

**AEC DISTRIBUTION FOR PART 50 DOCKET MATERIAL
(TEMPORARY FORM)**

CONTROL NO: 6259

ACKNOWLEDGED

DO NOT REMOVE

FILE: _____

FROM: Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge Washington, D. C. 20006 George F. Trowbridge			DATE OF DOC 8-15-73		DATE REC'D 8-15-73		LTR x	MEMO	RPT	OTHER
TO: D. L. Ziemann			ORIG 1 signed		CC		OTHER		SENT AEC PDR x SENT LOCAL PDR x	
CLASS	UNCLASS x	PROP INFO	INPUT		NO CYS REC'D 40		DOCKET NO: 50-263			

DESCRIPTION: Ltr submitted on behalf of NSP....re our 7-16-73 ltr....trans the following: NOTE: 1 cy Advance to Ziemann 1 cy Advance to Butler PLANT NAME: Monticello					ENCLOSURES: Ltr dtd 8-15-73 fm NSP re our 7-16-73 ltr furnishing info re GE Topical Report NEDM-10735, "Densification Considerations in BWR Fuel Design and Performance". (40 cys encl rec'd)				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

FOR ACTION/INFORMATION 8-16-73 LB

✓ BUTLER(L)	SCHWENCER(L)	✓ ZIEMANN(L)	REGAN(E)
W/ 1 Copies	W/ Copies	W/ 1 Copies	W/ Copies
CLARK(L)	STOLZ(L)	DICKER(E)	
W/ Copies	W/ Copies	W/ Copies	W/ Copies
GOLLER(L)	VASSALLO(L)	KNIGHTON(E)	
W/ Copies	W/ Copies	W/ Copies	W/ Copies
KNIEL(L)	SCHEMEL(L)	YOUNGBLOOD(E)	
W/ Copies	W/ Copies	W/ Copies	W/ Copies

INTERNAL DISTRIBUTION

<u>REG FILE</u> ✓ AEC PDR OGC, ROOM P-506A MUNTZING/STAFF CASE GIAMBUSO BOYD MOORE (L) (BWR) DEYOUNG (L) (PWR) ✓ SKOVHOLT (L) P. COLLINS <u>REG OPR</u> ✓ FILE & REGION (3) MORRIS STEELE	<u>TECH REVIEW</u> HENDRIE SCHROEDER MACCARY KNIGHT PAWLICKI SHAO ✓ STELLO HOUSTON ✓ NOVAK ✓ ROSS IPPOLITO TEDESCO LONG LAINAS BENAROYA VOLLMER	DENTON GRIMES GAMMILL KASTNER BALLARD SPANGLER <u>ENVIRO</u> MULLER DICKER KNIGHTON YOUNGBLOOD REGAN PROJECT LDR HARLESS	<u>LIC ASST</u> DIGGS (L) GEARIN (L) GOULBOURNE (L) LEE (L) MAIGRET (L) SERVICE (L) SHEPPARD (E) SMITH (L) ✓ TEETS (L) WADE (E) WILLIAMS (E) WILSON (L)	<u>A/T IND</u> BRAITMAN SALTZMAN <u>PLANS</u> MCDONALD DUBE <u>INFO</u> C. MILES ✓ RUBENSTEIN ✓ V. ROONEY ✓ CRUTCHFIELD ✓ VARGA ✓ SCHIERLING
---	---	---	---	--

EXTERNAL DISTRIBUTION

1 - LOCAL PDR Minneapolis, Minn. 1 - DTIE (ABERNATHY) 1 - NSIC (BUCHANAN) 1 - ASLB (YORE/SAYRE/ WOODARD/"H" ST. 16 - CYS ACRS XXXXXX SENT TO LIC ASST.	(1) (2X10) NATIONAL LAB'S 1 - R. Schoonmaker, OC, GT, D-323 1 - R. CATLIN, E-256-GT 1 - CONSULTANT'S NEWMARK/BLUME/AGBABIAN 1 - GERALD ULRIKSON... ORNL	1 - PDR-SAN/LA/NY 1 - GERALD LELLOUCHE BROOKHAVEN NAT. LAB 1 - AGMED (WALTER KOESTER RM-C-427-GT 1 - RD..MULLER..F-309 GT
--	--	--

Regulatory

File Cy.

