

Forrest T. Rhodes Vice President Engineering & Ter inical Services

February 26, 1992

ET 92-0050

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission ATTN: Document Control Desk Mail Station P1-137 Washington, D. C. 20555

Subject:

Reference: Letter ET 90-0132 dated August 21, 1990, from F. T. Rhodes, WCNOC, to the USNRC Docket No. 50-482: Transmittal of Additonal Information on the Rod Exchange Methodology for Startup Physics Testing

Gentlemen:

The purpose of this letter is to submit Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Cor, oration's (WCNOC) response to questions from the US Nuclear Regulatory Commission (USNRC) on WCNOC's Rod Exchange Methodology for Startup Physics Testing which was submitted in the Reference. The response to these questions is provided in the attachment.

If you have any questions concerning this matter, please contact me or Mr. S. G. Wideman of my staff.

Very truly yours,

Forrest T. Rhodes Vice President Engineering & Technical Services

FTR/aem

02000

Attachment

cc: A. T. Howell (NRC), w/a R. D. Martin (NRC), w/a G. A. Pick (NRC), w/a W. D. Reckley (NRC), w/a

0482

D. Box 411 / Burlington, KS 66839 / Phone: (316) 364-8831 An Equal Opportunity Employer M F HC/VET

Attachment to ET 92-0050 Page 1 of 21

Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Corporation (WCNOC) submitted Rod Exchange Methodology for Startup Physics Testing on August 21, 1990. During telephone conversations on August 8, 1991, and August 12, 1991, the US Nuclear Regulatory Commission (USNRC) provided a list of questions on the topical to WCNOC. In a meeting held on January 28, 1992, these questions were discussed between WCNOC and the USNRC, with WCNOC agreeing to submit answers in February, 1992. The questions are listed below with WCNOC's response immediately following each.

- Question 1: Provide additional information regarding WCNOC's actions in the event that rod worth measurements fail to meet the Acceptance Criteria outlined in Section 4.2 of the topical report.
- Response: Currently, paragraph #4 on page 14 of the WCNOC Rod Exchange topical addresses this situation. To further quantify the steps WCNOC will take in this event, paragraph #4 will be revised as follows:

"Failure of the Acceptance Criteria will result in additional evaluations. Further specific actions depend on evaluation results. These actions can include repeating the tests with more detailed attention to test prerequisites, added tests to search for anomalies, or design personnel performing detailed analyses of potential safety problems because of parameter deviation. If all subsequent actions and tests fail, the rod worths will be measured using the standard boration/dilution technique. Power is not escalated until evaluation shows that plant safety will not be compromised by such escalation."

- Question 2: Provide additional benchmarks of rod worth predictions for measurements performed with the rod exchange technique as well as those performed with the boron dilution technique. Additionally provide, for comparison, any rod exchange predictions performed by outside contractors.
- Response: The benchmark of the Wolf Creek models to rod worths obtained via the dilution technique is shown in the Wolf Creek topical report, "Qualification of Steady State Core Physics Methodology for Wolf Creek Design and Analysis."

Additionally, the recent Wolf Creek cycle 6 rod exchange results are reported in Table 1. These measurement results show excellent agreement with the Wolf Creek predictions. All are well within the requirements of both the review and acceptance criteria discussed in the topical.

An outside contractor was used to provide the rod exchange predictions for Wolf Creek cycles 5 and 6. These data are presented for comparison purposes in Tables 2 and 3. Attachment to ET 92-0050 Page 2 cf 21

- Question 3: Several places in the topical text refer to the position of the Reference Bank being "at or nearly fully inserted" at the conclusion of the boron dilution measurement of the Reference Bank worth. Provide a more detailed discussion regarding the position of the reference bank being at or nearly fully inserted, including what administrative limits WCNOC will use for this position as well as an engineering basis for these limits.
- When performing the boron dilution measurement of the Response: reference bank, it is necessary to secure the boron dilution process prior to the reference bank actually reaching the fully inserted position, to allow the coolant to complete mixing and reach an squilibrium boron concentration level. In the ideal case, the final mixing would result in the core being critical with the reference bank exactly at the fully inserted position. In practice, however, this is rarely the case, with the usual final position of the reference bank a few steps above the bottom of the core. In order to correct for this small amount of reactivity, the worth of the final few steps of the rod is typically determined using a standard endpoint technique by temporarily inserting the rod to the fully inserted position and measuring the resulting reactivity change with the reactivity computer. The reactor is then returned to criticality by withdrawing the rod back to its original position.

