



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 29 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-21

WASHINGTON PUBLIC POWER SUPPLY SYSTEM

WPPSS NUCLEAR PROJECT NO. 2

DOCKET NO. 50-397

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Washington Public Power Supply System has filed with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission a request to amend Facility Operating License NPF-21. The amendment would approve a revision to the licensee's physical security plan entitled, "WNP-2 Physical Security Plan", Revision 11.

2.0 EVALUATION

By letter dated March 20, 1986 the licensee submitted for staff review a revision to the WNP-2 Physical Security Plan involving changes to the intrusion detection system currently installed at the WNP-2 site. The purpose of the change is to eliminate a secondary alarm system thus reducing unacceptably high maintenance requirements at the site.

The WNP-2 plan currently has commitments that require two alarm systems, a primary and a secondary system. The purpose of the secondary system is to replace the primary system in the event of a primary system failure.

3.0 FINDINGS

The basis for deciding on the acceptability of this change is whether or not the licensee could continue to meet the provisions of 10 CFR 73.55 with only one intrusion detection system. The licensee has advised that the system that is being proposed for elimination has "never worked properly" and is requiring unusually high maintenance attention to meet current physical security plan commitments regarding false and nuisance alarm rates and system detectability. In addition the licensee has stated the system to be eliminated was only considered as a backup system to be relied upon in the event the primary detection system failed. The remaining system is one that complies with regulatory guidance and is deployed successfully at many sites throughout the country. The licensee has committed to providing additional surveillance through the use of dedicated closed circuit camera systems or the posting of guards in the event the remaining intrusion detection system fails in part or in total.

Regulations do not require the use of more than one intrusion detection system at the perimeter of the protected area. At WNP-2, adequate provisions have been made to compensate in the event of a degradation of the

8610220088 861016
PDR ADOCK 05000397
P PDR

primary intrusion detection system. Accordingly, the elimination of the redundant system will not significantly degrade the overall performance of their physical protection system.

4.0 RESULTS

The staff has concluded that the revised physical security plan continues to satisfy the requirements of 10 CFR 73.55.

5.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

This amendment involves a change in the installation and use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20 and changes to surveillance requirements. The staff has determined that this amendment involves no significant increase in the amounts, and no significant change in the types, of any effluents that may be released offsite, and that there is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. The Commission has previously issued a proposed finding that this amendment involves no significant hazards consideration and there has been no public comment on such finding. Accordingly, this amendment meets the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(9). Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the issuance of this amendment.

6.0 CONCLUSION

The Commission made a proposed determination that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration which was published in the Federal Register (51 FR 30584) on August 27, 1986, and consulted with the state of Washington. No public comments were received, and the state of Washington did not have any comments.

The staff has concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, and (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations and the issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributor: Charles E. Gaskin, NMSS

Dated: October 16, 1986

