



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION  
SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 25 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-51

ARKANSAS POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

ARKANSAS NUCLEAR ONE - UNIT 1

DOCKET NO. 50-313

Introduction

By letter dated April 15, 1976, Arkansas Power & Light Company (AP&L) requested an extension of the first "refueling period" for Arkansas Nuclear One - Unit 1 (ANO-1). The ANO-1 Technical Specifications defined "refueling period" as the time between normal refuelings of the reactor, not to exceed 24 months without prior approval of the AEC (NRC). Because ANO-1 had been shutdown for several extended periods during the first fuel cycle, AP&L therefore requested a 6-month extension to accumulate operating time prior to the first refueling outage.

By letter dated May 13, 1976, the NRC informed AP&L that the "refueling period" definition applied solely to the frequency of certain surveillance tests and was not intended to limit the fuel cycle period. Our letter also stated that revision and clarification of the ANO-1 Technical Specifications was necessary and that we would provide further guidance. Such guidance was forwarded by our June 7, 1976 letter.

AP&L replied by letter dated September 30, 1976, which forwarded requested changes to clarify the Technical Specification requirements.

Discussion and Evaluation

AP&L's requested changes to the ANO-1 Technical Specifications would delete certain references to "refueling period", "refueling outage", and "refueling shutdown", and would replace these phrases with established intervals between required surveillance. This would fulfill the requirements of our June 7, 1976 letter and is therefore acceptable. There are no new safety considerations associated with these changes.

Technical Specification paragraph 4, SURVEILLANCE STANDARDS, has been changed as requested in our June 7, 1976 letter, with the exception that, at AP&L's request, the "minus 25 percent" provision shall remain. This provision adds additional flexibility to accommodate schedules, and is therefore acceptable.

Other changes have been made to correct typographical errors in specifications and bases and to delete references to required initial testing which has already been accomplished. These changes do not alter the requirements of their respective specifications in any manner and are therefore acceptable.

#### Environmental Consideration

We have determined that the amendment does not authorize a change in effluent types or total amounts nor an increase in power level and will not result in any significant environmental impact. Having made this determination, we have further concluded that the amendment involves an action which is insignificant from the standpoint of environmental impact and pursuant to 10 CFR §51.5(d)(4) that an environmental impact statement or negative declaration and environmental impact appraisal need not be prepared in connection with the issuance of this amendment.

#### Conclusions

We have concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) because the amendment 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 amendment 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: June 1, 1977