

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

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



DUKE POWER

September 2, 1988

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Attention: Document Control Desk  
Washington, DC 20555

Subject: McGuire Nuclear Station  
Docket Nos. 50-369 and 50-370  
NRC/OJE Inspection Report Nos. 50-369, -370/88-13  
Supplemental Reply to a Notice of Violation

Gentlemen:

Pursuant to 10 CFR 2.201, please find attached Duke Power Company's supplemental response to the violation identified in the subject inspection report. Duke's initial response was transmitted to the NRC by my letter dated July 8, 1988.

Should there be any questions concerning this matter, contact S.E. LeRoy at (704) 373-6233.

Very truly yours,

Hal B. Tucker

SEL/323/mmf

Attachment

xc: Dr. J. Nelson Grace, Regional Administrator  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Region II  
101 Marietta Street, NW, Suite 2900  
Atlanta, Georgia 30323

Mr. Darl Hood  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555

Mr. W.T. Orders  
NRC Resident Inspector  
McGuire Nuclear Station

8809140458 880902  
PDR PNC X 05000369  
G PNU

IEO1  
11

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

September 2, 1988

Page 2

bx: A.V. Carr  
R.C. Futrell  
S.A. Gewehr  
R.L. Gill  
R.M. Glover  
G.W. Graves  
G.W. Hallman  
C.L. Harlin  
A.R. Hollins  
S.S. Kilborn W  
P.B. Nardoci  
R.P. Ruth  
R.O. Sharpe  
QA Technical Services NRC Coordinator (EC-1255)  
File: MC-815.01  
(15)

Duke Power Company  
McGuire Nuclear Station  
Supplemental Reply to Notice of Violation  
Inspection Report Nos. 50-369/88-13 and 50-370/88-13

Violation 369, 370/88-13-01

In Duke Power's earlier response to Inspection Report 50-369/88-13 and 50-370/88-13, the technical issues of that report were addressed. After additional consideration, a supplemental response is being provided to address the programmatic issues of the report.

McGuire Nuclear Station has a proven track record of maintaining an open, productive and responsive relationship with the NRC. This philosophy has been strongly supported and encouraged by McGuire management. In light of this, we were surprised and disappointed to see Mr. Girard's comments concerning the McGuire staff's lack of responsiveness to his concerns during this inspection. We were surprised because he did not make station management aware of his concerns during his visit and did not mention them during his exit. We were disappointed because our reviews cause us to conclude that his concerns are not well founded. While we flatly deny any lack of responsiveness, we do acknowledge that enhanced communications between the licensee and the inspector can minimize misunderstandings of this kind. On our part, we will endeavor to improve our communication with Mr. Girard and other NRC inspectors in the future.