

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
REGION II
101 MARIETTA STREET, N.W., SUITE 2900
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30323-0199



Report Nos.: 50-400/94-20

Licensee: Carolina Power and Light Company
P. O. Box 1551
Raleigh, NC 27602

Docket Nos.: 50-400

License Nos.: NPF-63

Facility Name: Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant Unit 1

Inspection Conducted: December 11 - 15, 1995

Inspector: David Thompson 1/3/96
David Thompson, Safeguards Inspector Date Signed

Approved by: Paul Fredrickson 1/4/96
Paul Fredrickson, Chief Date Signed
Special Inspection Branch
Division of Reactor Safety

SUMMARY

Scope:

This routine, announced inspection was conducted in the various aspects of the Security Program For Power Reactors, specifically: Management Support; Security Program Plans and Implementing Procedures and Audits; Security Training and Qualification and Safeguards Information.

Results:

In the areas inspected, violations or deviations were not identified. Observation and inspection results confirmed operational effectiveness of the security program. Senior management support was evident by the continued efforts to enhance security program capabilities through upgraded security system components and personal equipment utilized by the security force. The security program was well managed by experienced and innovative managers, supervisors and security shift personnel. Security plans and procedures were found to be very detailed and they fully implemented regulatory requirements. The annual audits were reviewed and found to be effective to determine if a program weakness existed within the security program. Based on observation of the personnel performing day-to-day duties the inspector determined that the training program was very effective. Storage and handling of safeguards information was found satisfactory, however, the licensee continues to classify material as safeguards information even though the material could be declassified.



REPORT DETAILS

1.0 Persons Contacted

1.1 Licensee Employees

- *D. Braund, Superintendent Security, Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant (SHNPP)
- *M. Calloway, Manager, Access Authorization, Corporate Office, Carolina Power and Light (CP&L)
- *B. Gauty, Manager, Maintenance, SHNPP
- *R. German, Manager, Plant Support Services, SHNPP
- *O. Oglesby, Associate Analyst Security, SHNPP
- *G. Olive, Senior Support Analyst, SHNPP
- *B. Robinson, Vice President, SHNPP
- *M. Wallace, Senior Analyst, Licensing, SHNPP
- *T. Walt, Manager, Regulatory Affairs, SHNPP
- *O. Wilkins, Superintendent, Licensing and Regulatory Program, SHNPP
- *J. Yarborough, Director, Plant Access Authorization, Corporate Office, CP&L
- *S. Young, Project Support Analyst, CP&L

1.2 U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

- *D. Roberts, Resident Inspector

*Attended Exit Interview

2.0 Physical Security Program For Power Reactors (81700)

2.1 Management Support, Security Program Plans and Implementing Procedures, and Security Program Audit

2.2 Management Support

Management support provided by the licensee for the site security program was reviewed to ensure that the criteria specified in Section 1 of the approved Physical Security Plan (PSP) as implemented by Security Procedure SP-001, "Security Operations, Conduct of Operations, Duties and Responsibilities," were adequately implemented. Observation of security operation activities confirmed that the site security program was being effectively managed and security resources were appropriately utilized. Review and observation further determined that the current staffing levels appeared to meet PSP commitments and regulatory requirements. It was noted that the security force is currently composed of four Carolina Power and Light (CP&L) employees supported by 97 Burns Security, Inc., contract security force members. Management stated that effective January 1996, the security force will be reduced to four CP&L employees supported by 85 Burns personnel. Security management stated that to accommodate the reduction that they would convert from eight hour shifts



to two 12-hour shifts and reduce the exterior area patrols from three to two. Central Alarm Station (CAS) operators will be reduced from two to one; however, one sergeant would be assigned to the CAS as a supervisor. Additionally, the vehicle search officer will be deleted during the evening shifts. Supervision for day-to-day shift operations is provided by Burns lieutenants. The training for the security operations is provided by three Burns personnel, two lieutenants and one sergeant. To date, there has been a 16 percent turnover rate of the contract security force. Review of records revealed that the reason for termination of the individuals was to seek other employment or for cause. Based on review and observation, it was determined that the current staffing is adequate to meet the PSP commitments and regulatory requirements.

Management support of the security program was evident by the continued upgrade of the security equipment such as, the hand geometry for access control, video capture for better assessment, and new shoulder weapons. Based on observation during the inspection, it was apparent that corporate and site senior management were responsive to the site security organization's requirements for resources and maintenance support.

Based on review of the security operational activities, it was concluded that the security organization was currently adequately staffed, trained, and equipped, and was supported by licensee management in accordance with commitments contained in the PSP, Revision 9, dated October 5, 1995. After the implementation of the 12-hour shift schedule and the reduction of the security force, additional review of the security program may be required to verify that the licensee continues to meet the requirements of the PSP and regulatory requirements.

There were no violations of regulatory requirements noted in this area.

2.3 Security Program Plans and Implementing Procedures

The licensee's approved Physical Security, Contingency and Training and Qualification Plans were reviewed to verify that the provisions of 10 CFR 50.34(c) and the procedural requirements for compliance with the provisions of Part 73, were effectively implemented.