This correction shows up as the $(\Delta \rho)_{\rm corr}$ term in Equation (7) of the topical. WCNOC uses guidelines promulgated by Westinghouse regarding the allowable magnitude of this correction, which is to maintain this correction lower than 50 pcm in magnitude. Historically, the average value of this correction from Wolf Creek Generating Station (WCGS) Cycles 3, 5, and 6 has been 13.6 p.m. "ne average of the correction from WCGS Cycle 1 was 34.2 pcm. Note that although the correction from Cycle 1 was larger, this is to be expected since Cycle 1 was a completely fresh core with associated higher differential rod worths near the ends of the core. The average rod position for these corrections from WCGS Cycles 1, 3, 5, and 6 was 25.8 steps withdrawn.

The effect of beginning with the reference bank slightly above the bottom of the core will be to cause the measured critical height of the reference bank to be higher. If the reference bank begins at a position 50 pcm from the bottom of the core, the new critical height will be at a position which corresponds to 50 pcm higher in the core.

Attachment to ET 92-0050 Page 3 of 21



Figure 1: Ideal and Actual Rod Positions

In Figure 1, the new critical height is 50 pcm higher than the ideal case critical height. The actual step difference will be different for each rod bank, depending on the differential rod worth of the shadowed reference bank in the region near the critical height. For rod banks which have a critical height very near the top of the core, it is possible that this variation in critical height could be quite significant, since the differential rod worths can be low in this region. However, for all cases, the actual worth difference will still be 50 pcm, regardless of how different the new critical height may be.

In the ideal case, the inferred worth of the test bank is given by Equation (3) of the topical (repeated here):

$$W_{inf} = W_{ref} - (\alpha_x)(\Delta \rho)_{un}$$

where the value of $\alpha_{\rm X}$ is calculated for the ideal case predicted critical height. For the actual case, a correction is made to the above equation to account for the initial position of the reference bank. This equation is given in the topical as Equation (7):

$$W_{inf} = W_{ref} - (\alpha_x)(\Delta \rho)_{un} - (\Delta \rho)_{corr}$$

There will be a small error introduced into the determination of W_{inf} with this equation, since the value of $\alpha_{\rm X}$ is calculated assuming a given critical height, which has changed. However, since $\alpha_{\rm X}$ is largely insensitive to critical height, the introduced error is small (see discussion on page 7 of topical).

Attachment to ET 92-0050 Page 4 of 21

> To show that the introduced errors are small, and to conclusively demonstrate that small variations in critical height do not significantly affect the calculation results, the following steps can be taken:

- Assume an initial position of the reference bank at some known worth above the boltom of the core. For the purposes of this discussion 50 pcm will be assumed.
- 2. Determine the new critical height:
 - o determine the differential rod worth of the reference bank, shadowed by the fully inserted test bank, in the area near the critical height
 - o adjust the reference bank critical height nearer the top of the core by 50 pcm
- 3. Using the new critical height, determine the new value of $(\Delta \rho)_{\rm un}$. Recall that this term is defined as the worth of the unshadowed reference bank worth from the critical height position to fully withdrawn.
- 4. The α_X values are NOT adjusted for the new critical height. The values based on the ideal critical heights are used.
- 5. Use Equation (7) of the topical to determine the new Winf test bank values.
- 6. Compare the new Winf values with the ideal case Winf values.

Note that this procedure exactly simulates the steps which would be taken during the measurement process, i.e. the initial position of the reference bank induces a small change to the critical height, but the ideal case values of $\alpha_{\rm X}$ are used in the calculation. Note also that the assumption of a +50 pcm shift in the critical height can be further generalized into a +/- 50 pcm variation either up or down in the ideal critical height.

