



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 112 TO LICENSE NO. DPR-49

IOWA ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
CENTRAL IOWA POWER COOPERATIVE  
CORN BELT POWER COOPERATIVE

DUANE ARNOLD ENERGY CENTER

DOCKET NO. 50-331

1.0 Introduction

On September 26, 1984, as supplemented October 26, 1984, the Iowa Electric Light and Power Company (the licensee) filed with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for the Duane Arnold Energy Center (DAEC) pursuant to 10 CFR 50.90, a proposed amendment to its Facility Operating License No. DPR-49. The amendment would approve revisions to its approved Security Plan and Guard Training and Qualification Plan.

The proposed change would delete from the security and guard training and qualifications plans commitments to utilize two types of shoulder-fired weapons. 10 CFR 73.55 requires 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 of 10 CFR 73.55 requires each guard to be qualified in the use of assigned weapons. The licensee has complied with these requirements. Currently, DAEC 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 security and guard training and qualification plans be changed to eliminate one of the two weapons available to the guard force during a security event.

2.0 Evaluation

NRC physical security requirements 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 the 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 finds that the amended Security

Plan for DAEC continues to satisfy the requirements of 10 CFR 73.55(b) through (h), and Appendices B and C to Part 73.

### 3.0 Environmental Considerations

This amendment relates solely to safeguards matters and does not involve any significant construction impacts. Accordingly, this 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 this amendment.

### 4.0 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 this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributor: R. F. Skelton

Dated: February 26, 1985