

**ENCLOSURE**

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
REGION IV

Docket No.: 50-133  
License No.: DPR-7  
Report No.: 50-133/98-02  
Licensee: Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E)  
Facility: Humboldt Bay Power Plant Unit No. 3  
Location: 1000 King Salmon Avenue  
Eureka, California 95503  
Dates: April 14-15, 1998  
Inspectors: A. Bruce Earnest, Physical Security Specialist  
Approved By: D. Blair Spitzberg, Ph.D., Chief  
Nuclear Materials Safety Branch 2  
Attachment: Supplemental Information

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Humboldt Bay Power Plant, Unit No. 3  
NRC Inspection Report 50-133/98-02

Humboldt Bay has been in a SAFSTOR decommissioning status since 1976. This routine, announced inspection focused on the licensee's physical security program. The areas inspected included review of alarm stations, physical barriers, detection aids, assessment aids, management effectiveness, and security program audits.

### **Plant Support**

- The physical security program was effectively implemented. Strengths included the security audit program and management effectiveness (Sections S6.1 and S7.1).
- The alarm station operators were efficient. The alarm station met physical security plan requirements (Section S1.1).
- The protected area barriers were adequate to provide delay of an attempted intrusion (Section S2.1).
- An effective detection system was installed and maintained (Section S2.2).
- The assessment aids system provided adequate assessment of the protected area (Section S2.3).

## Report Details

### **S1 Conduct of Security and Safeguards Activities**

#### **S1.1 Alarm Stations**

##### **a. Inspection Scope**

The alarm stations were inspected to determine compliance with the requirements of 10 CFR 73.55(e)(1) and (2), (f)(1) and (2), and the physical security plan.

##### **b. Observations and Findings**

The inspector asked questions of the station operators and determined that they were effectively trained and knowledgeable of their duties. The licensee used station operators as alarm station operators. In accordance with physical security plan requirements, the alarm station equipment was contained in the plant control room. If the operators are outside the control room (allowed by the physical security plan) and an alarm sounds, the system is attached to a series of loud horns that allows the operators to immediately respond to the alarm station and take the corrective action to respond to the alarm. During tests of the alarm and communications systems, the inspector determined that the system was effective and met the physical security plan requirements.

##### **c. Conclusion**

The alarm station operators were efficient. The alarm station met physical security plan requirements.

### **S2 Status of Security Facilities and Equipment**

#### **S2.1 Physical Barriers - Protected Area**

##### **a. Inspection Scope**

The protected area physical barriers were inspected to determine compliance with the requirements of 10 CFR 73.2, 73.55(c)(1) through (3) and the physical security plan.

##### **b. Observations and Findings**

The inspector observed the protected area barrier on April 15, 1998. The protected area barriers are the reactor building walls and the doors leading into the building. The walls and doors are of substantial construction and would provide an adequate delay to adversaries attempting to enter the protected area. The inspector confirmed that all openings in the barrier were smaller than 96 square inches or the openings had substantial barriers in place to cover the openings.



c. Conclusion

The protected area barriers were adequate to provide delay of an attempted intrusion.

S2.2 Detection Aids - Protected Area

a. Inspection Scope

The detection aids program for the protected area was inspected to determine compliance with the requirements of 10 CFR 73.55(c)(4), (e)(2) and (3) and the requirements of the physical security plan.

b. Observations and Findings

The licensee's protected area detection aids consist of balanced magnetic switches on the portals leading into the protected area and motion detectors within the building and the spent fuel pool. The inspector observed licensee tests of the detection aids on April 15, 1998. Every test of all detection devices was successful. The licensee's detection aids system met the physical security plan requirements.

c. Conclusion

An effective detection system was installed and maintained.

S2.3 Assessment Aids

a. Inspection Scope

The assessment aids program was inspected to determine compliance with 10 CFR 73.55 (h)(4) and (6) and the physical security plan. The areas inspected included the application of closed-circuit television to provide observation of the perimeter isolation zones and the adequacy of the monitoring system in the alarm stations.

b. Observations and Findings

The areas inspected included adequacy of the closed-circuit television system and the monitoring system in the alarm station. The inspector observed tests of the assessment aids system. The camera system consisted of four fixed cameras showing either the outside of the main access portal or the area around the spent fuel pool. Camera resolution was clear on three of the cameras. One of the cameras, camera No. 3, was malfunctioning. Compensatory measures were in place. However, the inspector noted that a work order had been issued approximately 2 months prior to the inspection, and the camera was still not repaired. The licensee acknowledged that the time frame appeared to be excessive and that they would review measures to expedite security work orders in the future. The monitors were placed in an appropriate manner for use by

the alarm station operators to monitor activities around and inside the protected area. The assessment aids system met physical security plan requirements.

c. Conclusion

The assessment aids system provided adequate assessment of the protected area.

**S6 Security Organization and Administration**

**S6.1 Management Support and Effectiveness**

a. Inspection Scope

The effectiveness and adequacy of the licensee's management as it related to the administration of the security program was evaluated. The inspector interviewed security management personnel in order to determine the level of support from licensee management. In addition, the inspector interviewed one licensee management official senior to the security manager.

b. Observations and Findings

The inspector determined that senior level management provided very strong support to the security program. Interviews with the security manager indicated that he was knowledgeable, proficient, and effective in managing the security program. Security staffing was maintained at an adequate level. Security management appeared to communicate well with security force members.

c. Conclusion

The security program received strong management support.

**S7 Quality Assurance in Security and Safeguards Activities**

**S7.1 Security Program Audit**

a. Inspection Scope

The audit of the security program was inspected to determine compliance with the requirements of 10 CFR 73.55(g)(4) and the requirements of the physical security plan.

b. Observations and Findings

The inspector confirmed that a security program audit was conducted at least every 12 months. By review of licensee records and interviews with licensee personnel, the inspector confirmed that the audit team personnel were independent of plant security management and plant security management supervision. It was determined that the

audit team personnel were qualified to conduct audits and included at least one person with nuclear security experience from another power reactor facility.

The inspector reviewed Audit Report 980090001 dated February 25, 1998. The audit was comprehensive and appeared thorough. Response to the findings by security management was ongoing at the time of this inspection.

c. Conclusion

The annual audit was excellent.

**V. Management Meeting**

**X1 Exit Meeting Summary**

The inspector presented the inspection results to members of the licensee management at the exit meeting on April 15, 1998. The licensee acknowledged the findings presented. The licensee did not identify as proprietary any information provided to, or reviewed by, the inspector.



ATTACHMENT

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

**PARTIAL LIST OF PERSONS CONTACTED**

Licensee

T. Moulia, Plant Manager  
M. Grossman, Operations Supervisor  
V. Jensen, Quality Control Supervisor  
J. Paul, Fire Marshall  
T. Rasmussen, Senior Power Production Engineer  
D. Sokolsky, Senior Licensing Engineer  
R. Sorensen, Staff Consultant  
S. Thrash, Maintenance Supervisor  
T. Tyler, Maintenance Supervisor  
C. Winfrey, Shift Foreman

Contractor

B. Maloney, Burns Contract Manager

**INSPECTION PROCEDURES USED**

IP 81700      Physical Security Program for Power Reactors

**ITEMS OPENED, CLOSED, AND DISCUSSED**

Open

None

Closed

None

Discussed

None