This calculation was performed on the WCGS data from Cycles 1, 3, 5, and 6. The results are shown in Tables 4 through 18. The results show that the introduction of a 50 pcm critical height variation results in almost negligible changes in the test bank W_{inf} values. The maximum error introduced on any bank was 3.1 pcm. The average error was 1.1 pcm. Based on these results, WCNOC will use 50 pcm as the limit for the magnitude of the rod endpoint correction, and will attempt to minimize this correction in any case.

Attachment to ET 92-0050 Fage 5 of 21

Bank	MCP	(AP) un	ax	(AP) GATT	Meas Winf	Pred Winf	*Diff	PCM Diff
D	201	50	1.2163	10	637.2	615.4	3.5	21.8
ç	193	76	0.9250	10	627.7	642.6	-2.3	-14.9
В	228*	6**	0.8442	12	702.0	679.5	2.4	16.5
A	113.5	402	1.0643	10	270.2	300.7	-10.3	-30.5
SE	120	371	0.8806	10	371.3	389.5	-4.7	-18.2
SD	149	241	1.0425	10	446.8	422.6	5.7	24.2
sc	147	249	1.0421	9	439.5	422.6	4.0	16.9
SA	110	419	1.0527	7	259.4	251.6	3.1	7.8
SB					708.0	711.7	-0.5	-3.7
Total			i hidi a dari	1.000	4462.1	4436.2	0.6	25.9

Table 1: Cycle 6 Rod Exchange Final Result:

* Reference Bank SB fully withdrawn

** Wfinal

5

Attachment to ET 92-0050 Page 6 of 21

SD

SC

SA

SB

Ŗ

Total

453

446

266

708

4475

	Meas	Pred		PCM
Bank	Winf	Winf	%Diff	Diff
D	540.5	595	-9.2	-54.5
C	686.8	776	-11.5	-89.2
B	785.6	797	-1.4	-11.4
A	192.4	249	-22.7	-56.6
SE	330.7	374	-11.6	-43.3
SD	452.1	463	-2.4	-10.9
SC	448.6	465	-3.5	-16.4
SA	370.2	369	0.3	1.2
ъB	781.6	838	-6.7	-56.4
Total	4588.5	4926	-6.9	-337.5

Table 2: Contractor Cycle 5 Rod Exchange Results

Bank	Meas Winf	Pred Winf	8Diff	PCM Diff
D	638	656	-2.7	-18
C	628	682	-7.9	-54
B	702	746	-5.9	-44
A	269	307	-12.4	-38
SE	365	399	-8.5	-34

459

454

278

756

4737

-1.3

-1.8

-4.3

-6.3

-5.5

--6

-8

-12

-48

-262

Table 3: Contractor Cycle 6 Rcd Exchange Results

6

Attachment to ET 92-0050 Page 7 of 21

Table 4: Wolf Creek Cycle 1, Banks D and C

RESULTS, Cycle 1, Bank D		
Stressed amount (pcm)	\$	50
Original critical height	2	125.8
New critical height	\$	132.7
Original Test Bank worth (pcm)	ξ.,	637.9
New Test Bank worth (pcm)	1	637.6
Worth Percent difference (%)	\$	-0.04
Height Percent difference (%)	t	5.51

RESULTS,	Cycle 1, Bank D		
Stressed	amount (pcm)	\$	-50
Original	ciitical height	\$	125.8
New criti	cal height	1	118.9
Original	Test Bank worth (pcm)	1	637.9
New Test	Bank worth (pcm)	:	638.6
Worth Per	cent difference (%)	τ.	0.11
Height Pe	rcent difference (%)	1	-5.51

RESULTS, Cycle 1, Bank C		
Stressed amount (pcm)	τ.	50
Original critical height	ž.	187.9
New critical height	\$	213.1
Original Test Fank worth (pcm)	:	942.5
New Test Bank worth (pcm)	:	944.1
Worth Percent difference (%)	:	0.17
Height Percent difference (%)		13.40

