanical components are those that are subject to an aging management review. This is “screening” of mechanical components in a system to identify those that are “passive” and “long-lived.”

The applicant has the flexibility to determine the set of structures and components for which an aging management review is performed, provided that this set encompasses the structures and components for which the Commission has determined an aging management review is required. This is based on the statements of consideration for the license renewal rule (60 FR 22478). Therefore, the reviewer should not review components that the applicant has identified as subject to an aging management review, because it is an applicant’s option to include more components than those required by 10 CFR 52.21(a)(1).

The following areas relating to the methodology implementation results for the mechanical systems are reviewed:

### **2.3.1.1 Components Within the Scope of License Renewal**

The applicant’s identification of mechanical system components that are within the scope of license renewal is reviewed. (Scoping)

### **2.3.1.2 Components Subject to an Aging Management Review**

The applicant’s identification of mechanical system components within the scope of license renewal that are “passive” and “long-lived” is reviewed. (Screening)

### **2.3.2 Acceptance Criteria**

The acceptance criteria for the areas of review define methods for meeting the requirements of the Commission’s regulations in 10 CFR 54.21(a)(1). For the applicant’s implementation of its methodology in 10 CFR 54.21(a)(2) to be acceptable, the staff should find no omission of mechanical system components that are subject to an aging management review.

#### **2.3.2.1 Components Within the Scope of License Renewal**

Mechanical components are within the scope of license renewal as delineated in 10 CFR 54.4(a) if they are:

1. Safety-related systems, structures, and components which are those relied upon to remain functional during and following design-basis events (as defined in 10 CFR 50.49(b)(1)) to ensure the following functions --
  - (i) The integrity of the reactor coolant pressure boundary;
  - (ii) The capability to shut down the reactor and maintain it in a safe shutdown condition; or

- (iii) The capability to prevent or mitigate the consequences of accidents that could result in potential offsite exposure comparable to the guidelines in 10 CFR 50.34(a)(1) or 10 CFR 100.11, as applicable.
- 2. All nonsafety-related systems, structures, and components whose failure could prevent satisfactory accomplishment of any of the functions identified in 10 CFR 54.4(a)(1)(i), (ii), or (iii).
- 3. All systems, structures, and components relied on in safety analyses or plant evaluations to perform a function that demonstrates compliance with the Commission's regulations for fire protection (10 CFR 50.48), environmental qualification (10 CFR 50.49), pressurized thermal shock (10 CFR 50.61), anticipated transients without scram (10 CFR 50.62), and station blackout (10 CFR 50.63).

### **2.3.2.2 Components Subject to Aging Management Review**

Mechanical components are subject to an aging management review if they are within the scope of license renewal and perform an intended function as defined in 10 CFR 54.4(b) without a change in configuration or properties ("passive"), and are not subject to replacement based on a qualified life or specified time period ("long-lived") (10 CFR 54.21(a)(1)(i) and (ii)).

### **2.3.3 Review Procedures**

For each area of review, the following review procedures are to be followed:

#### **2.3.3.1 Components Within the Scope of License Renewal**

This step determines whether the applicant has properly identified the components within the scope of license renewal. The reviewer should review selected components that the applicant did not identify as within the scope of license renewal to verify that they did not omit components with intended functions.

The reviewer should use the plant Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR), orders, applicable regulations, exemptions, and license conditions to determine the design basis for the systems, structures, and components. The design basis determines the system intended function(s), which in turn, determines the components within that system that are required for the system to perform its intended functions.

An applicant should provide plant drawing (P&IDs) marking the portion of the system that is within the scope of license renewal. The reviewer should focus the review on those components that are not identified as being within the scope of license renewal, especially boundary points and major system components, to ensure the applicant has not omitted components that are required for the system to perform its intended functions. Portions of the system identified as being within the scope of license renewal by the applicant do not have to be identified by the reviewer because the applicant has the option of including more components than the rule requires to be in the scope.

For example, if a portion of a system does not perform an intended function, is not identified as being within the scope of license renewal, and is isolated from the portion of the system that is

identified as being within the scope of license renewal by a boundary valve, the reviewer should verify that this particular boundary valve is identified as being within the scope of license renewal, or that the valve does not have an intended function (that is, the valve is not required for the system to perform its intended function). Another example, the reviewer should sample the system function of piping runs and components that are not identified as being within the scope of license renewal to ensure they do not meet the requirement of 10 CFR 54.4.

Further, the reviewer should select functions described in the UFSAR to verify that components having intended functions were not omitted from the scope of the rule. The reviewer should find no omissions of components within the scope of license renewal by the applicant to make the staff finding that there is reasonable assurance that the applicant has identified the components within the scope of license renewal for the mechanical systems.

Section 2.1 of this standard review plan contains additional guidance on the following:

- commodity groups
- complex assemblies
- scoping events
- hypothetical failure
- cascading

Table 2.3-1 provides examples of mechanical components scoping lessons learned from the review of the initial license renewal applications and basis for disposition.

At the completion of this review step, the reviewer has confidence that the applicant has identified the components within the scope of license renewal.

### **2.3.3.2 Components Subject to an Aging Management Review**

This step determines whether the applicant has properly identified the components subject to an aging management review from among those identified in the previous step, that is, Subsection 2.3.3.1 of this review plan section. The reviewer should review selected components that the applicant has identified as within the scope of license renewal to verify that the applicant has identified these components as subject to an aging management review if they perform intended functions without moving parts or without a change in configuration or properties and are not subject to replacement on the basis of a qualified life or specified time period.

