

cc: Licensee  
NRC PDR  
Local PDR  
R. C. DeYoung  
D. E. Vassallo  
W. R. Bulter  
O. D. Parr  
V. A. Moore  
J. F. Stolz  
K. Kniel  
A. Schwencer  
D. J. Skovholt  
P. F. Collins  
R. H. Vollmer  
R. W. Houston  
K. R. Goller  
R. A. Purple  
C. L. Ziemann  
G. Lear  
R. Reid  
R. P. Denise  
R. A. Clark  
T. P. Speis  
D. R. Muller  
G. W. Knighton  
G. K. Dicker  
B. J. Youngblood  
W. H. Regan  
S. Varga  
T. J. Carter  
R. Heineman  
R. L. Tedesco  
J. Collins  
G. Lainas  
V. Benaroya  
R. R. Maccary  
J. P. Knight  
S. S. Pawlicki  
L. C. Shao  
V. Stello  
D. F. Ross  
T. M. Novak  
T. A. Ippolito

H. Denton  
B. Grimes  
M. B. Spangler  
R. L. Ballard  
J. Kastner  
W. P. Gammill  
Project Manager  
Attorney, OELD  
OI&E (3)  
S. M. Sheppard  
NRC Participants  
R. Fraley , ACRS (16)  
T. B. Abernathy, DTIE  
D. Eisenhut

MO

UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

DOCKET NOS.: 50-269/270/287                      DATE: October 10, 1975  
LICENSEE: Duke Power Company (DPC)  
FACILITY: Oconee Units 1, 2, and 3

SUMMARY OF MEETING HELD ON OCTOBER 2, 1975, TO DISCUSS THE  
QUALIFICATION REQUIREMENTS OF REVIEW AND AUDIT PERSONNEL FOR  
OCONEE UNITS 1, 2, & 3

On October 2, 1975, representatives of Duke Power Company met with the NRC staff to discuss the licensee's proposed amendment to the Oconee Technical Specifications which would reassign the review and audit function from a committee responsibility to a full time review unit. Specific discussions were also directed toward the qualification requirements of the members of the proposed unit.

A list of attendees is enclosed.

Significant points are discussed below.

The licensee was informed that their proposed amendment of June 19, 1975, had been reviewed and that with the exception of questions we had regarding the qualifications of review and audit personnel and the proposed formation of a review unit to replace the existing review committee, the proposed amendment had been found to be acceptable.

It was pointed out to the licensee that the proposed shift from the existing committee method of performing the required review and audit functions raised several questions regarding the comparative qualification requirements of the members of the new review and audit unit. We advised the licensee that it was our view that a person performing review and audit functions should have a minimum of 5 years professional work experience in the discipline or specialty he represents, in addition to an appropriate degree. This requirement is intended to quantify the provisions of section 4.2.2.3 of ANSI N18.7 which calls for "extensive experience."

The proposed amendment by the licensee would require that personnel assigned to the review and audit unit have a minimum of seven years of technical experience, of which a minimum of three years would be in one or more specific areas. A maximum of four years of this seven years could be academic or related technical training. These requirements are less than those described above and are not considered to be acceptable requirements.

October 10, 1975

With respect to the qualification requirements of the supervisor of the proposed review and audit unit, the licensee's amendment would require that the requirements be the same as those for the members of the proposed unit, i.e., seven years technical experience, four of which could be academic or related technical training. We advised the licensee that we felt that the supervisor of a full time unit would have considerably more authority than a committee chairman for making unilateral decisions on review and audit activities, and, therefore, we felt that the supervisor should be a person of considerable experience. Specifically, our criteria for such a position is a minimum of ten years professional work experience including three years nuclear plant design and/or operations, in addition to an appropriate degree.

We indicated that the experience and education requirements were not completely inflexible and that, in the case of review unit members, appropriate consideration would be given, for example, to allow credit for the years spent in obtaining an advanced degree.

The licensee responded to the above remarks by describing the intended procedures by which the proposed review and audit unit would function. From this description, it appeared that the members of the review unit would be people who would remain in their present jobs, performing the review function as an added responsibility. Only the supervisor, and perhaps one or two other people, would be full time dedicated to the review and audit function. It thus appeared that the review unit, as envisioned by the licensee, was not significantly different in concept from a committee operation. Accordingly, it was possible that we could find that the qualifications of the supervisor could be less than described above. The licensee agreed to revise his submittal to more clearly describe the operating characteristics of the review and audit function and to include certain restraints on the authority of the supervisor of the unit so as to ensure consensus consideration of safety-related activities rather than unilateral decisions by a single individual. The licensee's resubmittal will also propose a specified minimum number of member-qualified personnel so as to meet the areas of technical expertise listed in Section 4.2.2.2 of ANSI N18.7.



Gary G. Zech, Project Manager  
Operating Reactors Branch #1  
Division of Reactor Licensing

Enclosure:  
List of Attendees

cc: See next page

LIST OF ATTENDEES  
FOR DUKE POWER COMPANY

OCTOBER 2, 1975

NRC

D. J. Skovholt  
F. R. Allenspach  
R. A. Purple  
G. Zech  
S. M. Sheppard

DUKE POWER COMPANY

D. Holt  
M. Tuckman  
E. Blakeman