Commonwealth Edison
1400 Opus Place
Downers Grove, Illinois 60515

May 8, 1990

Dr. Thomas E. Murley, Director
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Attn: USNRC Document Control Room

Subject: Dresden Nuclear Power Station
Unit 3 Cycle 12 NRC Startup Test Report
NRC Docket No. 50-249

Dear Dr. Murley:

Enclosed is the Dresden Unit 3 Cycle 12 Startup Test Report. Technical Specification 6.6.A.1 requires a submittal of the Startup Test Report to the NRC within 90 days following resumption of commercial power operation. This report contains summaries of those startup tests identified in Draft Regulatory Guide SC 521-4 for LWR reloads. Additional test results are available at the site.

Please contact this office should further information be required.

Very truly yours,

J.A. Silady
Nuclear Licensing Administrator

0972T/tlm

Enclosure

cc: A.B. Davis - Regional Administrator
P.L. Eng - Project Manager, NRR
S.G. DuPont - Senior Resident Inspector, Dresden

IE26
1/1

DRESDEN UNIT 3

CYCLE 12

STARTUP TESTING SUMMARY

Dresden Unit 3 resumed commercial operation for Cycle 12 on February 11, 1990, following a refueling outage. During the outage, the fifth reload of Advanced Nuclear Fuels (ANF) fuel was installed. The reload consisted of 136 9x9 fuel assemblies with natural uranium blankets on each end.

The startup test program was similar to that performed for previous reloads at Dresden 2 and 3. The program consisted of various physics tests (shutdown margin, critical eigenvalue comparison, etc.), and instrument calibrations (LPRM, TIP's, flow instrumentation) as addressed by the Technical Specifications, Final Safety Analysis Report, and previous commitments to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. No unusual conditions were noted and the test results were as expected.

Summaries of the startup tests identified in the Draft Regulatory Guide SC 521-4 on refueling and startup tests for LWR reloads are attached per DPR-25 Technical Specification 6.6.A.1. Additional test results are available at the site.

DRESDEN UNIT 3
CYCLE 12
STARTUP TEST NO. 1
CORE VERIFICATION AND AUDIT

PURPOSE

The purpose of this test is to visually verify that the core is loaded as intended.

CRITERIA

The as-loaded core must conform to the reference core design used in the various licensing analyses. At least one independent party must either participate in performing the core verification or review a videotaped version prior to unit startup. Any discrepancies discovered in the loading will be promptly corrected and the affected areas reverified to be properly loaded prior to unit startup.

Conformance to the reference core design will be documented by a permanent core serial number map signed by the audit participants.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Cycle 12 core verification consisted of a core height check performed by the fuel handlers and two videotaped passes over the core. The height check verifies the proper seating of an assembly in the fuel support piece while the serial number/orientation visual check (which is videotaped) verifies proper assembly orientation and location.

With a member of the C.E.Co. Audit Staff present, the core was officially verified as being properly loaded and consistent with Advanced Nuclear Fuels Cycle 12 core design on January 19, 1990. Therefore, the as-loaded core configuration is consistent with what Advanced Nuclear Fuels used in their evaluation of Dresden Unit 3 Cycle 12 Reload Licensing Analyses.

DRESDEN UNIT 3
CYCLE 12
STARTUP TEST NO. 2
CONTROL ROD OPERABILITY AND SUBCRITICALITY CHECK

PURPOSE

The intent of this test is to ensure that no gross local reactivity irregularities exist, that each control blade is latched to its control rod drive, and that all control blades are functioning properly.

CRITERIA

The following must be met:

a) Each control blade will be withdrawn after the four fuel assemblies in the given control cell are loaded. This will guarantee that the mobility of the control blade is not impaired.

b) During control blade movement, the process computer is utilized to time the travel of the blade between notch positions and verify proper withdrawal and insertion times.

c) After the core is fully loaded, each control blade will be withdrawn and inserted individually to assure that criticality will not occur. As it is withdrawn, nuclear instrumentation (SRM's) will be monitored to verify subcriticality. Once withdrawn, each control blade is tested for overtravel as required by Technical Specification 4.3.B. by continually applying a withdrawal signal. A blade fails this check if rod position indication is not evident or if an overtravel alarm is received.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

After core loading, every control blade was withdrawn, checked for overtravel, and inserted to position 00 verifying each control blade's mobility. All control blades passed their overtravel checks.

While performing control rod drive friction testing, drive G-05 was found out of specifications. The apparent cause of the problem was a damaged filter on the drive. This drive was replaced and testing of the replacement drive was successful. There were no other problems found during the testing. Subcriticality was confirmed for every control blade at position 48 by observing the response on SRM's.

TIP SYSTEM SYMMETRY - UNCERTAINTY

PURPOSE

The purpose of this test is to perform a gross symmetry check and a detailed statistical uncertainty analysis on the Traversing In-Core Probe (TIP) System.

CRITERIA

1) TIP Symmetry - Gross Check

The maximum deviation between symmetrically located TIP pairs of LPRM strings should be less than 25%.

2) TIP Symmetry - Statistical Check

X^2 is a statistical tool that measures the consistancy between the actual (measured) TIP error distribution and that assumed in Advanced Nuclear Fuels (ANF) error analysis. The calculated X^2 of the integrated TIP responses should be less than 34.81. X^2 is calculated using equation 3.3.

NOTE: One data set may be used to meet the above criteria. If either criteria is not met, the instrumentation and data processing system should be checked for any problems that could lead to asymmetries. If the problem persists, the fuel vendor should be consulted to assure that the larger than expected TIP asymmetries do not significantly affect core monitoring calculations.

