



ARKANSAS POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

February 22, 1988

ØCANØ288Ø9

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Document Control Desk  
Washington, DC 20555

ATTN: Mr. Frank J. Miraglia, Jr.  
Associate Director for Projects

SUBJECT: Arkansas Nuclear One - Units 1 & 2  
Docket Nos. 50-313 and 50-368  
License Nos. DPR-51 and NPF-6  
Integrated Safety Assessment  
Program II, Generic Letter 88-02

Dear Mr. Miraglia:

The Arkansas Power & Light Company (AP&L) is in receipt of your correspondence of January 20, 1988 (ØCNAØ1881Ø), Generic Letter 88-02 with regard to the Integrated Safety Assessment Program II (ISAP II).

The enclosed information is being provided, as requested by Generic Letter 88-02, to reflect AP&L's interest in ISAP II.

If you have any questions regarding this submittal, please contact my office.

Very truly yours,

Dan R. Howard  
Manager, Licensing

DRH:MTW:lw

Enclosure

A062  
1/1

8803080026 880222  
PDR ADOCK 05000313  
P DCD

Integrated Safety Assessment Program (ISAP) II

Response Format to Generic Letter 88-02

Facility Name: Arkansas Nuclear One (ANO) Units 1 & 2

Utility: Arkansas Power & Light Company

Individual Contact Name: John Smith

Phone Number: (501) 377-5911

As expression of interests will not be considered a commitment to participate on the part of the utility.

1. Would you be interested in participating in ISAP II? If so, in what time frame?

The Arkansas Power & Light Company (AP&L) is currently addressing the use of probabilistic risk assessment (PRA) on ANO Units 1 & 2. Our current schedule is to complete PRAs within 18-24 months. Therefore, participation in an ISAP II program would not begin until that time. We do have an interest in the ISAP II effort, since the program appears to provide a method of obtaining additional benefits from application of PRAs.

2. Do you believe that an industry/NRC seminar consisting of a brief discussion by NRC followed by a question and answer period would be beneficial prior to making a decision?

An industry/NRC seminar would be beneficial by providing for an exchange of information regarding ISAP II. The proposed schedule for such a meeting would need to be established significantly enough in advance to accommodate other commitments.

3. Would you be interested in a one-on-one meeting with the NRC to discuss your particular facility or facilities?

Such a meeting would be premature at this time, however, might be of interest following the industry/NRC seminar discussed above.

4. If you remain undecided regarding participation, what additional information do you need in order to make a decision?

No additional specific information is required at this time, however, questions may arise as a result of our continuing evaluations of PRA related issues.

5. Do you have any potential concerns about participating in ISAP II?

No specific concerns have been identified.

6. Do you have any suggestions for program improvements or changes?

For utilities currently initiating PRA programs it is suggested that implementation of an ISAP II program be closely coordinated with resolution of "severe accident" issues.