

50-335

## NRC DISTRIBUTION FOR PART 50 DOCKET MATERIAL

FILE NUMBER

TO:

MR. VICTOR STELLO

FROM:

FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY  
MIAMI, FLORIDA  
MR. ROBERT E. UHRIG :

DATE OF DOCUMENT

5/14/76

DATE RECEIVED

5/19/76

☒ LETTER  
☒ ORIGINAL  
☐ COPY☒ NOTORIZED  
☒ UNCLASSIFIED

PROP

INPUT FORM

NUMBER OF COPIES RECEIVED

THREE SIGNED

DESCRIPTION

LTR. NOTORIZED 5/14/76 RE THEIR LTRS. OF  
4/27/76 & 4/30/76 TRANS THE FOLLOWING:

ENCLOSURE

APPENDIX A : CONTAINS ADDITIONAL ECCS INFO.

APPENDIX B : CONTAINS CALORIMETRIC INFO.

ACKNOWLEDGED

DO NOT REMOVE

PLANT NAME:

ST. LUCIE #1

SAFETY

FOR ACTION/INFORMATION

ENVIRO 5/20/76 RJL

ASSIGNED AD :

BRANCH CHIEF :

PROJECT MANAGER:

LIC. ASST. :

ZIEMANN (6)

DIGGS

ASSIGNED AD :

BRANCH CHIEF :

PROJECT MANAGER :

LIC. ASST. :

## INTERNAL DISTRIBUTION

☒ REG FILE☒ NRC PDR☒ I & E (2)☒ OELD☒ GOSSICK & STAFF

MIPC

CASE

HANAUER

HARLESS

SYSTEMS SAFETY

HEINEMAN

SCHROEDER

ENGINEERING

MACCARY

KNIGHT

SIEMEL

PAWLICKI

PLANT SYSTEMS

TEDESCO

BENAROYA

JAINAS

IPPOLITO

OPERATING REACTORS

STELLO

OPERATING TECH

EISENHUT

SHAO

BAER

SCHWENCER

GRIBES

ENVIRO TECH

ERNST

BALLARD

SPANGLER

SITE TECH

GANNILL

STEFF

HULMAN

SITE ANALYSIS

VOLLMER

BUNCH

☒ J. COLLINS

KREGER

PROJECT MANAGEMENT

BOYD

P. COLLINS

HOUSTON

PETERSON

MELTZ

HELMES

SKOVHOLT

REACTOR SAFETY

ROSS

NOVAK

ROSZTOCZY

CHECK

AT &amp; I

SALTZMAN

RUTBERG

## EXTERNAL DISTRIBUTION

☒ LPDR: FT. PIERCE, FLA.☒ TIC☒ NSIC

ASLB

☒ ACRS 16 HOLDING/SENT

NATL. LAB

REG. V-IE

LA PDR

CONSULTANTS

DIGGS

BROOKHAVEN NATL. LAB

ULRIKSON (ORNL)

CONTROL NUMBER

5054

[illegible]

“ ”

