

REGION V

IE Inspection Report No. 50-142/76-01 (IE-V-140)

Licensee University of California at
Los Angeles

Docket No. 50-142

License No. R-71

Priority F

Facility _____

Group Category 2

Location Los Angeles, California 90024

Type of Facility Training/Research Reactor

Type of Inspection Special, Unannounced, Physical Security

Dates of Inspection July 29-30, 1976

Dates of Previous Inspection May 20, 1975

Principal Inspector *M. D. Schuster* 8-13-76
M. D. Schuster, Physical Protection Inspector Date

Accompanying Inspectors None _____ Date
_____ Date

Other Accompanying Personnel: None

Reviewed by *V. N. Rizzolo* 8/13/76
V. N. Rizzolo, Chief, Safeguards Branch Date

76-168
_____ of _____ 10 copies
6 pages

THIS DOCUMENT IS NOT TO BE REPRODUCED WITHOUT SPECIFIC APPROVAL OF IEV

Summary of FindingsEnforcement Action

A. Violations

None

B. Infractions

None

C. Deficiencies

The licensee had determined through that one key had been lost and that one key had been duplicated. No corrective action had been taken as a result (Details, paragraph 5)

D. Deviations

None

Licensee Action on Previously Identified Enforcement Items

Inspection Report 50-142/75-02 (May 20, 1975) reported one infraction pertaining to the lack of required training in the health physics course for members

The licensee took corrective action in July 1975 and completed the necessary training for members. This was verified during this inspection through the licensee's training records.

Unusual Occurrences

None

Other Significant FindingsA. Weaknesses and Vulnerabilities1. Essential Equipment

Essential equipment is not specifically identified in the security plan. (Details paragraph 3)

- 2 -

2. Security Areas

The reactor control room is not considered a security area. (Details, paragraph 4)

3. Procedures

There are no provisions for corrective actions as a result of reviews, inspections or inventories. In addition, only limited information is available in the event of a bomb threat. (Details, paragraph 7)

B. Assessment of Licensee's Response to NRC Request for Review and Augmentation of Security

At the time of notification to licensees (February 1976), UCLA was considered a safeguards group 5, accordingly they were not notified.

Management Interview

The exit interview was held on July 30, 1976. Attendees were as follows:

UCLA

N. Ostrander, Laboratory Manager
J. Horner, Resident Health Physicist
C. Ashbaugh, Laboratory Security Officer
B. Taylor, Research Physicist

NRC Region V

M. Schuster, Physical Protection Inspector

Items Discussed/Scope of Inspection

The scope of the special inspection was reiterated to be an examination of the licensee's security program and equipment with emphasis on their capabilities to withstand an external attack and included the following areas:

<u>Procedure No.</u>	<u>Subject</u>
81705B	Physical Protection - Security Plan
81710B	Physical Protection - Essential Equipment
81715B	Physical Protection - Security Areas
81720B	Physical Protection - Security Systems

- 3 -

81725B	Physical Protection - Security Organization
81730B	Physical Protection - Access Control
81735B	Physical Protection - Surveillance
81740B	Physical Protection - Procedures
81745B	Physical Protection - Security Program Review
81750B	Physical Protection - Protection of SIM

The licensee was advised of the item of noncompliance and replied that prompt corrective action would be taken. The licensee indicated they would consider the security weaknesses for possible solutions. With respect to defining essential equipment the licensee indicated they would pursue that item with Licensing.

Details1. Time on Site

Arrived - 1000 hours, July 29, 1976
 Departed - 1200 hours, July 30, 1976

Total manhours on site - 10

2. Persons Contacted

T. Zane, Reactor Supervisor
 N. Ostrander, Laboratory Manager
 J. Horner, Resident Health Physicist
 C. Ashbaugh, Laboratory Security Officer
 J. Carter, Lt. UCLA Police Department

3. Essential Equipment

The licensee's new security plan (April 1, 1976) paragraph I.A contains a general description and refers the reader to the attached Appendices A and B for a further description. Essential equipment, if any, for this Argonaut reactor such as;
 etc. have not been designated.

4. Security Areas

The reactor control room is considered an operational area

5. Security Systems

The licensee's security plan sets forth the controls and a description of the lock and key system. A review of the licensee's revealed that a was conducted on 8/18/75. The following was entered:

As a result the licensee had taken no action to correct the noted deficiencies. This was identified as an item of noncompliance.

6. Security Organization7. Procedures

The licensee's security plan (April 1, 1976), page 8, paragraph E states "The security program will be reviewed and tested every twelve months by the Laboratory Security Officer. He will also conduct on a semi-annual basis." No provisions for corrective action, if needed, as a result of those reviews and/or have been included.

Bomb threat procedures provide that the laboratory would be secured. That procedure does not contain guidance to the receiver of such calls to record all information, ask questions, listen for background noise, etc.