

AEC DISTRIBUTION FOR PART 50 DOCKET MATERIAL
(TEMPORARY FORM)

CONTROL NO: 6739

FILE:

FROM: Duke Power Company Charlotte, N.C. 28201 A. C. Thies			DATE OF DOC: 7-19-74	DATE REC'D 7-23-74	LTR X	TWX	RPT	OTHER
TO: A. Giambusso			ORIG 1 signed	CC	OTHER	SENT AEC PDR X SENT LOCAL PDR X		
CLASS	UNCLASS XXX	PROP INFO	INPUT	NO CYS REC'D 1	DOCKET NO: 50-269			

DESCRIPTION:
Ltr re our 8-20-74 ltr, trans the following:

NOTE: Dist Per S. Sheppard

ACKNOWLEDGED

PLANT NAME: Oconee Unit #1

ENCLOSURES:
Oconee Nuclear Station Unit 1 Power Distribution Comparison Status Report.

DO NOT REMOVE

(1 cy rec'd)

FOR ACTION/INFORMATION 7-26-74 GC

- | | | | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| BUTLER(L)
W/ Copies | ✓SCHWENCER(L)
W/ 2Copies(info) | ZIEMANN(L)
W/ Copies | REGAN(E)
W/ Copies |
| CLARK(L)
W/ Copies | STOLZ(L)
W/ Copies | DICKER(E)
W/ Copies | LEAR(L)
W/ Copies |
| PARR(L)
W/ Copies | VASSAR(L)
W/ Copies | KNIGHTON(E)
W/ Copies | W/ Copies |
| KNIEL(L)
W/ Copies | ✓PURPLE(L)
W/2 Copies | YOUNGBLOOD(E)
W/ Copies | W/ Copies |

INTERNAL DISTRIBUTION

- | | | | | |
|-------------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| ✓ <u>REG FILE</u> | <u>TECH REVIEW</u> | DENTON | <u>LIC ASST</u> | <u>A/T IND</u> |
| ✓REC PDR | HENDRIE | GRIMES | | BRAITMAN |
| OGC, ROOM P-506A | SCHROEDER | GAMMILL | DIGGS (L) | SALTZMAN |
| MUNTZING/STAFF | MACCARY | KASTNER | GEARIN (L) | B. HURT |
| CASE | KNIGHT | BALLARD | GOULBOURNE (L) | <u>PLANS</u> |
| GIAMBUSSO | PAWLICKI | SPANGLER | KREUTZER (E) | MCDONALD |
| BOYD | SHAO | | LEE (L) | CHAPMAN |
| MOORE (L)(BWR) | ✓STELLO | <u>ENVIRO</u> | MAIGRET (L) | DUBE w/input |
| BEYOUNG(L)(PWR) | HOUSTON | MULLER | REED (E) | E. COUPE |
| SKOVHOLT (L) | NOVAK | DICKER | SERVICE (L) | D. THOMPSON (2) |
| ✓GOLLER(L) | ✓ROSS (4) | KNIGHTON | ✓SHEPPARD (L) | KLECKER |
| P. COLLINS | IPPOLITO | YOUNGBLOOD | SLATER (E) | EISENHUT |
| DENISE | TEDESCO | REGAN | SMITH (L) | |
| ✓REG OPR | LONG | PROJECT LDR | TEETS (L) | |
| FILE & REGION(3) | LAINAS | | WILLIAMS (E) | |
| MORRIS | BENAROYA | HARLESS | WILSON (L) | |
| STEELE | VOLIMER | | | |

EXTERNAL DISTRIBUTION

- | | | |
|---|---------------------------------|------------------------|
| ✓1 - LOCAL PDR Walhalla, S.C. | (1)(2)(10)-NATIONAL LAB'S | 1-PDR-SAN/LA/NY |
| ✓2 - TIC (ABERNATHY) | 1-ASLBP(E/W Bldg, Rm 529) | 1-LIBRARIAN |
| ✓2 - NSIC(BUCHANAN) | 1-W. PENNINGTON, Rm E-201 GT | BROOKHAVEN NAT. LAB |
| 1 - ASLB | 1-CONSULTANT'S | 1-AGMED(Ruth Gussman) |
| 1 - P. R. DAVIS (AEROJET NUCLEAR) | NEWMARK/BLUME/AGBABIAN | RM-B-127, GT. |
| ✓16 - CYS ACRS XXXXXXXX SENT TO LIC. ASST. | 1-GERALD ULRIKSON...ORNL | 1-RD..MULLER..F-309 GT |
| 7-26-74 SHEPPARD | 1-B & M SWINEBROAD, Rm E-201 GT | |

Regulatory Docket File

DUKE POWER COMPANY


POWER BUILDING

422 SOUTH CHURCH STREET, CHARLOTTE, N. C. 28201

A. C. THIES
SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT
PRODUCTION AND TRANSMISSION

P. O. Box 2178

July 19, 1974



Mr. Angelo Giambusso
Deputy Director for Reactor Projects
Directorate of Licensing
Office of Regulation
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission
Washington, D. C. 20545

Re: Oconee Nuclear Station
Unit 1
Docket No. 50-269

Dear Mr. Giambusso:

Please find attached a copy of "Power Distribution Comparison Status Report." This report is in response to Mr. R. C. DeYoung's letter of August 20, 1973 and provides comparisons of the power distributions measured before and after repatching of the control rod drives at 196 effective full power days with Babcock & Wilcox Company's PDQ computer code predictions.

