



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 118 TO
FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-38
ENTERGY OPERATIONS, INC.
WATERFORD STEAM ELECTRIC STATION, UNIT 3
DOCKET NO. 50-382

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letters dated September 7, 1993, as supplemented by letters dated February 8, 1994, and August 9, 1995, Entergy Operations (the licensee) requested to amend the Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3, Operating License No. NPF-38. The licensee submitted for staff review and approval a revision to the Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3 Physical Security Plan. These revisions provide explicit details which would allow alternative actions for compensatory measures for failed protected area security equipment and systems at the Waterford Generating Station.

The August 9, 1995, letter provided clarifying information that did not change the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination.

2.0 DISCUSSION

The licensee's proposal to modify how alternative compensatory measures can be utilized for failed protected area security equipment and systems was analyzed by the NRC staff. It was determined that these changes can be used in the place of the existing compensatory measures which are consistent with NUREG-1045, "Guidance on the Application of Compensatory Safeguards Measures for Power Reactor Licensees", and will continue to provide adequate capability to the protected area perimeter barrier and isolation zones for assessing and detecting unauthorized access to the site.

3.0 CONCLUSION

It is the staff's determination that the amendment to the Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3 Physical Security Plan, as described in the licensee's letters of September 7, 1993, February 8, 1994, and August 9, 1995, does not increase the risk of sabotage at the facility. The plan continues to satisfy 10 CFR Part 73.55.

4.0 STATE CONSULTATION

In accordance with the Commission's regulations, the Louisiana State official was notified of the proposed issuance of the amendment. The State official had no comments.

5.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

The amendment is related solely to safeguards matters and does not involve any significant construction impacts. Accordingly, the amendment meets the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 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 the amendment.

6.0 CONCLUSION

The Commission has 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, (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations, and (3) the issuance of the amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributor: R. B. Manili

Date: December 19, 1995