

## APPENDIX A

NOTICE OF VIOLATION

Based on the results of the NRC inspection on January 21, 22, 23 and 27, 1975, it appears that certain of your activities were not conducted in full compliance with NRC regulations and requirements as indicated below:

1. Contrary to 10 CFR 50.54(p), at the time of the inspection sections of the protected area barrier along the banks of the intake and discharge canal were left unprotected, where fencing had been removed for necessary construction work. (On February 3, 1975, Licensee Representative, R. Baron, called IE:I and announced that this item of noncompliance was corrected.)

This infraction was identified by the inspector and had the potential for causing or contributing to an occurrence with safety significance.

2. Contrary to the Oyster Creek Industrial Security Plan, dated January 7, 1974, Section 4.2.1, Security Procedure Requirements, written security procedures had not been issued or placed at specific locations for use by employees and security force members. (On February 3, 1975, Licensee Representative, R. Baron, called IE:I and announced that this item of noncompliance was corrected.)
3. Contrary to the Oyster Creek Industrial Security Plan, dated January 7, 1974, Section 3.4.2, Control, doors to the emergency diesel generator were unlocked, at a time when the building was unoccupied and no individual had the doors under surveillance. The northeast door to the reactor building and two other doors in the maintenance shop of the turbine building also were unlocked.

This infraction was identified by the inspector and had the potential for causing or contributing to an occurrence with safety significance.

4. Contrary to the Oyster Creek Industrial Security Plan, dated January 7, 1974, Section 3.3.3, Surveillance, and Attachment A of the supplement thereto, dated April 19, 1974, vital area alarms were not fully in-

~~10 CFR 2.790 INFORMATION~~

IE:I;37  
Cy 4 of 8

stalled and operational. (Prior to the exit interview on January 27, 1974, this item of noncompliance was corrected.)

This infraction was identified by the inspector and had the potential for causing or contributing to an occurrence with safety significance.

5. Contrary to the Oyster Creek Industrial Security Plan, dated January 7, 1974, Section 3.3.3, Surveillance, lighting of the protected area section of the canal was insufficient to permit effective visual inspection of the area using the closed-circuit television cameras.

This infraction was identified by the inspector and had the potential for causing or contributing to an occurrence with safety significance.

6. Contrary to the Oyster Creek Industrial Security Plan, dated January 7, 1974, Section 3.3.2.3, Inspection or Searches, at the time of the inspection licensee personnel and security force members at the Oyster Creek Station advised that no unannounced or scheduled searches of individuals had been conducted.

This deficiency was identified by the inspector.

7. Contrary to the Oyster Creek Industrial Security Plan, dated January 7, 1974, Section 3.3.2.3, Inspection or Searches, signs posted at access points fail to advise those who pass that their persons, effects and vehicles are subject to random search.

This deficiency was identified by the inspector.