

INITIAL  
NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS CONSIDERATION DETERMINATION  
AND NOTICING ACTION

Docket No. 50-368 Facility: Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit 2  
 Licensee: Arkansas Power & Light Co. Date of application: August 1 & October 27, 19

## Request for:

The amendment would revise the Technical Specifications (TS) to delete the reload fuel enrichment from TS 5.3.1. This change would allow the licensee to reload with fuel assemblies with a slight increase in fuel enrichment to permit longer operating cycles. The licensee has indicated that the next operating cycle (Cycle 4) is scheduled to run for 18 months. Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit No. 2 (ANO-2) has been operating on a 12 month cycle.

Initial Determination:

- ( x ) Proposed determination - amendment request involves no significant hazards considerations (NSHC).  
 ( ) Final determination - amendment request involves significant hazards considerations (SHC).

Basis for Determination

- ( ) Licensee's NSHC discussion has been reviewed and is accepted. See attached amendment request.  
 ( ) Basis for this determination is presented in the attached notice.  
 ( x ) Other (state):

See attached sheet.

Initial Noticing Action: (Attach appropriate notice or input for monthly FRN)

1. ( ) Monthly FRN. Notice of opportunity for hearing (30 days) and request for comments on proposed NSHC determination - monthly FRN input is attached (Attachment 8).
2. ( ) Individual FRN (30 days). Same notice matter as above. Time does not allow waiting for next monthly FRN (Attachments 9a and 9b).

(THIS FORM SHOULD BE TYPED EXCEPT FOR UNUSUAL, URGENT CIRCUMSTANCES.)

#### Basis for determination

The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of the examples of actions involving no significant hazards relates to fuel reload amendments involving no fuel significantly different than previously found acceptable at the facility in question.

This change revises the Technical Specifications (TS) to delete the reload fuel enrichment. Such a change in the TS does not directly affect safety since there are other provisions in the TS that determine safe operating and fuel storage limits related to fuel enrichment. These other limits are not proposed to be changed in connection with the use of higher enriched fuel and therefore there would be no change to safety levels. This amendment is similar to the aforesaid example in that the amendment would not authorize operation of the reactor with a core reload with fuel assemblies significantly different from those previously found acceptable at this facility.

Based on the foregoing discussion, the staff determines that the proposed amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

- 3. ( ) Local media notice. Valid exigent circumstances exist (evaluated below). Local media notice requesting public comments on proposed NSHC determination is attached (Attachment 10).
- 4. (x) No notice. A valid emergency situation exists (evaluated below) and there is no time for public notice on proposed NSHC determination. (No attachment.)
- 5. ( ) Individual FRN (30-days). Licensee's claim of exigent or emergency circumstances is invalid (evaluated below). Notice of opportunity for hearing (30 days) and request for comments on proposed NSHC determination is attached (Attachments 9a and 9b). Letter of explanation to licensee is also attached.
- 6. ( ) Individual FRN (30-days). The amendment request involves SHC. Notice of opportunity for prior hearing is attached (Attachment 5). Letter to licensee also attached.
- 7. ( ) Individual Short FRN. Valid emergency circumstances exist (evaluated below). There is no time for the usual 30-day FRN. (Attachment 16).

Evaluation of exigent or emergency circumstances (if applicable):

By letter dated October 27, 1983, the licensee informed the staff that the reload is scheduled for November 11, 1983. This amendment, which would allow the licensee to reload with fuel assemblies with a slight increase in fuel enrichment to permit longer operating cycles, is needed prior to reload. The application was submitted by letter dated August 1, 1983 and revised by letter dated October 27, 1983. At the time of the original submittal, it was not expected that the facility would begin the outage on October 5, 1983 due to the inoperable station battery which could not

(See attached sheet for additional information.)

Approvals:

- |    |  | <u>Date</u>    |
|----|--|----------------|
| 1. | R. S. Lee <u><i>[Signature]</i></u><br>(Project Manager) | <u>11/2/83</u> |
| 2. | J. R. Miller <u><i>[Signature]</i></u><br>(Branch Chief) | <u>11/2/83</u> |
| 3. | <u><i>[Signature]</i></u><br>(OELD)                      | <u>11/4/83</u> |

Additional Approval (for noticing actions types 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7):

- |    |   |                |
|----|---|----------------|
| 4. | <u><i>[Signature]</i></u><br>G. C. Linnas<br>(Assistant Director) | <u>11/2/83</u> |
|----|---|----------------|

Additional approval (for noticing action types 4 and 5):

- |    |                                   |       |
|----|-----------------------------------|-------|
| 5. | _____                             | _____ |
|    | (Director, Division of Licensing) |       |

Attachment: as indicated

cc: Original - Docket File (with note "Docket File only")  
Project Manager  
Licensing Assistant  
Branch Files

Evaluation of exigent or emergency circumstances (continued)

be restored to operable status within the time allowed by the Technical Specifications. In addition, there were differing points of view among the staffs as to whether a sufficient basis exists to make a proposed determination that the amendment request would not involve a significant hazards consideration. The differences among the staffs has been resolved. However, there are not 15 calendar days between now and the time by which the amendment must be issued. Therefore, no prior notice of any type is to be issued since time does not allow the issuance of the short notice as discussed in page 13a of DLOP 228 and a valid emergency exists in that failure to act in a timely way would result in extending the shutdown of the facility

no



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

Docket No. 50-368

Mr. John M. Griffin, Vice President  
Nuclear Operations  
Arkansas Power & Light Company  
P. O. Box 551  
Little Rock, Arkansas 72203

Dear Mr. Griffin:

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. to Facility Operating License No. NPF-6 for Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit No. 2. This amendment is in response to your application dated August 1, 1983, as superseded by your revised application dated October 27, 1983.

The amendment revises the Technical Specifications (TS) to delete the reload fuel enrichment limit from TS 5.3.1.

Our basis for approving the requested deletion of reload fuel enrichment limit is that specification of reload fuel enrichment is unnecessary and superfluous in that there are other provisions in the TS which determine safe operating and fuel storage limits related to fuel enrichment. These other safe operating limits include dynamic parameters, rod worths and peaking factors. In other words, specification of reload fuel enrichment has no bearing on the safe operation of the reactor core provided that existing safety limits and limiting conditions for operation (LCOs) are satisfied. It should be noted that prior to each reload, a safety evaluation with respect to 10 CFR 50.59 is required to confirm that the various reactor core safety limits and LCOs set forth in the TS are satisfied by the particular design of the proposed core loading specifying the number of fuel assemblies loaded during refueling, exposure of fuel assemblies which are to remain in the core, fuel management scheme and reload fuel enrichment. Based on the above, we conclude that the reload fuel enrichment limit in the TS is unnecessary and should be deleted.

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 §50.51(d)(4), that an environmental impact statement or negative declaration and environmental impact appraisal need not be prepared in connection with the issuance of the amendment.

Mr. John M. Griffin

- 2 -

We have also concluded, based on the consideration 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 the amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

The notice of issuance will be included in the Commission's next monthly Federal Register Notice.

Sincerely,

James R. Miller, Chief  
Operating Reactors Branch #3  
Division of Licensing

Enclosures:

1. Amendment No. to NPF-6
2. Notice of Issuance

cc w/enclosures:

See next page