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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 93 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 May 30, 1991, the licensee (Entergy Operations, Inc.), submitted a request for changes to the Grand Gulf Nuclear Station, Unit 1 (GGNS) Technical Specifications (TS). The requested changes would delete from the TS several references to operation of the Reactor Recirculation System in the Non-Loop Manual (automatic) mode of flow control.

2.0 EVALUATION

The Reactor Flow Control system was originally capable of controlling the two-loop flow control valves either individually in Loop Manual (manual) flow control or together in Non-Loop Manual (automatic) flow control. The automatic mode was comprised of circuitry that adjusted total core flow by simultaneous signals to both valves. The adjustments maintained a desired turbine-generator output, reactor neutron flux level, or total recirculation drive flow as selected by the operator.

During the fourth Refueling Outage, in accordance with 10 CFR 50.59, the licensee implemented a design change that permanently disabled the automatic mode of flow control. The automatic mode was removed by installing wiring in the circuitry that prevents transferring the flow control system out of the Loop Manual mode under any circumstances.

There are no TS operating conditions or actions requiring the availability of the automatic mode of flow control. Both operating modes are unique and function independently of each other. The choice of operating in the automatic or manual modes is based on the preference of the operator. As this is a non-safety related system and with the automatic mode permanently disabled, references to and inferences from this mode are unnecessary and potentially misleading. The revisions to the TS remove these references and inferences and include removal of thermal operating limit curves strictly associated with the automatic mode of operation.

The staff concludes that these changes are not safety-significant and are acceptable.

3.0 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.

4.0 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 and changes surveillance requirements. 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 (56 FR 31433). Accordingly, the amendment meets the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 FR 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.

5.0 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: R. Twigg

Date: March 9, 1992