

Mr. Jerry W. Yelverton
Vice President, Operations AND
Entergy Operations, Inc.
1448 S. R. 333
Russellville, AR 72801

December 2, 1995

SUBJECT: ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT NO. 173 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE
NO. NPF-6 - ARKANSAS NUCLEAR ONE, UNIT NO. 2 (TAC NO. M92970)

Dear Mr. Yelverton:

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 173 to Facility Operating License No. NPF-6 for the Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit No. 2 (ANO-2). This amendment consists of changes to the Technical Specifications (TSs) in response to your application dated July 19, 1995.

The amendment reduces requirements associated with the exercise frequency of control element assemblies from once per 31 days to once per 92 days.

A copy of our related Safety Evaluation is also enclosed. A Notice of Issuance will be included in the Commission's next biweekly Federal Register notice.

Sincerely,

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY:
George Kalman, Senior Project Manager
Project Directorate IV-1
Division of Reactor Projects III/IV
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-368

Enclosures: 1. Amendment No. 173 to NPF-6
2. Safety Evaluation

cc w/encls: See next page

DISTRIBUTION:

Docket File	PUBLIC	PD4-1 r/f
J. Roe	PNoonan	ACRS
OGC(15B18)	G. Hill (2)	J. Dyer, RIV
C. Grimes (11E22)	G. Kalman	M. Chatterton
L. Hurley, RIV	J. Kilcrease, RIV File Room	

Document Name: AR292970.AMD

OFC	(A)LA/PD4-1	PM/PD4-1	OGC NID
NAME	PNoonan	GKalman/vw	M20964
DATE	12/13/95	12/17/95	21/1/95
COPY	(YES/NO)	YES/NO	YES/NO

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

9512280228 951222
PDR ADOCK 05000368
P PDR

2 F01
111



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

December 22, 1995

Mr. Jerry W. Yelverton
Vice President, Operations AND
Entergy Operations, Inc.
1448 S. R. 333
Russellville, AR 72801

SUBJECT: ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT NO. 173 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE
NO. NPF-6 - ARKANSAS NUCLEAR ONE, UNIT NO. 2 (TAC NO. M92970)

Dear Mr. Yelverton:

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 173 to Facility Operating License No. NPF-6 for the Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit No. 2 (ANO-2). This amendment consists of changes to the Technical Specifications (TSs) in response to your application dated July 19, 1995.

The amendment reduces requirements associated with the exercise frequency of control element assemblies from once per 31 days to once per 92 days.

A copy of our related Safety Evaluation is also enclosed. A Notice of Issuance will be included in the Commission's next biweekly Federal Register notice.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "George Kalman", is written over the typed name.

George Kalman, Senior Project Manager
Project Directorate IV-1
Division of Reactor Projects III/IV
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-368

Enclosures: 1. Amendment No. 173 to NPF-6
2. Safety Evaluation

cc w/enc's: See next page

Mr. Jerry W. Yelverton
Entergy Operations, Inc.

Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit 2

cc:

Mr. Harry W. Keiser, Executive Vice
President & Chief Operating Officer
Entergy Operations, Inc.
P. O. Box 31995
Jackson, MS 39286-1995

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

Ms. Greta Dicus, Director
Division of Radiation Control
and Emergency Management
Arkansas Department of Health
4815 West Markham Street
Little Rock, AR 72205-3867

Mr. Robert B. McGehee
Wise, Carter, Child & Caraway
P. O. Box 651
Jackson, MS 39205

Mr. Nicholas S. Reynolds
Winston & Strawn
1400 L Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3502

Mr. Robert B. Borsum, Manager
Rockville Nuclear Licensing
B&W Nuclear Technologies
1700 Rockville Pike, Suite 525
Rockville, MD 20852

Senior Resident Inspector
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
P. O. Box 310
London, AR 72847

Regional Administrator, Region IV
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
611 Ryan Plaza Drive, Suite 400
Arlington, TX 76011-8064

County Judge of Pope County
Pope County Courthouse
Russellville, AR 72801



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

ENTERGY OPERATIONS, INC.

DOCKET NO. 50-368

ARKANSAS NUCLEAR ONE, UNIT NO. 2

AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 173
License No. NPF-6

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has found that:
 - A. The application for amendment by Entergy Operations, Inc. (the licensee) dated July 19, 1995, complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations set forth in 10 CFR Chapter I;
 - B. The facility will operate in conformity with the application, the provisions of the Act, and the rules and regulations of the Commission;
 - C. There is reasonable assurance: (i) that the activities authorized by this amendment can be conducted without endangering the health and safety of the public, and (ii) that such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations;
 - D. The issuance of this license amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public; and
 - E. The issuance of this amendment is in accordance with 10 CFR Part 51 of the Commission's regulations and all applicable requirements have been satisfied.

