



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 91 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-51

ARKANSAS POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

ARKANSAS NUCLEAR ONE, UNIT 1

DOCKET NO. 50-313

INTRODUCTION

By letter dated September 12, 1984, supplemented by letter dated November 8, 1984, Arkansas Power and Light Company (AP&L or the licensee) requested amendment to the Technical Specifications (TSs) appended to Facility Operating License No. DPR-51 for Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit 1 (ANO-1). The proposed changes would provide operating requirements, limiting conditions for operation and surveillance requirements for the upgrades in the Emergency Feedwater (EFW) System which will be completed during the sixth refueling outage in December 1984.

EVALUATION

As the result of the requirements of the TMI Action Plan, NUREG-0737, Items II.E.1.1, Auxiliary Feedwater Evaluation, and II.E.1.2, Auxiliary Feedwater Flow Indication and Initiation, the licensee has upgraded the EFW System with modifications which include the installation of a new Emergency Feedwater Initiation and Control (EFIC) System. This EFW System upgrade also includes the safety function which was previously performed by the Steam Line Break Instrumentation and Control (SLBIC) System. The proposed TSs reflect the deletion of the SLBIC system.

The EFW System upgrade design has been reviewed and accepted by the NRC staff, as documented in two Safety Evaluation (SEs) dated October 6, 1983 (for Item II.E.1.1) and July 26, 1982 (for Item II.E.1.2). We have reviewed the proposed TSs against the recommended TS changes identified in the above SEs and compared the proposed changes to the current ANO-1 plant TSs.

Based on our review, we conclude that the proposed revised TSs for the EFW System upgrade are acceptable.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

This amendment involves a change in the installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. We have determined that the amendment involves no significant increase in the amounts, and no significant change in the types, of any effluents that may be released offsite, and that there is no significant increase in

individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. The Commission has previously issued a proposed finding that this amendment involves no significant hazards consideration and there has been no public comment on such finding. Accordingly, this amendment meets the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(9). Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the issuance of this amendment.

CONCLUSIONS

We have concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, and (2) 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: December 20, 1984

Principal Contributors: H. Li, R. Anand, and G. Vissing