

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
REGION I

Report No. 70-371/89-06

Docket No. 70-371

License No. SNM-368

Licensee: UNC, Incorporated
UNC Naval Products
67 Sandy Desert Road
Uncasville, Connecticut 06382

Facility Name: UNC Naval Products

Inspection At: Uncasville, Connecticut

Inspection Conducted: December 18-21, 1989

Type of Inspection: Routine Physical Security

Inspectors:

R. C. Smith, Sr.
R. C. Smith, Sr. Physical Security Specialist

1-9-90
date

T. W. Dexter
T. W. Dexter, Physical Security Inspector

1/09/90
date

Approved by:

R. R. Keimig
R. R. Keimig, Chief, Safeguards Section
Division of Radiation Safety and Safeguards

1-9-90
date

Inspection Summary: Unannounced Physical Security Inspection on
December 18-21, 1989 (Report No. 70-371/89-06)

Areas Inspected: Records and Reports; Testing and Maintenance; Physical Barriers - Protected Areas; Physical Barriers - Material Access Areas; Assessment Aids; Access Control (Personnel, Packages and Vehicles); Alarm Stations; and Personnel Training and Qualifications.

Results: The licensee was in compliance with NRC requirements in the areas inspected.

DETAILS

1. Key Persons Contacted

- *R. Gregg, Director, Technical Services
- *R. Gigliotti, Director of Security
- R. Ormeno, Security Operations Supervisor
- R. Jason, Security Training Officer
- J. Brady, Plant Services Manager
- B. Gibson, Security Shift Supervisor
- E. Ezzel, Security Shift Supervisor

The inspectors also interviewed employees of the licensee's contract security organization.

*present at the exit interview

2. Records and Report

The inspectors reviewed the following records and reports generated since the last inspection: duty logs; security incident reports; and testing and maintenance records. All records were found to be well-maintained and were completed in accordance with commitments in the NRC-approved physical security plan (the Plan) and its implementing procedures.

3. Testing and Maintenance

The inspectors reviewed the testing and maintenance records and procedures for the intrusion detection system, metal detectors, explosives detectors, and assessment aids. The inspectors also observed licensee conducted tests of personnel and package search equipment and perimeter intrusion detection equipment. No discrepancies were identified.

4. Physical Barriers - Restricted Areas

The inspectors observed all physical barriers that form the protected area perimeter and found that the barriers were installed and maintained in accordance with the Plan and licensee conditions.

5. Physical Barriers - Material Access Areas

The inspectors observed the interior and exterior barrier features of the Material Access Areas and found that they were installed and maintained in accordance with the Plan and license conditions.

6. Access Control - Personnel and Packages

The inspectors reviewed the personnel and package access control procedures and determined them to be as committed to in the Plan. The inspectors noted minimum delays while observing personnel access processing during the peak traffic periods at shift changes. The inspectors noted that, in accordance with the Plan and regulatory requirements, 100% of all personnel and hand carried packages entering the protected area were searched prior to entry.

7. Alarm Stations

The inspectors confirmed that operators in the Central Alarm Station (CAS) and Secondary Alarm Station (SAS) were performing their duties in conformance with commitments in the Plan and its implementing procedures.

8. Personnel Training and Qualification

The inspectors reviewed the licensee's Training and Qualification Plan (T&QP) and its implementation. The inspectors randomly selected twenty security force members (SFMs) and reviewed their training and medical records. The inspectors identified the following:

1. The medical records of an armed SFM did not have a current hearing test on file. The individual was immediately relieved of duty and administered a hearing test. The satisfactory test results were shown to the inspectors before the medical records review was completed.
2. The licensee has a formal lesson plan for Tactical Response Training. However, the remaining lesson plans presented to the inspectors, titled "Topical Outline", lacked sufficient details to assure all aspects of subjects identified in the T&QP were being completely and consistently covered by all instructors. This was identified during the September 11-15, 1989 inspection (IFI 89-05-02), and the licensee indicated at that time that formal lesson plans would be developed. It appears that the progress on developing these lesson plans is very slow. This IFI will remain open for further follow-up.
3. The inspectors' review of training records indicated that SFMs are trained in the use of a gas mask. However, during the course of interviewing security training instructors, supervisors, and SFMs, it was determined that security personnel who were required to wear glasses did not have eye glass inserts provided to them to wear with the gas mask. It was also determined that the gas masks, which are prepositioned at

designated locations throughout the plant, were only one size and, therefore, could present a fit problem for some individuals. These deficiencies could adversely affect the Armed Response Force (ARF) and Tactical Response Team (TRT) members' ability to perform their assigned duties in a chemical environment. These types of deficiencies could have been prevented by formal lesson plans that contained the proper information on the function and operation of materials and/or equipment provided to SFMs. The licensee indicated that these concerns would be researched and resolved. This is an unresolved item (UNR 89-06-01).

4. The inspectors discovered that not all training documentation on each individual was being maintained in one training record. For example, when an inspector requested the most current documentation on gas mask and baton training from the training supervisor, he could not produce the records; but one of the training instructor's indicated he had those records in a separate file. It appears that this fragmented filing system could cause a problem, such as missed requalification dates and this problem could be exacerbated by the lack of a data-based program designed to project future requalification dates. The licensee indicated that the training records would be consolidated, but that a data-based program for projecting future training dates would be too costly to implement at this time. The consolidation of training files will be reviewed by the inspectors during a future inspection. (IFI 89-06-02)

9. Exit Interview

The inspectors met with licensee representatives indicated in paragraph 1 at the conclusion of the inspection on December 21, 1989, and summarized the scope and findings of the inspection. The inspectors also confirmed the commitments made by the licensee during the inspection, as documented in this report.