



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 13

ARKANSAS POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY

ARKANSAS NUCLEAR ONE, UNIT 2

DOCKET NO. 50-368

Introduction

By letter dated July 21, 1980, the Arkansas Power and Light Company (the licensee) proposed changes to the Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit 2 (ANO-2) Technical Specifications. The licensee's proposed change would change the July 31, 1980 Technical Specification date required for the completion of testing, qualification and implementation of post accident containment radiation monitors. The chronology of events regarding this matter and our evaluation of the licensee's proposed change to the Technical Specifications is provided below.

Discussion

By letters dated June 23, 1978 and August 31, 1978, the licensee informed us of problems it was encountering in environmentally qualifying Post Accident Containment Radiation Monitors for ANO-2. The ANO-2 monitors were the first monitors proposed for ANO-2 to detect radioactivity within containment up to 10^7 Roentgens per hour. As such, these radiation monitors had to be specifically designed and qualified.

By letters dated August 31, 1978 and September 14, 1978, the licensee proposed an interim method for determining post accident radiation levels in containment while testing and qualification of the radiation monitors continued.

The licensee proposed for an interim period of time to rely on a procedure which would monitor radiation levels inside containment by using portable radiation monitors at selected locations outside containment. Also, the licensee provided details regarding the calculational methods used in determining the locations and calibrational requirements for the portable counters. Procedures were provided which would be followed in measuring radiation for post accident conditions.

By letter dated October 10, 1979, the licensee proposed changes to the ANO-2 Technical Specifications. In our discussions with the licensee regarding these matters, an effective end date for use of interim method

8008140

220

was determined to be July 31, 1980. This July 31, 1980 date was projected to be the date by which the then scheduled first refueling outage would be completed at ANO-2. However, due to problems encountered during the ANO-2 startup, the current schedule now calls for the ANO-2 first refueling outage to be March, 1981.

Our review and basis for acceptance of the licensee's interim method described above is provided in our Safety Evaluation supporting Amendment No. 7 to Facility Operating License NPF-6. Amendment No. 7 was issued on December 1, 1978.

Evaluation

When Amendment No. 7 was issued on December 1, 1978 it was not expected that the first refueling outage would occur beyond the July 31, 1980 date nor were the implementation requirements of NUREG-0578 in effect.

We reaffirm our conclusions set forth in Amendment No. 7 to License NPF-6 regarding the acceptability of the use of portable radiation monitors and find that extending the required date for the implementation of the high range containment radiation monitors to be consistent with the NUREG-0578 requirements as discussed in item 2.1.8.b of the letter of Mr. H. R. Denton, NRC, dated October 30, 1979 to all power reactor licensees is 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.

Conclusion

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 of Issuance: July 31, 1980