11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100 101 102 103 104 105 106 107 108 109 110 111 112 113 114 115 116 117 118 119 120 121 122 123 124 125 126 127 128 129 130 131 132 133 134 135 136 137 138 139 140 141 142 143 144 145 146 147 148 149 150 151 152 153 154 155 156 157 158 159 160 161 162 163 164 165 166 167 168 169 170 171 172 173 174 175 176 177 178 179 180 181 182 183 184 185 186 187 188 189 190 191 192 193 194 195 196 197 198 199 200 201 202 203 204 205 206 207 208 209 210 211 212 213 214 215 216 217 218 219 220 221 222 223 224 225 226 227 228 229 230 231 232 233 234 235 236 237 238 239 240 241 242 243 244 245 246 247 248 249 250 251 252 253 254 255 256 257 258 259 260 261 262 263 264 265 266 267 268 269 270 271 272 273 274 275 276 277 278 279 280 281 282 283 284 285 286 287 288 289 290 291 292 293 294 295 296 297 298 299 300 301 302 303 304 305 306 307 308 309 310 311 312 313 314 315 316 317 318 319 320 321 322 323 324 325 326 327 328 329 330 331 332 333 334 335 336 337 338 339 340 341 342 343 344 345 346 347 348 349 350 351 352 353 354 355 356 357 358 359 360 361 362 363 364 365 366 367 368 369 370 371 372 373 374 375 376 377 378 379 380 381 382 383 384 385 386 387 388 389 390 391 392 393 394 395 396 397 398 399 400 401 402 403 404 405 406 407 408 409 410 411 412 413 414 415 416 417 418 419 420 421 422 423 424 425 426 427 428 429 430 431 432 433 434 435 436 437 438 439 440 441 442 443 444 445 446 447 448 449 450 451 452 453 454 455 456 457 458 459 460 461 462 463 464 465 466 467 468 469 470 471 472 473 474 475 476 477 478 479 480 481 482 483 484 485 486 487 488 489 490 491 492 493 494 495 496 497 498 499 500 501 502 503 504 505 506 507 508 509 510 511 512 513 514 515 516 517 518 519 520 521 522 523 524 525 526 527 528 529 530 531 532 533 534 535 536 537 538 539 540 541 542 543 544 545 546 547 548 549 550 551 552 553 554 555 556 557 558 559 560 561 562 563 564 565 566 567 568 569 570 571 572 573 574 575 576 577 578 579 580 581 582 583 584 585 586 587 588 589 590 591 592 593 594 595 596 597 598 599 600 601 602 603 604 605 606 607 608 609 610 611 612 613 614 615 616 617 618 619 620 621 622 623 624 625 626 627 628 629 630 631 632 633 634 635 636 637 638 639 640 641 642 643 644 645 646 647 648 649 650 651 652 653 654 655 656 657 658 659 660 661 662 663 664 665 666 667 668 669 670 671 672 673 674 675 676 677 678 679 680 681 682 683 684 685 686 687 688 689 690 691 692 693 694 695 696 697 698 699 700 701 702 703 704 705 706 707 708 709 710 711 712 713 714 715 716 717 718 719 720 721 722 723 724 725 726 727 728 729 730 731 732 733 734 735 736 737 738 739 740 741 742 743 744 745 746 747 748 749 750 751 752 753 754 755 756 757 758 759 760 761 762 763 764 765 766 767 768 769 770 771 772 773 774 775 776 777 778 779 780 781 782 783 784 785 786 787 788 789 790 791 792 793 794 795 796 797 798 799 800 801 802 803 804 805 806 807 808 809 810 811 812 813 814 815 816 817 818 819 820 821 822 823 824 825 826 827 828 829 830 831 832 833 834 835 836 837 838 839 840 841 842 843 844 845 846 847 848 849 850 851 852 853 854 855 856 857 858 859 860 861 862 863 864 865 866 867 868 869 870 871 872 873 874 875 876 877 878 879 880 881 882 883 884 885 886 887 888 889 890 891 892 893 894 895 896 897 898 899 900 901 902 903 904 905 906 907 908 909 910 911 912 913 914 915 916 917 918 919 920 921 922 923 924 925 926 927 928 929 930 931 932 933 934 935 936 937 938 939 940 941 942 943 944 945 946 947 948 949 950 951 952 953 954 955 956 957 958 959 960 961 962 963 964 965 966 967 968 969 970 971 972 973 974 975 976 977 978 979 980 981 982 983 984 985 986 987 988 989 990 991 992 993 994 995 996 997 998 999 1000 1001 1002 1003 1004 1005 1006 1007 1008 1009 1010 1011 1012 1013 1014 1015 1016 1017 1018 1019 1020 1021 1022 1023 1024 1025 1026 1027 1028 1029 1030 1031 1032 1033 1034 1035 1036 1037 1038 1039 1040

$\frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{2}$  =  $\frac{1}{4}$

Figure 1. The effect of the concentration of the *Agrobacterium* suspension on the transformation efficiency of *Agrobacterium* strains. The number of transformed cells was determined by the number of colonies obtained on the selective medium. The results are the mean of three independent experiments. Error bars represent the standard deviation.


1.  $f = \gamma$  2.  $\alpha$  3.  $\beta$  4.  $\delta$

79 100 100 100


 y: r

• • •

100



May 14, 1976  
L-76-190

Director of Nuclear Reactor Regulation  
Attention: Mr. Victor Stello, Director  
Division of Operating Reactors  
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington DC 20555

Dear Mr. Stello:

Re: St. Lucie Plant Unit 1  
Docket No. 50-335  
Proposed Amendment to Facility  
Operating License DPR-67



This letter provides additional information to supplement our letters of April 27 and April 30, 1976.

Appendix A to this letter contains additional ECCS information.  
Appendix B contains calorimetric information.

The detailed methodology for determining reactor coolant flow is in the public record in the "Reactor Coolant Pump (RCP) Flow Test Report," which is a part of the Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 2, Docket No. 50-336. This is applicable to the St. Lucie Plant.

