REGULATORY INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (RIDS)

ACCESSION NBR:8003040494 DOC.DATE: 80/02/28 NOTARIZED: NO DOCKET #
FACIL:50-250 Turkey Point Plant, Unit 3, Florida Power and Light C 05000250
50-251 Turkey Point Plant, Unit 4, Florida Power and Light C 05000251
AUTH.NAME AUTHOR AFFILIATION
UHRIG,R.E. Florida Power & Light Co.
RECIP.NAME RECIPIENT AFFILIATION
EISENHUT,D.G. Division of Operating Reactors

SUBJECT: Forwards Attachment 1 to 800123 ltr submitting info re potential effect of new fuel clad research data on ECCS analysis.Page omitted from original submittal.

DISTRIBUTION CODE: A001S COPIES RECEIVED:LTR 1 ENCL 1 SIZE: 5
TITLE: General Distribution for after Issuance of Operating Lic

NOTES:

	RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME	COPIES LTTR	COPIES ENCL	RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME	COPIES LTTR	COPIES ENCL
ACTION:	05 BC ORB #1	7	7			
INTERNAL:	01 REG FILE	1	1	02 NRC PDR	1	1
	12 I&E	2	2	15 CORE PERF BR	1	1
	17 ENGR BR	1	1	18 REAC SFTY BR	1	1
	19 PLANT SYS BR	1	1	20 EEB	1	1
	21 EFLT TRT SYS	1	1	EPB-DOR	1	1
	OELD	1	0	STS GROUP LEADR	1	1
EXTERNAL:	03 LPDR	1	1	04 NSIC	1	1
	23 ACRS	16	16			

MAR 5 1980

TOTAL NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED: LTTR 38 ENCL 37

P.O. BOX 529100, MIAMI, FL 33152

FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

February 28, 1980
L-80-64

Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
Attention: Mr. Darrell G. Eisenhut
Acting Director
Division of Operating Reactors
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

Dear Mr. Eisenhut:

Re: Turkey Point Units 3 & 4
Docket Nos. 50-250 & 50-251

On January 23, 1980 (L-80-34), Florida Power & Light Company submitted information concerning the potential effect of new fuel clad research data on the ECCS analysis for Turkey Point Units 3 and 4. A page was omitted from Attachment 1 to that letter. Attachment 1 is forwarded in its entirety with this letter. We apologize for any inconvenience this oversight may have caused you.

Very truly yours,

J. A. DeMastry for

Robert E. Uhrig
Vice President
Advanced Systems & Technology

REU/GDW/ah

cc: J. P. O'Reilly, Region II
Harold F. Reis, Esquire

A001
S
1/1

8003040494

ATTACHMENT 1

A. Evaluation of the potential impact of using fuel rod models presented in draft NUREG-0530 on the Loss of Coolant Accident (LOCA) analysis for Turkey Point Units 3 and 4.

This evaluation is based on the limiting break LOCA analysis identified as follows:

BREAK TYPE - DOUBLE ENDED COLD LEG GUILLOTINE

BREAK DISCHARGE COEFFICIENT 0.4

WESTINGHOUSE ECCS EVALUATION MODEL VERSION Modified* February, 1978

* The fuel rod burst model was modified to factor in heatup rate dependence as documented in WCAP-8970-P-A "Westinghouse Emergency Core Cooling System Small Break, October 1975 Model." Fuel rod burst curves used in this analysis represented clad heatup rates of 15 Degrees F for the Hot Rod and 11 Degrees F for the Average Hot Assembly Rod.

CORE PEAKING FACTOR 1.89

HOT ROD MAXIMUM TEMPERATURE CALCULATED FOR THE BURST REGION OF THE CLAD - 2161. °F = PCT_B

ELEVATION - 6.0 Feet.

HOT ROD MAXIMUM TEMPERATURE CALCULATED FOR A NON-RUPTURED REGION OF THE CLAD - 1982. °F = PCT_N

ELEVATION - 7.75 Feet

CLAD STRAIN DURING BLOWDOWN AT THIS ELEVATION 0.32 Percent
MAXIMUM CLAD STRAIN AT THIS ELEVATION - 5.5 Percent

Maximum temperature for this node occurs when the core reflood rate is (GREATER/[illegible]) than 1.0 inch per second and reflood heat transfer is based on the (FLECHT/[illegible]) calculation.

AVERAGE HOT ASSEMBLY ROD BURST ELEVATION - 6.0 Feet

HOT ASSEMBLY BLOCKAGE CALCULATED - 28.7 Percent

1. BURST NODE

The maximum potential impact on the ruptured clad node is expressed in letter NS-TMA-2174 in terms of the change in the peaking factor limit (FQ) required to maintain a peak clad temperature (PCT) of 2200°F and in terms of a change in PCT at a constant FQ. Since the clad-water reaction rate increases significantly at temperatures above 2200.°F, individual effects (such as ΔPCT due to changes in several fuel rod models) indicated here may not accurately apply over large ranges,

but a simultaneous change in FQ which causes the PCT to remain in the neighborhood of 2200.°F justifies use of this evaluation procedure.