50-263

50-263

SHAW, PITTMAN, POTTS & TROWBRIDGE

BARR BUILDING

910 17TH STREET, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20006


(202) 296-3888

CABLE: "SHAWLAW"

TELEX: 440143

MURDAUGH STUART MADDEN
OF COUNSEL

BRACKLEY SHAW
RAMSAY D. POTTS
STUART L. PITTMAN
GEORGE F. TROWBRIDGE
STEPHEN D. POTTS
GERALD CHARNOFF
PHILLIP D. BOSTWICK
R. TIMOTHY HANLON
GEORGE M. ROGERS, JR.
A. J. DONICH, JR.
BRUCE W. CHURCHILL
LESLIE A. NICHOLSON, JR.
MARTIN D. KRALL
RICHARD J. KENDALL
JAY E. SILBERG
BARRY M. SMOLER
BARBARA M. ROSSOTTI
PETER ANDREW MARK
STEPHEN L. PARKER
MARK AUGENBLICK
FRED DRASNER
ERNEST L. BLAKE, JR.
J. E. MURDOCK III
CARLETON S. JONES*
THOMAS A. BAXTER
* NOT ADMITTED IN D.C.



August 15, 1973

Mr. D. L. Ziemann, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch #2
Directorate of Licensing
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission
Washington, D.C. 20545

Dear Mr. Ziemann:


I am enclosing 40 copies of response
by Northern States Power Company to your letter of
July 16, 1973, as received in our office by telecopy.
A confirming typewritten letter is being mailed
today by Northern States Power Company.

Sincerely,

George F. Trowbridge

GFT:lc
Encl.

6259



NORTHERN STATES POWER COMPANY

MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA 55401

August 15, 1973

Mr. D L Ziemann, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch #2
Directorate of Licensing
United States Atomic Energy Commission
Washington, D C 20545

Dear Mr. Ziemann:

MONTICELLO NUCLEAR GENERATING PLANT
Docket No. 50-263 License No. DFR-22

Response to July 16, 1973
AEC Letter on Fuel Densification

This letter is written in response to your letter of July 16, 1973 to Mr. Arthur V Dienhart (NSP) which presented the elements the AEC Staff wished to be included in the evaluation of fuel densification in boiling water reactors. Analysis for the Monticello reactor was done generically and is reported in Supplement 6 to General Electric Topical Report NEDM-10735, "Densification Considerations in BWR Fuel Design and Performance," which is being concurrently filed with AEC by General Electric.

The July 16, 1973 letter asked that the effects of densification using the Staff assumptions be analyzed for normal operation, anticipated transients and accidents including the loss-of-coolant accident (LOCA). Each of these events is discussed in NEDM-10735, Supplement 6; evaluation of the results presented show that the only significant effect of fuel densification involves the postulated LOCA.

As part of the Staff conclusions, the July 16, 1973 letter stated that if changes in design or operating conditions are necessary to maintain required margins we should submit proposed changes and operating limitations with the analyses. Section 6 of NEDM-10735, Supplement 6 presents, in Technical Specification format, two potential Limiting Conditions for Operation which would maintain required margins should the staff densification criteria be implemented. The LOCA analysis to meet this criteria was performed in two ways. First, the maximum allowable average planar linear heat generation rate (APLHGR) was determined as a function of exposure based on a very conservative interpretation of the Staff criteria. Second, an analysis was done using a suitably conservative alternative interpretation of the AEC criteria based on a statistical analysis of existing data; the maximum allowable APLHGR was likewise determined. The results are presented in Figures 4-9C1 and 4-9C2 of NEDM-10735, Supplement 6 along with a comparison to that allowed by current Technical Specification limits. In addition to the LOCA analysis, which determined allowable fuel bundle segment power levels, the Staff criteria on power spiking as it affects the normal operating linear heat generation rate of the hottest fuel pin was also determined. The maximum allowable LHGR is reduced from 17.5 kw/ft as shown in Figure 3-6 and discussed in Section 6 of NEDM-10735. A summary of results pertaining to the Monticello Plant is presented in column C of Table 6.2 of NEDM-10735, Supplement 6.

