

APPENDIX

NOTICE OF VIOLATION

Entergy Operations, Inc.  
River Bend Station  
EA No.: 94-004

Docket: 50-458  
License: NPF-47

During an NRC inspection conducted on October 25-29 and November 8-12, 1993, 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. Criterion V of Appendix B to 10 CFR Part 50 states, in part, that activities affecting quality shall be prescribed by documented instructions, procedures, or drawings of a type appropriate to the circumstances and shall be accomplished in accordance with these instructions, procedures, or drawings.
1. Contrary to the above, the licensee failed to prescribe activities affecting quality by documented instructions and drawings appropriate to the circumstances in that the documentation for identification of safety-related valves and their locked position did not accurately reflect all the appropriate valves installed in the plant (01014).
  2. Contrary to the above, the licensee failed to prescribe activities affecting quality by documented instructions appropriate to the circumstances in that Procedure STP-204-4223, "ECCS-LPCI Pump B Discharge Pressure-High Monthly CHFUNCT, 18 Month CHCAL, 18 Month LSFT (E12-N055B, E12-N655B)," did not state that the pressure transmitter was required to be vented during the performance of a surveillance activity. The test could not be properly completed without performing the venting evolution (01024).
  3. Contrary to the above, the licensee failed to prescribe activities affecting quality by documented instructions appropriate to the circumstances in that Procedure STP-204-6302, "Division II LPCI (RHR) Pump and Valve Operability Test," did not specify that temporary test equipment should be attached to a structure. As a result of this procedure deficiency, a test gage fell from atop system piping, became disconnected, and sprayed process fluid on individuals observing the testing (01034).
  4. Contrary to the above, the licensee failed to prescribe activities affecting quality by documented instructions appropriate to the circumstances in that Procedure STP-511-4514, "\*RMS-Main Plant Exhaust Duct Noble Gas Activity Quarterly CHFUNCT (1RMS\*RE125)," could not be performed in accordance with this approved procedure, which had been issued for implementation, because the test required the performance of 14 different operations within 30 seconds, which was physically impossible (01044).

5. Contrary to the above, the licensee failed to accomplish activities affecting quality in accordance with documented instructions in that a change to Procedure STP-511-4209, "RMS-Main Control Room Ventilation Radiation Monitor Local Intake 18 Month CHCAL (RMS\*RE13A)," was made, on January 29, 1990, using a surveillance test comment control form, which was prohibited by Procedure ADM-0015, Revision 14 (01054).

This is a Severity Level IV violation. (Supplement I) (458/9325-03)

- B. Criterion XVI to Appendix B of 10 CFR Part 50 states, in part, that measures shall be established to assure that conditions adverse to quality and nonconformances are promptly identified and corrected. In the case of significant conditions adverse to quality, the measures shall assure that the cause of the condition is determined and corrective action taken to preclude repetition.
  1. Contrary to the above, the licensee was aware, since plant startup in 1985, that spare breakers installed in safety- and nonsafety-related motor control centers were not properly labeled to indicate the electrical load supplied by the breaker, if any, and did not initiate prompt actions to correct this nonconforming condition (02014).
  2. Contrary to the above, the licensee was aware, since 1992, that the emergency stop button for the diesel generator was inadvertently depressed on two occasions and resulted in the shutdown of the diesel and did not implement prompt corrective actions to correct this nonconforming condition (02024).
  3. Contrary to the above, the licensee identified, on three occasions since 1991, that access was required to Valve 1E12\*VF063C, which was located approximately 20 feet above the floor. The licensee initiated corrective actions to resolve this nonconforming condition; however, the corrective actions taken by the licensee did not preclude repetition of this nonconforming condition (02034).
  4. Contrary to the above, the licensee was aware, since 1990, that a nonconformance existed with the wide-range suppression pool water level indicator in that the meter scale was incorrect and did not promptly correct the nonconforming condition (02044).
  5. Contrary to the above, the licensee identified that the distribution system for safety-related procedures did not provide the correct procedure revision to personnel performing plant activities and did not take appropriate corrective actions to preclude repetition in that the incorrect revision of the same procedure was issued for use two subsequent months in a row (02054).

6. Contrary to the above, the licensee has experienced numerous failures of the containment airlock door seals since 1985 and has not taken appropriate corrective actions to preclude repetition in that the seals have failed an average of five per year since 1985 (02064).
7. Contrary to the above, the licensee was aware, since 1987, of the continued failure of the flow switches in the sample lines for Radiation Monitors RMS\*RE-11A and -11B and did not take appropriate corrective actions to preclude repetition of the flow switch failures (02074).

This is a Severity Level IV violation. (Supplement I) (458/9325-04)

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 *1st* day of *April* 1994