Very truly yours,


Robert E. Uhrig  
Vice President

REU:tg

Attachments

cc: Mr. Norman C. Moseley  
Jack R. Newman, Esquire

Regulatory Docket File



5054


STATE OF FLORIDA )  
 )  
COUNTY OF DADE )

SS.

ROBERT E. UHRIG, being first duly sworn, deposes and says:


That he is a Vice President of Florida Power & Light Company,  
the Licensee herein;

That he has executed the foregoing instrument; and that the  
statements made in this said instrument are true and correct  
to the best of his knowledge, information, and belief; and  
that he is authorized to execute the instrument on behalf  
of said Licensee.

  
Robert E. Uhrig

Subscribed and sworn to before me

this 14 day of May, 1976.

  
Notary Public in and for the County  
of Dade, State of Florida

NOTARY PUBLIC STATE OF FLORIDA AT LARGE  
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES JAN 26, 1979  
My Commission expires BONDED 11/26/75



## APPENDIX A

### St. Lucie I Reduced Flow ECCS Performance Results

#### I. Introduction and Summary

The results of a St. Lucie I break spectrum analysis, using the approved Combustion Engineering large break evaluation model<sup>(2)</sup>, are reported in Reference 1. This analysis, which employed a system flow rate of  $139.44 \times 10^6$  lbs/hr, demonstrated that the LOCA Acceptance Criteria<sup>(3)</sup> were met at a peak linear heat generation rate (PLHGR) of 15.8 kw/ft.

Subsequent to the analysis reported in Reference 1, a conservative reanalysis has been performed to determine the allowable PLHGR when the system flow rate is reduced to  $134.06 \times 10^6$  lbs/hr, which is 4% less than the flow rate used in Reference 1. The allowable PLHGR at the reduced flow was found to be 15.6 kw/ft. In order to determine sensitivity to linear heat rate, a second reduced flow case was examined, at a PLHGR of 14.2 kw/ft. The results for this case, as well as those discussed above, are summarized below:

#### Worst Break\* LOCA Results

System Flow ( $\times 10^6$ lb/hr)	139.44	134.06	134.06
PLHGR (kw/ft)	15.8	15.6	14.2
Peak Clad Temperature ( $^{\circ}$ F)	2192	2189	1956
Peak Local Clad Oxidation (%)	10.42	9.71	5.32
Peak Core-Wide Clad Oxidation (%)	<.787	<.787	<.787

These results show that all LOCA acceptance criteria<sup>(3)</sup> are met at a PLHGR of 15.6 kw/ft, and there is substantial margin at 14.2 kw/ft.

An analysis is presented in Reference 1 which demonstrates that one Safety Injection Tank can be isolated without reducing core power or PLHGR. The flow rate reduction will not alter this conclusion.

#### II. Discussion and Results

In order to determine the sensitivity of peak clad temperature to flow, the worst break (0.8 DEG/PD) identified in Reference 1 was repeated at the lower flow rate. As a conservative approximation, the CEFLASH-4A<sup>(4)</sup> flow

\* The worst break is the 0.8 Double-Ended Guillotine at the Pump Discharge (0.8 DEG/PD)



rate determined for the worst break in Reference 1 was simply reduced 4% and the STRIKIN-II<sup>(5)</sup> calculation was repeated; the CEFLASH-4A calculation was not rerun at the lower flow rate (or at a reduced core power).

If the CEFLASH-4A calculation had been rerun with a lower initial flow rate, the transient flow during blowdown would not have been as conservative as the flow obtained by uniformly reducing the reference flow by 4%.

As noted in Section I, calculations were performed at two PLHGR values: 15.6 kw/ft and 14.2 kw/ft. The core and system parameters used for these calculations are the same as those reported in Reference 1; the only differences are the flow and parameters dependent on the PLHGR, which are tabulated in Table II-1.

Pertinent information for the two cases are reported in Table II-2. Since the peak clad temperatures and peak local oxidation percentages for the reduced flow cases are less than the values reported in Reference 1, it follows that the core-wide oxidation percentages would also be lower. Therefore, it was not necessary to recalculate the core-wide oxidation percentage; the value in Table II-2 is from Reference 1.

The results of the low flow reanalysis are depicted graphically in Figures II-1 and II-2, which show peak clad temperature and local clad oxidation percentage as a function of time for the two PLHGR values considered.



### III. REFERENCES

1. Safety Injection System Analysis of St. Lucie Unit I for FSAR, Section 6.3.3.6 as amended by Revision #55, 2-9-76.
2. CENPD-132, "Calculative Methods for the C-E Large Break LOCA Evaluation Model", August, 1974 (Proprietary).

