

APPENDIX A

NOTICE OF VIOLATION

Entergy Operations, Inc.  
River Bend Station

Docket: 50-458  
License: NPF-47

During an NRC inspection conducted on January 30 through March 12, 1994, two 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. Technical Specification 6.2.1 requires, in part, that written procedures shall be implemented covering surveillance and test activities of safety-related equipment and covering the applicable procedures recommended in Appendix A of Regulatory Guide 1.33, Revision 2, February 1978.

Regulatory Guide 1.33, Appendix A, states, in part, that maintenance that can affect the performance of safety-related equipment should be performed in accordance with written procedures appropriate to the circumstances.

Contrary to the above, three examples were identified for which written procedures affecting safety-related maintenance activities were not implemented as required by the procedure:

1. On January 3, 1993, Administrative Procedure ADM-0015, "Station Surveillance Test Program," Revision 14, required that the steps in surveillance test procedures be performed in sequential order unless specifically stated otherwise in the procedure. While performing Procedure STP-207-4813, "RCIC Isolation - RCIC Steam Supply Pressure Low, 18 Month Response Time Channel A," Revision 5, the technicians performed Steps 7.1.23.43.a, -b, and -c out of sequence.
2. On January 11, 1994, Step 2 of Maintenance Work Order R200150 required the inner door of the containment airlock to be locked while performing the maintenance activity on the door. Step 2 was signed off as completed by plant personnel; however, the door was not locked as required.
3. On January 11, 1993, Procedure STP-201-6312, "SLC Quarterly Valve Operability and Pump Flow Test Division II," Revision 1, required running suction and discharge pressures to be recorded on Data Sheet 1. During performance of the test, the steps requiring this action were signed off as completed; however, the data were not recorded as required.

This is a Severity Level IV violation (458/93031-2) (Supplement I).

- B. Technical Specification 6.8.1.d requires, in part, that written procedures shall be established and maintained covering surveillance and test activities of safety-related equipment.

Contrary to the above, on January 11, 1994, Surveillance Test Procedure STP-201-6312, "SLC Quarterly Valve Operability and Pump Flow Test Division II," Revision 1, failed to require the pump to be run for a minimum of 5 minutes before taking data as required by IWP-3500 of the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code, Section XI. In contrast, Steps 7.2.29 and 7.2.30 required the pump to be run for 3 minutes maximum and to take data during that time.

This is a Severity Level IV violation (458/93031-3) (Supplement I).

Pursuant to the provisions of 10 CFR 2.201, Entergy Operations, Inc. 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 IV, 611 Ryan Plaza Drive, Suite 400, Arlington, Texas 76011, 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 a Demand for Information may be issued to show cause 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 Arlington, Texas,  
this *29th* day of *March* 1994