

FEB 3 1983

DISTRIBUTION

Document Control 50-382

NRC PDR

LPDR

NSIC

PRC System

Docket No.: 50-382

Mr. L. V. Maurin
Vice President - Nuclear Operations
Louisiana Power and Light Company
142 Delaronde Street
New Orleans, Louisiana 70174

Dear Mr. Maurin:

LB#3 Reeling
DGEisenhut/RPurple
TMNovak
DMuller
GWKnighton
JWilson
JLee
JTaylor, IE
EJordan, IE
STurk, OELD
ACRS (16)

Subject: Chemical Explosion and Fire at Union Carbide on December 11, 1982

As you know, in the early morning hours of December 11, 1982, a chemical explosion and fire occurred at the Union Carbide plant located in Taft, Louisiana about 2 miles from Waterford 3. As a result, approximately 17,000 persons were evacuated from 2 parishes in a 5-mile area around the plant, including two to three hundred non-essential personnel from Waterford 3. The evacuation was implemented in accordance with St. Charles Parish and St. John the Baptist Parish Emergency Plans. These offsite plans, which have been developed for a variety of emergencies under the authority of State of Louisiana statutes, are reviewed and evaluated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). While we understand that the evacuation was highly successful, FEMA intends to review the results of the evacuation to determine if any inadequacies existed at the time of the evacuation, or if any State or local emergency procedures need to be improved. The results of a FEMA fact-finding study (now underway) will be reviewed by FEMA and the NRC staff, and any improvement that may be required in emergency planning preparedness will be addressed by the staff during the NTOL emergency preparedness inspection phase currently scheduled to commence in February, 1983.

Because of the nature of this external event, it is requested that you provide the staff with an evaluation of the expected plant response (which should include all actions expected of onsite personnel) that this event would have caused had the unit been operating at full power. This evaluation should compare the expected behavior to the anticipated operational occurrences and postulated accidents which form the design basis envelope for the Waterford 3 station.

We request that this information be submitted with 30 days of receipt of this letter.

Sincerely,

151

8302170041 830203
PDR ADOCK 05000382
F PDR

*See previous concurrence.

Darrell G. Eisenhut, Director

Telephone
Concurrence 2/2/83

OFFICE	DL:LB#3	DL:LB#3	DE:AD*	Division of Licensing	DL:AD/L*	OELD	DL:DIR
SURNAME	JWilson	GWKnighton	DMuller	TMNovak	STurk	DGEisenhut	
DATE	2/1/83	2/ /83	2/ /83	2/ /83	2/2/83	2/ /83	

Industrial Preparedness

Our review of the December 11, 1982 chemical explosion at the Union Carbide plant indicates that there were at least two chemicals (acrolein and acrylic acid) stored in significant quantities, neither of which appear in the list of hazardous chemicals in the Waterford Unit 3 FSAR (Table 2.2-4). Specifically, the explosion appears to have involved one or two 45,000 gallon acrolein tanks with an additional three acrolein tanks and three acrylic acid tanks nearby being threatened by the ensuing 16 hour fire. In view of the above, we request that the current hazardous chemical listing in the FSAR be updated to include all significant quantities of hazardous chemicals near the site. This information should be provided in an amendment to the FSAR prior to issuance of the OL.

In recognition of the multitude of chemicals that are handled or stored near the Waterford Unit 3 site, the staff has previously concluded that there is a need for several diverse means of protection against potential toxic gas releases. Several methods were outlined in Section 2.2-1 of Supplement 1 to the Waterford 3 Safety Evaluation Report (NUREG-0787). In particular, one measure involves a periodic survey of the industrial and transportation activities in the area. The intent is to maintain an awareness of any significant chemical feedstock or product changes which may dictate modifications in the existing toxic gas protection features. We will include this requirement in the Waterford 3 Technical Specifications.