RESULTS, Cycle 1, Bank C Stressed amount (pcm) : -50 Original critical height : 187.9 New critical height : 162.7 Original Test Bank worth (pcm): 942.5 N=W Test Bank worth (pcm) : 941.0 Worth Percent difference (%) : -0.16 Height Percent difference (%) : -13.40 Attachment to ET 92-0050 Page 8 of 21

Table 5: Wolf Creek Cycle 1, Banks B and A

Stressed amount (pcm) : 50 Original critical height : 119.4 New critical height : 130.1
Original critical height : 119.4 New critical height : 130.1
New critical height : 130.1
Original Test Bank worth (pom): 721.4
New Test Bank worth (pcm) : 721.8
Worth Percent difference (%) : 0.05
Height Percent difference (%) : 8,97

RESULTS,	Cycle 1, Bank B		
Stressed	amount (pcm)	x.	-50
Original	critical height	£.	119.4
New criti	cal height	ξ.	108.7
Original	Test Bank worth (pcm)	5	721.4
New Test	Bank worth (pcm)	i.	720.6
Worth Per	cent difference (%)	\$	-0.11
Height Pe	rcent difference (%)	1	-8.97

RESULTS, Cycle 1, Bank A		
Stressed amount (pcm)		50
Original critical height	- 1	87.6
New critical height	2	92.7
Original Test Bank worth (pc	m):	354.9
New Test Bank worth (pcm)	1	354.7
Worth Percent difference (%)		-0.06
Height Percent difference (%) :	5.85

RESULTS, CY	cle 1, Bank A		
Stressed am	ount (pcm)	2	-50
Original cr.	itical height	ŧ.	87.6
New critical	l height	÷	82.5
Original Te	st Bank worth (pcm)	÷.	354.9
New Test Ban	nk worth (pcm)	÷	354.4
Worth Percei	nt difference (%)	1	-0.15
Height Perce	ent difference (%)	1	-5.85

Attachment to ET 92-0050 Page 9 of 21

Table 6: Wolf Creek Cycle 1, Banks SE and SA

RESULTS, Cycle 1, Bank SE		
Stressed amount (pcm)	1	50
Original critical height	1	94
New critical height	1	101.3
Original Test Bank worth (pcm)	÷.	552.7
New Test Bank worth (pcm)	1	554.5
Worth Percent difference (%)	1	0.32
Height Percent difference (%)	٤.	7,80

RESULTS, Cycle 1, Bank SE		
Stressed amount (pcm)	1	~50
Original critical height	1	94
New critical height	1	86.7
Original Test Bank worth (pcm)	1	552.7
New Test Bank worth (pcm)	3	550.7
Worth Percent difference (%)	1	-0.36
Height Percent difference (%)	\$	-7.80

RESULTS, CY	cle 1, Bank SA		
Stressed an	nount (pcm)	1	50
Original cr	itical height	2	91.6
New critica	al height		96.8
Original Te	st Bank worth (pcm)	1.0	392.4
New Test Ba	K worth (pcm)	1	392.0
Worth Perce	ant difference (%)		-0.11
Height Perc	cent difference	4	5.70

RESULTS, Cycle 1, Bank SA		
Stressed amount (pcm)	£.	-50
Original critical height	2	91.6
New critical height	2	85.4
Original Test Bank worth (pcm)	1	392.4
New Test Bank wolt (pcm)	1	393.9
Worth Percent difference (%)	ż.	0.37
Height Percent difference (%)	\$	-5,70

Attachment to ET 92-0050 Page 10 of 21

Table 7: Wolf Creek Cycle 1, Bank SD/SC

RESULTS, Cycle 1, Bank SD/SC		
Stressed amount (pcm)	÷	50
Original critical height	t.	94.1
New critical height	\$	99.8
Original Test Bank worth (pcm)	1	439.9
New Test Bank worth (pcm)	1	441.6
Worth Percent difference (%)	£	0.40
Height Percent difference (%)	÷	6.07

RESULTS, Cycle 1, Bank SD/SC Stressed amount (pcm) : -50 Original critical height : 94.1 New critical height : 88.4 Original Test Bank worth (pcm): 439.9 New Test Bank worth (pcm) : 438.9 Worth Percent difference (%) : -0.22 Height Percent difference (%) : -6.07

