Southern California Edison Company

P. O. BOX 128

SAN CLEMENTE, CALIFORNIA 92674-0128

TELEPHONE 714-368-9470

H. E. MORGAN VICE PRESIDENT AND SITE MANAGER SAN ONOFRE

December 12, 1991

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

Subject:

Docket Nos. 50-206, 50-361 and 50-362

Revised Semiannual 10 CFR 26 Fitness For Duty Program Data

San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1, 2 & 3

Pursuant to 10 CFR 26.71(d), a semiannual Fitness For Duty (FFD) submittal had been provided to the NRC on August 20, 1991. This submittal provided SONGS FFD performance data for the period January 1, 1991 to June 30, 1991. Subsequently, it was noted that Attachment 1 to that submittal, titled "Fitness for Duty Program Performance Data Personnel Subject to 10 CFR 26," contained typographical errors (which have no material effect on the program) on page 1 of 2 in regards to the reported confirmation sample cutoff levels for barbiturates, methadone, and propoxyphene. As such, the enclosed revised report is being submitted for your records.

If you require any additional information, please so advise.

Sincerely,

HE Moy

Attachments: Revised 10 CFR 26 Performance Data

cc: C. W. Caldwell (USNRC Senior Resident Inspector, Units 1, 2 and 3)

J. B. Martin (Regional Administrator, USNRC Region V)

Institute of Nuclear Power Operations (INPO)

9112170524 911212

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

ATTACHMENT 1 Page 1 of 2

Company								
	January 1 to June 30, 1991 6 Months Ending							
San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station								
Location Location								
T.M. Calloway, Mgr., Access Authorization (714) 368-9554								
Contact Name	Phone Number							
Cutoffs: Screen/Confirmation (ng/ml)								
	turates 300 / 200							
	diazepine 300 / 300							
,	done 300 / 200 xyphene 300 / 200							
	yclidine 25 / 25							
Testing Results SCE Employees	Contractor Personnel							
Average Number with Unescorted Access	1294							
Test Types # Tests # Posit	ive # Tests # Positive							
Pre-Badging 265 2	81020							
For Cause 1 1	11							
Post Accident 0 0	0							
Random	6849							
Follow-Up 133 1	0							
Other <u>43</u> 1	0							
Total	<u> 1553</u> <u> 30</u>							
Number of Employees Referred To Mandatory Trea	atment 2							
Number of Personnel With Access Restored SCE	5_ Contract 2							
otal Number of PERSONNEL Tested One or More T								
Cotal Number of Random Tests 1771 Random Te								

Page 2 of 2

								rage 2 of 2
Individuals	Tested	1989		1990		1991	1992	1993
# Failed # Tested		N/A N/A	1 302*	18 2422	12 1842	11 1771		
% Failed		N/A	1.3%	.7%	.6%	.6%		
Graph of % Failed	.9- .8- .7- .6-							
	.5- .4- .3-							
†Donas a suit	.2-		1 6					

^{*}Represents only two months of testing.

All Confirmed Positive Samples (Excludes Appeals) for Specific Substances Includes Multiple Submittals

SUBSTANCES	1989		1990		1991	1992	1993
Marijuana 100/15 Marijuana 50/10	N/A N/A	N/A**	24 32	11 13	15 32/27		
Cocaine	N/A	0	11	5	5/5		
Opiates	N/A	0	20	28	18/0		
Amphetamines	N/A	0	13	18	11/11		
Phencyclidine	N/A	0	0	0	0/0		
Alcohol	N/A	0	4	1	4/4		
Barbiturates	N/A	0	15	15	14/0		
Benzodiazepine	N/A	0	22	17	17/0		
Methadone	N/A	0	0	0	1/0		
Propoxyphene	N/A	0	4	1	9/0		

^{**} Not performed during this period.

NOTE: The first number in column 5 represents the confirmed positive samples as reported by the testing laboratory. The second number represents the number of positive specimens that were determined by the MRO to be associated with test failures. This figure illustrates the differences between specimens that are reported positive but were not considered test failures due to prescription drug use, etc.

SUMMARY OF MANAGEMENT ACTIONS AND REPORTABLE EVENTS FITNESS FOR DUTY PROGRAM

(January 1991 - June 1991 period)

- 1. A total of fifteen (15) individuals (contract workers and employees) had unescorted protected area access withdrawn following substance test failures.
- 2. Five (5) employees were placed on investigatory suspension.
- 3. Two (2) disciplinary suspensions from employment were enforced during this period.
- 4. Employment was terminated for three (3) employees.
- 5. There were no transfers of licensee employees to non-nuclear positions (away from the San Onofre site) during this time frame as a result of failed substance tests.
- 6. Two (2) employees were required to enroll in a treatment program.
- 7. Five (5) employees and two (2) contract personnel were granted unescorted access after having previously failed a drug or alcohol test at San Onofre or elsewhere.
- 8. There were no modifications to the Fitness For Duty program as a result of management actions during the current reporting period.
- 9. There were no controlled substances found in the Protected Area at San Onofre during the reporting period.
- 10. Two events were reported to the Commission pursuant to 10 CFR 26 during the period January 1 to June 30, 1991:
 - A. Pursuant to 10 CFR 26.73(a)(2)(ii), a twenty-four hour non-emergency notification was made on January 22, 1991. It was determined that an employee, who was a licensed reactor operator assigned to Units 2/3, had tested positive on a drug screen urinalysis test. The employee's protected and vital area unescorted access authorization was terminated within ten minutes.

The employee, who has been employed by SCE since July 2, 1984, had not previously failed a substance screen test. The employee's unescorted access was restored on April 13, 1991, after the individual successfully met the Company's criteria for reinstatement. The drug screen urinalysis test was administered as part of the random testing program on January 12, 1991.

Unit 1 was in a refueling outage, and Units 2 and 3 were operating at 100% power.

B. Pursuant to 10 CFR 26, Appendix A, Section 2.8(e), a submittal was made on June 17, 1991 summarizing SCE's investigation concerning unsatisfactory blind drug performance test results.

Two blind samples were reported negative by the NIDA-certified testing laboratory used by SCE on May 19, 1991 and May 24, 1991. These specimens should have been reported positive. Although SCE submitted these samples in accordance with the supplier specified shelf life, the specimens had degraded to below the SCE established cut-off level, thus resulting in the negative laboratory report. Additional testing by the specimen supplier later confirmed the sample degradation to below the cut-off level.

SCE has discontinued processing blind performance samples provided by this supplier and has technically qualified two separate blind performance specimen providers.