

July 20, 1981

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE

RECEIVED

JUL 21 1981

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

OFFICE OF APPL. & REPORTS SERVICES
BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

In the Matter of)

HOUSTON LIGHTING & POWER COMPANY)

(Allens Creek Nuclear Generating)
Station, Unit No. 1)

Docket No. 50-466



TESTIMONY OF GUY MARTIN, JR., ON BEHALF OF
HOUSTON LIGHTING & POWER CO., ON
McCORKLE CONTENTION 9 RELATING TO
CHLORINE MONITORING

Q. Please state your name and business address.

A. My name is Guy Martin, Jr., and my business
address is Ebasco Services, Inc., 2 World Trade Center,
New York, N.Y.

Q. What is your position with Ebasco?

A. I am presently Supervising Engineer of Enviro-
sphere's Radiological Impact Assessment Department.

Q. Please describe your education and professional
qualifications.

A. A statement of my education and professional
qualifications is attached to this testimony as Attachment
GM-1.

DS03
1/1

1
2 Q. Mr. Martin, what is the purpose of your testimony?

3 A. My testimony will address Intervenor McCorkle's
4 Contention 9 in which it has been alleged that:

5 No plan has been developed to protect the plant
6 operators from the danger of poisoning from
7 gases such as chlorine which could come into
8 the control room in sufficient quantities to
9 force evacuation before the plant was brought
down to low power status. Railroad accidents
and on-site storage of gases such as chlorine
could be sources for such gases.

10 Q. Is the Allens Creek control room designed to
11 protect control room operators from accidents involving
12 releases of toxic gases, including chlorine, which are
13 stored on site?

14 A. Yes. In PSAR Appendix C the Applicant has
15 committed to provide protection for control room operators
16 from accidents involving the release of toxic gases.
17 Our analysis shows that, of the materials stored on
18 site, only chlorine presents any potential danger to
19 control room personnel. Therefore, the design of the
20 control room includes detectors located in the fresh air
21 inlets which, upon detection of chlorine, will provide
22 an audible alarm and automatically isolate the control
23 room. These detectors will also detect chlorine releases
24 which may originate from offsite sources, including the
nearby Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe (AT&SF) railroad.

1
2 In addition, adequate self-contained breathing apparatus
3 will be provided for further protection of control room
4 operators.

5 Q. Are there any offsite sources of potentially
6 toxic gases other than chlorine that could pose a hazard
7 to control room operators?

8 A. Currently there is insufficient data upon
9 which to base such a determination.

10 Q. Please explain.

11 A. An accident involving a train traveling along
12 the AT&SF railroad line, which is located approximately
13 4500 feet west of the control room, presents the only
14 possible offsite source of toxic gases of sufficient
15 quantity to pose a potential threat to control room
16 operators.

17 The limited data on toxic materials shipments
18 obtained thus far from AT&SF indicates that the probability
19 of accidents on the AT&SF line which might involve
20 materials which could adversely affect control room
21 habitability approaches the NRC acceptance criterion of
22 10^{-6} per year. Neither the data concerning the frequency
23 of toxic materials shipments provided by AT&SF nor the
24 data I have reviewed concerning railroad accidents are

1
2 sufficient to support a full and complete evaluation of
3 the risk to the control room operators from toxic gases
4 released as a result of a railroad accident.

5 Q. What efforts are being made to compile the
6 data necessary to make such a determination?

7 A. Efforts are currently underway to compile more
8 complete data concerning shipments of toxic materials on
9 the AT&SF line. For years after 1980, data concerning
10 the frequency of hazardous materials shipments as well
11 as accidents on the AT&SF line will be systematically
12 collected. In addition, a more in-depth examination of
13 the characteristics of accidents involving release of
14 toxic material will be undertaken. With this additional
15 information, a study to determine whether there is a
16 potential hazard from offsite toxic gases to the control
17 room operators will be completed and submitted in the
18 Final Safety Analysis Report at the Operating License
19 review stage.

20 Q. Does a study of this type need to be completed
21 at this time?

22 A. No. The outcome of a study of this type will
23 have no effect upon the suitability of the ACNGS site.
24

1
2
3 Moreover, the large data base which will be obtained
4 during the Operating License review stage will allow a
5 more accurate determination of both the need for additional
6 toxic chemical protection and the identification of the
7 specific hazardous materials for which protection may be
8 required.

