

NOTICE OF VIOLATION

Tennessee Valley Authority  
Watts Bar Unit 1

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

During an NRC inspection conducted May 21 through June 17, 1995, a violation of NRC requirements was identified. In accordance with the Federal Register Notice 60 FR 34381, the violation is listed below:

10 CFR 50, Appendix B, Criterion V, Instructions, Procedures, and Drawings, and TVA Nuclear Quality Assurance Plan, TVA-NQA-PLN89A, Revision 4, Section 6.1, require that activities affecting quality be prescribed by documented instructions or procedures and be accomplished in accordance with these instructions or procedures.

Contrary to the above, activities affecting quality were not accomplished in accordance with documented instructions or procedures in the following examples:

1. Site Standard Practice SSP-9.03, Plant Modifications and Design Change Control, Revision 8, Step 2.2.A.4, requires that changes during implementation of a design change notice require the same level of technical review and approval as the original notice.

Work Orders 93-11751-61, 93-11751-66, 93-11751-21, 93-11751-19, and 93-13527-00 were closed without completing the required splice replacements based on a determination that the planned work was not within the intent of Design Change Notice Q-17111-A. However, the splice terminations were identified in the design change notice for replacement and the work order did not receive the same level of technical review and approval as Design Change Notice Q-17111-A. The splices are associated with the following temperature elements.

<u>Work Order</u>	<u>Temperature Element</u>
93-11751-61	1-TE-068-0001-D
93-11751-66	1-TE-068-0018-D
93-11751-21	1-TE-068-0043-E
93-11751-19	1-TE-068-0065-E
93-13527-00	1-TE-074-0014-G

2. Site Standard Practice SSP-3.06, Problem Evaluation Reports, Revision 16, paragraph 2.2.D, requires that the initiating supervisor of a problem evaluation report determine if the report is potentially reportable in accordance with Site Standard Practice SSP-4.05, NRC Reporting Requirements. Question II on

Enclosure 1

Appendix E-1 of Site Standard Practice SSP-4.05, 10 CFR 50.55(e) Screening Form Guidelines for Potential Reportability Determination, requires that the deficiency being evaluated be identified as potentially reportable and be forwarded to site licensing for further evaluation if the evaluator cannot confirm that, if left uncorrected, the affected safety system or component could have performed its required safety function without reliance on future tests or operator actions.

On March 29, 1995, Site Standard Practices SSP-3.06 and SSP-4.05 were not followed when Problem Evaluation Report WBP950192 was determined to be not potentially reportable even though operator actions were required to remove a plug from the reference leg of level transmitter 1-LT-63-181 and subsequent retesting was required to confirm component operability.

On March 30, 1995, Site Standard Practices SSP-3.06 and SSP-4.05 were not followed when Problem Evaluation Report WBP950193 was determined to be not potentially reportable even though operator actions were required to reconfigure terminations for incorrectly wired temperature switch 1-TS-30-183 and subsequent retesting was required to confirm component operability.

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, Watts Bar, 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 11th day of July 1995