UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

June 24, 2013

Vice President, Operations
Entergy Operations, Inc.
Grand Gulf Nuclear Station
P.O. Box 756
Port Gibson, MS 39150

SUBJECT: GRAND GULF NUCLEAR STATION, UNIT 1 - CORRECTION TO AMENDMENT NO. 188, RE: POWER RANGE NEUTRON MONITORING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT (TAC NO. ME2531)

Dear Sir or Madam:

By letter dated March 28, 2012, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) issued Amendment No. 188 to Facility Operating License No. NPF-29 for the Grand Gulf Nuclear Station, Unit 1 (GGNS). The safety evaluation for Amendment No. 188 contains proprietary information and, therefore, has been withheld from public disclosure. A public version of the safety evaluation is available in the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) at Accession No. ML120400319.

The amendment was in response to your application dated November 3, 2009, as supplemented by letters dated February 8, 2010, May 18, 2010, June 3, 2010, June 18, 2010, July 29, 2010, September 29, 2010, December 13, 2010, December 14, 2010, May 3, 2011, May 16, 2011, May 26, 2011, May 31, 2011, June 13, 2011, June 28, 2011, July 22, 2011, September 28, 2011, October 18, 2011, October 26, 2011, November 8, 2011, and December 1, 2011. The amendment revised the Technical Specifications (TSs) to reflect replacement of the existing Average Power Range Monitor (APRM) subsystem of the Neutron Monitoring System with a digital General Electric - Hitachi Nuclear Measurement Analysis and Control (NUMAC) Power Range Neutron Monitoring System (PRNMS).

By letter dated May 22, 2013 (ADAMS Accession No. ML13150A008), the licensee informed the NRC staff that by letter April 9, 2013, General Electric - Hitachi (GEH) informed Entergy Operations, Inc. (Entergy, the licensee), that it had identified errors in the response to Request for Additional Information (RAI) 18 in Entergy's letter dated May 26, 2011 (Reference 12 of the NRC staff's safety evaluation dated March 28, 2012). It should be noted that Reference 12 is no longer the correct reference for RAI 18 and has been superseded by the May 22, 2013, letter. Entergy has stated that the errors do not affect the original conclusion that Staff Positions 1.19 and 1.20 are met and that the original conclusions remain valid.

The Enclosure to this letter contains Proprietary Information. When separated from the Enclosure, this letter is DECONTROLLED.

The NRC staff has reviewed the May 22, 2013, letter and determined the following:

With regard to Position 1.19 of DI&C-ISG-04, the NRC staff's conclusions contained in Amendment No. 188 that relate to RAI 18's response address the demonstration of adequate digital communications bandwidth. Pages 2 and 3 of the revised RAI 18 response changed values relating to bandwidth utilization of digital communications when addressing Staff Position 1.19 of DI&C-ISG-04. The revised values reflect a slight increase in theoretical maximum bandwidth utilization and a slight reduction on nominal bandwidth utilization. The increase in bandwidth utilization is associated with a single data message (Stability/Power Data).

The NRC staff used the previously docketed information to determine that the analysis demonstrated that the bandwidth of each communication link is adequate for its respective message transmission protocol. After reviewing the revised RAI 18 response, the NRC staff has determined that the original NRC staff conclusion that the "analysis demonstrated that the bandwidth of each communication link is adequate for its respective message transmission protocol" remains valid based on two factors. First, the revised values do not represent a material increase in maximum bandwidth utilization. Second, the revised values continue to represent a small percentage (less than 5 percent) of the available bandwidth; therefore, the increase does not challenge the digital communication protocol.

With regard to Staff Position 1.20 of DI&C-ISG-04, page 5 of the revised RAI 18 response includes an administrative change to refer to the original RAI 20 response in place of "as in this attachment." Therefore, the licensee did not change technical information regarding its prior response to address Staff Position 1.20 of DI&C-ISG-04. The NRC staff has concluded that this change is administrative in nature rather than technical and, therefore, it does not alter the basis of the NRC staff's prior safety evaluation.

The NRC staff has determined that page 60 of the safety evaluation needs to be revised to reflect the revised RAI 18 response. Enclosed is the corrected page 60 (proprietary) to the SE of Amendment No. 188, as discussed above.

Sincerely,

Alan Wang

Alan B. Wang, Project Manager
Plant Licensing Branch IV
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-416

Enclosure:
As stated

cc w/o Enclosure: Distribution via Listserv

The NRC staff has reviewed the May 22, 2013, letter and determined the following:

With regard to Position 1.19 of DI&C-ISG-04, the NRC staff's conclusions contained in Amendment No. 188 that relate to RAI 18's response address the demonstration of adequate digital communications bandwidth. Pages 2 and 3 of the revised RAI 18 response changed values relating to bandwidth utilization of digital communications when addressing Staff Position 1.19 of DI&C-ISG-04. The revised values reflect a slight increase in theoretical maximum bandwidth utilization and a slight reduction on nominal bandwidth utilization. The increase in bandwidth utilization is associated with a single data message (Stability/Power Data).

The NRC staff used the previously docketed information to determine that the analysis demonstrated that the bandwidth of each communication link is adequate for its respective message transmission protocol. After reviewing the revised RAI 18 response, the NRC staff has determined that the original NRC staff conclusion that the "analysis demonstrated that the bandwidth of each communication link is adequate for its respective message transmission protocol" remains valid based on two factors. First, the revised values do not represent a material increase in maximum bandwidth utilization. Second, the revised values continue to represent a small percentage (less than 5 percent) of the available bandwidth; therefore, the increase does not challenge the digital communication protocol.

With regard to Staff Position 1.20 of DI&C-ISG-04, page 5 of the revised RAI 18 response includes an administrative change to refer to the original RAI 20 response in place of "as in this attachment." Therefore, the licensee did not change technical information regarding its prior response to address Staff Position 1.20 of DI&C-ISG-04. The NRC staff has concluded that this change is administrative in nature rather than technical and, therefore, it does not alter the basis of the NRC staff's prior safety evaluation.

The NRC staff has determined that page 60 of the safety evaluation needs to be revised to reflect the revised RAI 18 response. Enclosed is the corrected page 60 (proprietary) to the SE of Amendment No. 188, as discussed above.

Sincerely,
/ RA /
Alan B. Wang, Project Manager
Plant Licensing Branch IV
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-416

Enclosure:
As stated

cc w/o Enclosure: Distribution via Listserv

DISTRIBUTION:

LPLIV r/f	RidsNrrDorlLpl4 Resource	RidsNrrLAJBurkhardt Resource	KBucholtz, NRR/DSS/STSB
RidsAcrsAcnw_MailCTR Resource	RidsNrrDraAhpb Resource	RidsNrrPMGrandGulf Resource	GLapinsky, NRR/DRA/AHPB
RidsNrrDeEicb Resource	RidsNrrDssSrxb Resource	RidsRgn4MailCenter Resource	
RidsNrrDorlDpr Resource	RidsNrrDssStsb Resource	BDittman, NRR/DE/EICB	

ADAMS Accession No. (PROPRIETARY) ML13149A203 (REDACTED) ML13449A225

OFFICE	NRR/DORL/LPL4/PM	NRR/DORL/LPL4/LA	NRR/DE/EICB/BC	NRR/DORL/LPL4/BC	NRR/DORL/LPL4/PM
NAME	AWang	JBurkhardt	JThorp	MMarkley	AWang
DATE	6/3/13	5/31/13	6/3/13	6/7/2013	6/24/2013

OFFICIAL AGENCY RECORD