



RECEIVED

Entergy Operations, Inc.
1340 Echelon Parkway
Jackson, Mississippi 39213-8298
Tel 601-368-5758

2004 JUN 17 AM 8:42

F. G. Burford
Acting Director
Nuclear Safety & Licensing

Rules and Directives
Branch
USNRC

CNRO-2004-00037

June 10, 2004

Mr. Michael T. Lesar
Chief, Rules and Directives Branch
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: T-6 D59
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington DC 20555-0001

4/19/04
69 FR 20953
(3)

SUBJECT: Solicitation of Public Comments on the Report on the Independent Verification of the Mitigating Systems Performance Index (MSPI) Results for the Pilot Plants

Dear Mr. Lesar:

Entergy Corporation is please to submit the following comments on the subject report, as requested by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in the *Federal Register* on Monday, April 19, 2004 (69 *Fed. Reg.* 20953).

While Entergy was not a pilot in the MSPI effort completed last year, we have closely followed MSPI with great interest and look forward to the implementation of the MSPI. Entergy views the MSPI as a superior replacement for the current Safety System Unavailability (SSU) performance indicator.

Regarding the subject report:

- We endorse the comments of the Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) provided under separate correspondence. The recommendations provided in the report regarding front stops and back stops are sound and should minimize false positive and false negative indications.
- We understand some of the Staff's reluctance to roll out MSPI without the application of the Significance Determination Process (SDP) in conjunction with or parallel with the MSPI. If the SDP's are to be used in this fashion, we hope this parallel use is short lived due to the burden associated with SDP.
- We understand the Staff's concern with the adequacy of a licensee's PRA model as applied to MSPI and possible differences between the licensee's model and the NRC's model (SPAR). Regarding the second aspect, the pilot demonstrated that SPAR/PRA differences were understandable and could be generalized in many respects and applied to non-pilot plants. Entergy does not consider these differences to be a significant barrier to MSPI implementation. The question of the adequacy of licensee' PRA models is not a valid standard for judging the adequacy of MSPI and should be addressed exclusive of MSPI.

ERFS = ADM-03
Cald = D. Dube (DAD3)

Template = ADM-013

- Finally, the report noted a concern on how to treat external events. Entergy believes MSPI is adequate as is without trying to develop a "fix" that incorporates external event contributors. A great deal of effort was spent effort in addressing common cause and additional effort is still needed there. Including external event contributors in MSPI would be laudable if it could be done efficiently, but enough time has already been spent developing an indicator that has been shown to be superior to the current indicator.

The opportunity to comment on this report is appreciated. If there are questions on these comments, please do not hesitate to contact me at the number above or Rick Thomas at 601-368-5747.

Sincerely,



FGB/RLT/bal

cc: Mr. M. A. Balduzzi (PIL)
Mr. W. R. Campbell (ECH)
Mr. F. R. Dacimo (IPEC)
Mr. J. P. DeRoy (ECH)
Mr. J. S. Forbes (ANO)
Mr. P. D. Hinnenkamp (RBS)
Mr. M. R. Kansler (WPO)
Mr. J. Knubel (WPO)
Mr. J. R. McGaha (ECH)
Mr. T. A. Sullivan (JAF)
Mr. G. J. Taylor (ECH)
Mr. J. K. Thayer (VY)
Mr. J. E. Venable (W-3)
Mr. G. A. Williams (GGNS)

Mr. T. W. Alexion, NRR Project Manager (ANO-1)
Mr. R. B. Ennis, NRR Project Manager (VY)
Mr. D. G. Holland, NRR Project Manager (ANO-2)
Mr. N. Kalyanam, NRR Project Manager (WF3)
Mr. B. S. Mallett, Administrator (RIV)
Mr. P. D. Millano, NRR Project Manager (IPEC)
Mr. H. J. Miller, Administrator (Region I)
Mr. T. L. Tate, NRR Project Manager (PNPS)
Mr. B. K. Vaidya, NRR Project Manager (GGNS)
Mr. G. S. Vissing, NRR Project Manager (JAF)
Mr. M. K. Webb, NRR Project Manager (RBS & IPEC1)