## CATEGORY 1



## U．S．Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Attn：Document Control Desk
Washington，D．C． 20555

## Ladies／Gentlemen：

Docket 50－305
Operating License DPR－43
Kewaunee－Nuclear Power Plańt

ル土口，
Reference：1）Letter from M．Li Marchi（WPSC）to Document Control Desk（NRC） dated September 27， 1995

During the February 15， 1996 phone call in regard to Reference 1 between Gary Harrington and Dave Will of WPSC and Rich Laufer and Peter Kang of NRC，two questions were raised on our Validation of the DAPPER Loadflow program against measurements taken at KNPP．

1）Why are the bus 6 results better than bus 5 ？
2）PSB1 calls for the measured versus calculated voltages to be within $3 \%$ of each other． It also assumes that the measured load data will be input to the program to calculate the bus voltages．In our initial response，we did not do that．We simply compared our calculated to measured currents and voltages．They asked if we could rerun the program as assumed for PSB1．

## Response

1）$\because$ Bus 6 results were better than bus 5 simply because the plant conditions at the time our measurements were taken were closer to the loadflow model assumptions on bus 6 than
S． 5 on bus 5 ．For example，the 125 horsepower charging pump $C$ was assumed to be arm running on bus 52 but was actually off during the measurements．The heavier load overestimations of the model on bus 52 resulted in a larger calculated voltage drop on Station Service Transformer 52 and thus a lower bus 52 voltage．
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2) The DAPPER loadflow model has been rerun as requested. The results have been tabulated on the attached table labelled "Calculated Vs. Measured Safeguards Bus Voltages and Currents, Adjusted - 1995". An error was noticed in the original table. The bus 5 measured current was shown as 140 Amperes. An updated copy of the original table is attached with the corrected value of 173 Amperes. The sum of the individual breaker ammeter readings gave the 140A value, however, the feeder breaker ammeter reading indicated 173 A . The bus 51 and 52 ammeter is believed to be reading about 30 A low, so the bus 5 ammeter reading is now shown as the measured value. The results show good agreement between calculated and measured voltages with a maximum error of $1.4 \%$, well within the $3 \%$ criteria of PSB1. (NOTE: The DAPPER rerun, table revision, and this writeup took about 15 manhours)

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact Mr. David Will at (414) 388-2560, extension 2244.

Sincerely,

## motmanars

Mark L. Marchi
Manager-Nuclear Business Group
DJW/jmf
Attach.

cc - US NRC Region III US NRC Senior Resident Inspector

CALCULATED VS. MEASURED SFGDS BUS VOLTAGES AND CURRENTS, ADJUSTED-1995

*Current values are for bus 51\&52 combined and for bus 61862 combined due to single ammeter.
**Bus 51 and 52 ammeter may read 30A low (or Bus 5 ammeter 30A high).

CALCULATED VERSUS MEASURED SAFEGUARDS BUS VOLTAGES AND CURRENTS-1995

|  | Voltages ( in Volts ) |  | Ratio |  | Currents (in Amperes) |  | Ratio |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bus Name | Calculated | Measured |  |  | Calculated | Measured | Calc/Measured |  |
| 5 | 4236 | 4224 | 1.003 |  | 249 | 173 | 1.44 |  |
| 51 | 494 | 493 | 1.002 | (see **) | 151 | 77 | 1.96 | (see **) |
| 52 | 475 | 492 | 0.965 |  | (see *) | (see *) | (see *) |  |
| MCC 52A | 474 | 487.3 | 0.973 |  | 44 | 45.1 | 0.98 |  |
| MCC 52B | 472 | 488.5 | 0.966 |  | 123 | 35.4 | 3.47 |  |
| MCC 52C | 473 | 486.9 | 0.971 |  | 97 | 48.7 | 1.99 |  |
| MCC 52D | 474 | 486.6 | 0.974 |  | 36 | 22.6 | 1.59 |  |
| MCC 52E | 473 | 487.6 | 0.970 |  | 150 | 86 | 1.74 |  |
| MCC 52F | 471 | 484.7 | 0.972 |  | 135 | 94.4 | 1.43 |  |
| MCC 5262 | 474 | 487.6 | 0.972 |  | 74 | 0.35 | 211.43 |  |
| BRA-105 | 202 | 210 | 0.962 | (see ***) | 112 | 5.94 | 18.86 | (see ***) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | 4277 | 4265 | 1.003 |  | 239 | 134 | 1.78 |  |
| 61 | 492 | 501 | 0.982 | (see **) | 143 | 68 |  |  |
| 62 | 492 | 497 | 0.990 |  | (see *) | (see *) | (see *) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MCC 62A | 491 | 494.6 | 0.993 |  | 27 | 18.9 | 1.43 |  |
| MCC 62B | 492 | 492.4 | 0.999 |  | 0 | 0.82 | 0.00 |  |
| MCC 62C | 490 | 492.1 | 0.996 |  | 155 | 55.7 | 2.78 |  |
| MCC 62D | 490 | 493.5 | 0.993 |  | 31 | 5.14 | 6.03 |  |
| MCC 62E | 490 | 493.1 | 0.994 |  | 193 | 122 | 1.58 |  |
| MCC 62G | 502 | 499 | 1.006 |  | 241 | 222.8 | 1.08 |  |
| MCC 62H | 491 | NA | NA |  | 2 | NA | NA |  |
| MCC 62J | 491 | 494.7 | 0.993 |  | 26 | 21 | 1.24 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BRB-105 | 208 | 211.3 | 0.984 | (see ***) | 150 | 4.26 | 35.21 | (see ***) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

*Current values are for bus $51 \& 52$ combined and for bus $61 \& 62$ combined due to single ammeter.
**A 250 Hp CC Pump was assumed on for bus 61 and off for bus 51 . The opposite occurred.
${ }^{* * *} A$ Design Change has removed load from these panels.

