

DOCUMENT CONTAINS
SAFEGUARDS INFORMATION

APPENDIX

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
REGION IV

Inspection Report: 50-498/93-23
50-499/93-23

Operating Licenses: NPF-76
NPF-80

Licenses: Houston Lighting and Power Company
P.O. Box 1700
Houston, Texas 77251

Facility Name: South Texas Project

Inspection At: Bay City, Texas

Inspection Conducted: July 12-16, 1993

Inspector: T. W. Dexter, Senior Physical Security Specialist
Facilities Inspection Programs Section

Approved:

Blaine Murray
Blaine Murray, Chief, Facilities Inspection
Programs Section

6/3/93
Date

Inspection Summary

Areas Inspected (Units 1 and 2): Routine, announced inspection of the physical security program including records and reports, security system power supply, testing and maintenance, assessment aids, compensatory measures, security plans and procedures, and security training and qualification.

Results:

- Some security plan implementing procedures were too general (Section 1.1).
- Security events were being properly recorded and reported to the NRC. Security access control records were reviewed as required. Alarm

DOCUMENT CONTAINS
SAFEGUARDS INFORMATION

ENCLOSURE CONTAINS
SAFEGUARDS INFORMATION
UPON SEPARATION THIS
PAGE IS DECONTROLLED

station operators were inconsistent when logging alarm response information into the computer (Section 1.2).

- Testing records for detection aids and access control equipment were on file and completed. However, the procedure used to conduct the tests did not include specifics to ensure that all security personnel conducting tests do so in a uniform manner that challenges the equipment (Section 1.3).
- Compensatory measures were being implemented for degraded security equipment as required by the NRC-approved Physical Security Plan. However, a program weakness was identified in that alarm station operators continue to demonstrate a lack of aggressiveness in implementing compensatory measures for degraded cameras (Section 1.4).
- A test of the emergency power supply demonstrated that the security diesel was performing as designed (Section 1.5).
- The security equipment required frequent repairs, and compensatory posting for some equipment had become the normal routine rather than the exception. Overtime was controlled, and security officers were receiving appropriate time off (Section 1.6).
- Problems continue with the quality of the video cameras, the monitors, and the adjustment of the monitors by alarm station operators. Some alarm station operators continue to operate with video monitors out of adjustment during day and/or nighttime operation (Section 1.7).
- Required training had been conducted in accordance with the security program plans. However, lesson plan instructions being provided to the security officers for many of the crucial tasks were too general. Training facilities were very good and weapons training was conducted in a very professional and competent manner (Section 1.8).

Summary of Inspection Findings:

- Inspection Followup Item 498/9323-01; 499/9323-01 was opened (Section 1.4).
- Inspection Followup Item 498/9316-02; 499/9316-02 was closed (Section 1.6)

Attachment:

- Persons Contacted and Exit Meeting