

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGION III

Reports No. 50-440/92021(DRSS)

Docket Nos. 50-440

Licenses No. N2F-58

Licensee: Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company
10 Center Road
Perry, OH 44081

Facility Name: Perry Nuclear Power Plant

Inspection Dates: November 16-20, 1992

Type of Inspection: Announced Routine Physical Security

Date of Previous Physical Security Inspection: May 18-22, 1992

Inspector: James R. Kniceley
James R. Kniceley
Physical Security Inspector

11/30/92
Date

Approved By: James R. Creed
James R. Creed, Chief
Safeguards Section

11/30/92
Date

Inspection Summary

Inspection on November 16-20, 1992 (Report No. 50-440/92021(DRSS))

Areas Inspected: Routine, announced physical security inspection involving Management Support; Protected and Vital Area Barriers; Detection and Assessment Aids; Access Control-Personnel, Packages, and Vehicles; Alarm Stations and Communications; Power Supply; Testing, Maintenance and Compensatory Measures; and Training and Qualifications.

Results: The licensee was found to be in compliance with NRC requirements within the areas examined. We have concluded that the security program is well implemented and is well managed. Licensee management attention to and involvement in the security program are strong resulting in a high level of security awareness and performance. The licensee continues to be proactive regarding upgrades to and evaluation of their existing security program.

Management's dedication to improving security performance was demonstrated through extensive manhours devoted to auditing the security program. These audits were compliance and performance based and determined that the licensee meets and in some areas exceeds regulatory requirements. Additionally, their is extensive prior planning and oversight for proposed alarm station upgrades. The effectiveness of the security force is also attributed to the stability of

the security organization. Licensee resources are adequate and the Training and Qualification program is effective.

DETAILS

1. Key Persons Contacted

In addition to the key members of the licensee's staff listed below, the inspector interviewed other employees, and members of the security organization. The asterisk (*) denotes those present at the onsite Exit Interview conducted on November 20, 1992.

- * F. Stead, Director, Nuclear Support Department, Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company (CEI)
- * T. Mahon, Manager, Site Protection, CEI
- * R. Rose, General Supervisor, Nuclear Security Operations, CEI
- * D. Craine, Security and Fire Protection Supervisor, CEI
- * M. Benedict, Access Authorization and Fitness for Duty Supervisor
- * P. Paine, Security Analyst, CEI
- * J. Gorman, Training Supervisor, CEI
- * J. Bahleda, Lead Quality Engineer, CEI
- * D. Conran, Compliance Engineer, CEI
- * L. Lindrose, Nuclear Security Operations Supervisor, CEI
- * K. Donovan, Manager, Licensing and Compliance

- * R. Lanksbury, Section Chief-Perry, Region III
- * T. Vogel, Resident Inspector, NRC Region III

2. Entrance and Exit Interviews

- a. At the beginning of the inspection, Mr. Thomas Mahon, Manager, Site Protection was informed of the purpose of this inspection, it's scope and the topical areas to be examined.
- b. The inspector met with the licensee representatives, denoted in Section 1, at the conclusion of onsite inspection activities. A general description of the scope and conduct of the inspection was provided. Briefly listed below are the findings discussed during the exit interview. The licensee representatives were invited to provide comments on each item discussed. Those comments are included. The details of each finding listed below are referenced, as noted, in the report.
 - (1) The licensee was informed of and acknowledged the inspector's comments that no violations were identified during this inspection.
 - (2) The inspector commented that the security program is well implemented and well managed.
 - (3) Security personnel observed and questioned during this inspection were knowledgeable of their assigned duties.
 - (4) The inspector identified the stability of the security force and the Quality Assurance Surveillance/Audit program as program strengths.

- (5) The inspector identified the licensee's major challenge is the modifications and upgrades planned for the alarm stations. The licensee agreed to discuss this modification with Region III when the plans are finalized.

3. Program Areas Inspected:

Listed below are the areas examined by the inspector in which no findings (strengths, violations, deviations, unresolved items or inspection followup items) were identified. Only findings are described in subsequent Report Details sections.

