

REGULATORY INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (RIDS)

ACCESSION NBR: 8106220283 DOC. DATE: 81/06/11 NOTARIZED: NO DOCKET #  
 FACIL: 50-335 St. Lucie Plant, Unit 1, Florida Power & Light Co. 05000335  
 AUTH. NAME AUTHOR AFFILIATION  
 UHRIG, R.E. Florida Power & Light Co.  
 RECIP. NAME RECIPIENT AFFILIATION  
 CLARK, R.A. Operating Reactors Branch 3

SUBJECT: Forwards response to NRC 810511 request for addl info re stretch power application.

DISTRIBUTION CODE: A001S COPIES RECEIVED: LTR 3 ENCL 3 SIZE: 3 711  
 TITLE: General Distribution for after Issuance of Operating License

NOTES:

ACTION:	RECIPIENT	COPIES	RECIPIENT		COPIES
	ID CODE/NAME		LTR	ENCL	
	CLARK, R.	04	13	13	
INTERNAL:	D/DIR, HUM FAC08	1	1		1
	I&E	06	2	2	1
	OELD	11	1	0	0
	RAD ASMT BR		1	1	1
EXTERNAL:	ACRS	09	16	16	
	NSIC	05	1	1	
					03

JUN 23 1981

HA  
4

TOTAL NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED: LTR 40 ENCL 38

RG

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO  
 DIVISION OF THE PHYSICAL SCIENCES  
 DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY  
 5708 S. UNIVERSITY AVENUE  
 CHICAGO, ILLINOIS


MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD  
 DATE: 1950

TO: [Name]  
 FROM: [Name]

SUBJECT: [Topic]

[Detailed text of the memorandum, including experimental results, observations, and conclusions. The text is mostly illegible due to the quality of the scan.]

[Additional text, possibly a list of references or a detailed description of the work. The text is mostly illegible.]



June 11, 1981  
L-81-246

Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation  
Attention: Mr. Robert A. Clark, Chief  
Operating Reactors Branch #3  
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D. C. 20555

Dear Mr. Clark:

Re: St. Lucie Unit 1  
Docket No. 50-335  
Stretch Power Application

Enclosed is our response to the information request of your letter dated May 11, 1981.

Very truly yours,

  
Robert E. Uhrig  
Vice President  
Advanced Systems & Technology

REU/DME/ah

Attachment

cc: Mr. J. P. O'Reilly, Region II  
Mr. Harold F. Reis, Esquire

A001  
s  
3/3

8106220 283  
p

1944  
JUL 10 1944  
U.S. AIR FORCE  
OFFICE OF THE  
PROSTATEUR GENERAL  
WASHINGTON, D.C.

### Question 1

What is the magnitude of the bias applied to increase the maximum calculated radial peaking factors in fuel pins adjacent to CEA water holes?

### Response

For the St. Lucie 1 Cycle 4 Stretch Power Analysis, a bias value of 4.9% was applied to increase the maximum radial peaking factors around the water holes. The effects of water hole peaking are included in both the nominal and safety peaking data presented in the Stretch Power Application.

### Question 2

For the CEA withdrawal event, it is stated that either the Variable High Power Level or Thermal Margin/Low Pressure trip are used in conjunction with the initial steady state LCOs to prevent DNBR limits from being exceeded. It was our understanding that the CEAW event was reclassified as per CEN-126(F) so that only the High Power Trip or the Variable High Power Trip were required to prevent violation of SAFDLs in lieu of including a pressure bias component in the TM/LP trip algorithm. Explain the continued reliance on the TM/LP trip for the CEAW event depending on the initial conditions and the reactivity insertion rate.

### Response

The CEAW event for St. Lucie 1 Cycle 4 stretch power was analyzed without crediting the TM/LP trip. This event was analyzed with the methods reported in CEN-126(F)-P. Although no reliance is placed on the TM/LP trip, it is our best estimate that the TM/LP trip will still act as an additional preventative measure to prevent DNB limits from being exceeded.

### Question 3

The key parameters assumed in the full length CEA drop analysis are shown in Table 7.2.4-1. The dropped CEA worth for the unrodded condition has decreased from 0.10% to 0.04%  $\Delta\rho$ . Please explain this decrease in CEA worth.

### Response

The minimum dropped CEA worth presented in Table 7.2.4-1 of 0.04%  $\Delta\rho$  is an "enveloping" value which is significantly below the actual reactivity change calculated for Cycle 4. This explanation may also be found in Table 5-5 (Footnote 3) of Section 5 where the



1950

Response Continued

input physics data for the CEA drop analysis is presented. The lowest calculated dropped CEA worth for a configuration which also produces the maximum increase in the radial peaking factor is .10%  $\Delta\rho$  and is the same as the value presented for the Cycle 3 reference analysis. The minimum reactivity change is conservative with respect to the CEA drop analysis because it produces the smallest decrease in core power during the event.