With regard to the postulated LOCA, previous analyses indicate that the Monticello Plant satisfies the Interim Acceptance Criteria applicable to this event without additional specific restriction or altered modes of operation. It is made clear in the July 16, 1973 letter that the principal effect of the

Staff's fuel densification models on the LOCA calculation is a modification of the 1000 btu/hr ft²°F gap conductance in the AEC approved GE ECCS evaluation model. We recommend that the Staff continue to utilize the existing 1000 btu/hr ft²°F value for all analyses until such time as General Electric can reasonably complete development of a more sophisticated analytical model representing the changes of gap conductance in relation to the various phenomena, including fuel densification, associated with increasing exposure. There does not appear to be any safety reason for immediate action. Deferral of action until development of a complete analytical model upon which general agreement can be reached appears to be the preferable alternative.

We have reviewed the impact on Monticello cycle 2 operation, should the suggested General Electric Technical Specifications be implemented following AEC Staff evaluation. The APISER limitations based on the LOCA analysis appear to be more restrictive, at all times, than the LHCR limitations imposed on normal operation; the latter, in themselves, would have minimal impact on cycle 2 operation. If the suitably conservative alternative approach were deemed appropriate, a maximum plant derate of 5% may be necessary near the end of cycle 2. If adherence to the more conservative interpretation of Staff criteria were required, it appears that a greater plant derate may be necessary during a significant portion of the remainder of cycle 2. It should be noted that the suggested Technical Specification limitations refer to bundle segment power rather than total plant power. A detailed analysis of the impact of these bundle power limitations on future plant operation is being initiated. Projected near-term operation indicates that the plant will operate below the beta curves of Figures 4-9C1 and 4-9C2 for the next one to two months and is currently below the gamma curve.

Having reviewed NEDM-10735 and Supplements 1 through 6, we agree with the General Electric position that the Staff criteria presented with the July 16, 1973 Letter is overly conservative in light of existing data concerning BWR fuel densification. Based on comparisons of the information in Supplement 6 to NEDM-10735 and our current Monticello cycle 2 operating parameters, we believe that no immediate action is required and that normal operation may be safely continued.

It is requested that General Electric generic filing of NEDM-10735, Supplements 1 through 6 be referenced in the Monticello docket. Please advise us if any other action or additional information is required with regard to this matter.

Yours truly,



L. O. Meyer, PE
Director of Nuclear Support Services

LDM/MEV/br

cc: B H Grier
G Charnoff
Minnesota Pollution Control Agency
Attn. K Dzigan


NSP

NORTHERN STATES POWER COMPANY

MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA 55401

August 15, 1973

Mr. D L Ziemann, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch #2
Directorate of Licensing
United States Atomic Energy Commission
Washington, D C 20545



Dear Mr. Ziemann:

MONTICELLO NUCLEAR GENERATING PLANT
Docket No. 50-263 License No. DPR-22

Response to July 16, 1973
AEC Letter on Fuel Densification

This letter is written in response to your letter of July 16, 1973 to Mr. Arthur V Dienhart (NSP) which presented the elements the AEC Staff wished to be included in the evaluation of fuel densification in boiling water reactors. Analysis for the Monticello reactor was done generically and is reported in Supplement 6 to General Electric Topical Report NEDM-10735, "Densification Considerations in BWR Fuel Design and Performance," which is being concurrently filed with AEC by General Electric.

The July 16, 1973 letter asked that the effects of densification using the Staff assumptions be analyzed for normal operation, anticipated transients and accidents including the loss-of-coolant accident (LOCA). Each of these events is discussed in NEDM-10735, Supplement 6; evaluation of the results presented show that the only significant effect of fuel densification involves the postulated LOCA.



