

November 8, 2001

Mr. John T. Herron  
Vice President Operations  
Entergy Operations, Inc.  
17265 River Road  
Killona, LA 70066-0751

SUBJECT: WATERFORD STEAM ELECTRIC STATION, UNIT 3 - REQUEST FOR  
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION RELATED TO TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION  
CHANGE REGARDING APPENDIX K MARGIN RECOVERY - POWER  
UPRATE REQUEST (TAC NO. MB2971)

Dear Mr. Herron:

By letter dated September 21, 2001, Entergy Operations, Inc. proposed changes to the Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3 (Waterford 3) Technical Specifications, which would allow an increase in the rated thermal power of Waterford 3 from 3,390 megawatts thermal (MWt) to 3,441 MWt.

After reviewing your request, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff has determined that additional information is required to complete the review. On November 5, 2001, we discussed this information with your staff by telephone and they agreed to provide the additional information requested in the enclosure within 30 days of receipt of this letter.

If you have any questions, please call me at (301) 415-1480.

Sincerely,

*/RA/*

N. Kalyanam, Project Manager, Section 1  
Project Directorate IV  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-382

Enclosure: Request for Additional Information

cc: See next page

November 8, 2001

Mr. John T. Herron  
Vice President Operations  
Entergy Operations, Inc.  
17265 River Road  
Killona, LA 70066-0751

SUBJECT: WATERFORD STEAM ELECTRIC STATION, UNIT 3 - REQUEST FOR  
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION RELATED TO TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION  
CHANGE REGARDING APPENDIX K MARGIN RECOVERY - POWER  
UPRATE REQUEST (TAC NO. MB2971)

Dear Mr. Herron:

By letter dated September 21, 2001, Entergy Operations, Inc. proposed changes to the Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3 (Waterford 3) Technical Specifications, which would allow an increase in the rated thermal power of Waterford 3 from 3,390 megawatts thermal (MWt) to 3,441 MWt.

After reviewing your request, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff has determined that additional information is required to complete the review. On November 5, 2001, we discussed this information with your staff by telephone and they agreed to provide the additional information requested in the enclosure within 30 days of receipt of this letter.

If you have any questions, please call me at (301) 415-1480.

Sincerely, **/RA/**

N. Kalyanam, Project Manager, Section 1  
Project Directorate IV  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-382

Enclosure: Request for Additional Information

cc: See next page

DISTRIBUTION

PUBLIC	PDIV-1 r/f	Rids OgcRp
RidsAcrsAcnwACRS	RidsNrrDlpmLpdiv1 (RGramm)	RidsNrrPMNKalyanam
RidsNrrLADJohnson	RidsRgn4MailCenter (KBrockman)	M. Hart

Accession No.: ML013120439

OFFICE	PDIV-1/PM	PDIV-1/LA	PDIV-1/SC
NAME	NKalyanam	DJohnson	RGramm
DATE	11/7/01	11/7/01	11/8/01

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

ENTERGY OPERATIONS, INC.

WATERFORD STEAM ELECTRIC STATION, UNIT 3

A. Radiological Consequences:

1. On page 3-81 of attachment 2 to your letter dated September 21, 2001, you state that current design constraints limit the hot rod radial peaking factor to lower than the maximum assumed in the accident analyses. What value was assumed for the maximum radial peaking factor in determining the radiological source term for non-loss of coolant accident fuel failure events? To what value is the hot rod radial peaking factor limited by the current fuel design constraints?

B. Electrical:

1. Please provide details about the grid stability analysis including major assumptions and results and conclusions of the analysis.
2. Please provide the output in megawatts electrical corresponding to 3,390 Megawatts thermal (MWt) and 3,441 MWt.
3. The initial conditions and assumptions for a station blackout (SBO) under power uprate (3,441 MWt) condition shall include an operating history of 100 days at 101.5 percent power conditions. Clarify that the assumption used for the maximum decay heat for SBO analysis is for power uprate condition.
4. Section 3.11.3.1, does not provide any conclusion regarding the impact of equipment qualification of equipment located outside the containment due to power uprate. Please provide a discussion about the equipment qualification of equipment located outside the containment due to power uprate.
5. Section 3.9.2, there is no mention of adequacy of equipment terminal voltages. Please provide a discussion about the adequacy of equipment terminal voltages (safety and non-safety loads) due to power uprate.
6. Section 4.3, states that "Other elements of the SBO analysis have not significantly changed." Please provide details about the battery margins both before and after power uprate.

Waterford Generating Station 3

cc:

Mr. Michael E. Henry, Administrator  
and State Liaison Officer  
Department of Environmental Quality  
P. O. Box 82135  
Baton Rouge, LA 70884-2135

Vice President, Operations Support  
Entergy Operations, Inc.  
P. O. Box 31995  
Jackson, MS 39286-1995

Director  
Nuclear Safety Assurance  
Entergy Operations, Inc.  
17265 River Road  
Killona, LA 70066-0751

Wise, Carter, Child & Caraway  
P. O. Box 651  
Jackson, MS 39205

General Manager Plant Operations  
Waterford 3 SES  
Entergy Operations, Inc.  
17265 River Road  
Killona, LA 70066-0751

Licensing Manager  
Entergy Operations, Inc.  
17265 River Road  
Killona, LA 70066-0751

Winston & Strawn  
1400 L Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3502

Resident Inspector/Waterford NPS  
P. O. Box 822  
Killona, LA 70066-0751

Regional Administrator, Region IV  
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
611 Ryan Plaza Drive, Suite 1000  
Arlington, TX 76011

Parish President Council  
St. Charles Parish  
P. O. Box 302  
Hahnville, LA 70057

Executive Vice-President  
and Chief Operating Officer  
Entergy Operations, Inc.  
P. O. Box 31995  
Jackson, MS 39286-1995

Chairman  
Louisiana Public Services Commission  
Baton Rouge, LA 70825-1697