10

Attachment to ET 92-0050 Page 11 of 21

Table 8: Wolf Creek Cycle 3, Banks D and B

RESULTS, Cycle 3, Bank D		
Stressed amount (pcm)	3	50
Original critical height	\$	177.9
New critical height	4	187.4
Original Test Bank worth (pcm)	\$	521.3
New Test Bank worth (pcm)	\$	523.0
Worth Percent difference (%)	4	0.33
Height Percent difference (%)	3	5.35

RESULTS, Cycle 3, H	Bank D	
Stressed amount (po	cm) 1 -50	
Original critical H	height i 177.9	ł.
New critical height	: 168.4	Ľ
Original Test Bank	worth (pcm): 521.3	ł.
New Test Bank worth	n (pom) : 519.9	l.
Worth Percent diffe	erence (%) : -0.28	ł.
Height Percent diff	feren(u (%) : -5.35	

RESULTS, Cycle 3, Bank B		
Stressed amount (pcm)	τ.	50
Original critical height	2	211.8
New critical height	1	223.1
Original Test Bank worth (pcm)	5	678.7
New Test Bank worth (pcm)	3	678.9
Worth Percent difference (%)	1	0.03
Height Percent difference (%)	3	5.31

RESULTS, Cycle 3, Bank B			
Stressed amount (pcm)		2	-50
Original critical height		÷.	211.8
New critical height		\$	200.5
Original Test Bank worth	(pcm)	1	678.7
New Test Bank worth (pcm)	ŝ.	678.2
Worth Percent difference	(8)	2	+0.07
Height Percent differenc	e (8)	2	-5.31

Attachment to ET 92-0050 Page 12 of 21

Table 9: Wolf Creek Cycle 3, Banks A and SE

RESULTS, Cycle 3, Bank A		
Stressed amount (pcm)	¢.	50
Original critical height	ž.	102.2
New critical height	٤.	115.5
Original Test Bank worth (pcm)	1	268.8
New Test Bank worth (pcm)	÷.	268.0
Worth Percent difference (*)	ŧ.	-0.29
Height Percent difference (%)	\$	13.00

RESULTS,	Cycle 3, Bank A		
Stressed	amount (pcm)	1	-50
Original	critical height	ş.	102.2
New criti	cal height	\$	88.9
Original	Test Bank worth (pcm)	1	268.8
New Test	Bank worth (pom)	ŧ.	269.5
Worth Per	cent difference (%)	ä.	0.27
Height Pe	rcent difference (%)	ŧ.	-13.00

RESULTS, Cycle 3, Bank SE		
Stressed amount (pcm)	1	50
Original critical height	ŝ.	129.8
New critical height	÷	142.3
Original Test Bank worth (pcm)	2	372.2
New Test Bank worth (pcm)	2	372.0
Worth Percent difference (%)	\$	-0.05
Height Percent difference (%)	\$	9.60

RESULTS, Cycle 3, Bank SE		
Stressed amount (pcm)	\$	-50
Original critical height	Ξ.	129.8
New critical height	t.	117.3
Original Test Bank worth (pcm)	3	372.2
New Test Bank worth (pcm)	1	372.8
Worth Percent difference (%)	ŝ.	0.15
Height Percent difference (%)	1	-9.60

20/---

Attachment to ET 92-0050 Page 13 of 21

Table 10: Wolf Creek Cycle 3, Banks SA and SD/SC

RESULTS, Cycle 3, Bank SA		
Stressed amount (pcm)	\$	50
Original critical height	Ŧ.	181.9
New critical height	2	109.7
Original Test Bank worth (pcm)	ŧ.	497.5
New Test Bank worth (pcm)	ŧ.	500.6
Worth Percent difference (%)	ą.,	0.63
Height Percent difference (%)	ŧ.	4.27