Sincerely,

Darrell G. Eisenhut, Director
Division of Licensing

cc: See next page

Distribution:

Document Control 50-382

NRC PDR

L PDR

NSIC

PRC System

LB#3 Reading File	JTaylor, IE
DEisenhut/RPurple	EJordan, IE
TNovak	STurk, ELD
DMuller	ACRS (16)
GKnighton	
JWilson	
JLee	

*See previous page for concurrence

OFFICE	DL:LB#3	DL:LB#3	DE:AD	DL:AD:1	DL:DI?	OELD	
SURNAME	*JWilson:ph	*GKnighton	*DMuller	*TNovak	DEisenhut	STurk	
DATE	1/14/83	1/19/83	1/18/83	1/20/83	1/ /83	1/ /83	

Docket No.: 50-382

Mr. L. V. Maurin
Vice President - Nuclear Operations
Louisiana Power and Light Company
142 Delaronde Street
New Orleans, Louisiana 70174

Dear Mr. Maurin:

Subject: Chemical Explosion and Fire at Union Carbide on December 11, 1982

As you know, in the early morning hours of December 11, 1982, a chemical explosion and fire occurred at the Union Carbide plant located in Taft, Louisiana about 2 miles from Waterford 3. This event has ramifications on two aspects of our licensing review; (1) offsite emergency preparedness, and (2) the onsite impacts of industrial hazards in the plant vicinity. Those aspects are discussed separately below. In order to assist us in completing the licensing process for Waterford 3, we request that you provide to us, within 30 days of receipt of this letter, an evaluation of the effect that the December 11, 1982 accident would have had on Waterford 3 if the plant had been operating at full power. If your evaluation shows that modifications to your current operating procedures are desirable, we request that you submit all such changes to us for review and approval as soon as possible, in order to avoid licensing delays.

Emergency Preparedness

As a result of the December 11, 1982 explosion, approximately 17,000 persons were evacuated from 2 parishes in a 5-mile area around the plant, including two to three hundred non-essential personnel from Waterford 3. The evacuation was implemented in accordance with St. Charles Parish and St. John the Baptist Parish Emergency Plan. These offsite plans, which have been developed for a variety of emergencies under the authority of State of Louisiana statutes, are reviewed and evaluated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). While we understand that the evacuation was highly successful, FEMA intends to review the results of the evacuation to determine if any inadequacies existed at the time of the evacuation, or if any State or local emergency procedures need to be improved. The results of a FEMA fact-finding study (now underway) will be reviewed by FEMA and the NRC staff, and any improvement that may be required in emergency planning preparedness will be addressed by the staff during the NTOL emergency preparedness inspection phase currently scheduled to commence in February, 1983.

OFFICE ▶
SURNAME ▶
DATE ▶

Mr. L. V. Maurin

- 2 -

The intent is to maintain an awareness of any significant chemical feedstock or product changes which may dictate modifications in the existing toxic gas protection features. We will include this requirement in the Waterford 3 Technical Specifications.

As a result of the December 11, 1982 explosion, approximately 17,000 persons were evacuated from 2 parishes in a 5-mile area around the plant, including two to three hundred non-essential personnel from Waterford 3. The evacuation was implemented in accordance with St. Charles Parish and St. John the Baptist Parish Emergency Plans. These offsite plans, which have been developed for a variety of emergencies under the authority of State of Louisiana statutes, are reviewed and evaluated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). In our review, this was strictly an offsite matter falling under the purview of FEMA who has the responsibility to determine if any inadequacies existed at the time of the evacuation or if any State or local emergency procedures need to be improved.

Sincerely,

Darrell G. Eisenhut, Director
Division of Licensing

cc: See next page

Distribution:

Document Control 50-382

NRC PDR

L PDR

NSIC

PRC System

LB#3 Reading File

DEisenhut/RPurple

TNovak

DMuller

GKnighton

JWilson

JLee

JTaylor, IE

EJordan, IE

STurk, OELD

ACRS (16)

*See previous page for concurrence

OFFICE	DL:LB#3	DL:LB#3	DE:AD	DL:AD:L	DL:DIR		
SURNAME	*JWilson:ph	*GKnighton	*DMuller	*TNovak	DEisenhut		
DATE	1/14/83	1/19/83	1/18/83	1/20/83	1/ /83		

Mr. L. V. Maurin

- 2 -

The intent is to maintain an awareness of any significant chemical feedstock or product changes which may dictate modifications in the existing topic gas protection features. We will include this requirement in the Waterford 3 Technical Specifications.

