

DIS. DISTRIBUTION

Docket
NRC PDR/Local PDR
ORB #2 Reading
VStello
DRoss
KRGoller
TJCarter
OELD
OI&E (5)
DLZiemann
WEConverse
RDSilver
RMDiggs
DEisenhut
TBAbernathy
JRBuchanan
ACRS (16)

AUG 30 1976

Docket No. 50-313

Arkansas Power & Light Company
ATTN: Mr. J. D. Phillips
Senior Vice President
Production, Transmission and
Engineering
Sixth and Pine Streets
Pine Bluff, Arkansas 71601

Gentlemen:

We are reviewing your June 4, 1976 submittal which provided the Arkansas Nuclear One - Unit No. 1 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix I Evaluation. We have determined that the information described in the enclosure, some of which was requested in our February 19, 1976 letter, is necessary to continue our review.

To enable us to maintain our review schedule, please submit the requested information within 30 days of the date of this letter.

Sincerely,

Original signed by
Dennis L. Ziemann

Dennis L. Ziemann, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch #2
Division of Operating Reactors

Enclosure:
Request for Additional
Information

THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS
POOR QUALITY PAGES

DB

OFFICE →	OR:ORB #2 <i>WCC</i>	OR:ORB #2			
SURNAME →	WEConverse:rc	DLZiemann			0004220 956
DATE →	8/23/76	8/30/76			

P

Arkansas Power & Light Company

- 2 -

AUG 30 1976

cc w/enclosure:
Horace Jewell, Esquire
House, Holms & Jewell
1550 Tower Building
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201

Mr. Donald Rueter
Manager, Licensing
Arkansas Power & Light Company
Post Office Box 551
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201

Arkansas Polytechnic College
Russellville, Arkansas 72801

ARKANSAS POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

ARKANSAS NUCLEAR ONE - UNIT NO. 1

DOCKET NO. 50-313

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING
ANO - UNIT NO. 1 APPENDIX I SUBMITTAL DATED JUNE 4, 1976

References:

1. Letter, Mr. J. Phillips to Mr. R. DeYoung, May 17, 1972.
 2. Letter and attached Report regarding ANO-1 Appendix I Evaluation, Mr. W. Cavanaugh III to Director of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, June 4, 1976.
 3. Letter, Mr. D. Ziemann to Mr. J. Phillips, February 19, 1976.
-
1. Response to Question 19 of reference 1 indicates that there is no separate cation demineralizer for lithium and cesium while Table 3 of reference 2 indicates that there is. Explain this discrepancy.
 2. Response to Question 14 of reference 1 indicates that the condensate demineralizer flow is 7,826,000 lb/hr which is approximately 70% of the steam flow rate indicated in response to Question 13 of reference 1. Table 3 of reference 2 indicated 100% steam flow becomes condensate demineralizer flow. Explain this discrepancy.
 3. Provide a docketed reference for the values listed in Table 3 of reference 3 for equipment drain and clean waste flow rates.
 4. Table 3 of reference 2 indicates that there will be 4 purges per year during power operation. Indicate whether this purge frequency is based on operating experience or engineering judgement.
 5. For each of the plant release points, provide the following:
 1. Height above grade.
 2. Height above adjacent structures.
 3. Expected average temperature difference between gaseous effluents and ambient air.

4. Effluent flow rate.
 5. Effluent exit velocity.
 6. Vent size and shape.
 7. The use of deflectors or diffusers on the vent.
6. You based your model on the general straight-line airflow model described in Regulatory Guide 1.111; however, you did not specifically describe the version which you used. Describe your model including all equations used. Discuss its validity and accuracy as related to this site and region.
 7. Our review of information supplied in reference 2 indicates that certain information requested in reference 3 was not supplied. Specifically, we require the information requested in Questions 2, 3, 5, 7, 8 and 9 of Enclosure 2 to reference 3.