

January 10, 1984

*W+E
PR
Carolina P+LC*

The Honorable Richard L. Ottinger, Chairman,
Subcommittee on Energy Conservation and Power
Committee on Energy and Commerce
United States House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Enclosed for your information is an announcement that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff has proposed a \$40,000 civil penalty against Carolina Power & Light Company for alleged noncompliance with NRC requirements at the Brunswick nuclear power plant.

It is planned to mail this information to the news media today, January 10, 1984.

Sincerely,

Carlton Kammerer, Director
Office of Congressional Affairs

Enclosure:
As stated

cc: Rep. Carlos Moorhead

IDENTICAL LETTER SENT TO:

Sen. Simpson/cc: Sen. Hart
Rep. Udall/cc: Rep. Lujan
Rep. Markey/cc: Rep. Marlenee
Sen. East
Sen. Heims
Rep. Rose

8510230018 851004
PDR FOIA
JACOBS85-478 PDR

66

OFFICE	OCA						
SURNAME	COMBS: Tac						
DATE	1/10/84						



**UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**
Office of Public Affairs
Washington, D.C. 20555

No. 84-4
Tel. 301/492-7715

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
(Tuesday, January 10, 1984)

**NRC STAFF PROPOSES \$40,000 CIVIL PENALTY AGAINST CP&L
FOR NONCOMPLIANCE AT BRUNSWICK NUCLEAR PLANT**

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff has proposed a \$40,000 civil penalty against Carolina Power & Light Company for alleged noncompliance with NRC requirements at the Brunswick nuclear power plant, located near Southport, North Carolina.

James P. O'Reilly, Administrator of the NRC's Region II office in Atlanta, told the company in a letter that the civil penalty was being proposed because CP&L failed to post a continuous fire watch, as required, while both trains of the Unit 1 standby gas treatment system fire suppression system were inoperable between February 11 and March 13, 1983. The standby gas treatment system is a filter system designed for use in treating the reactor containment building air before release to the outside atmosphere during accident conditions. When both trains of the fire suppression system, designed to extinguish unexpected fire in the filter system, are out, the plant is required to place a fire watch and arrange for alternate fire suppression mechanisms within one hour if plant operation continues.

O'Reilly said, based upon additional violations detected in the fire protection area, that surveillance performed by fire protection personnel was incorrectly documented due to "a programmatic breakdown of fire protection administrative and managerial controls."

In another enforcement action contained in the letter, the NRC staff cited, but did not fine, CP&L for an additional violation of NRC requirements. O'Reilly said the utility was being cited for "submittal to the NRC of an inaccurate statement having safety implications" in a company response to an April 2, 1982, NRC Notice of Violation. In that case, the company responded to the NRC notice with a statement that discrepancies in a required list of equipment important to safety had been corrected. However, a later followup inspection by the NRC resident inspector at the plant in November and December of 1982 indicated that discrepancies continued to exist.

O'Reilly told the company that the inaccurate statement "appears to have resulted from. . .failure to have an appropriate system in effect to ensure the accuracy of statements submitted to the NRC." However, he said that because "substantive improvements have been made" in the company's program to ensure that statements made to the NRC are accurate and complete, a decision was made not to impose a civil penalty for submittal of the inaccurate statement.

The company has 30 days in which to either pay the proposed civil penalty or to protest its imposition, in whole or in part.

#