RESULTS,	Cycle 3, Bank SA		
Stressed	amount (pcm)	ż.	-50
Original	critical height	ε.	181.9
New criti	cal height	ξ.	174.1
Original	Test Bank worth (pcm)	ξ.	497.5
New Test	Bank worth (pom)	2	495.1
Worth Per	cent difference (%)	1	-0.49
Height Pe	rcent difference (%)	ξ.	-4.27

RESULTS, Cycle 3, Bank SD/SC		
Stressed amount (pcm)	ź.	50
Original critical height	£.	159.4
New critical height	1	168.7
Original Test Bank worth (pcm)	ş.	420.5
New Test Bank worth (pcm)	ŧ.	418.3
Worth Percent difference (%)	ŝ.	-0.52
Height Percent difference (%)	į.,	5,80

RESULTS, Cycle 3, Bank SD/SC		
Stressed amount (pcm)	\$	-50
Original critical height	2	159.4
New critical height	3	150.1
Original Test Bank worth (pcm)	1	420.5
New Test Bank worth (pcm)	\$	422.8
Worth Percent difference (%)	£.	0.55
Height Percent difference (%)	ε.	-5.80

Attachment to 'T 92-0050 Page 14 of 21

Table 11: Wolf Creek Cycle 5, Banks D and C

RESULTS,	Cycle F, Bank D		
Stressed	amount (pcm)	1	50
Original	critical height	÷.	181,1
New criti	cal height	ŝ.	191.0
Original	Test Bank worth (pcm)	ξ.	557.1
New Test	Bank worth (pcm)	ţ.	558.3
Worth Per	cent difference (%)	ŝ.	0.21
Height Pe	rcent difference (%)	ż.	5.49

RESULTS,	Cycle 5, Bank D		
Stressed	amount (pcm)	٤.	-50
Original	critical height	2	181.1
New criti	cal height	τ.	171.2
Original	Test Bank worth (pcm)	ŧ.	557.1
New Test	Bank worth (pcm)	ş.,	555.9
Worth Per	cent difference (%)	x.	-0.22
Height Pe	rcent difference (%)	t	-5.49

RESULTS, Cycl	e 5, Bank C		
Stressed amou	nt (pem)	į.	50
Original crit	ical height	2	208.9
New critical	height	t	229.1
Original Test	Bank worth (pcm)	1	696.1
New Test Bank	worth (pcm)	5	696.6
Worth Percent	difference (%)		0.07
Height Percen	t difference (%)	4	9.66

RESULTS,	Cycle 5, Bank C		
Stressed	amount (pcm)	1	-50
Original	critical height	3	208.9
New criti	cal height	÷	1.8.7
Original	Test Bank worth (pcm)	t.	696.1
New Test	Bank worth (pcm)	ξ.	695.4
Worth Per	cent difference (%)	t.	-0.10
Height Pe	rcent difference (%)	÷.	-9.66

Attachment to ET 92-0050 Page 15 of 21

Table 12: Wolf Creek Cycle 5, Banks B and A

RESULTS, Cycle 5, Bank B		
Stressed amount (pcm)	ŧ.	50
Original critical height	1	206.8
New critical height	έ.	227.2
Original Test Bank worth (pcm)	ġ.	692.1
New Test Bank worth (pcm)	2	691.3
Worth Percent difference (%)	1	-0.12
Height Percent difference (%)	ŝ.	9.87

RESULTS, Cycle 5, Bank B		
Stressed amount (pcm)	1	-50
Original critical height	1	206.8
New critical height	\$	186.4
Original Test Bank worth (pcm)	1	692.1
New Test Bank worth (pcm)	ε.	693.1
Worth Percent difference (%)	ź.	0.14
Height Percent difference (%)	1	-9.87

RESULTS, Cycle 5, Bank A		
Stressed amount (pcm)	1	50
Original critical height	5	110.1
New critical height	5	119.4
Original Test Bank worth (pom)	5	240.1
New Test Bank worth (pcm)	ŧ.	237.7
Worth Percent difference (%)	5	-1.01
Height Percent difference (%)	5	8.42

