

DOCUMENT CONTAINS  
SAFEGUARDS INFORMATION

ENCLOSURE 2

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
REG<sup>1</sup> IV

NRC Inspection Report: 50-206/95-05  
50-361/95-05  
50-362/95-05

Operating License: DRP-13  
NPF-10  
NPF-15

Licensee: Southern California Edison Company (SCE)  
Irvine Operations Center  
23 Parker Street  
Irvine, California 92718

Facility Name: San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1, 2, and 3

Inspection At: Camp Pendleton, California

Inspection Conducted: March 20 through April 14, 1995

Inspector: D. W. Schaefer, Physical Security Specialist  
Reactor Inspection Branch

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

*Blaine Murray*  
Blaine Murray, Chief  
Reactor Inspection Branch

*4/18/95*  
Date

Inspection Summary

Areas Inspected: Routine, announced inspection of the licensee's physical security program. The areas inspected included management effectiveness, physical security plans and implementing procedures, vital area barriers and detection aids, records and reports, assessment aids, alarm stations, communications, review of previous inspection findings, and followup of licensee event reports.

DOCUMENT CONTAINS  
SAFEGUARDS INFORMATION

ENCLOSURE CONTAINS  
SAFEGUARDS INFORMATION  
UPON SEPARATION THIS  
PAGE IS DECONTROLLED

DOCUMENT CONTAINS  
SAFEGUARDS INFORMATION

Violation" and should include for each violation: (1) the reason for the violation, or, if contested, the basis for disputing the violation, (2) the corrective steps that have been taken and the results achieved, (3) the corrective steps that will be taken to avoid further violations, and (4) the date when full compliance will be achieved. Your response may reference or include previous docketed correspondence, if the correspondence adequately addresses the required response. If an adequate reply is not received within the time specified in this Notice, an order or a Demand for Information may be issued to show cause why the license should not be modified, suspended, or revoked, or why such other action as may be proper should not be taken. Where good cause is shown, consideration will be given to extending the response time.

Dated at Arlington, Texas  
this 21st day of April 1995

DOCUMENT CONTAINS  
SAFEGUARDS INFORMATION

ENCLOSURE CONTAINS  
SAFEGUARDS INFORMATION  
UPON SEPARATION THIS  
PAGE IS DECONTROLLED

Results:

- Senior management provided strong support for the security program. The security program was managed by a well trained and highly qualified staff (Section 1.1).
- Changes to security programs and plans were reported and implemented as required with no decrease of program effectiveness. Implementing procedures met performance requirements in the Physical Security Plan (Section 1.2).
- The vital area barriers and detection systems were in place and would be effective in providing delay and detection during a penetration attempt (Section 1.3).
- An excellent records and report program was in place. The security staff was correctly reporting security events as required by regulations. A noncited violation regarding the failure to post a compensatory security measure was identified (Section 1.4).
- Assessment of perimeter security alarms was excellent. An Inspection Followup Item was identified concerning the poor image produced by a closed circuit television (CCTV) camera (Section 1.5).
- The Central Alarm Station (CAS) and the Secondary Alarm Station (SAS) were redundant and well protected. Station operators were alert and well trained (Section 1.6).
- An excellent communications system was maintained. The availability and quality of portable radios was excellent (Section 1.7).
- A violation was identified regarding the inappropriate issuance of security badges to three individuals, granting these individuals unescorted access to the protected area prior to the Central Processing Facility recording all requirements as satisfied, including the fulfillment of a fitness-for-duty drug and alcohol test within 60 days prior to the initial granting of access (Section 2.3).

Summary of Inspection Findings:

- A noncited Violation was identified (Section 1.4).
- Followup Item 362/9505-01 was opened (Section 1.5).
- Violation 206/9232-01, 361/9232-01, 362/9232-01 was closed (Section 2.1).

DOCUMENT CONTAINS  
SAFEGUARDS INFORMATION

- Violation 361/9404-01, 362/9404-01 was reviewed and remains open (Section 2.2).
- Licensee Event Report 206/95-001-00, 361/95-001-00, 362/95-001-00 was closed (Section 2.3).
- Violation 361/9505-02, 362/9505-02 was opened (Section 2.3).

Attachment:

- Attachment - Persons contacted and exit meeting.

DOCUMENT CONTAINS  
SAFEGUARDS INFORMATION

ENCLOSURE CONTAINS  
SAFEGUARDS INFORMATION  
UPON SEPARATION THIS  
PAGE IS DECONTROLLED

ATTACHMENT

1 PERSONS CONTACTED

1.1 Licensee Personnel

R. Beatty, Supervisor, Nuclear Security Operations  
\*C. Bartolomeo, Specialist, Nuclear Security  
\*S. Blue, Administrator, Fitness-For-Duty  
\*P. Champion, Supervisor Security Compliance  
K. Demain, Software Engineer, Computer Engineering  
D. Flannery, Supervisor, CAS/SAS Operations, Nuclear Security  
\*W. Flannery, Supervisor, Central Processing Facility  
\*G. Gibson, Supervisor, Onsite Nuclear Licensing  
R. Jones, Supervisor, Security Projects  
\*R. Kaplan, Engineer, Onsite Nuclear Licensing  
R. Mardon, Regional Manager, Telecommunications  
\*W. Marsh, Manager, Nuclear Regulatory Affairs  
\*J. Matthews, Supervisor, Business and Personnel Planning, Nuclear Security  
R. Mitchell, Control Systems, Computer Engineering  
\*G. Plumlee, Lead Onsite Nuclear Licensing  
\*M. Ramsey, Root Cause Engineer, Nuclear Oversight Division  
O. Robertson, Auditor, Corporate Security  
\*M. Speer, Manager, Site Security  
\*J. Wallace, Manager, Access Authorization

1.2 NRC Personnel

D. Solario, Resident Inspector  
\*J. Sloan, Senior Resident Inspector

\*Denotes those that attended the exit meeting.

The inspector also interviewed other licensee employees during the inspection. Those employees included members of the licensee's technical and management staff and members of the security organization.

2 EXIT MEETING

An exit meeting was conducted on March 20, 1995. During this meeting, the inspector reviewed the scope and findings of the report. On April 7 and 14, 1995, the licensee provided additional information, as discussed in paragraph 1.4.1 above.