



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 69 TO  
FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-51

ARKANSAS POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY

ARKANSAS NUCLEAR ONE, UNIT NO. 1

DOCKET NO. 50-313

Introduction

By letter dated July 14, 1982, supplemented by letter dated August 24, 1982, Arkansas Power and Light Company (the licensee or AP&L) requested amendment of the Technical Specifications (TSs) appended to Facility Operating License No. DPR-51 for Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit No. 1 (ANO-1). The amendment would require chlorine detection and protection capability for the control room.

Discussion and Evaluation

In our Safety Evaluation dated March 24, 1978, we determined that the control room habitability systems for Units Nos. 1 and 2 were adequate for protection of personnel against the effects of accidental release of toxic and radioactive gases with one exception. This exception concerned the habitability of the control room with respect to chlorine whenever Unit 1 is operating and Unit 2 is shutdown.

This issue was also identified in our Safety Evaluation for the resolution of NUREG-0737 Item III.D.3.4, "Control Room Habitability", which was transmitted to the licensee by letter dated February 12, 1982. In that Safety Evaluation, we determined that the licensee should modify the ANO-1 TSs so that the existing chlorine detection and protection system is equally effective whenever either unit is at power. We have evaluated the proposed TSs and have determined that the proposed operability requirements, limiting conditions of operation, and surveillance requirements are similar to those of ANO-2 and would provide for the chlorine detection and protection system to be equally effective for ANO-1. This would satisfy the concerns identified in our letters dated March 24, 1978, and February 12, 1982, including the complete resolution of NUREG-0737 Item III.D.3.4. Therefore, we find the proposed TSs are 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 an accident previously evaluated, does not create the possibility of an accident of a type different from any evaluated previously, and does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety, 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.

Dated: September 21, 1982

The following NRC personnel have contributed to this Safety Evaluation:  
G. S. Vissing.