RESULTS

One complete set of data required for evaluating TIP uncertainty was obtained during the D3 BOC12 Startup Testing Program. Data was obtained at steady state power levels greater than 75% of rated power. The results for each method of analysis are summarized below.

1) TIP Symmetry - Gross Check

In order to determine the overall symmetry of the TIP system, machine normalized, power adjusted six inch TIP readings were obtained and averaged for each symmetric TIP pair (the symmetric locations are given in Table 3.1). The absolute percent deviation between each symmetric TIP pair was calculated and summarized in Table 3.2. The maximum absolute deviation was 6.76% for TIP pair #6 which is well below the 25% criteria.

2) TIP Symmetry - Statistical Check.

The TIP symmetry analysis was performed using the standard X^2 test as recommended by ANF. Machine normalized, power adjusted six inch TIP values obtained from a whole core LPRM calibration performed during the startup test program were summed (elevations 3 through 22 only) for each TIP location. The absolute relative difference (Dm) for each symmetric TIP pair was then calculated using equation 3.1 - the results are summarized in Table 3.3. From equations 3.2 and 3.3 the variance and X^2 were calculated to be 6.59 and 3.30 respectively. Note that the value for X^2 is well within the limit established by ANF of 34.81.

TABLE 3.1. Symmetric TIP Locations

TIP PAIR	LPRM	TIP PAIR	LPRM
1	08-17 16-09	10	24-33 32-25
2	08-25 24-09	11	24-41 40-25
3	08-33 32-09	12	24-49 48-25
4	08-41 40-09	13	24-57 56-25
5	08-49 48-09	14	32-41 40-33
6	16-25 24-17	15	32-49 48-33
7	16-33 32-17	16	32-57 56-33
8	16-41 40-17	17	40-49 48-41
9	16-49 48-17	18	40-57 56-41

TABLE 3.2. TIP Symmetry - Gross Check

Symmetric TIP Pair	Absolute Percent Deviation
1	6.25
2	3.06
3	0.05
4	4.59
5	1.51
6	6.76
7	1.22
8	2.21
9	4.04
10	2.76
11	3.26
12	0.78
13	1.39
14	0.57
15	3.59
16	4.61
17	1.20
18	4.61

Maximum Absolute Percent Deviation: 6.76

TABLE 3.3. TIP Symmetry - Statistical Check

Symmetric TIP Pair	Relative Difference Dm
1	6.371
2	2.979
3	0.553
4	5.193
5	1.536
6	7.037
7	1.026
8	2.835
9	4.373
10	2.652
11	2.956
12	0.974
13	2.118
14	0.262
15	3.886
16	4.768
17	1.394
18	4.420

Equation 3.1 $$Dm = 100 \frac{(Tm_1 - Tm_2)}{\frac{Tm_1 + Tm_2}{2}}$$

Note: $Tm_1 = \sum_{k=3}^{22} T(k)$ for TIP_1 and $Tm_2 = \sum_{k=3}^{22} T(k)$

for TIP_2 where TIP_1 and TIP_2 are symmetric TIP pairs.

Equation 3.2 (Variance)

$$S2_{TIP_{ij}} = \sum_{m=1}^{18} \frac{Dm^2}{36} = 6.59$$

Equation 3.3

$$X^2 = \frac{18S2_{TIP_{ij}}}{36} = 3.30$$

ZR07/2034

DRESDEN UNIT 3
CYCLE 12
STARTUP TEST NO. 4
INITIAL CRITICALITY COMPARISON

PURPOSE

The intent of this procedure is to perform a critical Eigenvalue comparison as required by Technical Specification 3.3.E. This is done by comparing the predicted control rod pattern to the actual control rod pattern at criticality taking into account period and temperature coefficient corrections.

CRITERIA

The actual cold critical rod pattern shall be within 1.0% Δk/k of the predicted control rod pattern. If the difference is greater than ± 1.0% Δk/k, Advanced Nuclear Fuels Corporation and Commonwealth Edison Company Core Management Engineers will be promptly notified to investigate the discrepancy.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Unit 3 went critical on February 9, 1990 at 5:47 a.m. utilizing an A-2 sequence. The moderator temperature was 182°F and the reactor period was 120 seconds.

Advanced Nuclear Fuels predictions and rod worths were calculated using the XTGBWR Code, which assumed a moderator temperature of 170°F. After corrections were made for temperature and period, the actual critical was within 1.0% Δk/k of the predicted critical. Table 4-1 summarizes the results.

TABLE 4-1

INITIAL CRITICALITY COMPARISON CALCULATIONS

Predicted (XTGBWR Code) k_{eff}:

k_{eff} with all rods in adjusted to 170°F	= 0.9546 *
Reactivity inserted by all group 1 rods	= 0.0338 *
Reactivity inserted by additional rods from group 2 at criticality	= 0.0159 *
Predicted k_{eff} at critical rod pattern (170°F)	= 1.0043 *

Temperature correction to predicted k_{eff}:

Moderator temperature coefficient = -4.0×10^{-5} (Δ k/k)/°F *

Temperature correction between 182°F and 170°F	= -0.0005
Predicted k_{eff} at critical rod pattern (182°F)	= 1.0038

Period correction to actual k_{eff}:

k_{eff} at time of criticality with °° period	= 1.000
Period correction for 120.0 second period	= 0.0005*
Actual k_{eff} with 120.0 second period	= 1.0005

Difference

$\lvert$XTGBWR k_{eff} - actual $k_{eff}\rvert$ x 100%	= 0.33% Δk/k

SOURCES

* Dresden 3 Cycle 12 Cycle Management Report/Prestartup Operation Plan dated January 24, 1990.