9 Q. What would have to be done at Allens Creek if
10 this final study were to show that the probability of a
11 toxic gas release hazardous to the control room operators
12 did not meet the NRC acceptance criteria?

13 A. If the data accumulated at the Operating
14 License stage indicate that the probability of accidents
15 which may adversely affect control room habitability
16 does not meet the applicable acceptance criteria, HL&P
17 will provide appropriate means to assure that a higher
18 level of protection is given to the control room operators.
19 Appropriate technical means and engineering designs,
20 including warning systems and toxic chemical detectors,
21 are currently available to insure that toxic chemicals
22 will pose no hazard to control room habitability regard-
23 less of the accident probability. If necessary, such
24 systems can be installed at Allens Creek with only minor
alterations to the control room.

1
2 Q. Will such toxic chemical detectors be able to
3 detect the presence of any potentially toxic gases?

4 A. Yes. Detectors are commercially available
5 which can detect all types of toxic gases including all
6 those gases which are currently carried on the AT&SF
7 railroad.

8 Q. What are your conclusions?

9 A. A final study concerning the effects of the
10 postulated release of toxic gas from an accident on the
11 AT&SF railroad will be performed during the Operating
12 License review stage. If the results of this study
13 indicate a toxic gas hazard does indeed exist to the
14 control room operators, HL&P will provide a higher level
15 of protection in the control room. This higher level of
16 protection may take the form of appropriate engineering
17 design changes, such as warning systems or toxic chemical
18 detectors, which are currently available to the nuclear
19 industry.
20
21
22
23
24

Guy Martin, Jr.

I received a ME from the City College of the City of New York in 1974. I received a MS in Nuclear Engineering from Polytechnic Institute of New York in 1976. I have been employed by Ebasco since 1973. I have eight years' experience in preparation of Safety Analysis and Environmental Reports sections dealing with the impact analysis of toxic chemicals and radiological releases. Such analyses are performed for both routine plant operation and accident conditions. In this regard, I conduct reviews of radwaste handling systems, air handling and cleanup systems and estimate radionuclide releases from plant effluents and calculate and calculation of implant dose rates to equipment and personnel from air borne radionuclide exposure and I have performed ALARA of air cleanup systems. I have performed safety reviews of engineered safety systems, which included a review of the specifications and operation from the radiation protection viewpoint and have provided design recommendations based on assessed radiological doses and established nuclear safety criteria. I have performed analyses of the transport of toxic chemicals postulated to be released accidentally and calculated the concentration in critical locations of the power plant. I have provided technical feedback to the designers on required protection levels. In this regard I have assisted in making the determination of toxic chemical detector specifications based on worker and equipment protection criteria.

I have responsibility for the preparation of radiological environmental surveillance programs wherein I have prepared detailed surveillance program description based on site specific critical pathways of exposure. I have established the sampling requirements of the frequency and types of analyses to be performed.

I have also participated in preparation of a study regarding the establishment of a comprehensive data base regarding high level waste disposal and I have supervised the health physics activities related to decontamination work at the Kellex Laboratory.

Prior to my employment with basco, I was employed as a cost analyst by Equitable Life Assurance Society of the US.

I am a member of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, a member of the Health Physics Society, and a member of the American Nuclear Society, and Intern Engineer of New York State. I have written the following publications:

Martin, G. and J. Thomas 1978. Meeting the dose requirements of 10CFR100 for site suitability and general design criteria 19 for control room habitability: a parametric approach. Transactions of American Nuclear Society 24th Annual Meeting. Vol. 18.

Martin, G. D. Michlewicz and J. Thomas 1978. Fission 2120: a program for assessing the need for engineered safety feature grade air cleaning systems in post-accident environment. Proceedings of 15th DCE Nuclear Air Cleaning Conference.

Letizia, A. P., G. Martin and J. F. Silvey 1979. - Implications for nuclear facilities of changes being initiated in the NRC standard atmospheric diffusion model. Proceeding of the 41st Annual Meeting of the American Power Conference.

Bhatia, R. K., Mauro, J., Martin, G. - Effectuations of Containment Purge on the Consequences of a Loss-of-Coolant Accident. Transactions of the American Nuclear Society 1980 Annual Meeting.