The below listed clear areas were reviewed and evaluated as deemed necessary by the inspector to meet the specified "Inspection Requirements" (Section 02) of the applicable NRC Inspection Procedure (IP). Sampling reviews included interviews, observations, and document reviews that provided independent verification of compliance with requirements. Gathered data was also used to evaluate the adequacy of the reviewed program and practices to adequately protect the facility and the health and safety of the public. The depth and scope of inspection activities were conducted as deemed appropriate and necessary for the program area and operational status of the security system. Additional testing of security systems was not requested by the inspector.

IP 81700-Physical Security Inspection Program for Power Reactors

01. Management, Plans, Audit: (a) Degree of Management Support for Program; (b) Security Program Plans Changes; (c) Audits Program Corrective Action, Auditor Qualification.
02. Protected and Vital Area Physical Barriers, Detection and Assessment Aids: (a) PA and VA Barrier Resistance; (b) Isolation Zones Maintained; (c) PA and VA Detection Functional and Effective; (d) Assessment Aids Functional and Effective.
03. Protected and Vital Area Access Control of Personnel, Packages and Vehicles: (a) Personnel Access: (1) Identification and Authorization Checked Before Access; (5) Personnel Are Searched; (6) Badges Are Displayed; (7) Visitors Are Escorted; (8) Rapid Ingress and Egress in Emergencies. (b) Package Control: (1) Packages Authorization Checked; (2) Handcarried Packages Searched at PA; (3) Material Controlled at Containment. (c) Vehicle Control: (1) Vehicles Are Searched; (2) Authorization Verified Prior to Entry; (3) Two Officers at Open Gates; (4) All Self-Propelled and Towed Vehicles Are Controlled.
04. Alarm Stations and Communication: (a) CAS and SAS Are Manned, Equipped, Independent and Diverse and Can Call For Assistance; (b) No Interference of CAS activities; (c) CAS and SAS Have Continuous Communications With Each Onsite and Can Call Offsite.

05. Power Supply: Alarms and Nonportable Communications Equipment on Standby Power System, Equipment Located in VA, Automatic Indication of Failure or Use.
 06. Testing and Maintenance: (a) Licensee Implements Programs To Verify Installation, Testing, Maintenance and Correction; (b) Compensatory Measures Implemented That Do Not Decrease Effectiveness.
 07. Security Training and Qualification: (a) Each Individual Is Trained, Qualified and Equipped For Each Task Prior To Assignment; (b) Security Personnel Have Knowledge and Ability To Perform Duties. (c) Response Capabilities Are Adequate and Effective To Meet Plans and Protect Against Design Basis Threat; (d) Size and Leadership of Response Adequate; (e) Non-Security Personnel Are Trained.
4. Physical Security Program For Power Reactors (IP 81700): Two program strengths were identified regarding the stability of the security force and the high quality of audits of the security organization. Additionally one licensee challenge was identified regarding modifications and upgrades to the alarm stations.
- a. The licensee's security organization was extremely knowledgeable of program requirements. Their appearance and demeanor demonstrated a highly motivated, aggressive and professional security organization. Their has no new hires for approximately two years and their has been no turnover.
 - b. The licensee's Quality Assurance (QA) organization has spent approximately 746 man-hours auditing the security program this calendar year. The audits were compliance and performance based and identified that the security organization meets and in some areas exceed regulatory requirements. This does not include time which has been spent auditing the Fitness-For-Duty program.
 - c. The licensee's major challenge is their proposed upgrades to their alarm stations and the security computer system. They have established a team of representatives from Site Protection, Instrument and Calibration, Fire Protection, Human Factors, Security Engineering and the Computer Services Unit, to evaluate possible upgrades. The team, referred to as ASSET (Associated Sections Security Evaluation Team) continues to meet weekly and discuss this project. They are currently planning which vendors they want to solicit and what the bid specifications will be. The licensee agreed to keep the region informed for their progress and to discuss their proposed actions as necessary.