



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NOS. 95 AND 76

TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NOS. DPR-53 AND DPR-69

BALTIMORE GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

CALVERT CLIFFS NUCLEAR POWER PLANT UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2

DOCKET NOS. 50-317 AND 50-318

1.0 Introduction

On October 24, 1983 the Baltimore Gas and Electric Company filed with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for the Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant pursuant to 10 CFR 50.90, a proposed amendment to their Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-53 and DPR-69. The amendment would approve revisions to their approved Physical Security, Training and Qualification, and Safeguards Contingency Plans.

2.0 Discussion

The proposed change would delete from the physical security, training and qualification, and safeguards contingency plans commitments to utilize two types of shoulder-fired weapons. The Commission's regulations, 10 CFR Part 73.55, require that armed guards be immediately available to fulfill response requirements and to use force sufficient to counter the force directed at them, including the use of deadly force. Appendix B to 10 CFR Part 73.55 requires each guard to be qualified in the use of assigned weapons. The licensee has complied with these requirements. Currently, Calvert Cliffs response guards are trained in and have immediately available two types of shoulder-fired weapons. The licensee is now requesting that the commitment in the physical security, training and qualification, and safeguards contingency plans be changed to eliminate one of the two weapons available to the guard force during a security event.

3. Findings

NRC physical security regulations do not explicitly require that shoulder-fired weapons be available onsite for response purposes. However, the staff has consistently maintained that either shotguns or semi-automatic rifles (but not both) were necessary to satisfy the response requirements of Section 73.55(h), particularly in regard to neutralization of the threat as set forth in subparagraph (4)(iii) of this Section. This position is stated in paragraph 3.6 of NUREG-0908. The licensee's justification for deleting one type of response weapon from the site armament is based on site specific considerations. The staff has reviewed the licensee's proposal in this regard and concluded that the compensating features identified (size and

configuration of the defended area, and the proximity of offsite response forces) do reduce the need to maintain both types of defense weaponry. Accordingly, the staff supports this change.

4.0 Conclusion

It is the staff's judgement that the amended Security Plans for Calvert Cliffs continue to satisfy the requirements of 10 CFR Part 73.55(b) through (h), and Appendices B & C to Part 73.

Environmental Consideration

These amendments relate solely to safeguards matters and do not involve any significant construction impacts. Accordingly, these amendments meet the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR Section 51.22(c)(12). Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the issuance of these amendments.

Conclusion

We have concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, and (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations and the issuance of the amendments will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Date: August 1, 1984

Principal Contributor:
R. B. Manili, NMSS