FEB 1 4 1992

Official

TEOI

Docket Nos. 50-413 and 50-414 License Nos. NPF-35 and NPF-52 EA 91-191

Duke Power Company ATTN: Mr. M. S. Tuckman Vice President Catawba Nuclear Station Post Office Box 256 Clover, South Carolina 29710

Gentlemen:

SUBJECT: NOTICE OF VIOLATION AND PROPOSED IMPOSITION OF CIVIL PENALTY - \$15,000 (NRC INSPECTION REPORT NOS. 50-412/91-27 AND 50-414/91-27)

This refers to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) inspection conducted by Mr. W. Orders on November 3 - December 10, 1991, at the Catawba Nuclear Station. The inspection included a review of the facts and circumstances related to five examples of failure to follow procedures, which were identified by your staff, associated with the control room ventilation system shared by both units, the Unit 2 safety injection system, and various Unit 2 containment penetrations. The report documenting this inspection was sent to you by letter dated December 31. 1991. As a result of this inspection, a violation of NRC requirements was identified and was considered to be a repeat violation involving configuration control. An enforcement conference was held on January 15, 1992, in the NRC Region 11 office to discuss the violation, and the adverse trend, the repetitive nature of these problems, the causes, and your corrective actions to preclude recurrence. A summary of this conference was sent to you by letter dated January 21, 1992.

The violation described in the enclosed Notice of Violation and Proposed Imposition of Civil Penalty (Notice) involved five examples of failure to adequately implement plant procedures. The first example involved an incorrect breaker alignment in the Control Room Ventilation (VC) system which resulted in both trains of the VC system being inoperable for approximately 90 minutes on Sentember 13, 1991. The second example involved a valve misalignment during testing of the 2A Safety Injection Tump which resulted in the pump experiencing runout flow on startup for testing on November 17, 1991. The third example involved an inappropriate verification of the 28 steam generator pressure operated relief valve (PORV) drain line isolation valve on November 16, 1991, as being closed when it was actually open. The fourth example involved an inappropriate verification of a 20 steam generator outlet header drain block valve on November 18, 1991, as being closed when it was actually open. The fifth example involved the verification of the "inside" containment isolation lineup on November 18, 1991, when verification of the "outside" containment isolation was required to be verified. During the period these failures This occurred, Unit 1 was at full power and Unit 2 was in a refueling outage.

9203230197 920214 PDP ADOCK 05000413 G PDR

violation with five examples has been categorized at Severity Level 1V in accordance with the "General Statement of Policy and Procedure for NRC Enforcement Actions," (Enforcement Policy) 10 CFR Part 2, Appendix C (1991).

. 2 .

This current violation is similar to three previous violations identified since June 1991, involving configuration control and independent verification problems. The letter transmitting NRC Inspection Report Nos. 50-413/91-13 and 50-414/91-13 issued on June 26, 1091, discussed the NRC's concerns regarding continuing configuration control problems at the Catawba Nuclear Station and cautioned that more significant enforcement sanctions could result from your lack of effective corrective actions for configuration control problems. You were advised that an enforcement conference would not be conducted nor would a civil penalty be proposed for those violations. However, a management meeting was conducted in the Region 11 office on July 29, 1991, with you and your staff to discuss configuration control problems and the actions taken or proposed to correct those problems.

By letter dated July 30, 1991, NRC Inspection Report Nos. 50-413/91-15 and 50-414/91-15 was issued and it addressed a configuration control problem that occurred on June 4, 1991, involving the failure of control room operators to provide an adequate suction to an operating centrifugal charging pump. This was cited as a Severity Level IV violation and was included for discussion at the management meeting conducted on July 29, 1991.

By letter dated October 31, 1991, NRC Inspection Report Nos. 50-413/91-21 and 50-414/91-21 was issued and it addressed the NRC's concern regarding personnel failing to follow station procedures governing independent verification requirements when performing maintenance and surveillance activities. It was pointed out that repetitive examples of inadequate independent verification had been noted, and you were urged to apply additional management attention in that area.

In responding to these earlier violations both in correspondence and in your discussions at the July 29th management meeting, you outlined your proposed short-term and long-term corrective actions. Some short-term corrective actions focused on the individuals involved in the violations, and the long-term corrective actions included procedural and other administrative revisions, personnel training, communication enhancements, equipment improvements, and increased management involvement.

During the January 15, 1992 enforcement conference, you stated your belief that the broader problems with configuration control have been substantially improved, but acknowledged that a problem still exists with operator errors related to component positioning. You provided examples of your long-term corrective actions such as the Total Quality Management concept and The Journey To Excellence Program that are being implemented at the Catawba Nuclear Station. The NRC recognizes that some corrective actions, once implemented, will take considerable time to become fully effective and produce a permanent change. However, the trend of failure to establish adequate measures for plant configuration control is a significant and continuing concern to the NRC because of the number of occurrences of this violation in the recent past. A trend of recurring violations is of particular concern because the NRC expects licensees to learn from past failures and take corrective action to preclude recurrence.

FE9 1 4 1992

Duke Power Company

Although the NRC does not normally consider monetary civil penalties for Severity Level IV violations, the Enforcement Policy does provide for such penalties when it is evident that the licensee has not implemented effective corrective action for previous similar violations. The staff finds that such is the case in this situation and that a civil penalty is warranted.

