C 09/28/78

REGULATORY INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (RIDS)
DISTRIBUTION FOR INCOMING MATERIAL 50-269

REC: DENTON H R
NRC

ORG: PARKER W O
DUKE PWR

DOCDATE: 09/22/78
DATE RCVD: 09/28/78

DOCTYPE: LETTER NOTARIZED: NO
SUBJECT:
FURNISHING ADDL INFO CONSISTING OF REVISED RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS 4 & 5 OF NRC"S LTR DTD 08/21/78, CONCERNING THE RELOAD OF UNIT 1 FOR CYCLE 5...W/ATT.

COPIES RECEIVED
LTR 1 ENCL 40

PLANT NAME: OCONEE - UNIT 1

REVIEWER INITIAL: XJM
DISTRIBUTOR INITIAL: ML

********** DISTRIBUTION OF THIS MATERIAL IS AS FOLLOWS **********

NOTES:
1. M. CUNNINGHAM -- ALL AMENDMENTS TO FSAR AND CHANGES TO TECH SPECS

GENERAL DISTRIBUTION FOR AFTER ISSUANCE OF OPERATING LICENSE.
(DISTRIBUTION CODE A001)

FOR ACTION: BR CHIEF ORB#4 BC**W/7 ENCL

INTERNAL:
REG FILE**W/ENCL
I & E**W/2 ENCL
HANAUER**W/ENCL
AD FOR SYS & PROJ**W/ENCL
REACTOR SAFETY BR**W/ENCL
EEB**W/ENCL
J MCGOUGH**W/ENCL
NRC PDR**W/ENCL
OELD**LTR ONLY
CORE PERFORMANCE BR**W/ENCL
ENGINEERING BR**W/ENCL
PLANT SYSTEMS BR**W/ENCL
EFFLUENT TREAT SYS**W/ENCL

EXTERNAL:
LPDR'S
WALHALLA, SC**W/ENCL
TERA**W/ENCL
NSIC**W/ENCL
ACRS CAT B**W/16 ENCL

DISTRIBUTION: LTR 40 ENCL 39
SIZE: 1P+1P

CONTROL NBR: 7817280131

********** THE END **********

DUKE POWER COMPANY
POWER BUILDING
422 SOUTH CHURCH STREET, CHARLOTTE, N. C. 28242

WILLIAM O. PARKER, JR.
VICE PRESIDENT
STEAM PRODUCTION

TELEPHONE: AREA 704
373-4083

September 22, 1978

Mr. Harold R. Denton, Director
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

Attention: Mr. R. W. Reid, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch #4

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

Dear Sir:

My letter of August 28, 1978 provided responses to several staff questions concerning the reload of Oconee Unit 1 for Cycle 5. Since that submittal, discussions have been held with the staff on the responses and it has been determined that additional information is required in response to questions 4 and 5 of your letter of August 21, 1978. In this regard, please find attached revised responses to these two questions.

On another item, my initial submittal of June 26, 1978 provided a description of the reload for Cycle 5 and stated that five Batch 4 assemblies would be loaded for a fourth cycle. These assemblies are identified in Figure 3-1 of the "Oconee Unit 1, Cycle 5, Reload Report, BAW-1493." During the pre-insertion examination of the five candidate assemblies during the refueling outage, two assemblies, 1D54 and 1D21 (intended for core locations E-08 and M-08, respectively), were determined to be not suitable for reinsertion. Therefore, 1D24 and 1D21 will be replaced by 1D55 and 1D26, which were previously selected as alternate assemblies. The replacement assemblies have identical enrichment, similar burnups, and occupied symmetric core locations in previous cycles as 1D54 and 1D21. Therefore, the analyses previously performed are not affected by the replacement assemblies, and no revisions to the previously submitted cycles analyses and Technical Specification limits are required.

Very truly yours,

William O. Parker, Jr.

William O. Parker, Jr.

RLG:scs
Attachments

A001 S 1/40

Question 4

You have stated in phone conversations that the action to be taken if the sum of the worth of groups 5, 6 and 7 differs from predicted by more than ±10%, is to measure group 4 by dilution. And that if the sum of the worths of groups 4, 5, 6 and 7 differs from the predicted by jore than ±10% additional measurements, as well as evaluation of the discrepancy, will be made. Please provide these statements as an amendment to your 06-23-78 letter on startup testing.

Response

The action to be taken in the event the total measured worth of Groups 5-7 differed from the predicted value by more than ±10% is to perform an evaluation consisting of one or more of the following items as appropriate to the situation:

1. Review of measurement data and data analysis.

2. Verification that the available shutdown margin based on the measured data satisfies the minimum shutdown margin requirement.

3. Review of the results of other physics test.

4. Review of calculations used to obtain the predicted value.

5. Evaluation of the impact of the discrepancy on safety of operation and on Technical Specifications limits, if any.

6. Determination as to whether retest of one or more of the regulating groups would be required.

7. Determination as to whether measurement of one or more of the safety groups would be required based on considerations of the extent and nature of the discrepancy and of item 5 above.

If it is determined that measurement of one or more of the safety groups would be required to resolve the discrepancy, such measurements will be performed.

Question 5

Your description of ejected control rod reactivity worth test in the June 23, 1978 letter does not state that 4 symmetric control rods will be measured. As stated in BAW-1477-"Oconee 1, Cycle 4 Quadrant Flux Tilt," page 12, this test "has proven to be an indicator of core symmetry." Please indicate if measurement of ejected rod worth at 4 symmetric locations is part of your test program for the Cycle 5 core.

Response

Measurement of the ejected rod worth at four symmetric locations is not part of the standard restart test program. However, additional measurements may be made of the symmetric rod locations, as necessary, based on the results of the initial rod measurement. In the case of Oconee 1, Cycle 5 startup testing, the symmetric ejected rod worth measurements will be performed to provide additional confirmation of the initial ejected rod worth measurement.