Lewis Sumner Vice President Hatch Project Support Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc. 40 Inverness Parkway Post Office Box 1295 Birmingham, Alabama 35201

Tel 205 992 7279 Fax 205 992 0341



August 23, 2002

Energy to Serve Your World™

Docket Nos.

50-321

50-366

HL-6288

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission ATTN: Document Control Desk Washington, DC 20555

Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant Fitness For Duty Performance Data

#### Ladies and Gentlemen:

Southern Nuclear Operating Company hereby submits the Fitness For Duty Performance Data for the six-month reporting period, January 2002 through June 2002, as required by 10 CFR 26.71(d). The data reflected in this report covers employees at the Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant. The report data is summarized in the attached enclosures.

Should you have any questions, please advise.

Sincerely,

H. L. Sumner

HLS/JMG

Attachments:

Enclosure 1: Hatch FFD Performance Data Sheets (2 pages)

Enclosure 2: Hatch FFD Program Summary

60

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission August 23, 2002

Page 2

## cc: Southern Nuclear Operating Company

Mr. P. H. Wells, Nuclear Plant General Manager Document Management – A2.001

## U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC

Mr. L. N. Olshan, Project Manager - Hatch

# U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Region II

Mr. L. A. Reyes, Regional Administrator

Mr. J. T. Munday, Senior Resident Inspector - Hatch

HL-6288 File: J.02

# **ENCLOSURE 1**

Hatch FFD Performance Data Sheets

# Fitness for Duty Program Performance Data Personnel Subject to 10CFR 26

Company	<b>':</b>			6 Months Ending							
Southern	Nuclear	Operating Compan	ıy	06/30/2002							
Location											
E. I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Baxley, GA											
Contact N	Vame	Phone									
Dianne C		205-992-7231									
Cutoffs: Screen/Confirmation (ng/ml) Appendix A to 10CFR 26											
Marijuana	50 / 15	Amphetamines	/	/							
Cocaine	1	Phencyclidine /	<del></del>	/							
Opiates	1	Alcohol (% BAC)		/							

Testing Results			ensee	_	Term	Short Term Contractor Personnel		
		Emp	loyees		ractor			
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Pers	onnel			
Average Number with unescorted access		9	24	ç	98	267		
		#	#	#	#	#	#	
Categories		Tested	Positive	Tested	Positive	Tested	Positive	
Pre-Access		18	0	8	0	939	16	
For Cause	Post accident	0	0	0	0	0	0	
ıse	Observed Behavior	4	1	0	0	1	0	
Rai	ndom	245	0	23	1	68	3	
Fol	low-up	30	0	0	0	17	1	
Other: Safety & Health, Re-test, Return to work		19	0	2	0	26	0	
Total		316	1	33	1	1051	20	

# Breakdown of Confirmed Positive Tests for Specific Substances

# Hatch

	Marijuana	Cocaine	Opiates	Amphe- tamines	Phency- clidine	Alcohol	Refusal to Test	1	2	3	4	5	
Licensee Employees	0	0	0	0	0	1	0						
Long-Term Contractors	0	0	0	0	0	1	0						
Short-Term Contractors	11	5	1	1	0	2	2						ļ
Total	11	5	1	1	0	4	2		,				24

# **ENCLOSURE 2**

Hatch FFD Program Summary

#### Enclosure 2

### Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant Fitness For Duty Program Summary

The data generated under the Fitness for Duty (FFD) program from January 2002 through June 2002 has been reviewed and analyzed. The data reflected in this report covers workers, including contract personnel, of the Hatch Nuclear Plant.

The random pool contains not only those badged for unescorted access, but also those employees who may, in an emergency condition, be called upon to work at the site and may require unescorted access. Contractors without approved programs are included in the testing pool while on site. Testing during this time period was performed on a nominal weekly basis to include swing shifts, weekends, and holidays. During this testing period, the rate of testing was equal to 50% yearly of the total population.

In summarizing management actions associated with the FFD program, it should be emphasized that the incidents of confirming positive tests were very low. Consequently, management actions relative to determination of FFD have been limited. Contractor employees screened as positive are denied access and no further action is taken. Sixteen short-term contractors tested positive on pre-access tests and were denied access. One long term contractor and one short-term contractor tested positive from random tests and were terminated. Two other short-term contractors refused to provide a specimen in accordance with Appendix A on random tests — one by attempting to subvert the testing process and one by refusing to provide a sample. Both of these individuals were terminated. Also, one short-term contractor tested positive on follow-up and was terminated.

Management actions taken on licensee employees during this six-month period included one individual who tested positive for alcohol as a result of observed behavior and was subsequently referred to EAP for rehabilitation. The individual has returned to work and been entered into the follow-up testing pool.

Weekly quality control checks of the Fitness for Duty random pool revealed only minor discrepancies from January 2002 to June 2002.

Since 1996, employees who report a substance abuse related arrest submit to for-cause fitness for duty testing and are referred for Employee Assistance evaluation by a mental health professional to determine if there is a substance abuse or other problem. For this reporting period, there was one employee referred for evaluation.