+ 3 +

To emphasize the importance of ensuring that developed and implemented corrective actions are effective in precluding the occurrence of similar violations, I have been authorized, after consultation with the Director, Office of Enforcement, and the Deputy Executive Director for Nuclear Reactor Regulation, Regional Operations and Research, to issue the enclosed Notice of Violation and Proposed Imposition of Civil Penalty (Notice) in the amount of \$15,000 for the Severity Level IV violation. The base value of a civil penalty for a Severity Level IV violation is \$15,000.

The escalation and mitigation factors in the Enforcement Policy were considered. After considering the fact that you identified the violations, the fact that proposed long-term corrective actions are open-ended and have yet to be fully defined or scheduled for implementation, and the fact that you have had poor prior performance in this area, on balance, nu adjustment to the base civil penalty has been deemed appropriate.

You are required to respond to this letter and should follow the instructions specified in the enclosed Notice when preparing your response. In your response, you should document the specific actions taken and any additional actions you plan to prevent recurrence. Your response should also address two additional examples of configuration control problems that are documented in NRC Inspection Report Nos. 50-413/91-28 and 50-414/91-28 which was sent to you by letter dated February 5, 1992, and involved the operation of the 28 Containment Srray pump with no suction source and an inadvertent main turbine roll which occurred during post-modification testing. In addition, your response should include a description and schedule for the procedural changes that will implement the improved Duke Power Company (DPC) guidance on independent verification that was discussed during the enforcement conference and actions being taken to emphasize to your staff the importance, from a safety perspective, of adhering to procedures, positive communications, and accurate records.

After reviewing your response to this Notice, including your proposed corrective actions and the results of future inspections, the NRC will determine whether further NRC enforcement action is necessary to ensure compliance with NRC regulatory requirements.

In accordance with 10 CFR 2.790 of the NRC's "Rules of Practice," a copy of this letter and its enclosure will be placed in the NRC Public Document Room.

The responses directed by this letter and the enclosed Notice are not subject to the clearance procedures of the Office of Management and Budget as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980, Pub. L. No. 96-511.

Should you have any questions concerning this letter, please contact us.

Sincerely,

4 -

Original signed by SDEUneter

Stewart D. Ebneter Regional Administrator

Enclosure: Notice of Violation and Proposed Imposition of Civil Penalty

cc w/encl: A. V. Carr, Esq. Duke Power Company 422 South Church Street Charlotte, NC 28242-0001

J. Michael McGarry, III, Esq. Bishop, Cook, Purcell and Reynolds 1400 L Street, NW Washington, D. C. 20005

North Carolina MPA-1 Suite 600 P. O. Box 29513 Raleigh, NC 27626-0513

Heyward G. Shealy, Chief Bureau of Radiological Health South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control 2600 Bull Street Columbia, SC 29201

Richard F. Wilson, Esq. Assistant Attorney General S. C. Attorney General's Office P. O. Box 11549 Columbia, SC 29211

Michael Hirsch Federal Emergency Management Agency 500 C Street, SW, Room 840 Vashington, D. C. 20472

cc w/encl cont'd: (see next page)

- 5 -

FEB 1 4 1992

cc w/encl cont'd: North Carolina Electric Membership Corporation P. O. Box 27306 Raleigh, NC 27511

Karen E. Long Assistant Attorney General N. C. Department of Justice P. O. Box 629 Raleigh, NC 27602

Saluda River Electric Cooperative, Inc. P. O. Box 929 Laurens, SC 29360

Frank Modrak, Project Manager Mid-South Area ESSD Projects Westinghouse Electric Corporation MNC West Tower - Bay 241 P. O. Box 355 Pittsburgh, PA 15230

County Manager of York County York County Courthouse York, SC 29745

Piedmont Municipal Power Agency 121 Village Drive Greer, SC 29651

R. L. Gill Nuclear Production Department Duke Power Company P. O. Box 1007 Charlotte, NC 28201-1007

R. C. Futrell Compliance Duke Power Company P. O. Box 256 Clover, SC 29710

State of North Carolina

4

DISTRIBUTION: PDR SECY CA J. Sniezek, DEDR S. Ebneter, RII J. Lieberman, OE R. Pedersen, OE J. Goldberg, OGC Enforcement Coordinators RI, RII, RIII, RIV, RV B. Hayes, OI D. Williams, OIG E. Jordan, AEOD R. E. Martin, NRR J. Johnson, RII W. Miller, RII G. A. Eelisle, RII A. R. Merdt, RII EA File Day File Document Control Desk

NRC Resident inspector U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Route 2, Box 179-N York, SC 29745

*0E *RII RPedersen SEbneter 1/ /92 1/ /92 See previous page for concurrence

*0E:D JLieberman - 1/ /92

*DEDR JSniezek 1/ /92

AReyes 2/13/92

RII aut 9 the Rece CREVARS 21 192

RIL GRJenkins

2/13/92

- 6 -

R11 out of Place JLMithean

Duke Power Company DISTRIBUTION: PDR SECY CA J. Sniezek, DEDR S. Ebneter, RII J. Lieberman, OE R. Pedersen, OE J. Goldberg. OSC Enforcement Coordinators RI, RII, RIII, RIV, RV B. Hayes, OI D. Williams, OIG E. Jordan, AEOD R. E. Martin, NRR J. Johnson, RII W. Miller, RII G. A. Belisle, RII A. R. Herdt, RII EA File Day File Document Control Desk

16

NRC Resident Inspector U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Route 2, Box 179-N York, SC 29745

OE RHR RPedersen 1/30/92



