



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

SAFEGUARDS EVALUATION REPORT BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

RELATED TO AMENDMENTS NOS. 150 AND 58 TO FACILITY OPERATING

LICENSE NOS. DPR-63 AND NPF-69

NIAGARA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION

NINE MILE POINT NUCLEAR STATION, UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2

DOCKET NOS. 50-220 AND 50-410

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation has filed with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission a request to amend the Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station Operating License Nos. DPR-63 and NPF-69.

2.0 DISCUSSION

By letter dated June 6, 1994, Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation submitted for staff review and approval a revision to the Nine Mile Point Physical Security Plan. This revision provides explicit details in the plan change, the supporting documentation, and NUREG-0907, "Acceptance Criteria for Determining Armed Response Force Size at Nuclear Power Plant," which would allow the site to change the number of armed security force members that comprise the response force for each shift.

3.0 FINDINGS

The NRC's requirements for the number of armed response force members is provided in 10 CFR 73.55(h)(3). NUREG-0907 provides guidance for determining plant-specific response force sizes. The proposed revision for changing the number of response force members needed per shift is based on a recent analysis that the licensee completed using NUREG-0907. This guidance document contains acceptance criteria to be used as a worksheet and guideline for interpreting the worksheet score that can be used in determining the adequacy of the armed response force size at a site. We have reviewed the licensee's proposed changes in accordance with the guidance provided in NUREG-0907 and we have determined the proposed changes meet the requirements of 10 CFR 73.55(h)(3).

4.0 CONCLUSIONS

9411040171 941031
PDR ADDCK 05000220
P PDR

It is the staff's determination that the amendment to the Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station Physical Security Plan, as described in the licensee's letter of June 6, 1994, does not increase the risk of sabotage at the facility and continues to satisfy the requirements in 10 CFR 73.55(h)(3) concerning the number of response force members per shift at the site and is therefore acceptable.

Principal Contributor: R. Manili

Date: October 31, 1994

