UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMIVISSION
WASHINGTON. D. C. 205ss

## AUG 91983

$j$
The Honorable Gillis W. Long
United States House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515
Dear Congressman Long:
Your letter of July 6, 1983, regarding the cracks in the common foundation mat at the haterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3, has been forwarded to me for action. I am pleased to provide you the following information.

There have been two incidents of water seepage through the common foundation mat at the Waterford 3 nuclear facility. The first occurrence was identified and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission was notified in July 1977. The location of the water seepage was in the area where the concrete which supports the containment vessel was to be placed. The sealing and repair of the cracks was considered necessary by the licensee's architect-engineer before placing the containment support concrete, because the water could have been detrimental to the newly placed concrete. A method of repair was determined and the cracks were satisfactorily sealed and repaired. NRC Region IV inspected the corrective actions and concluded that the cracks were satisfactorily repaired.

A second occurrence was reported in May 1983 when a series of leaks were discovered in a different location. This event was documented in a noncompliance report and the NRC was notified. The cracks were identified by the observation of a small amounts of water percolating through the top of the mat at several locations.

Engineering studies were conducted by Ebasco, the architect-engineer, to determine if any detrimental or deleterious effects could result from water seeping through the 12 -foot steel reinforced concrete nat. These studies examined the stability of the containment vessel against flotation and overturning under buoyant conditions caused by postulated groundwater intrusion, by groundwater induced corrosion of the reinforcing steel and the containment vessel, and by any effect on the base mat structural integrity due to groundwater percolating through the mat.

Gur init inspectors are currently monitoring the recent leakage and reviewing the studies. The cracks are not visible to the nerved eye and are evidenced only by the moist spots on the unpainted floor, and by imperfections on parroted surfaces.

As a result of recent anonymous concerns, NRC has initiated an independent inquiry to determine if the indications have been properly evaluated. 'e have also learned that Lousiana Power \& Light has hired an independent consultant to review the significance of the leakage. A report on this independent review is scheduled to be available September $1,1983$.

I trust that this information is responsive to your request. We will provide you the results of the ongoing studies and our conclusions when they become available. If you have any additional questions or require additional information, we would be pleased to discuss them with you.

Sincerely,
(Signed) T. A. Rahm
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## 明荕

MEMORANDUM TO THE OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL RELATIONS

Enclosed is a copy of a letter I recently received from one of my constituents which concerns a matter under the jurisdiction of your agency．

I would be most grateful for your advice and assistance concerning the attached communication．Should you require any additional information，please call Nilliam Meaux of my staff： at（202）225－4926．

Thank you very much．
GILLIS LONG
MEMBER OF CONGRESS
Eighth Congressional District Louisiana

7／13．．To EDO for Direct Reply．．Suspense：July 22．．OCA to Ack．．83－2035

Dear Concerned Public Officer:
Would you want e nuclear power plant with a cracked slab in your neighborhood? We don't and we don't think you would either. Waterford 3 hes a cracked slab! $h^{W}$ il the slab crack and result in a Louisiana disaster? Even a low probability is too high e possibility.

Once Waterford 3 is fueled, the consumer will be assigned the responsibility for paying for Waterford 3 , cracked sled end ell. They could be paying for the ir own destruction. If the crack in the sled propagates, the plant will have to be shut down. Then the customers of LP\&L will have to pay rot only for the construction, but also for the dismantling of Waterford 3. Why should the customer have to pay for the mistakes of L? kL management?
STOP WATERFORD 3 NOK, before it is fueled. Avert the physical or financial disaster that is sure to follow. Let LFtL pay for its managewent mistakes.

Sincerely,
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