



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

RELATED CORRESPONDENCE

August 9, 1984

DOCKETED  
USNRC

Christine N. Kohl, Chairman  
Atomic Safety and Licensing Appeal  
Board  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555

Dr. W. Reed Johnson  
Atomic Safety and Licensing Appeal  
Board  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555

'84 AGO 14 P2:27

OFFICE OF SECRETARY  
BRANCH

Howard A. Wilber  
Atomic Safety and Licensing Appeal  
Board  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555

In the Matter of  
LOUISIANA POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY  
(Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3)  
Docket No. 50-382 *02*

Dear Appeal Board Members:

Upon re-reading the Affidavit of James P. Knight dated August 7, 1984, and based upon subsequent conversations with Mr. Knight, it appears that a clarification of page 22 of his affidavit should be made, as set forth in the attachment hereto.

This letter is being submitted by Staff counsel in order that the Appeal Board be promptly informed of this clarification. Mr. Knight is out of town and will be away from the office for approximately two weeks; upon his return, a properly executed affidavit confirming this clarification will be submitted to the Appeal Board.

Sincerely,

Sherwin E. Turk  
Deputy Assistant Chief  
Hearing Counsel

Enclosure: As Stated

cc: See Page 2

DS07

cc: (w/enclosure)  
Sheldon J. Wolfe, Esq.  
Dr. Walter H. Jordan  
E. Blake, Esq.  
Luke B. Fontana, Esq.  
Mr. Gary L. Groesch  
Brian P. Cassidy  
Carole H. Burstein, Esq.  
Atomic Safety and Licensing  
Appeal Board Panel

Docketing and Service Section  
Dr. Harry Foreman  
B. Churchill, Esq.  
Malcolm Stevenson, Esq.  
Ian Douglas Lindsey, Esq.  
William J. Guste, Jr., Esq.  
Atomic Safety and Licensing  
Board Panel  
James P. Knight

judgment as to the performance of the base mat and supported structures under design basis seismic loads; however, all participants in this review agreed that the performance of the base mat and supported structures, under all other design loading conditions, are adequately addressed by the present analyses and that safety of the plant <sup>under such other conditions</sup> is assured with appropriate monitoring programs in place (as previously recommended by the Staff).

I have concluded, along with other members of the Division of Engineering and our BNL consultants, In considering the required schedule for completion of the confirmatory analyses, ~~the Staff concluded~~ that these confirmatory analyses need not be received by the Staff prior to licensing. This decision is based upon the Staff's satisfaction as to the safety of the Waterford facility even under design basis earthquake loads, as determined in the evaluation and conclusions drawn by the structural and geotechnical experts who comprised the BNL review team. These experts have probed the Applicant's analyses and performed sufficient independent analyses to satisfy themselves that significant changes to the predicted performance of the base mat was unlikely to result from the observed cracking (including consideration of the NDT results), notwithstanding their recommendation that improved analytical methods be employed to provide a final analysis of record and to confirm the BNL results.

Under these circumstances, the Staff has concluded that while these confirmatory analyses should be performed with reasonable promptness (that is, they should not be permitted to linger over an indefinite period), there are no safety reasons for restricting plant operation until the confirmatory analyses are completed. Accordingly, the Staff intends to discuss with the Applicant a schedule for the