RESULTS, C	ycle 5, Bank A		
Stressed a	mount (pcm)	2	-50
Original c	ritical height	1	110.1
New critic	al height	:	100.8
Original T	est Bank worth (pcm)	÷	240.1
New Test B	ank worth (pcm)	ŧ.	242.1
Worth Perc	ent difference (%)	2	0.84
Height Per	cent difference (%)	ŧ	-8.42

Attachment to ET 92-0050 Page 16 of 21

Table 13: Wolf Creek Cycle 5, Banks SE and SA

RESULTS, Cycle 5, Bank SE		
Stressed amount (pcm)	1	50
Original critical height	1	113.1
New critical height	1	125.6
Original Test Bank worth (pcm)	3	340
New Test Bank worth (pcm)	1	340.8
Worth Percent difference (%)	4	0.24
Height Percent difference (%)	4	10.66

RESULTS, Cycle 5, Bank SE		
Stressed amount (pcm)	τ.	~50
Original critical height	1	113.1
New critical height	1	101.0
Original Test Bank worth (pcm)	1	340
New Test Bank worth (pcm)	1	338.8
Worth Percent difference (%)	ŝ.	-0.35
Height Percent difference (%)	1	-10.66

RESULTS, Cycle 5, Bank SA		
Stressed amount (pcm)	1	50
Original critical height	1	133.6
New critical height	÷.	143.5
Original Test Bank worth (pcm)	1	342.9
New Test Bank worth (pcm)	2	343.8
Worth Percent difference (%)	3	0.25
Height Percent difference (%)	1	7.41

RESULTS, Cycle 5, Bank SA		
Stressed amount (pcm)	ά.	50
Original critical height	1	133.6
New critical height	1	123.7
Original Test Bank worth (pcm)	ŧ.	342.9
New Test Bank worth (pcm)	ź.	341.9
Worth Percent difference (%)	τ.	-0.30
Height Percent difference (%)	ž.	-7.41

Attachment to ET 92-0050 Page 17 of 21

Table 14: Wolf Creek Cycle 5, Bank SD/SC

RESULTS, Cycle 5, Bank SD/SC		
Stressed amount (pcm)	1	50
Original critical height	4	149
New critical height	. 8	158.8
Original Test Bank worth (pcm)	12	429.2
New Test Bank worth (pcm)	1	428.0
Worth Percent difference (%)	1	-0.28
Height Percent difference (%)	1	7.28

RESULTS, Cycle 5, Bank SD/SC Stressed emount (pcm) : -50 Original critical height : 148 New critical height : 137.2 Original Test Bank worth (pcm) : 429.2 New Test Bank worth (pcm) : 430.4 Worth Percent difference (%) : 0.29 Height Percent difference (%) : -7.28 Attachment to ET 92-0050 Page 18 of 21

Table 15: Wolf Creek Cycle 6, Banke D and C

RESULTS, Cycle 6, Bank D		
Stressed amount (pcm)	\$	50
Original critical height	3	192.6
New critical height	4	205.8
Original Test Bank worth (pcm)	ş.	615.4
New Test Bank worth (pcm)	1	616.5
Worth Percent difference (%)	2	0.17
Height Percent difference (%)	2	6.86

RESULTS, Cycle 6, Bank D		
Stressed amount (pcm)	1	-50
Original critical height	\$	192.6
New critical height	\$	179.4
Original Test Bank worth (pcm)	1	615.4
New Test Bank worth (pcm)	1	614.3
Worth Percent difference (%)	\$	-0.18
Height Percent difference (%)	4	-6.86

RESULTS, Cycle 6, Bank C		
Stressed amount (pom)	4	50
Original critical height	χ.	194.0
New critical height	1	210.9
Original Test Bank worth (pcm)	1	642.6
New Test Bank worth (pcm)	1	642.2
Worth Percent difference (%)	ă.	-0.06
Height Percent difference (%)	1	8.70

RESULTS, CYCle 6, Bank C		
Stressed amount (pcm)	2	-50
Original critical height	ŧ.	194.0
New critical height	ŧ.	177.2
Original Test Bank worth (pcm)	ż.	642.6
New Test Bank worth (pcm)	1	643.1
Worth Percent difference (%)	1	0.06
Height Percent difference (%)	4	-8.70

