

CATEGORY 1

REGULATOR INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (RIDS)

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---|---------------|----------|
| ACCESSION NBR: 9708190072 | DOC. DATE: 97/08/13 | NOTARIZED: NO | DOCKET # |
| FACIL: 50-269 | Oconee Nuclear Station, Unit 1, Duke Power Co. | | 05000269 |
| 50-270 | Oconee Nuclear Station, Unit 2, Duke Power Co. | | 05000270 |
| 50-287 | Oconee Nuclear Station, Unit 3, Duke Power Co. | | 05000287 |
| 50-369 | William B. McGuire Nuclear Station, Unit 1, Duke Powe | | 05000369 |
| 50-370 | William B. McGuire Nuclear Station, Unit 2, Duke Powe | | 05000370 |
| 50-413 | Catawba Nuclear Station, Unit 1, Duke Power Co. | | 05000413 |
| 50-414 | Catawba Nuclear Station, Unit 2, Duke Power Co. | | 05000414 |

| | |
|---------------|---|
| AUTH. NAME | AUTHOR AFFILIATION |
| TUCKMAN, M.S. | Duke Power Co. |
| RECIP. NAME | RECIPIENT AFFILIATION |
| | Document Control Branch (Document Control Desk) |

SUBJECT: Responds to 970813 telcon RAI re QA program TR Duke-1, amend 21. Revised pp 17-10 & 17-27 encl to support proposed resolutions contained in responses.

DISTRIBUTION CODE: Q004D COPIES RECEIVED: LTR 1 ENCL 1 SIZE: 5+5
 TITLE: QA Topical Report, Change, Amendment, or Correspondence (Docket/Utili

NOTES:

| | RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME | COPIES LTTR ENCL | RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME | COPIES LTTR ENCL |
|-----------|---------------------------|------------------|------------------------|------------------|
| | LABARGE, D | 1 1 | NERSES, V | 1 1 |
| | TAM, P. | 1 1 | | |
| INTERNAL: | ACRS | 1 1 | DRS/RGN.... | 1 1 |
| | FILE CENTER 01 | 1 1 | NRR/DISP/PIMB | 1 1 |
| | NRR/DRCH/HQMB | 1 1 | NUDOCS-ABSTRACT | 1 1 |
| | OC/LFDCB | 1 1 | RGN2 FILE | 1 1 |
| EXTERNAL: | DMB/OSS | 1 1 | IHS | 1 1 |
| | NRC PDR | 1 1 | | |

NOTE TO ALL "RIDS" RECIPIENTS:

PLEASE HELP US TO REDUCE WASTE. TO HAVE YOUR NAME OR ORGANIZATION REMOVED FROM DISTRIBUTION LISTS OR REDUCE THE NUMBER OF COPIES RECEIVED BY YOU OR YOUR ORGANIZATION, CONTACT THE DOCUMENT CONTROL DESK (DCD) ON EXTENSION 415-2083

TOTAL NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED: LTTR 14 ENCL 14

C
A
T
E
G
O
R
Y

1

D
O
C
U
M
E
N
T



Duke Power Company

A Duke Energy Company

EC07H
526 South Church Street
P.O. Box 1006
Charlotte, NC 28201-1006

M. S. Tuckman
Executive Vice President
Nuclear Generation

(704) 382-2200 OFFICE
(704) 382-4360 FAX

August 13, 1997

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
ATTENTION: Document Control Desk
Washington, DC 20555-0001

SUBJECT: Duke Energy Corporation
Oconee Nuclear Station - Docket Nos. 50-269, 270,
287
McGuire Nuclear Station - Docket Nos. 50-369, 370
Catawba Nuclear Station - Docket Nos. 50-413, 414

Quality Assurance Program
Topical Report Duke-1, Amendment 21
Response to NRC Questions

TAC Nos. M96624, M96625, M96626, M96627, M96628,
M96629, and M96630

Proposed Amendment 21 to the Duke Quality Assurance Program Topical Report, Duke-1 (hereafter referred to as Topical Report or Amendment 21) was submitted to the NRC by Duke letter dated July 11, 1996 and supplemented by Duke letters dated November 19, 1996 and December 3, 1996. In a letter dated February 21, 1997, the NRC Staff requested that Duke Power provide additional information on Amendment 21. Duke provided its response to this NRC request for additional information in a letter dated June 2, 1997. On August 13, 1997, a telephone conference call was held between NRC Staff members and Duke representatives. During this conference call, the NRC Staff asked that Duke respond to three questions. These questions, along with the Duke answers, are contained in Attachment 1 to this letter.

