MAC FORM 195	U.S.	NUCLEAR REGULATORY (COMMISSION DOCKET NUMLER	
NRC DISTRIBUTION		TMATERIAL	FILL NUMBER INCIDENT REPORT	
TO: N.C.MOSEEEY FROM: DUKE CHARI W.O.I		E PWR CO. ARLOTTE, N.C.	DATE OF DOCUMENT	
		.PARKER, JR.	ARKER, JR. DATE RECEIVED 3/24/77	
DLETTER DNOTORIZED PROP		INPUT FORM	NUMBER OF COPIES RECEIVED	
X COPY			1 CY RECEIVED	
DESCRIPTION LTR. TRANS THE FOLLOWING DO NOT REMOVE		ENCLOSUBE REPORTABLE OCCI CONCERNING TWO THE CORE THERM TO BE SLIGHTLY	ENCLOSUBE REPORTABLE OCCURRENCE REPORT # 77-9, ON 2/28/77 CONCERNING TWO-PUMP COASTDOWN FLOW ASSUMED IN THE CORE THERMAL HYDRAULIC DESIGN ANALWSIS FOUND TO BE SLIGHTLY NON-CONSERVATIVE	
	(1P)	(2P)		
PLANT NAME: OCONEE # 1				
	-			
SAB	\ ,	NOTE: IF FERS	ONFIL EXPOSURE IS INVOLVED	
ACKNOWLEDGED		SEND DI	RECTLY TO KREGER/J. COLLINS	
999 (no. 1 land) blad dadwar all for 7 am an 2011 200 anna a mma 1961 ar ar mealaidh an 970 anna Allaidh ar ar Mhillinn a Alla	FOR ACTIC			
BRANCH CHIEF:	Schwencer			
W/3 CYS FOR ACTION	Charles	1		
W/ CYS	Sheppave			
ACRS 16 CYS HELDING/SE	NT AS CA?	F B	:	
	INTERNA			
REG FILE				
TAF(2)				
MIPC				
SCHROEDER/IFPOLITO				
HOUSTON	9 ya			
NOWAK/CHECK				
GRIMES				
CASE				
BUTLER				
TARGUER TERESCO/MACCAEV				
EISENGUT				
BAER				
SHAO				
VOLLMER/BUNCH	ne ale and a second			
KREGER/J. COLLINS				
	ana ana ang mangangan sa kang mangan ang mangan ang mangang mangang mangang mangang mangang mangang mangang ma		1	
	می از در این از می اورد و می از این			
LPDR: Walhe Ma, SC				
NSTC.		-		
			TANK TOTOL	
	an a			
NRC I ORM 195 (2-76)		nam version la sur a la sur a consistence despension provincianem artem services	anna an a an an an an an an ann an an an	

DUKE POWER COMPANY

Power Building 422 South Church Street, Charlotte, N. C. 28242

March 10, 1977 WILLIAM O. PARKER, JR. TELEPHONE: AREA 704 VICE PRESIDENT REGULATORY DOCKET THE COPY STEAM PRODUCTION 373-4083 Mr. Norman C. Moseley, Director U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Suite 818 230 Peachtree Street, Northwest Atlanta, Georgia 30303 Re: Oconee Unit 1 Docket No. 50-269 Dear Mr. Moseley: Pursuant to Sections 6.2 and 6.6.2 of the Oconee Nuclear Station Technical Specifications, please find attached Reportable Occurrence Report RO-269/ 77-9.

211058016

Very truly yours,

ue; U. Jack William O. Parker, Jr

MST:ge Attachment

cc: Director, Office of Management Information and Program Control DUKE POWER COMPANY OCONEE UNIT 1

Report No.: RO-269/77-9

Report Date: March 10, 1977

Occurrence Date: February 28, 1977

Facility: Oconee Unit 1, Seneca, South Carolina

Identification of Occurrence: Two-pump coastdown flow assumed in the core thermal hydraulic design analysis found to be slightly non-conservative

Description of Occurrence:

On February 28, 1977, while the core design analysis and the associated technical specification changes for Cycle 4 operation of Oconee 1 were being reviewed, the NSSS vendor (B&W) informed Duke Power Company of a change in the core thermal hydraulic design analysis. The change pertains to using the measured 2-pump coastdown flow instead of the design coastdown flow previously utilized in the design analysis because of the discovery that the design coastdown flow was slightly non-conservative (as compared to the measured coastdown flow) for certain times during the 2-pump coast-down.

Analysis of Occurrence:

The 2-pump flow coastdown values are used to establish the flux/flow trip setpoint, which is designed to ensure that the minimum DNBR in the event of a loss-of-2-pump incident will not be less than 1.3. The flux/flow trip setpoints for Oconee 1, Cycles 1, 2 and 3; Oconee 2, Cycles 1 and 2; and Oconee 3, Cycles 1 and 2 were established on the basis of the design coastdown flow. The measured coastdown flow has now been determined to be slightly less than the design coastdown flow (maximum difference of 3%), and this difference could possibly impact upon the flux/flow ratio. However, a review of the flux/flow trip setpoints of the current cycles and the previous fuel cycles for all three Oconee units revealed that these flux/flow trip setpoints were indeed safe and adequate. In the case of Cycle 1 of Units 1, 2 and 3, the thermal hydraulic analyses were based on 100% design RC flow and included conservative allowances for vent valve flow penalty and densification power spike penalty. Considering that the measured RC flow values were 108.6% for Unit 1, 111.5% for Unit 2, and 110% for Unit 3 and that the vent valve flow penalty and densification spike penalty are no longer necessary, a significant degree of margin is seen in the Cycle 1 flux/flow trip setpoints even when the difference between the measured and the design coastdown flows is considered. For Cycles 2 and 3 of Unit 1 and Cycle 2 of Units 2 and 3, design analyses were based on 107.6% of design RC flow and included conservative allowances for the densification power spike penalty and/or vent valve flow penalty, and it has been determined that the difference in the two flow coastdown values did not lead to non-conservative flux/flow trip setpoints for these cycles. The current flux/flow trip setpoints still provide DNBR margins of approximately 5.5% for Unit 1, 3.0% for Unit 2, and

3.0% for Unit 3. Thus, the slightly non-conservative nature of the coastdown flow used in the previous thermal hydraulic analyses did not in any way result in an unsafe operation of any Oconee unit, and it has been concluded that this incident did not affect the health and safety of the public.

Corrective Action:

A review of the core safety related technical specifications has been performed to verify that the existing technical specification limits continue to be valid with sufficient safety margins. The core thermal hydraulic design analysis procedure has been modified to utilize the conservative coastdown flow.



1977 MAR 25 PM 4 16