

JAN - 7 1993

NOTICE OF VIOLATION

Tennessee Valley Authority
Watts Bar 1

Docket No. 50-390
License No. CPPR-91

During an NRC inspection conducted on December 6-11, 1992, violations of NRC requirements were identified. In accordance with the "General Statement of Policy and Procedure for NRC Enforcement Actions," 10 CFR Part 2, Appendix C, the violations are listed below:

- A. 10 CFR 50 Appendix B Criterion III and the licensee's accepted Quality Assurance Program, TVA-NQA-PLN 89-A, Nuclear Quality Assurance Plan, Revision 2, Section 7.2.7.A, require that design changes including field changes shall be subject to design control measures commensurate with those applied to the original design. The licensee Quality Assurance Program endorses the requirements of ANSI N45.2.11-1974; Quality Assurance Requirements for the Design of Nuclear Power Plants. This standard, Section 8.0, requires that documented procedures shall be provided for design changes to approved design documents, including field changes. Additionally, these changes shall be justified and subjected to design control measures commensurate with those applied to the original design.

Contrary to the above, on March 26, 1992 Nuclear Engineering initiated a field change to the Auto Transfer Lockout Circuit for removal of a 52 auxiliary "a" contact from alternate power circuit breaker 1932 that was wired in parallel with lockout relay 86/932. The field change was documented as complete by use of Advance Authorization 15 to Field Design Change Notice 17784-A but the work was never accomplished. This resulted in failure to have the auxiliary "a" contact removed. This work-at-risk procedure exceeded the intent of changes which can be advanced authorized and does not impose design control measures commensurate with those applied to the original design.

This is a Severity Level IV violation (Supplement II)

- B. 10 CFR 50 Appendix B Criterion V and the licensee's accepted Quality Assurance Program, TVA-NQA-PLN 89-A, Nuclear Quality Assurance Plan, Revision 2, Section 6.1.2A1 require that activities affecting quality shall be prescribed by documented instructions, procedures, or drawing of a type appropriate to the circumstances and shall be accomplished in accordance with those instructions procedures or drawings. Instructions, procedures, or drawings shall include appropriate quantitative or qualitative acceptance criteria for determining that important activities have been satisfactorily accomplished.

Contrary to the above, procedures were inadequate, in that during May 1992 trouble shooting was performed under Generic Test Procedure GTE-XXX-02, Scheme Verification, to find an electrical ground in 6.9kv

Shutdown Board 1A-A. The procedure did not ensure restoration of lifted leads. As a result of this work, an electrical lead was left disconnected. Another lifted lead was discovered by testing but the cause could not be determined.

This is a Severity Level IV violation (Supplement II).

Pursuant to the provisions of 10 CFR 2.201, Tennessee Valley Authority is hereby required to submit a written statement or explanation to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, ATTN: Document Control Desk, Washington, D.C. 20555, with a copy to the Regional Administrator, Region II, and a copy to the NRC Resident Inspector at the facility that is the subject of this Notice, within 30 days of the date of the letter transmitting this Notice of Violation (Notice). This reply should be clearly marked as a "Reply to a Notice of Violation" and should include for each violation: (1) the reason for the violation, or, if contested, the basis for disputing the violation, (2) the corrective steps that have been taken and the results achieved, (3) the corrective steps that will be taken to avoid further violations, and (4) the date when full compliance will be achieved. If an adequate reply is not received within the time specified in this Notice, an order or Demand for Information may be issued as to why the license should not be modified, suspended, or revoked, or why such other action as may be proper should not be taken. Where good cause is shown, consideration will be given to extending the response time.

Dated at Atlanta, Georgia
this 7th day of January 1993