## Appendix

## NOTICE OF VIOLATION

The Detroit Edison Company

Docket No. 50-341

As a result of the inspection conducted on August 1, 1984, through September 30, 1984, and in accordance with the General Policy and Procedure for NRC Enforcement Action, (10 CFR Part 2, Appendix C), the following violations were identified:

 10 CFR 50, Appendix B, Criterion VI, as implemented by DECo Operational Quality Assurance Policies, OQAP-6, requires that measures be established to control the preparation, revision, issuance, and use of documents which prescribe activities affecting quality to assure that they are reviewed for adequacy.

Contrary to the above, the licensee failed to adequately review Alarm Response Procedures. These procedures included incorrect units, incorrect values, and incorrect initiating devices.

This is a Severity Level V violation (Supplement II).

- 2. 10 CFR 50, Appendix B, Criterion V, as implemented by DECo Operational Quality Assurance Policy 5, requires that activities affecting quality shall be prescribed by appropriately documented instructions or procedures and shall be accomplished in accordance with these documents.
  - a. DECo Startup Instruction 7.5.7.4.5.01, Revision 7, dated January 31, 1982, Section 4.5.4 states that the shift test engineers are responsible for determining if the work falls within the definitions of a minor deficiency.
    - Contrary to the above, the shift test engineer inadequately reviewed Minor Deficiency Logs (MDL) by allowing work to be performed using the MDL which did not fall within the category of a minor deficiency.
  - b. Procedure 12.000.52T, Revision 0, dated August 24, 1982, Section 6.1.3 required that generic equipment defects must be reported by a nonconformance report (NCR).
    - Contrary to the above, the licensee documented on March 1, 1983, that 332 Emergency Diesel Generator control wire terminations were discrepant on an March 1 rather than an NCR.
  - c. Project Procedure 7.13, Section 4.2 requires any site personnel observing a deviation shall bring it to the attention of QA and document it on a Design Deviation Report (DDR).

Contrary to the above, the licensee documented three discrepant conditions on Quality Surveillance Summary FC/M-4789 dated November 4, 1983, rather than on a DDR or NCR.

This is a Severity Level IV violation (Supplement II).

10 CFR 50, Appendix B, Criterion XVI, as implemented by DECo Operations Quality Assurance Policy 16, Corrective Action, states that measures shall be established to assure that conditions adverse to quality shall be identified promptly and corrected as soon as practical.

Contrary to the above, measures that the licensee established to promptly identify conditions adverse to quality were not effective in that 704 vendor supplied safety-related terminations were repaired and not identified in a nonconformance system until ten to twenty months after the discrepancies had been corrected. In addition, corrective action was not taken to preclude recurrence until three months after the problem was brought to the attention of the licensee.

This is a Severity Level IV violation (Supplement II).

With respect to item 3, the inspection showed that action had been taken to correct the identified item of noncompliance and to prevent recurrence. Consequently, no reply to this item of noncompliance is required and we have no further questions regarding this matter. With respect to items 1 and 2, 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 item of noncompliance: (1) corrective action taken and the results achieved; (2) corrective action to be taken to avoid further noncompliance; and (3) the date when full compliance will be achieved. Consideration may be given to extending your response time for good cause shown.

Dated

Projects Branch 1