



UNITED STATES  
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20545

Docket Nos. 50-269  
50-270  
and 50-287

JUL 11 1973

Duke Power Company  
ATTN: Mr. Austin C. Thies  
Senior Vice President,  
Production & Transmission  
422 South Church Street  
P. O. Box 2178  
Charlotte, North Carolina 28201

Gentlemen:

We have reviewed your April 27, 1973, submittal of the Oconee Nuclear Station Operational Quality Assurance Program which we requested for periodic review by letter dated March 27, 1973. Based on this review and discussion with your representatives on May 29, 1973, and June 12, 1973, it is our understanding that your company is taking measures to strengthen its Quality Assurance Program. Please provide information describing how these changes are being applied to the Oconee Nuclear Station QA Program for Units 1, 2 and 3. Also we require additional information as listed in the enclosure to complete our review. We would appreciate your response to this letter prior to July 31, 1973.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "A. Schwencer".

A. Schwencer, Chief  
Pressurized Water Reactors Br. No. 4  
Directorate of Licensing

Enclosure:  
Request for Additional Information

cc: William L. Porter  
Duke Power Company  
P. O. Box 2178  
422 South Church Street  
Charlotte, N. C. 28201

7911210669 P

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL QUALITY ASSURANCE INFORMATION

OCONEE NUCLEAR STATION

The following additional information is required:

1. Clear description of the specific responsibilities, authorities, and day-to-day duties of those responsible for formulating, establishing, approving, and implementing the QA policies, documented procedures, QA Manuals, and instructions and changes thereto relative to operation, maintenance, repair, modification, and refueling.
2. Provide a listing or tabulation of the titles of the more typical QA procedures that respond to each of the 18 QA requirements of Appendix B to 10 CFR 50. Provide a brief abstract denoting the scope and purpose of each such procedure.
3. Identify those positions or groups responsible for reviewing and approving the QA programs for vendors and contractors relative to the activities of maintenance, modification, repair and refueling.
4. Describe the responsibilities and authorities of the Station Review Committee and Nuclear Safety Review Committee relative to the implementation of the recommendations of AEC Regulatory Guide 1.33. Describe the interaction or role, if any, of these Committees relative to QA staff and its activities.
5. Provide a more indepth description of DPC's inspection and audit program including specific delineation of the onsite and offsite activities to be audited, and provisions of assuring independent acceptance inspection. Provide a specific list of the duties of

those responsible for independent review, inspection and internal and external audit.

6. We require a clear commitment with respect to implementation of AEC Regulatory Guide 1.33. For any items of a QA program that do not satisfy Regulatory Guide 1.33 describe and justify the proposed alternatives.