

**From:** Kalyanam, Kaly  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 03, 2012 1:35 PM  
**To:** CLARK, ROBERT W; BICE, DAVID B  
**Cc:** Burkhardt, Janet; Lent, Susan  
**Subject:** Acceptance of Arkansas Nuclear One - Unit 2 Request for Alternative (ME7646)

Subject: Acceptance of Arkansas Nuclear One – Unit 2 Request for Alternative, Use of Alternate ASME Code Case N-770-1 Baseline Examination Request for Alternative ANO2-ISI-007) (TAC No. ME7646)

Bob/Dave:

By letter dated November 30, 2011 (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession No. ML113340158), Entergy Operations Inc. (Entergy, the licensee) submitted a code alternative relief request for the Arkansas Nuclear One – Unit 2 (ANO-2). The provided submittal requests NRC approval of Inservice Inspection (ISI) Proposed Alternative ANO2-ISI-007 for the current Fourth 10-year ISI Interval. This request is associated with the use of an alternative to the requirements of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code, Code Case N-770-1, as conditioned in the Final Rule *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR) 50.55a(g)(6)(ii)(F)(3) dated June 21, 2011.

The purpose of this email is to provide the results of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff's acceptance review of this 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 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 and the protection of public health and safety and the environment. Given the lesser scope and depth of the acceptance review as compared to the detailed technical review, there may be instances in which issues that impact the NRC staff's ability to complete the detailed technical review are identified despite completion of an adequate acceptance review. If additional information is needed for the staff to complete its technical review, you will be advised by separate correspondence.

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

N (Kaly) Kalyanam

Project Manager – ANO-2  
US NRC/NRR/DORL/LPL4  
[kaly.kalyanam@nrc.gov](mailto:kaly.kalyanam@nrc.gov)  
301-415-1480