

ENCLOSURE 1

NOTICE OF VIOLATION

Duke Power Company  
Oconee 1, 2, and 3

Docket Nos. 50-269, 270, and 287  
License Nos. DPR-38, 47 and 55  
EA 93-120

During an NRC inspection conducted on May 1 - May 29, 1993, three 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. Oconee Technical Specification 6.4.1 requires that the Station be operated and maintained in accordance with approved procedures.

Operating Procedure OP/1/A/1104/02, High Pressure Injection System, Enclosure 6.1, Letdown Storage Tank (LDST) Pressure vs Indicated Level, Step 1.0 states "Maintain the LDST pressure vs indicated level within the normal operating region except for degassing or venting per an approved procedure".

Contrary to the above, on April 30, 1993, letdown storage tank pressure was not maintained within the normal operating region during a hydrogen addition which resulted in the letdown storage tank pressure exceeding the maximum allowable pressure per OP/1/A/1104/02 by approximately 9 pounds per square inch. Exceeding the requirements of OP/1/A/1104/02 placed the Unit 1 high pressure injection system in a condition outside of its design basis.

This is a severity level IV violation and applies to Unit 1 (Supplement 1).

- B. 10 CFR 50.72.b.1.ii.B requires a one hour non-emergency report be made if during plant operation a condition is identified that is outside the design basis of the plant.

Contrary to the above, a one hour report was not made to the NRC on April 30, 1993, when the Unit 1 High Pressure Injection system was placed in a condition outside the design basis of the system due to exceeding the allowable hydrogen overpressure in the letdown storage tank during a hydrogen addition.

This is a severity level IV violation and applies to Unit 1 (Supplement 1).

- C. 10 CFR 50 Appendix B, Section XI, Test Control, requires that a test program be established to assure that all testing required to demonstrate that structures, systems, and components will perform satisfactorily in service is identified and performed in accordance with written test procedures which incorporate the requirements and acceptable limits contained in applicable design limits.

Duke Power Company  
Oconee 1, 2, and 3

2 Docket Nos. 50-269, 270, and 287  
License Nos. DPR-38, 47 and 55  
EA 93-120

Contrary to the above, the licensee's test control process allowed improper performance of a required surveillance (Technical Specification 4.7.1) conducted under Instrument Procedure (IP) O/A/0330/003A, Control Rod Drive Rod Drop Time Test. The test control process was inadequate in that it allowed dropping of control rods numerous times in order to meet the acceptance criteria. This method of control rod drop time testing did not adequately demonstrate operability of control rods in that some control rods required multiple drops before the acceptance time was met.

This is a severity level IV violation (supplement 1)

Pursuant to the provisions of 10 CFR 2.201, Duke Power Company 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 18th day of June 1993