As part of the Staff conclusions, the July 16, 1973 letter stated that if changes in design or operating conditions are necessary to maintain required margins we should submit proposed changes and operating limitations with the analyses. Section 6 of NEDM-10735, Supplement 6 presents, in Technical Specification format, two potential Limiting Conditions for Operation which would maintain required margins should the staff densification criteria be implemented. The LOCA analysis to meet this criteria was performed in two ways. First, the maximum allowable average planar linear heat generation rate (APLHGR) was determined as a function of exposure based on a very conservative interpretation of the Staff criteria. Second, an analysis was done using a suitably conservative alternative interpretation of the AEC criteria based on a statistical analysis of existing data; the maximum allowable APLHGR was likewise determined. The results are presented in Figures 4-9C1 and 4-9C2 of NEDM-10735, Supplement 6 along with a comparison to that allowed by current Technical Specification limits. In addition to the LOCA analysis, which determined allowable fuel bundle segment power levels, the Staff criteria on power spiking as it affects the normal operating linear heat generation rate of the hottest fuel pin was also determined. The maximum allowable LHGR is reduced from 17.5 kw/ft as shown in Figure 3-6 and discussed in Section 6 of NEDM-10735. A summary of results pertaining to the Monticello Plant is presented in column C of Table 6.2 of NEDM-10735, Supplement 6.

With regard to the postulated LOCA, previous analyses indicate that the Monticello Plant satisfies the Interim Acceptance Criteria applicable to this event without additional specific restriction or altered modes of operation. It is made clear in the July 16, 1973 letter that the principal effect of the

Staff's fuel densification models on the LOCA calculation is a modification of the 1000 btu/hr ft²°F gap conductance in the AEC approved GE ECCS evaluation model. We recommend that the Staff continue to utilize the existing 1000 btu/hr ft²°F value for all analyses until such time as General Electric can reasonably complete development of a more sophisticated analytical model representing the changes of gap conductance in relation to the various phenomena, including fuel densification, associated with increasing exposure. There does not appear to be any safety reason for immediate action. Deferral of action until development of a complete analytical model upon which general agreement can be reached appears to be the preferable alternative.

We have reviewed the impact on Monticello cycle 2 operation, should the suggested General Electric Technical Specifications be implemented following AEC Staff evaluation. The APLHGR limitations based on the LOCA analysis appear to be more restrictive, at all times, than the LHGR limitations imposed on normal operation; the latter, in themselves, would have minimal impact on cycle 2 operation. If the suitably conservative alternative approach were deemed appropriate, a maximum plant derate of 5% may be necessary near the end of cycle 2. If adherence to the more conservative interpretation of Staff criteria were required, it appears that a greater plant derate may be necessary during a significant portion of the remainder of cycle 2. It should be noted that the suggested Technical Specification limitations refer to bundle segment power rather than total plant power. A detailed analysis of the impact of these bundle power limitations on future plant operation is being initiated. Projected near-term operation indicates that the plant will operate below the beta curves of Figures 4-9C1 and 4-9C2 for the next one to two months and is currently below the gamma curve.


NORTHERN STATES POWER COMPANY

- 4 -

Having reviewed NEDM-10735 and Supplements 1 through 6, we agree with the General Electric position that the Staff criteria presented with the July 16, 1973 letter is overly conservative in light of existing data concerning BWR fuel densification. Based on comparisons of the information in Supplement 6 to NEDM-10735 and our current Monticello cycle 2 operating parameters, we believe that no immediate action is required and that normal operation may be safely continued.

It is requested that General Electric generic filing of NEDM-10735, Supplements 1 through 6 be referenced in the Monticello docket. Please advise us if any other action or additional information is required with regard to this matter.

Yours truly,



L O Mayer, PE
Director of Nuclear Support Services

LOM/MHV/br

cc: B H Grier
G Charnoff
Minnesota Pollution Control Agency
Attn. K Dzugan