From NS-TMA-2174:

For the Burst Node of the clad:

- $0.01\ \Delta FQ \rightarrow \backsim 150^{\circ}F$ BURST NODE ΔPCT

- Use of the NRC burst model could require an FQ reduction of 0.015

- The maximum estimated impact of using the NRC strain model is a required FQ reduction of 0.03.

Therefore, the maximum penalty for the Hot Rod burst node is:

$$\Delta PCT_1 = (.015 + .03)\ (150^{\circ}F/.01) = 675^{\circ}F$$

Margin to the 2200°F limit is:

$$\Delta PCT_2 = 2200.^{\circ}F - PCT_B = \underline{\ 39.\ }\ ^{\circ}F$$

The FQ reduction required to maintain the 2200°F clad temperature limit is:

$$\Delta FQ_B = (\Delta PCT_1 - \Delta PCT_2)\left(\frac{.01\ \Delta FQ}{150^{\circ}F}\right)$$

$$= (\underline{675} - \underline{39})\left(\frac{.01}{150}\right)$$

$$= \underline{0.042}$$ (but not less than zero).

2. NON-BURST NODE

The maximum temperature calculated for a non-burst section of clad typically occurs at an elevation above the core mid-plane during the core reflood phase of the LOCA transient. The potential impact on that maximum clad temperature of using the NRC fuel rod models can be estimated by examining two aspects of the analyses. The first aspect is the change in pellet-clad gap conductance resulting from a difference in clad strain at the non-burst maximum clad temperature node elevation. Note that clad strain all along the fuel rod stops after clad burst occurs and use of a different clad burst model can change the time at which burst is calculated. Three sets of LOCA analysis results were studied to establish an acceptable sensitivity to apply generically in this evaluation. The possible PCT increase resulting from a change in strain (in the Hot Rod) is +20.°F per percent decrease in strain at the maximum clad temperature

locations. Since the clad strain calculated during the reactor coolant system blowdown phase of the accident is not changed by the use of NRC fuel rod models, the maximum decrease in clad strain that must be considered here is the difference between the "maximum clad strain" and the "clad strain during blowdown" indicated above.

Therefore:

$$\Delta PCT_3 = \left(\frac{20^0F}{.01\ strain}\right)\ (MAX\ STRAIN - BLOWDOWN\ STRAIN)$$

$$= \left(\frac{20}{.01}\right)\ (.058 - .0032)$$

$$= \underline{\quad 109.\ ^oF \quad}$$

The second aspect of the analysis that can increase PCT is the flow blockage calculated. Since the greatest value of blockage indicated by the NRC blockage model is 75 percent, the maximum PCT increase can be estimated by assuming that the current level of blockage in the analysis (indicated above) is raised to 75 percent and then applying an appropriate sensitivity formula shown in NS-TMA-2174.

Therefore,

$$\Delta PCT_4 = 1.25^oF\ (50 - PERCENT\ CURRENT\ BLOCKAGE) + 2.36^oF\ (75-50)$$

$$= 1.25\ (50 - \underline{28.2}) + 2.36\ (75-50)$$

$$= \underline{\quad 86.\quad}\ ^oF$$

If PCT_N occurs when the core reflood rate is greater than 1.0 inch per second $\Delta PCT_4 = 0$. The total potential PCT increase for the non-burst node is then

$$\Delta PCT_5 = \Delta PCT_3 + \Delta PCT_4 = 109 + 0 = 109.\ ^oF$$

Margin to the 2200°F limit is

$$\Delta PCT_6 = 2200^oF - PCT_N = 218.\ ^oF$$

The FQ reduction required to maintain this 2200°F clad temperature limit is (from NS-TMA-2174)

$$\Delta FQ_N = (\Delta PCT_5 - \Delta PCT_6)\ \left(\frac{.01\Delta FQ}{10^oF\ \Delta PCT}\right)$$

ΔFQ_N = $\underline{-0.10}$ but not less than zero.

$= 0$

The peaking factor reduction required to maintain the 2200 °F clad temperature limit is therefore the greater of ΔFQ_B and ΔFQ_K,

or; $\Delta FQ_{PENALTY}$ = 0.042

B. The effect on LOCA analysis results of using improved analytical and modeling techniques (which are currently approved for use in the Upper Head Injection plant LOCA analyses) in the reactor coolant system blowdown calculation (SATAN computer code) has been quantified via an analysis which has recently been submitted to the NRC for review. Recognizing that review of that analysis is not yet complete and that the benefits associated with those model improvements can change for other plant designs, the NRC has established a credit that is acceptable for this interim period to help offset penalties resulting from application of the NRC fuel rod models. That credit for two, three and four loop plants is an increase in the LOCA peaking factor limit of 0.12, 0.15 and 0.20 respectively.

C. The peaking factor limit adjustment required to justify plant operation for this interim period is determined as the appropriate ΔFQ credit identified in section (B) above, minus the $\Delta FQ_{PENALTY}$ calculated in section (A) above (but not greater than zero).

FQ ADJUSTMENT = 0.15 - 0.04

→ 0