DUKE POWER COMPANY I P.O. BOX 33189 OF GIA CHARLOTTE, N.C. 28242

HAL B. TUCKER VICE PRESIDENT NUCLEAR PRODUCTION

October 26, 1984 1: 23

TELEPHONE (704) 373-4531

Mr. James P. O'Reilly, Regional Administrator U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Region II 101 Marietta Street, N.W., Suite 2900 Atlanta, Georgia 30323

Subject: McGuire Nuclear Station

Docket Nos. 50-369 and 50-370

Reference: RII:WTO

NRC/OIE Inspection Report 50-369/84-23 and 50-370/84-20

Dear Mr. O'Reilly:

Pursuant to 10CFR 2.201, please find attached a response to Violation 50-369/84-23-01 which was identified in the above referenced inspection report. Note that our response to Report 50-369/84-21 and 50-370/84-18's Notice of Violation will also address the additional example concerning the use of an inadequate procedure for reactor trip breaker response time testing identified in this report, as requested.

Duke Power Company does not consider any information contained in this report to be proprietary.

Very truly yours,

Hal B. Tucker

PBN/mjf

Attachment

cc: Mr. W. T. Orders
Senior Resident Inspector- NRC
McGuire Nuclear Station

Duke Power Company McGuire Nuclear Station

Response to NRC/OIE Inspection Report 50-369/84-23 and 50-370/84-20

Violation 50-369/84-23-01, Severity Level V:

Technical Specification 3.3.3.10 requires that the loose part detection system be operable in Modes 1 and 2. Further, if one or more channels are inoperable for more than thirty days, a report outlining the cause of the malfunction and plans for restoring the channel(s) is to be prepared and submitted within the next ten days.

Contrary to the above, on July 27, 1984, the inspector has noted that the licensee failed to prepare and submit a special report within the required time frame when one of the four channels of the Unit 1 loose part detection system was declared inoperable on June 12, 1984 and remained in that state until the finding was made.

Response:

1. Admission or denial of the alleged violations:

Duke Power Company agrees that the violation occurred as stated.

2. Reasons for the violations if admitted:

Proper attention was not paid to applicable log books.

3. Corrective steps which have been taken and the results achieved:

The need to pay proper attention to the applicable log books has been emphasized to the appr riate individual. The special report was subsequently submitted by my letter dated July 30, 1984.

4. Corrective steps which will be taken to avoid further violations:

Increased emphasis has been placed on log book review.

5. Date when full compliance will be achieved:

The station is presently in full compliance with Technical Specification requirements in this area.