Very truly yours,


A. C. Thies

ACT:vr

Attachment

6739

OCONEE NUCLEAR STATION
UNIT 1

Power Distribution Comparison
Status Report

On May 1, 1974, Oconee Nuclear Station, Unit 1, was shut down with a core average burnup of 196 effective full power days (EFPD). During this shutdown, in accordance with design provisions, the control rod assemblies assigned to transient Control Rod Group 7 were reassigned as shown in Figures 1 and 2. These figures present the control rod assembly group configurations for the intervals 91.5-to-196 EFPD and 196-to-310 EFPD, respectively.


A comparison of measured and predicted radial power distributions, representative of the interval prior to the control rod group interchange, is given in Figure 3. It can be seen that the measured and predicted peak radial power factors agree within 3.9 percent. Figure 4 presents a power distribution comparison for a core average burnup of 200 EFPD, i.e., after the control rod group interchange at 196 EFPD. For this case the difference between the measured and predicted peak radial power factors is less than 3.0 percent. The average absolute percent difference between the measured and predicted radial power factors, for assemblies having radial power factors within five percent of the measured peak radial power factor, is shown as a function of burnup in Figure 5.

The measured core power distributions were obtained using the fixed incore detectors. The location of these detectors is shown in Oconee FSAR Figure 7-18. The measured data were corrected, where possible, by replacing signals from inoperative detectors with values obtained by interpolation or extrapolation of signals from adjacent detectors. As indicated in Figures 3 and 4, however, one detector string was completely inoperative and no measured value is available.

Predicted power distributions were obtained from two-dimensional PDQ thermal-hydraulic feedback calculations, using a standard two-zone representation for each fuel assembly in one-quarter core geometry.

As can be seen in the attached figures, the measured and predicted core power distributions agree quite well. Particularly, it is apparent that the control rod group interchange at 196 EFPD did not adversely affect the validity of the PDQ predicted core power distributions.


CONTROL ROD GROUP LOCATION
(91.5 to 196 EFPD)



(X) ← Control Rod Group Number

Figure 1

CONTROL ROD GROUP LOCATION
(196 to 310 EFPD)



(X) ← Control Rod Group Number

Figure 2

COMPARISON OF MEASURED AND CALCULATED RADIAL CORE POWER DISTRIBUTIONS

.90	1.19	1.25	1.29	1.26	1.17	1.13	.69
.89	1.15	1.24	1.24	1.22	1.20	1.05	.64
	1.25	1.28	1.24	1.22	1.21	1.00	.63
	1.21	1.25	1.23	1.21	1.17	1.02	.62
		1.28	1.17	1.11	1.14	.90	.46
		1.26	1.17	1.09	1.11	.92	.47
			.85	1.13	1.05	*	
			.90	1.11	1.07	.73	
				1.16	.94	.50	
				1.14	.93	.49	
					.57		
					.57		

*Inoperative Detector

x.xx	Measured
y.yy	Calculated (PDQ)

CONDITIONS

	<u>Measured</u>	<u>Calculated</u>
Core Average Burnup (EFPD)	196	196
Power Level (%FP)	100	100
Boron Concentration (ppm)	527	527
Control Rod Group Position (%wd)		
Group 1-5	100	100
Group 6	100	100
Group 7	27	27
Group 8	1	37.5

Figure 3

COMPARISON OF MEASURED AND CALCULATED
RADIAL CORE POWER DISTRIBUTIONS

1.20 1.16	1.10 1.06	.75 .76	1.29 1.13	1.30 1.25	1.23 1.27	1.16 1.12	.74 .70
	1.11 1.09	1.17 1.12	1.22 1.21	1.19 1.26	1.28 1.24	1.07 1.09	.68 .67
		1.33 1.30	1.33 1.32	1.22 1.18	1.21 1.16	.96 .96	.49 .51
			1.28 1.35	1.17 1.14	1.04 1.04	* .73	
				.72 .73	.80 .77	.47 .46	
					.48 .48		

*Inoperative Detector

x.xx	Measured
y.yy	Calculated (PDQ)

CONDITIONS

	Measured	Calculated
Core Average Burnup (EFPD)	200	200
Power Level (%FP)	99	100
Boron Concentration (ppm)	449	449
Control Rod Group Position (%wd)		
Groups 1-5	100	100
Group 6	90	100
Group 7	16	16
Group 8	4.5	37.5

Figure 4

COMPARISON OF MEASURED AND PREDICTED RADIAL POWER FACTORS




Figure 5