

NOTICE OF VIOLATION

Commonwealth Edison Company
Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station

Docket No. 50-254
Docket No. 50-265

As a result of the inspection conducted from November 4 through December 15, 1990, and in accordance with the "General Statement of Policy and Procedure for NRC Enforcement Actions," 10 CFR Part 2, Appendix C, (1990) (Enforcement Policy) the following violations were identified:

1. Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station Operating Licenses DPR-29 and DPR-30, Section 3.B. states that "the licensee shall operate the facility in accordance with the Technical Specifications".
 - a. Unit 1 Technical Specification 3.12.F.2 requires all penetration fire barriers protecting safety related areas be intact or else a continuous fire watch must be established.

Contrary to the above, for approximately six weeks ending on September 20, 1990, the Unit 1 cable tunnel access hatch was open without a continuous fire watch being established. A fire watch in 20 minute intervals was performed during this time.
 - b. Unit 2 Technical Specification 4.12.B.1.d requires each Fire Suppression System be demonstrated operable at least once per year by cycling each testable valve in the flow path through at least one complete cycle of full travel.

Contrary to the above, from April 20, 1989 to January 2, 1990, Unit 2 sprinkler system valve number 2-4199-72 exceeded the Technical Specification requirement, in that, it was not cycled to verify operability.
 - c. Unit 1 Technical Specification Table 4.8-1 requires the licensee to take a radiological effluent sample within 24 hours following a thermal power level change exceeding 20% of rated thermal power in one hour.

Contrary to the above, on July 2, 1990, a radiological effluent sample was not taken when Unit 1 power level was raised more than 20% of rated thermal power in one hour.
 - d. Technical Specification Table 4.1-1 footnote [2] states that an instrument check shall be performed on high steamline radiation once per shift.

Contrary to the above, on August 12 and August 14, 1990, the once per shift instrument check of the main steam line radiation monitors was not performed.

9101090085 910102
PDR ADOCK 05000254
PDR
Q

- e. Unit 1 Technical Specification 4.3.F requires that prior to entering Economic Generation Control (EGC) and once per shift while operating in EGC, the EGC operating parameters be reviewed for acceptability.

Contrary to the above, on November 4, 1990, the licensee discovered that the Core Monitoring Code that provides the EGC operating parameters had not been run and, therefore reviewed, for approximately 24 hours while the unit was operating in EGC.

Together, these examples are considered a Severity Level IV violation (Supplement I). (No. 50-254/90022-01(DRP); No. 50-265/90021-01(DRP))

2. 10 CFR 50, Appendix B, Criteria XVI states, in part, that measures shall be established to assure that conditions adverse to quality such as deficiencies and non-conformances are promptly identified and corrected. These measures shall assure that the cause of the condition is determined and corrective action taken to preclude repetition.

Contrary to the above, on October 4, 1990, it was identified that corrective actions for a previous Notice of Violation concerning the adequacy of work instructions (NRC Violation No. 89022-02a) did not preclude repetition of a similar event. On October 4, 1990 a violation for inadequate work instructions concerning lifted leads left unlabeled for #3 and #4 turbine control valve fast acting solenoid valves was identified. This is a repeat violation concerning electrical maintenance work package content and instructions.

This is a Severity Level IV violation (Supplement I).
(No. 50-265/90021-02(DRP))

Pursuant to the provisions of 10 CFR 2.201, you are required to submit to this office within thirty days of the date of this Notice a written statement or explanation in reply, including for each violation: (1) the corrective actions that have been taken and the results achieved; (2) the corrective actions that will be taken to avoid further violations; and (3) the date when full compliance will be achieved. Consideration may be given to extending your response time for good cause shown.

1/2/91
Dated

W. D. Shafer
W. D. Shafer, Chief
Reactor Projects Branch 1