Attachment to ET 92-0050 Page 19 of 21

Table 16: Wolf Creek Cycle 6, Banks B and A

RESULTS, Cycl	e 6, Bank B		
Stressed amou	nt (pcm)	2	50
Original crit	ical height	\$	205,9
New critical	height	1	229.6
Original Test	Bank worth (pcm)	1	679.5
New Test Bank	worth (pcm)	4	679.5
Worth Percent	difference (%)	1	-0.00
Height Percen	t difference (%)	1	11.47

RESULTS, Cycle 6, Bank B		
Stressed amount (pcm)	1	-50
Original critical height	\$	205.9
New critical height	1	182.3
Original Test Bank worth (pcm)	5	679.5
New Test Bank worth (pcm)	1	ETa.5
Worth Percent difference (%)	1	0.00
Height Percent difference (%)	à.	-11.47

RESULTS, Cycle 6, Bank A		
Stressed amount (pcm)	\$	50
Original critical height	1	117.4
New critical height	1	127.5
Original Test Bank worth (pcm)	×.	300.7
New Test Bank worth (pcia)	1	298.5
Worth Percent difference (%)	1	-0.74
Height Percent difference (%)	3	8,61

RESULTS, Cycle 6, Bank A		
Stressed amount (pcm)	Ξ.	-50
Original critical height	x.	117.4
New critical height	1	107.3
Original Test Bank worth (pcm)	3	300.7
New Test Bank worth (pcm)	\$	302.9
Worth Percent difference (%)	1	0.74
Height Percent difference (%)	1	-8.61

Attachment to ET 92-0050 Page 20 of 21

Table 17: Wolf Creek Cycle 6, Banks SA and SE

RESULTS, Cycle 6, Bank SA		
Stressed amount (pcm)	1	50
Original critical heigh-	1	106.9
New critical height	1	116.7
Original Test Bank worth (pcm)	4	251.6
New Test Bank worth (pcm)	1	251.6
Worth Percent difference (%)	ł.	0.02
Height Percent difference (%)	1	9.15

RESULTS, Cycle 6, Bank SA		
Stressed amount (pcm)	3	-50
Original critical height	\$	106.9
New critical height	4	97.2
Original Test Bank worth (pcm)	3	251.6
New Test Bank worth (pcm)	1	250.4
Worth Percent difference (%)	1	-0.47
Height Percent difference (%)	3	-9.15

RESULTS, Cycle 6, Bank SE		
Stressed amount (pcm)	1	50
Original critical height	\$	121.9
New critical height	1	134.7
Original Test Bank worth (pcm)	τ.	389.5
New Test Bank worth (pcm)	ž.	389.2
Worth Percent difference (%)	¢.	-0.09
Height Percent difference (%)	1	10.42

RESULTS, Cy	ycle 6, Bank SE		
Stressed an	aount (pcm)	2	50
Original cr	ritical neight	1	121.9
New critica	al height	1	109.2
Original Te	est Bank worth (pcm)	٤.	389.5
New Test Ba	ank worth (pcm)	1	389.9
Worth Perce	ent difference (%)	1	0.09
Height Perc	cent difference (%)	1	-10.42

Attachment to ET 92-0050 Para 21 of 21

κ.

Table 18: Wol' Creek Cycle 6, Bank SD/SC

RESULTS, Cycle 6, Bank SD/SC		
Stressed amount (pom)	\$	50
Original critical height	5	141.7
New critical height	2	153.4
Original Test Bank worth (pcm)	5	422.6
New Test Bank worth (pcm)	¥	426.6
Worth Percent difference (%)	ε.	0.94
Height Percent difference (%)	ţ.	8.21

RESULTS, Cycle 6, Bank SD/SC		
Stressed amount (pcm)	τ.	-50
Original critical height	1	141.7
New critical height	1	130.1
Original Test Bank worth (pcm)	£.	422.6
New Test Bank worth (pcm)	1	418.1
Worth Percent difference (%)	÷	-1.06
Height Percent difference (%)	1	-8.21