



Carolina Power & Light Company

JUL 31 1984

SERIAL: NLS-84-342

Director of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
Attention: Mr. D. B. Vassallo, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch No. 2
Division of Licensing
United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

BRUNSWICK STEAM ELECTRIC PLANT, UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2
DOCKET NOS. 50-325 & 50-324/LICENSE NOS. DPR-71 & DPR-62
RELOAD ANALYSIS
RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Dear Mr. Vassallo:

In a telephone conversation with your staff on July 17, 1984, Carolina Power & Light Company was requested to provide additional information concerning our submittal of March 15, 1984. Specifically, additional FIBWR compressed model power distribution cases were run allowing the code to calculate the core pressure drop, hot channel flow rate, and minimum critical power ratio (MCPR). These additional cases provide supplemental information concerning our question 15 response in the March 15, 1984 submittal and may be found in Attachment 1.

Should you have questions concerning this submittal, please contact Mr. John S. Dietrich at (919) 836-6154.

Yours very truly,

S. R. Zimmerman
Manager

Nuclear Licensing Section

MAT/ccc (405MAT)
Attachments

cc: Mr. D. O. Myers (NRC-BSEP)
Mr. J. P. O'Reilly (NRC-RII)
Mr. M. Grotenhuis (NRC)

8408080276 840731
PDR ADOCK 05000324
P PDR

A001
1/1

ATTACHMENT 1

QUESTION

The Topical Report presented results using one channel to represent one fuel bundle. If "collapsed" channels (one channel representing several fuel bundles) are intended for future analysis, discuss how it will be approached and the sensitivities on hot bundle parameters.

RESPONSE

The eighth core, 75 channel model illustrated in Figures 5A through 5D of the Topical Report, can be used to obtain individual assembly thermal-hydraulic conditions as well as accurate core-wide pressure drops and void fractions from detailed relative power distributions. The hot channel is identified by the highest relative peaking factor, which in turn determines the hot channel flow and void characteristics. A preferred method for core wide and hot channel analysis is to group channels according to common geometry and orifice type and to assign a representative average central, peripheral, or hot channel relative power factor to each group. This "compressed channel representation" has significant economic advantages and is shown here to preserve the accuracy of the detailed eighth core model.

A comparison between the eighth core and compressed channel models was made for each of the four 75 channel cases described in the Topical Report. Figures 15A through 15D provide the core operating parameters, relative power distribution, and fuel geometry mix for each case. These figures also identify the location of the hot channel. Please note that the location of the hot channel in Figure 5B of the topical was inadvertently misrepresented; the correct hot channel location for this case is that given in Figure 15B.

Each of the above cases was run using a compressed channel representation with fuel regions and power factors given in Table 15-1. The power factors for the compressed model were determined by first assigning the hot relative power factor from the 75-channel case to the hot channel, then taking the average of the power factors from the 76 peripherally zoned fuel assemblies, and finally calculating a single power factor for the remaining 483 central assemblies which would normalize the entire power distribution to 560. Since the hot channel in each case is located in the central region, the power distribution should normalize according to the following equation:

$$(76) R_{\text{periph.}} + (483) R_{\text{cent.}} + R_{\text{hot}} = 560.$$

where:

$R_{\text{periph.}}$ = average peripheral region relative power factor
 $R_{\text{cent.}}$ = average central region relative power factor
 R_{hot} = hot channel relative power factor

Each case was run with the total core flow specified, allowing the code to calculate the core pressure drop, hot channel flow rate, and minimum CPR. The test results are given in Table 15-2. In each case, the change in MCPR due to the compressed channel representation was less than the 0.005 Δ CPR uncertainty identified in Figure 7 of the Topical Report.

BRUNSWICK 2 CYCLE 4
83.13% POWER
98.99% FLOW

* HOT CHANNEL

BRUNSWICK 2 CYCLE 4
49.73% POWER
38.83% FLOW

	27	29	31	33	35	37	39	41	43	45
26	1.0849									
	8x8									
24	0.8841	1.1784								
	7x7	8x8R								
22	0.9785	1.0408	1.5445							
	8x8R	7x7	8x8R							
20	1.1357	1.2301	1.3006	1.4907						
	8x8	8x8R	7x7	8x8R						
18	1.3547	1.3252	1.4261	1.1846	1.4747					
	8x8R	8x8	8x8R	7x7	8x8R					
16	0.8879	1.2675	1.1182	0.9519	0.8555	1.3472				
	7x7	8x8R	7x7	8x8R	7x7	8x8R				
14	0.9293	1.1969	1.2279	0.8314	0.9563	1.2030	1.4210			
	8x8R	8x8	8x8R	8x8	8x8R	8x8	8x8R			
12	1.0537	1.2359	0.9838	1.1243	1.0341	1.2235	1.2844	1.3117		
	7x7	8x8R	7x7	8x8R	7x7	8x8R	8x8	8x8R		
10	1.2884	1.2042	1.3455	1.2036	1.2321	1.1571	1.2782	1.0977	1.0266	
	8x8R	8x8	8x8R	8x8	8x8R	8x8	8x8R	8x8	8x8R	
08	0.8281	1.1854	1.1780	1.1159	1.0603	1.1056	1.1181	0.8184	0.7138	0.5796
	8x8	8x8R	8x8	8x8R	8x8	8x8R	8x8R	8x8R	8x8R	7x7
06	0.7758	1.0108	1.1557	0.9639	0.8449	0.6682	0.4940	0.3730	0.2940	
	8x8R	8x8	8x8R	8x8	8x8R	7x7	7x7	7x7	7x7	
04	0.8698	0.9414	1.0111	0.9832	0.7217	0.4737				
	8x8	8x8R	8x8R	8x8R	8x8R	7x7				
02	0.4937	0.5690	0.4441	0.4029	0.3387					
	7x7	7x7	7x7	7x7	7x7					

