



Duke Power Company  
P.O. Box 33198  
Charlotte, N.C. 28242

HAL B. Tucker  
Vice President  
Nuclear Production  
(704)373-4531



**DUKE POWER**

November 8, 1988

Dr. Thomas E. Murley, Director  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555

Subject: Duke Power Company  
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 Verification Process

I would like to express my appreciation for the opportunity to discuss quality verification with you and members of your staff on October 28, 1988. We appreciate the time you and your staff devoted to our meeting. We feel the meeting accomplished our goal of establishing a clearer understanding of the quality verification process by both the NRC and Duke Power. This letter is intended to wrap up our discussions on this important subject and bring this matter to a close.

Since receiving the NRC reports of the QA verification inspection at Catawba and the AEOD evaluation of McGuire, we have been concerned with the findings related to quality verification. We felt these inspection/evaluation findings did not accurately reflect Duke's commitment to, and implementation of, the quality verification process at its nuclear stations. Additionally, during the course of these inspection/evaluation visits, we perceived that some aspects of the NRC activities were narrow in scope, and did not give all the NRC staff members a true representation of the Duke philosophy and implementation methodology for quality verification. Since our October 28 trip to the NRC headquarters gave us the opportunity to elaborate on quality verification at Duke Power, we feel our concerns with the NRC visits at Catawba and McGuire have been addressed. Notwithstanding the findings stated in the two NRC reports, it has always been our opinion that the Duke quality verification programs are strong.

As we described in the meeting, Duke has taken actions to confirm the extent and adequacy of its quality verification programs. Also we have implemented, or are in the process of implementing, improvements to further strengthen our commitment to the quality verification process. Some of these improvements, such as technical expertise for the QA audits and technical training for QA Department personnel, were underway before the NRC inspection/evaluation visits. These improvements further reinforce our position that Duke has a strong corporate program underway to assure quality at its three nuclear stations. In this regard, please recall the examples of the historical

8811140530 881108  
PDR ADOCK 05000269  
FDC

0004  
1/0

Dr. Thomas E. Murley

November 8, 1988

Page 2

success of Duke's quality of nuclear operations that were given during our presentation at the meeting. The record that has been established by our nuclear stations reflect quality operation that includes quality verification.

In conclusion, we feel the detailed presentations describing Duke's commitment to quality verification given to you and your key staff members on October 28, in conjunction with our previous formal responses to the NRC inspection/evaluation reports, should conclude this matter. Please let us know if we can provide any additional assistance or information regarding quality verification at Duke Power.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Hal B. Tucker".

Hal B. Tucker

JSW/335/mmf

Duke Power Company  
P.O. Box 33198  
Charlotte, N.C. 28242

Harold T. ...  
Vice President  
Nuclear Production  
(704) 333-4500



**DUKE POWER**

November 8, 1988

Dr. Thomas E. Murley, Director  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555

Subject: Duke Power Company  
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 Verification Process

I would like to express my appreciation for the opportunity to discuss quality verification with you and members of your staff on October 28, 1988. We appreciate the time you and your staff devoted to our meeting. We feel the meeting accomplished our goal of establishing a clearer understanding of the quality verification process by both the NRC and Duke Power. This letter is intended to wrap up our discussions on this important subject and bring this matter to a close.

Since receiving the NRC reports of the QA verification inspection at Catawba and the AEOD evaluation of McGuire, we have been concerned with the findings related to quality verification. We felt these inspection/evaluation findings did not accurately reflect Duke's commitment to, and implementation of, the quality verification process at its nuclear stations. Additionally, during the course of these inspection/evaluation visits, we perceived that some aspects of the NRC activities were narrow in scope, and did not give all the NRC staff members a true representation of the Duke philosophy and implementation methodology for quality verification. Since our October 28 trip to the NRC headquarters gave us the opportunity to elaborate on quality verification at Duke Power, we feel our concerns with the NRC visits at Catawba and McGuire have been addressed. Notwithstanding the findings stated in the two NRC reports, it has always been our opinion that the Duke quality verification programs are strong.

As we described in the meeting, Duke has taken actions to confirm the extent and adequacy of its quality verification programs. Also we have implemented, or are in the process of implementing, improvements to further strengthen our commitment to the quality verification process. Some of these improvements, such as technical expertise for the QA audits and technical training for QA Department personnel, were underway before the NRC inspection/evaluation visits. These improvements further reinforce our position that Duke has a strong corporate program underway to assure quality at its three nuclear stations. In this regard, please recall the examples of the historical

8811160530 881108  
FDR ADCK 05000269  
F DIC

0004  
110  
MIA 4

Dr. Thomas E. Murley  
November 8, 1988  
Page 2

success of Duke's quality of nuclear operations that were given during our presentation at the meeting. The record that has been established by our nuclear stations reflect quality operation that includes quality verification.

In conclusion, we feel the detailed presentations describing Duke's commitment to quality verification given to you and your key staff members on October 28, in conjunction with our previous formal responses to the NRC inspection/evaluation reports, should conclude this matter. Please let us know if we can provide any additional assistance or information regarding quality verification at Duke Power.

Very truly yours,



Hal B. Tucker

JSW/335/mmF