

UNITED STATES

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGION IV

611 RYAN PLAZA DRIVE, SUITE 400 ARLINGTON, TEXAS 76011 8064

JUL | 5 1997

Harold B. Ray, Executive Vice President Southern California Edison Co. San Oriofre Nuclear Generating Station P.O. Box 128 San Clemente, California 92674-0128

SUBJECT: NRC INSPECTION REPORT 50-361/97-04; 50-362/97-04

Dear Mr. Ray:

Thank you for your letter of May 23, 1997, in response to our letter and Notice of Violation dated May 8, 1997. We have reviewed your reply and find it responsive to the concerns raised in our Notice of Violation. We will review the implementation of your corrective actions during a future inspection to determine that full compliance has been achieved and will be maintained.

If you have further questions regarding our positions, please contact Mr. Blaine Murray (817/860-8126) of my staff.

Sincerely,

Arthur T. Howell III, Director Division of Reactor Safety

Docket Nos.: 50-361; 50-362 License Nos.: NPF-10: NPF-15

Chairman, Board of Supervisors County of San Diego 1600 Pacific Highway, Room 335 San Diego, California 92101

Alan R. Watts, Esq. Woodruff, Spradlin & Smart 701 S. Parker St. Suite 7000 Orange, California 92868-4720

9707180278 97071 ADOCK

Sherwin Harris, Resource Project Manager Public Utilities Department City of Riverside 3900 Main Street Riverside, California 92522

R. W. Krieger, Vice President Southern California Edison Company San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station P.O. Box 128 San Clemente, California 92674-0128

Dr. Harvey Collins, Chief
Division of Drinking Water and
Environmental Management
California Department of Health Services
P.O. Box 942732
Sacramento, California 94234-7320

Terry Winter, Manager Power Operations San Diego Gas & Electric Company P.O. Box 1831 San Diego, California 92112

Mr. Steve Hsu Radiological Health Branch State Department of Health Services P.O. Box 942732 Sacramento, California 94234

Mayor City of San Clemente 100 Avenida Presidio San Clemente, California 92672

Mr. Truman Burns\Mr. Robert Kinosian California Public Utilities Commission 505 Van Ness, Rm. 4102 San Francisco, California 94102 E-Mail report to T. Boyce (THB)

E-Mail report to NRR Event Tracking System (IPAS)

E-Mail report to Document Control Desk (DOCDESK)

bcc to DCD (IEO1)

bcc distrib. by RIV:

Regional Administrator DRS Director Branch Chief (DRS/PSB) Inspector Branch Chief (DRP/TSS) WCFO File

Resident Inspector DRS-PSB MIS System RIV File M. Hammond (PAO, WCFO)

DOCUMENT NAME: R:\ SO23\SO704ak.ABE

To receive copy of document, indicate in box: "C" = Copy without enclosures "E" = Copy with enclosures "N" = No copy

RIV:PSS:PSB	C:PSB AE	D:DRP E	D:DRS -3	
ABEarnest/Imb///2	BMurray (TPGwynn 12 N	ATHowell	
07/4/97	071497	07/1497 6.00	07//5/97	

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

E-Mail report to T. Boyce (THB)
E-Mail report to NRR Event Tracking System (IPAS)
E-Mail report to Document Control Desk (DOCDESK)

bcc to DCD (IEO1)

bcc distrib. by RIV:

Regional Administrator DRS Director Branch Chief (DRS/PSB) Inspector Branch Chief (DRP/TSS) WCFO File Resident Inspector DRS-PSB MIS System RIV File M. Hammond (PAO, WCFO)

DOCUMENT NAME: R:\ SO23\SO704ak.ABE

To receive copy of document, indicate in box: "C" = Copy without enclosures "E" = Copy with enclosures "N" = No copy

RIV:PSS:PSB	C:PSB	ΛE	D:DRP E	D:DRS -468
ABEarnest/Imb/172	BMurray	0	TPGWYND LIN	ATHowell
07/4/97	07197		07/1497	07//5/97

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY



Murray

Dwight E. Nunn Vice President

May 23, 1997

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Document Control Desk Washington, D.C. 20555

Subject:

Docket Nos. 50-361 and 50-362

Reply to a Notice of Violation

San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Units 2 and 3

References:

- Letter, Mr. A. T. Howell III (USNRC) to Mr. Harold B. Ray (Edison), dated May 8, 1997
- (2) Letter, Mr. D. E. Nunn (Edison) to USNRC Region IV (Attn: Mr. R. Wise), dated October 21, 1996

Reference 1 transmitted the results of NRC Inspection Report No. 50-361/97-04 and 50-362/97-04, conducted February 24-28, 1997, at the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Units 2 and 3. The enclosure to Reference 1 also transmitted a Notice of Violation containing two violations (9704-02 and 04). These violations involved: (1) the failure to change out the security lock and key system after the termination for cause of an individual with access to the keys of that system; and (2) a failure to follow physical security plan and procedural requirements prior to allowing a vehicle to access the area behind the vehicle barrier system.

