

Scott
Healy

DUKE POWER COMPANY
POWER BUILDING
422 SOUTH CHURCH STREET, CHARLOTTE, N. C.

December 22, 1970

P. O. Box 2178
28201

A. G. THIES
VICE PRESIDENT
PRODUCTION AND OPERATION

Mr. John G. Davis, Director
Division of Compliance
Region II - Suite 818
230 Peachtree Street, Northwest
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

SUBJECT: Oconee Nuclear Station Units 1, 2, 3
AEC Construction Permit No. CPPR-33

Dear Sir:

The following are our responses to your letter of November 25, 1970 questioning apparent non-compliance of the electrical installation as compared to the designs described in the "Final Safety Analysis Report" and with Appendix B to 10 CFR 50, "Quality Assurance Program for Nuclear Power Plants:

1] Physical Protection Provided Safety-related Cables.

- a] We agree that Sections 7.1, 7.3 and 8.2 require that safety-related cables be routed and protected from physical damage.

In our opinion, the installations for safety-related cables are adequately protected and do conform to the designs described in the "Final Safety Analysis Report" and with Appendix B to 10 CFR 50, as well as those described in meetings with DRL.

- b] The cable system designs are described generally in Section 8.2 of the FSAR and states that: "It is our intent wherever physically possible to utilize metallicly armored and protected cable systems. By this we mean the use of rigid and thin wall metal conduit, aluminum sheath cables, bronze armored control cables, steel interlocked armor power and control cables and either interlocked armored or served wire armored instrumentation cables. With this type construction fire stops as such are not

7911280576