

REGULATORY INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (RIDS)

ACCESSION NBR: 8003110602 DOC. DATE: 80/03/05 NOTARIZED: NO DOCKET #
 FACIL: 50-244 Robert Emmet Ginna Nuclear Plant, Unit 1, Rochester G 05000244
 AUTH. NAME AUTHOR AFFILIATION
 WHITE, L. D. Rochester Gas & Electric Corp.
 RECIP. NAME RECIPIENT AFFILIATION
 ZIEMANN, D. L. Operating Reactors Branch 2

SUBJECT: Forwards replacement Page 16, Attachment A, to 800220 ltr re
 proposal to load four mixed oxide fuel assemblies.

DISTRIBUTION CODE: A042S COPIES RECEIVED: LTR 1 ENCL 1 SIZE: 2
 TITLE: Resp to Lesson Learn Task Force - Comb Eng & 50-267

NOTES: LCY: J. SHAPAKER, C. HOFMAYER.

ACTION:	RECIPIENT	COPIES		RECIPIENT	COPIES	
	ID CODE/NAME	LTTR	ENCL		ID CODE/NAME	LTTR
	8 BC ORB #2	7	7			
INTERNAL:	1 REG FILE	1	1	15 I & E	2	2
	18 CORE PERF BR	1	1	19 ENG BR	1	1
	2 NRC PDR	1	1	20 REAC SFTY BR	1	1
	21 PLANT SYS BR	1	1	22 EEB	1	1
	23 EFLT TRT SYS	1	1	3 LPDR	1	1
	4 NSIC	1	1	5 C NELSON	2	2
	6 C ANDERSON	1	1	7 G CHALINA	1	1
	IMBRO, G.	1	1	OELD	1	0
	TELFORD, J. T.	2	2			
EXTERNAL:	24 ACRS	16	16			

MAR 14 1980

MA
4

TOTAL NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED: LTTR 45 ENCL 44
43 42

1708M304.5, 93434682.72 : 1991

12 11 820



ROCHESTER GAS AND ELECTRIC CORPORATION • 89 EAST AVENUE, ROCHESTER, N.Y. 14649

LEON D. WHITE JR.
VICE PRESIDENT

TELEPHONE
AREA CODE 716 546-2700

March 5, 1980

Director of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
ATTN: Mr. Dennis L. Ziemann, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch No. 2
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

Dear Mr. Ziemann:

In our letter of February 20, 1980, we provided information regarding our proposal to load four mixed oxide fuel assemblies in Ginna Cycle 10. It has come to our attention that page 16 of Attachment A to that letter was not properly copied by our copier. Therefore, we are enclosing with this letter forty (40) copies of page 16 to Attachment A. Please insert this replacement page in the appropriate place.

Very truly yours,

L. D. White, Jr.

Enc.

A042
5/11

8003110602

2

QUESTION 7

It is the position of the staff that credit may not be taken for decay heat values different than those specified in Appendix K when calculating the results of a LOCA. Therefore, please provide different justification that the MOX fuel will be less limiting than the UO_2 fuel for Cycle 10.

Response

The ECCS performance of the mixed oxide fuel to be loaded in the R. E. Ginna Nuclear Plant core is bounded by an existing analysis considering standard uranium oxide fuel. Since the fuel assembly designs are equivalent, the fluid thermal-hydraulic transients calculated for uranium oxide fuel may be applied to the mixed oxide fuel as well. Fuel performance parameters [pellet temperature, gap fill pressure, core peaking] have been calculated for the mixed oxide fuel to be loaded in the Ginna core. The fuel pellet average temperature upon which the most recent Westinghouse Evaluation Model ECCS performance analysis for Ginna is based is greater than the pellet average temperature of this mixed oxide fuel. Therefore, the stored energy present in the mixed oxide fuel at the time of a LOCA will be less than the stored energy available in the uranium oxide fuel analysis, and the calculated peak clad temperature (PCT) will also be less. The fill pressure of the mixed oxide fuel to be loaded in the Ginna core is less than the pressure utilized in the most recent Westinghouse analysis for Ginna, so no mixed oxide fuel PCT penalty due to clad burst effects can occur. Clearly, the mixed oxide fuel performance parameters make it less limiting in an ECCS performance evaluation than uranium oxide fuel which has previously been analyzed for Ginna.

QUESTION 8

Are the fuel assemblies "rods-off-bottom" or "rods-on-bottom"? If "on-bottom" discuss how fuel rod bowing is considered.

Response

The design of the MOX fuel assemblies is for the fuel rods to be off-bottom.

QUESTION 9

The mixed oxide fuel assemblies are stated to be similar in mechanical design to Region 7 assemblies. Discuss the performance of these fuel assemblies. Was there any aspect of the performance of those assemblies which was outside of expectations?