UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20545

T0(3)

SEP 20 1973

Docket No. 50-219

LICENSEE: JERSEY CENTRAL POWER & LIGHT COMPANY (JCPL)

FACILITY: OYSTER CREEK NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION (OC)

SUMMARY OF MEETING HELD ON SEPTEMBER 4, 1973, TO DISCUSS LIMITS ON EXXON FUEL IN OYSTER CREEK

On September 4, 1973, representatives of JCPL, GPU Service Corporation, and Exxon Nuclear Corporation met with members of the Regulatory staff to discuss the limits placed on the average planar linear heat generation rate (APLHGR) for the Type III fuel in Oyster Creek.

A list of attendees is attached to this report.

Significant points discussed are summarized below.

1. Gap Conductance

The licensee contended that they had followed the requirements as stated in Enclosure B to our July 16, 1973 letter, in that they had constructed a gap conductance vs. LHGR curve that was based on available data and that based on that data would predict with 95 percent confidence that 90 percent of future events will exceed the prediction.

The staff indicated that the quality of the data that was available was subject to question and that the uncertainty associated with the data led us to a preference for the GE correlation which gives more conservative predictions in the lower kW/ft region of the correlation. Exxon stated that they planned to submit their analytical gap conductance model in October.

2. Spray Heat Transfer Coefficient

JCPL stated that they had particular concern over the 100°F penalty applied to the Exxon Type III fuel because of the passive rod in the center of the fuel assembly. It is this penalty which is limiting them to 91 percent of rated power. They feel that the FLECHT data is conservatively applicable to the Exxon fuel. The conservatism is gained

B/141

in that they conclude there is probably an enhancement of the spray heat transfer coefficient for which they are not taking credit.

They presented, as qualitative justification for this conclusion the results of the FLECHT ZR2K test using the temperatures of rods adjacent to rods with failed heaters as an indication of improved cooling.

The licensee stated that they would submit for the staff's review additional argument in support of their contention.

3. Comparison of Exxon's MOXXY results with AEC MOXY results

The Exxon representatives brought their input and output printouts for their MOXXY calculation and these were compared to the AEC printouts to determine what differences there might be in the calculation. This portion of the meeting could not be completed and the Exxon personnel were to come in the following day to continue this comparison. It was agreed that the follow-up would be with the Technical Review personnel.

T. V. Wambach

T. V. Wambach
Operating Reactors Branch #1
Directorate of Licensing

Enclosure:
List of Attendees

cc: Docket File
AEC PDR
Local PDR
RP Reading File
L Reading File
RP Assistant Director
T. J. Carter
R. J. Schemel
J. M. Hendrie
TR Assistant Directors
TR Branch Chiefs
T. V. Wambach
R. Bevan
Attorney, OGC
RO (3)
ACRS (16)
Staff Participants

LIST OF ATTENDEES

NAME	AFFILIATION
B. H. Cherry	GPUSC
T. R. Robbins	GPUSC (Pickard Lowe & Assoc.)
N. G. Trikouros	GPUSC
L. G. Steves	Exxon Nuclear Co.
K. P. Galbraith	Exxon Nuclear Co.
R. F. Denning	GPUSC
W. B. Hardin	AEC, L
K. O. E. Fickeissen	JCP&L
G. R. Bond	GPUSC
V. P. Zodiaco	GPUSC
R. E. Collingham	Exxon Nuclear Co.
L. S. Rubenstein	AEC, L
T. V. Wambach	AEC, L
W. Minners	AEC, L
G. N. Lauben	AEC, L
R. W. Reid	AEC, L
T. J. Carter	AEC, L
R. Lobel	AEC, L
W. S. Nechodom	ENC
A. R. Rosztoczy	AEC, L
G. A. Sofer	ENC