



Southern California Edison Company

P. O. BOX 128

SAN CLEMENTE, CALIFORNIA 92674-0128

WALTER C. MARSH
MANAGER OF NUCLEAR REGULATORY AFFAIRS

February 12, 1996

TELEPHONE
(714) 368-7501

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

Gentlemen:

Subject: Docket Nos. 50-206, 50-361, and 50-362
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), this submittal provides the required semiannual Fitness For Duty program performance data for the period July 1, 1995 to December 31, 1995 (Attachment 1). Attachment 2 is a summary of information and management actions for the reporting period.

If you require any additional information, please so advise.

Sincerely,

Attachments: 10 CFR 26 Performance Data

cc: L. J. Callan, Regional Administrator, USNRC Region IV
J. E. Dyer, Director, Division of Reactor Projects, NRC
Region IV
K. E. Perkins, Jr., Director, Walnut Creek Field Office,
NRC Region IV
M. B. Fields, NRC Project Manager, San Onofre Units 2 and 3
J. A. Sloan, NRC Senior Resident Inspector, Units 1, 2, and 3
M. K. Webb, NRC Project Manager, San Onofre Unit 1
Louis Carson, Regional Project Inspector, San Onofre Unit 1

9602200212 960212
PDR ADOCK 05000206
R PDR

200052

A021
11

Fitness for Duty Program
Performance Data
Personnel Subject to 10CFR26

ATTACHMENT 1
Page 1 of 2

Southern California Edison July 1, - December 31, 1995

Company

6 Months Ending

San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station

Location

S.L. Blue; Administrator, Fitness For Duty (714) 368-2482

Contact Name

Phone Number

Cutoffs: Screen/Confirmation (ng/ml)

Marijuana	50/10	Barbiturates	300/200
Cocaine	300/150	Benzodiazepine	300/300
Opiates	300/300	Methadone	300/200
Amphetamines	1000/500	Propoxyphene	300/200
Methamphetamine	1000/500	Phencyclidine	25/25
Amphetamine	/200	Alcohol (%BAC)	.04

Testing Results	SCE Employees	Contractor Personnel		Total
Average Number with Unescorted Access	<u>2075</u>		<u>1156</u>	<u>3231</u>
Test Types	# Tests	# Failures	# Tests	# Failures
Pre-Badging	<u>155</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1005</u>	<u>29</u>
For Cause	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>
Post Accident	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Random	<u>476</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>283</u>	<u>4</u>
Follow-Up	<u>22</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>0</u>
Other	<u>16</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	<u>670</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>1334</u>	<u>34</u>

Number of Employees Referred To Mandatory Treatment 2
Number of Personnel With Access Restored Employees 0 Contract 7
Total Number of Random Tests 759 Random Testing Rate 23.48%
Annual Statistics, Total Random Tests 1711 Random Testing Rate 52.27%

Table 1, RANDOM TESTING PROGRAM RESULTS

Individuals Tested	1991		1992		1993		1994		1995	
# Failed	11	14	4	4	10	15	2	1	4	6
# Tested	1771	2604	1986	1890	1947	2148	996	701	952	759
% Failed	.6%	.5%	.2%	.2%	.5%	.7%	.2%	.2%	.4%	.8%

Table 2, BREAKDOWN OF CONFIRMED POSITIVE TESTS FOR SPECIFIC SUBSTANCES
Includes multiple submittals/substances detected.

	Marijuana		COC	OPI	AMP	ETOH	BARB	BENZ	PCP	PROP	TOTAL
	100/15a	50/10b									
Licensee Employees	0	1	3	7	3	1	1	4	0	2	
Contract Workers	14	20	4	6	8	2	4	3	1	5	
Totals	14	21	7	13	11	3	5	7	1	7	75
# Onsite Presumptive	n/a	20 ^c	6 ^c	<i>a - NRC Levels b - SCE Levels c - One THC and one cocaine sample pre-screened negative and reported positive at or near cut-off levels. d - If marijuana had been tested at 50/15, results for this reporting period would have been; on-site presumptive 20, total confirmed 21 for a confirmation ratio of 86%.</i>							
# Certified Lab	n/a	21	7								
Confirmation Ratio	n/a	95% ^d	86%								

Table 3, BREAKDOWN OF ALL CONFIRMED POSITIVE TESTS CAUSING FAILURES

	THC	METH	COC	PCP	OPI	BARB	ETOH	Total
Licensee Employees	1	1	2	0	0	0	1	
Contract Workers	17	6	3	1	4	1	2	
Total	18	7	5	1	4	1	3	39

(July 1, 1995 - December 31, 1995)

1. There were no temporary suspensions or other administrative actions taken against individuals based upon on-site presumptive positives for marijuana or cocaine.
2. A total of thirty eight (38) individuals (4 employees and 34 contract workers) had unescorted protected area access withdrawn for a minimum of 80 work hours following a substance test failure.

Two (2) employees and four (4) contract workers failed random tests. One (1) employee and one (1) temporary employee (employment was terminated) and twenty-nine (29) contract workers were denied unescorted protected area access following a pre-badging substance test failure. One (1) contract worker was permanently denied unescorted protected area access after failing a For Cause test. One (1) employee was permanently denied unescorted protected area access after failing a Post-Suspension test. This was the second failure for this employee during this period (the first was a pre-badging failure) and employment was terminated.

3. There were three (3) disciplinary suspensions from employment during the reporting period.
4. There were no transfers of licensee employees to non-nuclear positions (away from the San Onofre site) as a result of failed substance tests.
5. Three (3) individuals were required to enroll in a treatment program during this period.
6. Seven (7) contract workers were granted (reinstated) unescorted access with a single test failure on record.
7. The MRO reviewed a total of twenty eight (28) appeal results for five (5) employees and twenty three (23) contract workers. The original test results were confirmed. These individuals were provided with detailed instructions regarding their rights to appeal management actions which resulted in access denial. Eleven (11) contract workers left site prior to meeting with the MRO, resulting in non-contact positive tests.

Sixteen (16) workers appealed denial of access for a test failure, management actions were upheld.
8. There were no identified deficiencies in the Fitness For Duty program.

9. As depicted in Table 2, there were 75 samples confirmed by the lab as positive. As shown in Table 3, only 39 individuals were associated with MRO failed test declarations. Due to the SCE recollection procedure, several individuals submitted multiple positive samples resulting in a single declared individual failure. Positive tests for prescription medications were declared responsible use by the MRO with the exception of the non-contact positive tests.

In reconciling THC results, one sample pre-screened negative for THC while the HHS lab analysis was positive. Although a negative pre-screen result for THC was obtained, the sample was sent for off-site analysis (presumptive positive for a prescription drug) and tested positive at the off-site lab for THC just above the cutoff level.

In investigating the THC discrepancy, the HHS lab and on-site pre-screening utilized different EIA reagents for the detection of marijuana metabolites. Due to slight differences in sensitivity of the reagents used, in concert with a borderline positive sample, the results were technically acceptable. On-site pre-screening results and test protocol were verified and found to be accurate and consistent with the testing protocol. The appeal sample sent to a second HHS (appeal) lab, confirmed the positive results. The split sample (appeal) was screened at the second HHS lab utilizing the same EIA reagent as on-site pre-screening and a negative screening result was obtained.

In reconciling cocaine results, one individual submitted multiple samples and in accordance with site program procedures the initial sample was screened for any detectable level. This sample pre-screened negative but was reported positive by the HHS lab at or near the cut-off level. A subsequent sample from this individual pre-screened and was reported positive by the HHS lab.

10. During this period there were no reportable events to the Commission.