9512280232 951222
PDR ADOCK 05000368
P PDR


2. Accordingly, the license is amended by changes to the Technical Specifications as indicated in the attachment to this license amendment, and Paragraph 2.C.(2) of Facility Operating License No. NPF-6 is hereby amended to read as follows:

2. Technical Specifications

The Technical Specifications contained in Appendix A, as revised through Amendment No. 173, are hereby incorporated in the license. The licensee shall operate the facility in accordance with the Technical Specifications.

3. The license amendment is effective as of the date of issuance, to be implemented within 30 days.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION


George Kalman, Senior Project Manager
Project Directorate IV-1
Division of Reactor Projects III/IV
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Attachment: Changes to the Technical
Specifications

Date of Issuance: December 22, 1995

ATTACHMENT TO LICENSE AMENDMENT NO. 173

FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-6

DOCKET NO. 50-368

Revise the following page of the Appendix "A" Technical Specifications with the attached page. The revised page is identified by Amendment number and contains a vertical line to indicate the area of change.

REMOVE PAGES

3/4 1-19

INSERT PAGES

3/4 1-19

REACTIVITY CONTROL SYSTEMS

ACTION: (Continued)

- g. With more than one CEA trippable but misaligned from any other CEA in its group by more than 19 inches (indicated position), be in at least HOT STANDBY within 6 hours.

SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS

4.1.3.1.1 The position of each CEA shall be determined to be within 7 inches (indicated position) of all other CEAs in its group at least once per 12 hours.

4.1.3.1.2 Each CEA not fully inserted in the core shall be determined to be OPERABLE by movement of at least 5 inches in any one direction at least once per 92 days.



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 173 TO

FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-6

ENTERGY OPERATIONS, INC.

ARKANSAS NUCLEAR ONE, UNIT NO. 2

DOCKET NO. 50-368

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated July 19, 1995, Entergy Operations, Inc., requested revisions to the Surveillance Requirement 4.1.3.1.2 of the Technical Specifications (TSs) for Arkansas Nuclear One-Unit 2 (ANO-2). This proposed change modifies the Control Element Assembly (CEA) exercise frequency from at least once per 31 days to at least once per 92 days in accordance with Generic Letter (GL) 93-05, "Line-Item Technical Specifications Improvements to Reduce Surveillance Requirements for Testing During Power Operation," dated September 27, 1993.

The current ANO-2 TS Surveillance Requirement 4.1.3.1.2 requires each full length CEA not fully inserted and each part length CEA which is inserted in the core to be determined operable by movement of at least five inches in any one direction at least every 31 days. This test demonstrates the proper operation of the control element drive mechanism (CEDM), but more importantly verifies that the CEAs are not mechanically bound.

2.0 EVALUATION

Control rod motion testing was reviewed as part of the evaluation of power testing requirements. NUREG-1366 determined that electrical problems with the control rod drive system were the major contributor to rod motion failure. Mechanical problems were found to be less common than electrical problems. Most stuck rods were discovered during rod drop testing or during plant startup after refueling. Based on the generic evaluation it was concluded in GL 93-05 that the surveillance interval for control rod motion testing could be increased to once every 92 days without any decrease in plant safety.

The ANO-2 experience of CEA malfunctions has been similar to that of the industry. ANO-2 has not identified any stuck rods during routine surveillance testing. However, performance of the CEA exercise test has caused reactor trips and dropped and slipped CEAs. These problems are primarily due to electrical failures of the complex CEA control systems. These electrical problems would not prevent insertion of a CEA into the core when the reactor trip breakers were opened. Mechanical failures which would result in less than full insertion of a CEA upon reactor trip are very significant, but are much less common and have not been found during testing.

The maintenance practices at ANO-2 to detect and repair control element drive mechanism control system problems prior to the performance of any planned CEA movement have been successful in reducing the CEDM initiated transients during CEA surveillance testing. However, because of the NUREG-1366 findings that most stuck rods have been discovered during physics testing or during plant startup, instead of during surveillance testing and the fact that the ANO-2 experience reflects these findings, reducing the test frequency at ANO-2 is desirable.

3.0 TECHNICAL CONCLUSION

Based on the staff evaluation in Section 2.0 above, the staff concludes that the proposed TS change is acceptable. This change is also consistent with the Standard Technical Specifications. We have 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, and (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations, and issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

4.0 STATE CONSULTATION

In accordance with the Commission's regulations, the Arkansas 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 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 (60 FR 52929). 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: M. Chatterton

Date: December 22, 1995