

**From:** [Kalyanam, Kaly](#)  
**To:** [Chen, Qiao-Lynn](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Acceptance Review Report for ANO1-ISI-021  
**Date:** Thursday, September 06, 2012 1:09:04 PM

---

---

**From:** Kalyanam, Kaly  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 06, 2012 12:57 PM  
**To:** 'CLARK, ROBERT W'  
**Subject:** Acceptance Review Report for ANO1-ISI-021

Ms. Chen,

When you get a chance, could you please include this email in ADAMS?

Thanks

Kaly

The SUNSI information as follows:

Plant: Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit 1  
Docket No.: 50/313  
Subject: RAI on Request for Relief No. ANO1-ISI-021  
TAC NOS. ME9147  
SUNSI Review Done: Yes. Not Publicly Available, Normal Release, Non-sensitive,  
From: N. Kalyanam  
To: Robert Clark

DATE: September 6, 2012

TO: ROBERT CLARK

SUBJECT: ARKANSAS NUCLEAR ONE, UNIT 1 – ACCEPTANCE OF REQUESTED  
LICENSING ACTION RE: REQUEST FOR RELIEF, ANO1-ISI-021 FROM ASME  
SECTION XI VOLUMETRIC EXAMINATION REQUIREMENTS FOURTH 10-YEAR  
INTERVAL, FIRST PERIOD  
(TAC NO. ME9148)

DOCKET NO.: 50-313

By letter dated July 25, 2012, pursuant to 10 CFR 50.55a(g)(6)(i), Entergy Operations Inc. requested relief from the requirements of the ASME, Section XI pertaining to volumetric examinations at Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit 1 (ANO-1), since at several locations, examinations were not practical due to interference or geometry.

The purpose of this E-mail is to provide the results of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff's acceptance review of the relief request. The acceptance review was performed to determine if there is sufficient technical information in scope and depth to allow the NRC staff to complete its detailed technical review. The acceptance review is also intended to identify whether the application has any readily apparent information insufficiencies in its characterization of the regulatory requirements or the licensing basis of the plant.

Pursuant to Sections 50.55a(a)(3)(i) and 50.55a(a)(3)(ii) of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), the applicant shall demonstrate that the proposed alternatives would provide an acceptable level of quality and safety, or that compliance with the specified requirements of Section 50.55a would result in hardship or unusual difficulty without a compensating increase in the level of quality or safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed your application and concluded that it does provide technical information in sufficient detail to enable the staff to proceed with its detailed technical review and make an independent assessment regarding the acceptability of the proposed relief request in terms of regulatory requirements. If additional information is needed for the staff to complete its technical review, you will be advised by separate correspondence.

On August 23, 2012, the NRC staff had sent the acceptance review result for ANO1-ISI-022. However, due to an oversight, it was labeled as acceptance review result for ANO1-ISI-021. The error is regretted.

If you have any questions, please contact the undersigned, at (301) 415-1480.

Kaly N. Kalyanam, Project Manager  
ANO-1 and 2; Waterford 3  
NRR/DORL/LPL4  
Email: [kaly.kalyanam@nrc.gov](mailto:kaly.kalyanam@nrc.gov)