CENPD-132, Supplement 1, "Updated Calculative Methods for the C-E Large Break LOCA Evaluation Model", December, 1974 (Proprietary).

CENPD-132, Supplement 2, "Calculational Methods for the C-E Large Break LOCA Evaluation Model", July, 1975.

3. Acceptance Criteria for Emergency Core Cooling Systems for Light-Water-Cooled Nuclear Power Reactors, Federal Register, Vol. 39, No. 3 - Friday, January 4, 1974.

4. CENPD-133, "CEFLASH-4A, A FORTRAN IV Digital Computer Program for Reactor Blowdown Analysis", April 1974 (Proprietary).

CENPD-133, Supplement 2, "CEFLASH-4A, A FORTRAN IV Digital Computer Program for Reactor Blowdown Analysis (Modification)", December, 1974 (Proprietary).

5. CENPD-135 - "STRIKIN-II, A Cylindrical Geometry Fuel Rod Heat Transfer Program", April, 1974 (Proprietary).

CENPD-135, Supplement 2, "STRIKIN-II, A Cylindrical Geometry Fuel Rod Heat Transfer Program (Modification)", December, 1974 (Proprietary).

Table II-1

Selected System Parameters  
Reduced Flow Study

<u>Quantity</u>			
System Flow Rate (total)	134.06 x 10 <sup>6</sup>		lbs/hr
Core Flow Rate	129.10 x 10 <sup>6</sup>		lbs/hr
Peak Linear Heat Generation Rate	15.6	14.2	kw/ft
Gap Conductance at PLHGR	806.3	725.7	Btu/hr-ft <sup>2</sup> -°F
Fuel Centerline Temp. at PLHGR	4021.6	3765.9	°F
Fuel Average Temp. at PLHGR	2640.6	2513.3	°F

Table II-2

Times of Interest, Peak Clad Temperature, and Oxidation Percentages  
0.8 DEG/PD with Reduced Flow

PLHGR	15.6 kw/ft	14.2 kw/ft
Hot Rod Rupture Time	9.97 sec.	10.2 sec.
Peak Clad Temperature	2188.5 °F	1956.1 °F
Peak Local Clad Oxidation	9.71%	5.32%
Peak Core-Wide Clad Oxidation	<0.787%	<0.787%

Figure II.1





Figure II.2

ST. LUCIE UNIT 1  
REDUCED FLOW  
0.8 X DOUBLE ENDED GUILLOTINE BREAK IN PUMP DISCHARGE LEG  
LOCAL CLAD OXIDATION



## APPENDIX B

Calorimetric techniques are methods of measurement employing basic NSSS heat balance equations. Easily measured parameters, such as temperature and pressure, are used in a system heat balance equation to estimate other parameters which may be difficult to measure directly. Calorimetric techniques are used in power ascension testing to determine a variety of system parameters. The context in which calorimetrics are germane to the interim tech. specs. is limited to the extent that the subject tech. specs. allow ascension to the higher power levels which are prerequisite to accurate calorimetric determinations of flow.

The general form of the NSSS heat balance equation is as follows:

$$Q_{SG} = Q_{Core} + Q_{other\ sources} - Q_{losses}$$

i.e., the total heat output from the steam generators equals the sum of the sources (core, pumps, pressurizer heaters, etc.) minus the heat losses (to containment, ambient component cooling water, etc.), where heat output of the steam generator ( $Q_{SG}$ ) is determined by measurement of the saturated

steam pressure and the feedwater flow rate and temperature. The feedwater flow is accurately measurable due to the calibrated nozzles in the feedwater lines. The heat output of the core ( $Q_{Core}$ ) equals  $W\Delta h$ , where  $W$  is the flow rate

being derived and the enthalpy rise ( $\Delta h$ ) is derived from measured inlet and outlet coolant temperatures. It should be noted that the enthalpy rise measurement error decreases with increasing power level.  $Q_{other\ sources}$  is obtained by

applying known efficiencies and measurements of electrical power consumption of the R. C. pump motors and pressurizer heaters.  $Q_{losses}$  are measured during the post-core hot

functional testing in conjunction with measurement of the  $Q_{other\ sources}$ .

Solving this equation for flow yields an estimate which has an accuracy equivalent to that of the pump  $\Delta p$  flow measurement techniques. Calorimetrics provide a useful confirmatory technique due to the use of totally independent and accurately measurable system parameters.