In accordance with Reference 1, the enclosure to this letter provides Edison's reply to the Notice of Violation. However, as described in the enclosure, Edison took prompt corrective action while the inspector was on site or had completed the corrective actions prior to the inspection. Edison believes this information should have been reflected in the inspection report to accurately reflect the inspection.

If you have any further questions, please contact me.

Sincerely

Dwight E. Nunn

Enclosure

P. O. Box 128 San Clemente, CA 92674-0128 714-368-1480 Fax 714-368-1490

97-1210

97052700H-SPP

cc: E. W. Merschoff, Regional Administrator, NRC Region IV

A. T. Howell, Director, Division of Reactor Safety, NRC Region IV

K. E. Perkins, Director, Walnut Creek Field Office, NRC Region IV

J. A. Sloan, NRC Senior Resident Inspector, San Onofre Units 2 and 3

M. B. Fields, NRC Project Manager, San Onofre Units 2 and 3

ENCLOSURE

VIOLATION A

The enclosure to Mr. A. T. Howell's letter dated May 8, 1997, states in part:

"10 CFR 73.55(d)(9) states, in part, 'Whenever an individual's unescorted access is revoked due to his or her lack of trustworthiness, reliability, or inadequate work performance, keys, locks, combinations, and related access control devices to which that person had access must be changed or rotated.'

"Paragraph 4.4 of the licensee's physical security plan states, in part, 'In addition, whenever an individual's unescorted access is revoked due to his or her lack of trustworthiness, reliability, or inadequate work performance, keys, locks, combinations, and related access control devices to which that person had access are changed or rotated within five days.'

"Paragraph 6.4.2 of Security Procedure SO123-IV-4.4, Revision 1, states, in part, 'Evaluate termination to determine individual's reliability and trustworthiness. Direct a Security Specialist, Lock and Alarm to change applicable locks, keys, and combinations within five days from day of employee's termination for cause, if required.'

"Contrary to the above requirements, on December 18, 1995, a security officer, with access to security keys, was terminated for cause. The licensee determined the security officer was untrustworthy and unreliable in that she failed to report an arrest for driving under the influence of alcohol. However, the inspector determined that the licensee did not rotate or change the locks and keys after her termination.

"This is a Severity Level IV violation (Supplement III) (50-361;-362/9704-02)."

RESPONSE TO VIOLATION A

1. Reason for the Violation

The reason for the violation was an inadequate procedure (SO123-IV-4.4), which incorrectly allowed Security the flexibility to make a determination if the locks and keys needed to be changed when they terminated the individual in December 1995. The locks were changed in March 1996 (annual changeout).

2. Corrective Actions Taken and Results Achieved

As corrective action, Procedure SO123-IV-4.4 was changed the day of the NRC inspection exit (February 28, 1997) to not allow Security to make an independent determination of an individual's reliability and trustworthiness. Instead, now upon

Central Processing Facility notification of an employment termination for cause, or if unescorted access is permanently revoked for cause, the procedure requires all appropriate locks, keys, and combinations to be changed within five days.

3 Corrective Actions That Will Be Taken

No additional corrective actions are planned.

4. Date When Full Compliance Will be Achieved

Full compliance was achieved on March 10, 1996, when the locks were changed.

VIOLATION B

The enclosure to Mr. A. T. Howell's letter dated May 8, 1997, states in part:

"Paragraph 4.6.5 of the licensee's physical security plan requires that active barriers remain in the denial position and be removed only after the authorization for entry has been confirmed. It further states that access control measures for the vehicles provide assurance that the vehicle is not transporting a design basis threat explosive device.

"Paragraph 6.7.1.4.4 of licensee Security Procedure SO123-IV-5.3.3 requires a visual search, at the vehicle barrier system, of the vehicle for design basis threat explosives, weapons, and personnel.

"Paragraph 6.7.1.6.1 of licensee Security Procedure SO123-IV-5.3.3 states that, after the search, the active vehicle barrier system can be lowered and the vehicle allowed to enter the area behind the vehicle barrier system.

"Contrary to the above, on September 9, 1996, the inspector observed a security officer lower the vehicle barrier system prior to a search of a vehicle stopped at the barrier. Further, the security officer did not perform an adequate search of the vehicle prior to allowing it to proceed inside the barrier.

"This is a Severity Level IV violation (Supplement III) (50-361;-362/97-04)."

RESPONSE TO VIOLATION B

1. Reason for the Violation

As noted in Reference 2, the reason for the violation was personnel error for inadequate attention to detail. The security officer did not maintain proper observation over the subject vehicle because he was distracted while in-processing a tractor-trailer, and was unaware of brief periods when the vehicle was outside his direct visual range.

2. Corrective Actions Taken and Results Achieved

Prior to this inspection, disciplinary action had been taken for the security officer involved, which included counseling and subsequent retraining. Also, Procedure SO123-IV-5.3.3, "Search and Inspection," had been revised on December 2, 1996, to clarify the vehicle search process.

3. Corrective Actions That Will Be Taken

No additional corrective actions are planned.

4. Date When Full Compliance Was Achieved

Full compliance was achieved on December 2, 1996, upon issuance of SO123-IV-5.3.3, Revision 3.