

## Bowman, Adriane

---

**From:** Harris, Paul  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 04, 2014 1:09 PM  
**To:** Huyck, Doug  
**Cc:** Smith, Will; Chalk, Wayne; Shropshire, Alan  
**Subject:** RE: APPROVAL REQUESTED - FFD Electronic Forms  
**Attachments:** RE: RES Support Requested: FFD Electronic Forms Issues

Doug, good question.

The proposed changes are editorial, visual in nature, and did not affect the reporting of regulatory requirements. Therefore, an OGC review is not necessary nor required. The banding is consistent with staff guidance provided by ADM on their website. The "deletion" change only effects staff evaluation of data, and both records (the original submission and the "deletion" submission) are still official records consistent with MD 3.57.

The self-assessment I identified for completion this calendar year for you has the Topic: "Self-Assessment of the FFD Electronic Reporting Initiative." This initiative will include an independent review of the forms and will include OGC. Attached is the Task I sent to RES; if I got a verbal from them, I don't remember; I surely never got closure on the task or a product back from them.

Paul

---

**From:** Huyck, Doug  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 04, 2014 11:58 AM  
**To:** Harris, Paul  
**Cc:** Smith, Will; Chalk, Wayne; Shropshire, Alan  
**Subject:** FW: APPROVAL REQUESTED - FFD Electronic Forms  
**Importance:** High

Paul, I reviewed the e-forms attached and the hardcopy material you provided. I concur. One question/comment – did OGC review the proposed changes?

Thank you and others for the hard work in this area.

Doug

---

**From:** Harris, Paul  
**Sent:** Monday, February 03, 2014 4:10 PM  
**To:** Huyck, Doug  
**Subject:** APPROVAL REQUESTED - FFD Electronic Forms  
**Importance:** High

Doug,

If you would like me to schedule a time with on you on these forms, I will.

The changes are almost invisible to folks. They are logic changes and minor editorials. They hide "non-applicable blocks better and the guidance is more clear in the pop-up comments. The industry will not notice.

If the industry uses the old form or these new forms, we will be ok. The software is compatible.

Paul

Paul Harris, Senior Program Manager  
10 CFR Part 26, Fitness for Duty (Drug & Alcohol Testing)  
Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
(w) 301-287-9294

*The information in this response is provided as a public service and solely for informational purposes and is not, nor should be deemed as, an official NRC position, opinion or guidance, or "a written interpretation by the General Counsel" under 10 CFR 26.7, on any matter to which the information may relate. The opinions, representations, positions, interpretations, guidance or recommendations which may be expressed by the NRC technical staff responding to an inquiry are solely the NRC technical staff's and do not necessarily represent the same for the NRC. Accordingly, the fact that the information was obtained through the NRC technical staff will not have a precedential effect in any legal or regulatory proceeding.*