The inspector reviewed the 20 implementing procedures for ensuring compliance with the provisions and commitments of the PSP and Contingency Plan. The inspector noted that the procedures were detailed and that Security Procedure-002, "Safeguards Contingency Events," Revision 1, dated April 6, 1995, provided in-depth instructions concerning actions to be taken during contingency operations.

The inspector noted, while discussing the seven day light test that the licensee had not included the light test in the Testing and Maintenance Procedure. However, the inspector determined that the licensee was conducting the required seven day light test and that the requirement was in a memo that was directive in nature. The licensee was in the process of including the seven day light test in the Testing and Maintenance Procedure.

Based on review and discussion with management personnel and observation of security performing day-to-day activities, it was determined that the Security Plan and Implementing Procedures adequately addressed the security requirements.

There were no violations of regulatory requirements noted in this area.

2.4 Security Program Audit

The licensee's established program for auditing the security organization and security force functional activities was reviewed to verify compliance with regulatory requirements and commitments contained in Section 14 of the licensee's PSP.

Discussion with security management and review of the most recent audit of the security program documented in Audit Report No. H-SC-95-01, conducted April 17-28, 1995, confirmed that an acceptable audit program was established and maintained. Audit Report No. H-SC-95-01 reflected a detailed review of the Shearon Harris security program. The scope of the audit included:

- Security Procedures and Practices
- Effectiveness of the Physical Protection System
- Physical Protection System Testing and Maintenance Program
- Local Law Enforcement Response
- Safeguards Contingency Plans
- Training and Qualification of Personnel

The audit of the security program performed by the licensee's Nuclear Assessment Department concluded that the Nuclear Security Program was considered to be effective in support of the operation of the Harris plant and, in general, the Nuclear Security Program continues to be strong.

Based on review of the Report of Audit of the security program and discussion with security management, it was concluded that the licensee had established and maintained an adequate program for conducting audits of the security organization and ensuring compliance with commitments of the approved PSP and regulatory requirements.

There were no violations of regulatory requirements noted in this area.

3.0 Security Training and Qualification

The inspector reviewed the security training and qualification program to ensure that the criteria in the Security Personnel Training and Qualification Plan (T&QP) were met.

The inspector observed security officers performing daily duties and observed the security officers demonstrate their capability to operability and performance test security equipment. Additionally, the inspector observed security officers conducting vehicle searches. Training records of five contract security officers were reviewed by the inspector concerning training, firearms testing, job/task performance, and requalification. Documentation and equipment inspected were found as committed to in the approved T&QP.

The inspector noted that the training student workbook and study guide were very well written and provided an excellent training tool. The workbooks have a space for the student to fill in the blank as the instructor presents the course of instruction, which should help the student remember key elements of the instruction. The workbooks are provided to the students as future study guides.

Members of the security organization are requalified at least every 12 months in the performance of their assigned tasks, both normal and contingency. This included the conduct of physical exercise requirements and completion of the firearms course. The inspector observed the licensee conducting training with their new shoulder weapon, the Springfield National Match M1A 7.62 (.308). The .308 is a semi-automatic, 20 round magazine loaded weapon capable of firing 750 rounds per minute.

Based on the inspector's review, the licensee was providing excellent training and after the implementation of the 12-hour shifts the training will be further enhanced by the additional training hours for the tactical response team.

There were no violations of regulatory requirements noted in this area.

4.0 Safeguards information

While reviewing the 10 CFR 73.71, Security Event Logs, the inspector noted that the licensee, since December 3, 1994, to present, had two events of safeguards information left unattended and one event of a safeguards cabinet left open. While reviewing the events, the inspector determined that the cabinet left opened containing safeguards information was located in the CAS and that all personnel who had access to the area had access to safeguards information. Therefore, the safeguards material would not have been exposed to unauthorized compromise during the period from December 2 to December 3, 1995. One of the two events where safeguards information was left unattended was in the computer room behind the CAS. The other event was in the Administrative Building and the document was not under the control of an authorized individual for approximately 15 minutes. After further review of the documents the licensee determined that the documents in the two events were not safeguards information unless other pertinent documents were attached.

During discussion, the licensee indicated they would review the current safeguards information documents and determine what materials that are presently marked as safeguards information could be downgraded or marked to indicate that when separated as a single document or drawing there is not safeguards information. Based on the events listed above the licensee had taken action to make personnel aware of the responsibilities to protect safeguards information when handling or storing the materials.

The inspector discussed the events with the licensee and determined that the licensee had been very conservative by logging the events since none of the single safeguards documents had been deemed safeguards after further review and that the open safeguards cabinet had been secured in a access controlled room which far exceeded the criteria for storing safeguards material.

There were no violations of regulatory requirements noted in this area.

5.0 Exit Interview

The inspection scope and results were summarized on December 15, 1995, with those persons indicated in Paragraph 1. The inspector described the areas inspected and discussed in detail the inspection results listed below. The licensee was informed that no violations of regulatory requirements were identified during the inspection. The licensee was further informed that the recent employment of upgraded access control equipment and weapons were noted as a strength. It was further noted that the security force activity and performance were efficient and in compliance with regulatory requirements and commitments of the PSP. The licensee was informed that inspection results reflected that the security force was well managed and security resources were utilized effectively. After the inspector explained the safeguards information events the licensee agreed they needed to review and determine which safeguards documents could be re-marked. Dissenting comments were not received from the licensee.