

U. S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
OFFICE OF INSPECTION AND ENFORCEMENT
REGION IV

Report Nos. 50-313/78-02; 50-368/78-02

Docket Nos. 50-313
50-368

License No. DPR-51
Construction Permit No. CPPR-89

Licensee: Arkansas Power & Light Company
P. O. Box 551
Little Rock, Arkansas 72203

Facility Name: Arkansas Nuclear One, Units 1 and 2

Inspection At: Corporate Office, Little Rock, Arkansas

Meeting Conducted: January 31, 1978

Conducted By:

E. Morris Howard
E. Morris Howard, Director

2/7/78
Date

G. L. Madsen
G. L. Madsen, Chief, Reactor Operations &
Nuclear Support Branch

2/7/78
Date

Summary:

Meeting on January 31, 1978 (Report Nos. 50-313/78-02; 50-368/78-02)

Scheduled meeting to discuss IE/AP&L interface experience and concerns. The meeting involved four (4) hours at the corporate office by two (2) NRC personnel.

Results: No items of noncompliance were identified.

8004140671

DETAILS

1. Meeting Attendance

Arkansas Power and Light Company

W. Cavanaugh III, Executive Director, Generation & Construction
D. A. Rueter, Director of Technical & Environmental Services
D. R. Sikes, Director of Operations

Nuclear Regulatory Commission

E. M. Howard, Director, Region IV
G. L. Madsen, Chief, Reactor Operations and Nuclear Support Branch, RIV

2. Purpose of Meeting

Discussion of Inspection and Enforcement and Arkansas Power and Light interface experiences and problems.

3. Topics Discussed

- a. The results of the recent GAO audit.
- b. The timeliness and content of responses to IE Bulletins.
- c. The timeliness of completion of 30 day LER reports.
- d. Problems associated with the constantly changing scheduled fuel loading date for ANO-2.
- e. Status of completion of ANO-2 test and operating procedures.
- f. The fuel inspection program for receipt of new fuel, during reshuffling of fuel at ANO-1, and Cycle 1 fuel to be used in the Cycle 3 operation of ANO-1.
- g. The need for more comprehensive responses to Notice of Violation letters. The experience regarding timeliness and incomplete status of previous correspondence was reviewed.
- h. The concern relating to the 24 addenda to the approved Hot Functional Test procedure, which did not receive the same depth of review as the original procedure.