



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555-0001

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION  
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 112 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-29  
ENTERGY OPERATIONS, INC., ET AL.  
GRAND GULF NUCLEAR STATION, UNIT 1  
DOCKET NO. 50-416

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated April 21, 1993, the licensee (Entergy Operations, Inc.), submitted a request for changes to the Grand Gulf Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1 (GGNS) license. The requested change would delete License Condition 2.C(36), Attachment 1, Item (c)(4) which implemented the requirements of Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.97, "Instrumentation For Light-Water-Cooled Nuclear Power Plants to Access Plant and Environs Conditions During and Following an Accident," for the GGNS since analysis shows that these requirements are being met by alternative methods.

2.0 BACKGROUND

Amendment No. 94 to the Grand Gulf operating license requires that the licensee implement the requirements of RG 1.97, with regard to neutron flux monitoring, in a manner consistent with the resolution of the BWR Owners Group (BWROG) appeal of the NRC Staff's January 29, 1990, safety evaluation report on BWROG Licensing Topical Report NEDO-31558. The staff's safety evaluation related to Amendment No. 94 further concluded that the existing neutron flux monitoring instrumentation was acceptable for interim use while the NRC staff completed its review of the BWROG appeal of the RG 1.79 requirements.

By letter dated January 13, 1993, the NRC staff informed the BRWOG that for currently licensed boiling water reactors, the alternate criteria of NEDO-31558 provide an acceptable method for meeting the staff's neutron flux monitoring instrumentation requirements in lieu of RG 1.97.

By letter dated March 15, 1993, the licensee submitted its plant specific assessment of the criteria of NEDO-31558-A to the staff for review. By letter dated February 17, 1994, the staff concluded that the post-accident neutron flux monitoring instrumentation at the GGNS meets the criteria of NEDO-31558 and is, therefore, an acceptable alternative to the guidance in RG 1.97.

9403110248 940307  
PDR ADOCK 05000416  
P PDR

### 3.0 EVALUATION

Grand Gulf License Condition 2.C(36), Attachment 1, Item (c)(4) requires that the licensee implement the requirements of R.G. 1.97 core flux monitoring in a manner consistent with the resolution of the BWROG appeal of the staff's January 29, 1990, safety evaluation report on BWROG Topical Report NEDO-38558. The staff has completed its review of the BWROG appeal and by letter dated January 13, 1993, concluded that Topical Report NEDO-31558 provides an acceptable alternative to the guidance in RG 1.97.

By letter dated March 15, 1993, the licensee submitted an evaluation that compared the Grand Gulf Neutron Monitoring System to the acceptable alternative contained in the BWROG Topical Report approved by the staff, NEDO-31558-A. By letter dated February 17, 1994, the staff determined that the post-accident neutron flux monitoring instrumentation at the GGNS meets the criteria of NEDO-31558 and is, therefore an acceptable alternative to the guidance in RG 1.97.

Based on the above evaluation, the staff concludes that the licensee has satisfied the requirements of License Condition 2.C(36), Attachment 1, Item (c)(4) and that the deletion of this license condition is acceptable.

### 4.0 STATE CONSULTATION

In accordance with the Commission's regulations, the Mississippi State official was notified of the proposed issuance of the amendment. The State official had no comments.

### 5.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

The amendment changes a requirement with respect to installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. The NRC staff has determined that the amendment involves no significant increase in the amounts, and no significant change in the types, of any effluents that may be released offsite, and that there is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. The Commission has previously issued a proposed finding that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, and there has been no public comment on such finding (58 FR 28056). Accordingly, the amendment meets the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(9). Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the issuance of the amendment.

### 6.0 CONCLUSION

The Commission has concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations,

and (3) the issuance of the amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributor: P. O'Connor

Date: March 7, 1994