Attachment 1 to this letter restates the NRC questions and provides the associated Duke response for each.

The proposed resolutions contained in the Duke responses to the NRC questions will result in the need for a revision to two pages of Amendment 21. The necessary revisions to Amendment 21 have been made on pages 17-10 and 17-27. These pages (with the necessary revisions included) are provided as Attachment 2 to this letter. Following NRC approval of

Q004/1

9708190072 970813
PDR ADOCK 05000269
P PDR



Amendment 21, the appropriate number of copies of the complete final version of Amendment 21 will be provided to the NRC by means of the normal Duke distribution process.

Duke requests that the NRC review the information contained in the attachments in a manner such that the approval of Amendment 21 can be finalized on a timely basis. Duke knows of no other outstanding issues related to Amendment 21.

Please direct any further questions or comments on this matter to J. S. Warren at (704) 382-4986.

Very truly yours,



M. S. Tuckman.

MST/JSW

Attachments:

- Attachment 1: Duke Energy Corporation
Quality Assurance Program Amendment 21
NRC Questions and Duke Responses

- Attachment 2: Duke Energy Corporation
Quality Assurance Program
Topical Report Duke-1
Amendment 21
Revised Pages 17-10 and 17-27

xc w/att: L. A. Reyes
NRC Regional Administrator, Region II

D. E. Labarge (ONS)
V. Nerses (MNS)
P. S. Tam (CNS)
NRC Senior Project Managers
ONRR

NRC Senior Resident Inspector (CNS)

M. A. Scott
NRC Senior Resident Inspector (ONS)

S. M. Shaeffer (MNS)
NRC Senior Resident Inspector (MNS)

M. Batavia
South Carolina Department of
Health and Environmental Control

ATTACHMENT 1

DUKE ENERGY CORPORATION QUALITY ASSURANCE PROGRAM - AMENDMENT 21
NRC QUESTIONS AND DUKE RESPONSES
Discussed During NRC/Duke Conference Call on August 13, 1997
(TAC NOS. M96624 THROUGH 96630)

NRC Question 1:

Need to discuss the exact requirement vs. intent of the June 2, 1997 Duke response to Question 1. For instance, describe this demonstration process in written procedures or instructions and evaluate and document the results of the demonstration.

Duke Response to Question 1:

Duke's internal procedures have previously contained the referenced requirements; however, this was not discussed in the Topical Report. Page 17-10 of Amendment 21 has been revised to contain the following: "This process is described in approved procedures which require documentation of the evaluation and demonstration of results."

NRC Question 2:

Need to discuss the last sentence in the June 2, 1997 Duke response to Question 2.c: "Licensed operating US nuclear utilities may only be placed on the Approved Suppliers list by the Supplier Verification Manager without an audit or survey as third party auditors."

Duke Response to Question 2:

Page 17-27 of Amendment 21 has been revised to eliminate this sentence from the Topical Report.

NRC Question 3:

For the three-month extension contained in the June 2, 1997 Duke response to Question 2.d, the basis is not included in the QA program. Also, consider the person approving the extension (e.g., supervisor of the Supplier Verification Manager).

Duke Response to Question 3:

Specific examples of appropriate bases for the three-month extension have been added to the Topical Report. Page 17-27 of Amendment 21 has been revised to contain the following:

"Extensions would be on an infrequent basis for reasons such as: accommodating manufacturing schedules, synchronizing with other utility audits, or allowing time for implementation of supplier QA program changes."

Extensions are proposed by the assigned auditors for subsequent approval by the Supplier Verification Manager. As discussed in the August 13, 1997 conference call, Duke has determined this is the appropriate level of management to perform these approvals.