

ENCLOSURE 1

NOTICE OF VIOLATION

Entergy Operations, Inc.

Docket: 50-458

River Bend Station

License: NPF-47

During an NRC inspection conducted on January 8 through March 5, 1996, four violations of NRC requirements were identified. In accordance with the "General Statement of Policy and Procedure for NRC Enforcement Actions," (60 FR 34381; June 30, 1995), the violations are listed below:

A. Technical Specification 5.4.1 states, in part, "Written procedures shall be established, implemented, and maintained covering the following activities: a. The applicable procedures recommended in Regulatory Guide 1.33, Revision 2, Appendix A, February 1978." Appendix A of Regulatory Guide 1.33 lists activities that should be covered by written procedures, including, "Preparation for refueling and refueling equipment operation," and "Refueling and Core Operations."

1. Procedure ME01597, "Refueling Platform," Revision 8, Step 9.4.9.14, required checking the refueling bridge zone computer interlocks in accordance with Vendor Technical Manual 3224.110-000-016A, "Refueling Platform, GEK-83294." Step 3.19.16 of the technical manual contained detailed requirements for verifying the zone computer interlocks.

Procedure ADM-0081, "Cleanliness Control," Revision 3, was established to implement foreign material exclusion for all plant conditions, including refueling. Step 8.3 of the procedure required maintaining accountability and document tools and items entering and leaving a foreign material exclusion area, as well as, having devices to secure items from inadvertently falling into a foreign material exclusion area. In addition, Step 8.4.3 of the procedure required initiation of a condition report when material was lost introduced into an open system or component and not immediately retrieved.

Contrary to the above, the inspectors identified that:

- (a) The checking of refueling bridge zone computer interlocks on January 2, 1996, was not done in accordance with the requirements of Step 3.19.16 of the vendor technical manual but, instead, with a zone computer map and the skill of a test technician.
- (b) Between January 8 and February 2, 1996, there were numerous instances where Step 8.3 of Procedure ADM-0081 was not followed, and items brought into the fuel and reactor building pool areas were not accounted for, documented, and secured.

- (c) Personnel failed to follow Step 8.4.3 of Procedure ADM-0081 and initiate condition reports for numerous items lost in the suppression pool since the last refueling outage (RF-5).

Altogether, these examples constitute a Severity Level IV violation (Supplement I) (458/9601-01).

- 2. Procedure STP-055-0705, "Fuel Handling Platform Operability Test," Revision 9, stated the main hoist loaded interlock test was satisfied by performance of Step 7.1.10 of the procedure.

Contrary to the above, Step 7.1.10 of Procedure STP-055-0705, completed on January 6, 1996, did not adequately test the fuel handling platform main hoist loaded interlock in that it failed to test one of the contacts associated with the loaded interlock.

This example constitutes a Severity Level IV violation (Supplement I) (458/9601-02).

- 3. Fuel Handling Procedure FHP-0001, "Control of Fuel Handling and Refueling Operations," Revision 13, stated, in part, "The Reactor Engineer and spotter shall verify the correct bundle orientation and location prior to the lowering of a fuel bundle . . . Prior to grappling or loading fuel assemblies in the core, verify the correct core location. . . ."

Procedure REP-0029, "Fuel Movement," Revision 2B, stated, in part, "Movement of all nuclear material must be in accordance with and tracked by an approved Fuel Movement Plan . . . Fuel shall only be inserted into the core at its designated core loading plan locations."

Fuel Movement Plan FMP-COR-07-03 designated, in Step 1148, that Fuel Bundle YJ2151 be loaded into Cell Location 55-26.

Contrary to the above, on January 21, 1996, fuel handling activities revealed that Fuel Bundle YJ2151 was not loaded into the Fuel Movement Plan FMP-COR-07-03 designated Cell Location 55-26, but was misloaded into a different location.

This example constitutes a Severity Level IV violation (Supplement I) (458/9601-03).

- B. Criterion III of Appendix B to 10 CFR Part 50 requires, in part, that measures shall be established to assure that the design basis for safety-related structures, systems, and components is correctly translated into specifications, drawings, procedures, and instructions.

Contrary to the above, the inspectors identified that appropriate measures had not been established to assure that the design basis of the spent fuel pool and reactor cavity pneumatic gate seals were translated into drawings, procedures, and instructions.

This example constitutes a Severity Level IV violation (Supplement I) (458/9601-05).

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. Your response may reference or include previous docketed correspondence, if the correspondence adequately addresses the required response. If an adequate reply is not received within the time specified in this Notice, an order or a Demand for Information may be issued as to 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.

Because the response will be placed in the NRC Public Document Room (PDR), to the extent possible, it should not include any personal privacy, proprietary, or safeguards information so that it can be placed in the PDR without redaction. However, if it is necessary to include such information, it should clearly indicate the specific information that should not be placed in the PDR, and provide the legal basis to support the request for withholding the information from the public.

Dated at Arlington, Texas  
this 18<sup>th</sup> day of April 1996