Sincerely,

Darrell G. Eisenhut, Director
Division of Licensing

cc: See next page

Distribution:

Document Control 50-382

PRC System

NRC PDR

L PDR

NSIC

LB#3 Reading File

DEisenhut/RPurple

TNovak

DMuller

GKnighton

JWilson

JLee

JTaylor, IE

EJordan, IE

STurk, ELD

ACRS (16)

*See previous concurrence

NO BACK 1-27-83

*S. Turk
DECLD*

OFFICE	DL:LB#3	DL:LB#3	DE:A/D	DL:AD:L	DL:DIR		
SURNAME	*JWilson:ph	*GKnighton	*DMuller	*TNovak	DEisenhut		
DATE	1/14/83	1/19/83	1/18/83	1/20/83	1/ /83		

Mr. L. V. Maurin

- 2 -

As described in Section 2.2-1 of Supplement 1 to the staff's Safety Evaluation Report, you have agreed to perform a periodic survey of the local industrial and transportation activities in order to remain cognizant of any changes in potential external hazards near the Waterford 3 plant site. This agreement was sought by us in order to assure that the control room protection at Waterford 3 remains commensurate with the toxic gas hazards in the vicinity throughout the life of the plant. This commitment will appear as a technical specification in Appendix A of the operating license for Waterford 3. The Union Carbide event indicated that the assessment of the toxic gas hazards, as reported in Table 2.2-4 of the FSAR, may not be complete. Specifically, it appears that acrolein and acrylic acid were not analyzed. This raises the possibility that other chemicals also may have been overlooked. In view of this, and your commitment to survey and address significant changes from the initial toxic gas hazards assessment, we request that you revise Table 2.2-4 on the basis of a more complete survey.

Please furnish a response to this request with 30 days.

Sincerely,

Darrell G. Eisenhut, Director
Division of Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

cc: See next page

*See previous concurrence.

OFFICE	DL:LB#3 *	DL:LB#3	DL:AD/L	DL:DIR	DE:AD *		
SURNAME	JWilson/yt	GWNighton	TNovak	DGEisenhut	DMuller		
DATE	1/ /83	1/ /83	1/ /83	1/ /83	1/ /83		

Mr. L. V. Maurin

- 2 -

Please furnish a response to this request within 90 days.

Sincerely,

Darrell G. Eisenhut, Director
Division of Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

cc: See next page

DE:AD
DMiller
1/18/83

S. Turk
CCLO

OFFICE	DL:LB#3	DL:LB#3	DL:AD/L	DL:DIR			
SURNAME	JWilson/yt	GWKington	TMNovak	DGEisenhut			
DATE	1/14/83	1/14/83	1/ /83	1/ /83			

Mr. L. V. Maurin
Vice President - Nuclear Operations
Louisiana Power & Light Company
142 Delaronde Street
New Orleans, Louisiana 70174

cc: W. Malcolm Stevenson, Esq.
Monroe & Lemann
1423 Whitney Building
New Orleans, Louisiana 70130

Regional Administrator-Region IV
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
611 Ryan Plaza Drive
Suite 1000
Arlington, Texas 76012

Mr. E. Blake
Snow, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge
1800 M Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Mr. Gary L. Groesch
2257 Bayou Road
New Orleans, Louisiana 70119

Mr. F. J. Drummond
Project Manager - Nuclear
Louisiana Power & Light Company
142 Delaronde Street
New Orleans, Louisiana 70174

Mr. D. B. Lester
Production Engineer
Louisiana Power & Light Company
142 Delaronde Street
New Orleans, Louisiana 70174

Luke Fontana, Esq.
824 Esplanade Avenue
New Orleans, Louisiana 70116

Stephen M. Irving, Esq.
535 North 6th Street
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70802

Resident Inspector/Waterford NPS
P. O. Box 822
Killona, Louisiana 70066

Dr. D. C. Gibbs
Middle South Service, Inc.
P. O. Box 61000
New Orleans, Louisiana 70161