

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Office of Public Affairs, Region IV  
611 Ryan Plaza Drive - Suite 400  
Arlington, Texas 76011-8064

RIV: 97-73  
CONTACT: Breck Henderson  
OFFICE: 817/860-8128

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE  
December 2, 1997

E-MAIL: bwh@nrc.gov

NRC STAFF PROPOSES \$110,000 FINE  
AGAINST NPPD FOR VIOLATIONS AT COOPER NUCLEAR PLANT

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff has proposed a \$110,000 fine against the Nebraska Public Power District (NPPD), the operator of Cooper Nuclear Station near Brownville, Nebraska, for *failing to meet NRC requirements that power reactor licensees have measures established to ensure prompt identification and correction of conditions adverse to quality. Conditions adverse to quality include failures, malfunctions, inefficiencies, deviations, defective material and equipment and nonconformance.*

*The violations which involve nine examples of failure to meet this requirement were recorded during NRC inspections conducted last summer. They were discussed with NPPD and NRC officials on October 17 during a pre-disciplinary enforcement conference at the NRC Region III office in Arlington, Texas.*

*The first two examples were considered the most significant. The other seven similar concerns situations in which NPPD inadequately identified or corrected conditions adverse to quality.*

*In the first example, NPPD failed to identify and correct a problem that could have resulted in water inadvertently overflowing into the standby gas treatment system which is designed to filter radioactive materials from the reactor containment building under certain accident conditions. This condition was not corrected for more than two years and could have rendered the two trains of the system inoperable under certain circumstances.*

*In the second example, NPPD failed to identify and correct a significant problem in which mud clogged a heat exchanger in the residual heat removal system which is designed to remove heat from the reactor after it is shut down. NPPD failed to recognize the problem even after it was identified by the NRC and failed to take corrective actions to prevent its recurrence.*

His [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] Regional Administrator of NRC Region [redacted] said in a letter to [redacted] that the circumstances surrounding the violations [redacted] in [redacted] late contemporaneous weaknesses in [redacted] our staff [redacted] is a [redacted] lit [redacted] to recognize an [redacted] correct problems [redacted]

The NRC has categorized the nine examples as a single [redacted] level [redacted] violation [redacted] [redacted] the agency's enforcement system uses four [redacted] levels [redacted] with [redacted] level [redacted] being the most serious [redacted]

[redacted] level [redacted] level [redacted] violations carry a [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] civil penalty [redacted] which can be a [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] on the circumstances surrounding identification and corrective actions [redacted] the penalty in this case was a [redacted] [redacted] to [redacted] [redacted] because [redacted] was not given credit for identifying the violations or for corrective actions [redacted]

[redacted] has [redacted] [redacted] to respond to the NRC's citation [redacted] [redacted] during which time it may pay [redacted] the civil penalty or protest it [redacted] if the protest is denied the utility may [redacted] as [redacted] for a hearing [redacted]

[redacted]