



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 23 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-6
ARKANSAS POWER & LIGHT COMPANY
ARKANSAS NUCLEAR ONE, UNIT NO. 2
DOCKET NO. 50-368

Introduction

By letter dated June 1, 1981, Arkansas Power & Light Company (the licensee or AP&L) requested amendment of the Technical Specifications (TS), Appendix A, appended to Facility Operating License No. NPF-6 for Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit No. 2 (ANO-2). The amendment would revise the TS dealing with the operability requirements for fire detectors located in the containment penetration rooms.

Discussion and Evaluation

The staff's Fire Protection Safety Evaluation Report (FPSE), NUREG-0223, issued in August 1978 documented the need for further modifications to the fire protection systems. Section 7.0, "Technical Specifications", of the FPSE also noted that following the implementation of these further modifications the Technical Specifications would be similarly modified to incorporate the LCO and surveillance requirements for these modifications. The licensee's letter of June 1, 1981 presents an example of such modifications to the TS.

The licensee states that a new fire detection system was developed to meet the requirements of the FPSE. Implementation of this new system requires the removal of a number of existing smoke and heat detectors and replacement with new smoke detectors. Specifically, as reflected in revised TS Table 3.3-11 item 7, heat detectors will be removed from the containment penetration rooms and replaced by smoke detectors.

The previous system design relied upon the heat detectors for actuation of the water supply valves to the fusible head sprinkler system. The new system will rely upon smoke detectors both for alarming the presence of fire in the control room and for the automatic actuation of the water supply valves. The licensee concludes that this change will result in a system which can respond more rapidly to fires.

Based on the considerations discussed above we conclude that the proposed changes are consistent with the staff's findings and requirements reported earlier in the FPSE, involves no compromise to the safe operation of the plant 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.

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: June 16, 1981