

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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 7 TO FACILITY LICENSE NO. DPR-51

CHANGE NO. 7 TO THE TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS

ARKANSAS POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

ARKANSAS NUCLEAR ONE - UNIT 1

DOCKET NO. 50-313

INTRODUCTION

By letter dated October 7, 1975, Arkansas Power & Light Company (AP&L) requested an amendment to Facility License No. DPR-51 for Arkansas Nuclear One - Unit 1 (ANO-1). The request involves revisions to the Technical Specifications with regard to:

1. Establishing operating bands for the level and chemical concentration for the Borated Water Storage tank, the Sodium Thiosulfate tank, and the Sodium Hydroxide tank.
2. Shifting the emergency pond level specification and surveillance requirement from pond surface elevation and pond depth to pond depth only plus providing a time interval during which the minimum pond depth need not be maintained; and
3. Changing the tendon surveillance frequency requirement to be consistent with Regulatory Guide 1.35, Revision 1 (June 1974).

This evaluation concerns only item 3 above. Items 1 and 2 are unrelated and they will be evaluated at a later date.

DISCUSSION

The current Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff position regarding the inservice inspection of prestressed concrete (ungrouted tendon) reactor compartments is stated in Regulatory Guide 1.35, Revision 1 (June 1974), "Inservice Inspection of Ungrouted Tendons in Prestressed Concrete Containment Structures." This revision replaced the original Regulatory Guide 1.35, dated February 5, 1973. These guides differ in the following areas:

8004180610

1. Revision 1 changes the tendon test frequency from 1, 2 and 3 years after the initial containment structural test (ICST), and every 5 years thereafter to 1, 3 and 5 years after the ICST and every 5 years thereafter.
2. The revision permits a reduction in the number of tendons tested if experience shows that there are no significant problems with the prestressing tendons, and
3. The revision alters the reporting requirements for defective or degraded tendons or anchorage hardware to conform with Regulatory Guide 1.16.

The ANO-1 specification and test procedure concerning containment tendons are found in Technical Specification 4.4.2.1 of Appendix A to Facility License DPR-51 and ANO-1 Operating Procedure No. 1304.91, Revision 1 (February 21, 1975), respectively.

#### EVALUATION

The ANO-1 tendon surveillance provisions set forth in Technical Specification 4.4.2.1 and Operating Procedure No. 1304.91, Revision 1 differ from the current NRC staff position on ungrouted tendon surveillance (Regulatory Guide 1.35, Revision 1), in the following respects:

1. The testing frequency corresponds to that of the original Regulatory Guide 1.35 (February 1973).
2. No provision is made to reduce the number of tendons to be tested as provided in Revision 1 to Regulatory Guide 1.35.
3. The reporting requirements differ from both the original and Revision 1 to Regulatory Guide 1.35 in that a tendon surveillance test report is required to be submitted following every test vice just those tests which uncover degraded tendons or associated equipment. The remainder of the reporting requirements for tendon surveillance are stipulated in Technical Specifications 1.8.5 and 6.12.3.1 (definition and reporting of abnormal events involving degradation of containment boundaries). Specification 6.12.4(b) requires a written report within 90 days after completing the tendon surveillance tests.

We find that the present ANO-1 tendon surveillance specifications discussed in items 2 and 3 above are more conservative than the requirements set forth in Regulatory Guide 1.35, Revision 1. Since the requested testing frequency of the tendon surveillance is equivalent to that required by the Regulatory Guide and since the remaining tendon surveillance requirements presently in effect are more conservative than the Regulatory Guide, we conclude that the requested change is acceptable.

CONCLUSIONS

We have concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) because the change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of accidents previously considered and does not involve a significant decrease in a safety margin, the change does not involve a significant hazards consideration, (2) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, and (3) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations and the issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Date: NOV 20 1975