Starting with the boundary verified in Subsection 2.3.3.1 of this review plan, the reviewer should sample components that are within the scope of license renewal for that system, but were not identified by the applicant as subject to an aging management review. Only components that are “passive” and “long-lived” are subject to an aging management review. Table 2.1-2 of Section 2.1 of this standard review plan is provided for the reviewer to assist in identifying whether certain components are “passive.” Applicant should justify omitting a component that is within the scope of license renewal at their facility and is listed as “passive” on Table 2.1-2.

For example, an applicant has marked a boundary of a certain system that is within the scope of license renewal. The marked-up P&ID shows that there are piping, valves, and air compressors within this boundary. The applicant has identified piping and valve bodies as subject to an

aging management review. The reviewer verifies that Table 2.1-2 of Section 2.1 of this standard review plan indicates air compressors are not subject to an aging management review.

The reviewer should find no omissions of components subject to an aging management review by the applicant to make the staff finding that there is reasonable assurance that the applicant has identified the components subject to an aging management review for the mechanical systems.

Section 2.1 of this standard review plan contains additional guidance on screening the following:

- consumables
- heat exchanger intended functions
- multiple functions
- piece-parts

Table 2.3-2 provides examples of mechanical components screening lessons learned from the review of the initial license renewal applications and basis for disposition.

The applicant should also identify the component intended functions required to be managed by 10 CFR 54.4. Table 2.3-3 provides examples of mechanical component intended functions.

At the completion of the review step, the reviewer has confidence that the applicant has identified the “passive,” “long-lived” components subject to an aging management review.

#### **2.3.4 Evaluation Findings**

The reviewer verifies that sufficient and adequate information has been provided to satisfy the provision of this review plan section and that the staff’s evaluation supports conclusions of the following type, to be included in the staff’s safety evaluation report:

The staff evaluation concludes that there is a reasonable assurance that the applicant has appropriately identified the mechanical system components subject to an aging management review to meet the requirements stated in 10 CFR 54.21(a)(1).

#### **2.3.5 Implementation**

Except in those cases in which the applicant proposes an acceptable alternative method for complying with specific portions of the Commission’s regulations, the method described herein will be used by the staff in its evaluation of conformance with Commission regulations.

#### **2.3.6 References**

None

**Table 2.3-1. Examples of Mechanical Components Scoping and Basis for Disposition**

<b>Example</b>	<b>Disposition</b>
Piping segment that provides structural support	The safety-related/non-safety-related boundary along a pipe run may occur at a valve location. The piping segment between this valve and the next seismic anchor provides structural support in a seismic event. This piping segment is within the scope of license renewal.
Containment heating and ventilation system ductwork downstream of the fusible links providing cooling to the steam generator compartment and reactor vessel annulus	This non-safety-related ductwork provides cooling to support the applicant's environmental qualification (EQ) program. However, the failure of the cavity cooling system ductwork will not prevent the satisfactory completion of any critical safety function during and following a design basis accident. Thus, this ductwork is not within the scope of license renewal.
Standpipe installed inside the fuel oil storage tank	The standpipe ensures that there is sufficient fuel oil reserve for the emergency diesel generator to operate for the specified number of days in the plant technical specifications following design basis events. Therefore, this standpipe is within the scope of license renewal.
Insulation on boron injection tank	The temperature is high enough that insulation is not necessary to prevent boron precipitation. Technical specifications require periodic verification of the tank temperature. Thus the insulation is not relied on to ensure the function of the emergency system and is not within the scope of license renewal.
Pressurizer spray head	The spray head is not credited for the mitigation of any accidents addressed in the UFSAR accident analyses. The function of the pressurizer spray is to reduce reactor coolant system pressure during normal operating conditions. Therefore, the spray head is not within the scope of license renewal.

**Table 2.3-2. Examples of Mechanical Components Screening and Basis for Disposition**

<b>Example</b>	<b>Disposition</b>
Diesel engine jacket water heat exchanger, and portions of the diesel fuel oil system and starting air system supplied by a vendor on a diesel generator skid	These are “passive,” “long-lived” components having intended functions. They are subject to an aging management review for license renewal even though the diesel generator is considered “active.”
Fuel assemblies	The fuel assemblies are replaced at regular intervals based on the fuel cycle of the plant. They are not subject to an aging management review.
Valve internals (such as disk and seat)	10 CFR 54.21(a)(1)(i) excludes valves, other than the valve body, from aging management review. The statements of consideration of the license renewal rule provide the basis for excluding structures and components that perform their intended functions with moving parts or with a change in configuration or properties. Although the valve body is subject to an aging management review, valve internals are not.

**Table 2.3-3. Examples of Mechanical Component Intended Functions**

<b>Component</b>	<b>Intended Function*</b>
Piping	Pressure boundary
Valve body	Pressure boundary
Pump casing	Pressure boundary
Orifice	Pressure boundary Flow restriction
Heat exchanger	Pressure boundary Heat transfer
Reactor vessel internals	Structural support of fuel assemblies, control rods, and incore instrumentation, to maintain core configuration and flow distribution

\*The component intended function(s) are those that support the system intended function(s). For example, a heat exchanger in the spent fuel cooling system has a pressure boundary intended function, but may not have a heat transfer function. Similarly, not all orifices have flow restriction as an intended function.