BRUNSWICK 1 CYCLE 3
98.98% POWER
96.82% FLOW

* HOT CHANNEL

BRUNSWICK 1 CYCLE 3
54.38% POWER
44.68% FLOW

	27	29	31	33	35	37	39	41	43	45
26	0.8402 8x8									
24	0.6382 8x8	1.0681 8x8R								
22	0.8059 8x8R	0.9496 8x8	1.1846 8x8R							
20	0.9798 8x8	1.2040 8x8R	1.0707 8x8	1.2131 8x8R						
18	1.2377 8x8R	1.0907 8x8	1.2822 8x8R	1.0798 8x8	1.1497 8x8R					
16	0.7836 8x8	1.2524 8x8R	1.0853 8x8	0.9665 8x8R	0.7338 8x8	0.9972 8x8				
14	0.9317 8x8R	1.2001 8x8R	1.2228 8x8R	0.7845 8x8	0.8983 8x8R	1.1937 8x8R	1.3649 8x8R			
12	1.1825 8x8	1.3407 8x8R	1.0894 8x8	1.2431 8x8R	1.0286 8x8	1.2324 8x8R	1.1813 8x8	1.3402 8x8R		
10	1.2279 8x8R	1.0895 8x8	1.4188 8x8R	1.3317 8x8R	1.3263 8x8R	1.2993 8x8R	1.3735 8x8R	1.2843 8x8R	1.0264 8x8R	
08	0.7810 8x8	1.2198 8x8R	1.1297 8x8	1.1057 8x8R	0.9066 8x8	1.1989 8x8R	1.2883 8x8R	1.1911 8x8R	0.9019 8x8R	0.5906 8x8
06	0.8324 8x8R	1.0310 8x8R	1.1440 8x8R	0.9799 8x8R	0.8703 8x8R	0.9599 8x8R	0.6117 8x8	0.5368 8x8	0.4375 8x8	
04	0.9736 8x8R	0.9724 8x8R	0.9894 8x8R	0.9386 8x8R	0.8093 8x8R	0.5837 8x8				
02	0.4743 8x8	0.4792 8x8	0.4474 8x8	0.4307 8x8	0.3439 8x8					

TABLE 15-1
COMPRESSED MODEL POWER DISTRIBUTIONS

A. B2C4 HIGH FLOW CASE

ORIFICE ZONE	FUEL GEOMETRY	QUANTITY	RADIAL PEAKING FACTOR
CENTRAL	7x7	89	1.0848
PERIPHERAL	7x7	68	0.4553
CENTRAL	8x8	132	1.6848
PERIPHERAL	8x8	8	0.4553
CENTRAL	8x8R	262	1.0848
CENTRAL (HOT)	8x8R	1	1.4169

B. B2C4 LOW FLOW CASE

ORIFICE ZONE	FUEL GEOMETRY	QUANTITY	RADIAL PEAKING FACTOR
CENTRAL	7x7	89	1.0871
PERIPHERAL	7x7	68	0.4393
CENTRAL	8x8	132	1.0871
PERIPHERAL	8x8	8	0.4393
CENTRAL	8x8R	262	1.0871
CENTRAL (HOT)	8x8R	1	1.5445

C. B1C3 HIGH FLOW CASE

ORIFICE ZONE	FUEL GEOMETRY	QUANTITY	RADIAL PEAKING FACTOR
CENTRAL	8x8	152	1.0795
PERIPHERAL	8x8	76	0.4895
CENTRAL	8x8R	331	1.0795
CENTRAL (HOT)	8x8R	1	1.3952

D. B1C3 LOW FLOW CASE

ORIFICE ZONE	FUEL GEOMETRY	QUANTITY	RADIAL PEAKING FACTOR
CENTRAL	8x8	152	1.0796
PERIPHERAL	8x8	76	0.4885
CENTRAL	8x8R	331	1.0796
CENTRAL (HOT)	8x8R	1	1.4188

TABLE 15-2

COMPRESSED MODEL vs 1/8 CORE MODEL COMPARISON

A. B2C4 HIGH FLOW CASE

NUMBER OF CHANNELS	CORE ΔP (psi)	HOT CHAN. FLOW (Klb/hr)	MCPR
75	26.9770	121.0832	1.6097
6	26.9732	121.0773	1.6097

B. B2C4 LOW FLOW CASE

NUMBER OF CHANNELS	CORE ΔP (psi)	HOT CHAN. FLOW (Klb/hr)	MCPR
75	7.4664	47.3663	1.7734
6	7.4240	47.2210	1.7703

C. B1C3 HIGH FLOW CASE

NUMBER OF CHANNELS	CORE ΔP (psi)	HOT CHAN. FLOW (Klb/hr)	MCPR
75	20.7577	116.5756	1.3502
4	20.8068	116.7691	1.3507

D. B1C3 LOW FLOW CASE

NUMBER OF CHANNELS	CORE ΔP (psi)	HOT CHAN. FLOW (Klb/hr)	MCPR
75	7.4178	55.6338	2.0638
4	7.4305	55.7846	2.0667