

CATEGORY 1

REGULATORY INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (RIDS)

ACCESSION NBR: 9706240230	DOC. DATE: 97/06/17	NOTARIZED: NO	DOCKET #
FACIL: 50-269	Oconee Nuclear Station, Unit 1,	Duke Power Co.	05000269
50-270	Oconee Nuclear Station, Unit 2,	Duke Power Co.	05000270
50-287	Oconee Nuclear Station, Unit 3,	Duke Power Co.	05000287
50-369	William B. McGuire Nuclear Station, Unit 1,	Duke Powe	05000369
50-370	William B. McGuire Nuclear Station, Unit 2,	Duke Powe	05000370
50-413	Catawba Nuclear Station, Unit 1,	Duke Power Co.	05000413
50-414	Catawba Nuclear Station, Unit 2,	Duke Power Co.	05000414

AUTH. NAME	AUTHOR AFFILIATION
TUCKMAN, M.S.	Duke Power Co.
RECIP. NAME	RECIPIENT AFFILIATION
	Document Control Branch (Document Control Desk)

SUBJECT: Forwards unsatisfactory performance test results of fitness-for-duty program, per 10CFR26, App A.

DISTRIBUTION CODE: A021D COPIES RECEIVED: LTR 1 ENCL 1 SIZE: 4
 TITLE: "Semiannual Fitness for Duty Program Performance Rept/Data" 10CFR26.7

NOTES:

	RECIPIENT		COPIES		RECIPIENT		COPIES	
	ID CODE/NAME		LTTR	ENCL	ID CODE/NAME		LTTR	ENCL
	PD2-2 PD		1	1	LABARGE, D		1	1
	NERSES, V		1	1	TAM, P.		1	1
INTERNAL:	ACRS		1	1	<u>FILE CENTER</u> 01		1	1
	NRR/DRPM/PSGB		1	1	NRR/DSSA/SPSB		1	1
	NUDOCS-ABSTRACT		1	1	RGN2		1	1
EXTERNAL:	NOAC		1	1	NRC PDR		1	1

NOTE TO ALL "RIDS" RECIPIENTS:
 PLEASE HELP US TO REDUCE WASTE! CONTACT THE DOCUMENT CONTROL DESK,
 ROOM OWFN 5D-5 (EXT. 415-2083) TO ELIMINATE YOUR NAME FROM
 DISTRIBUTION LISTS FOR DOCUMENTS YOU DON'T NEED!

TOTAL NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED: LTTR 12 ENCL 12

C
A
T
E
G
O
R
Y

1

D
O
C
U
M
E
N
T

Duke Power Company
P.O. Box 1006
Charlotte, NC 28201-1006

M. S. TUCKMAN
Senior Vice President
Nuclear Generation
(704)382-2200 Office
(704)382-4360 Fax



DUKE POWER

June 17, 1997

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

Subject: Fitness-For-Duty Program
Unsatisfactory Performance Test Result
Oconee Nuclear Station
Docket Numbers 50-269, -270 and -287
McGuire Nuclear Station
Docket Numbers 50-369 and -370
Catawba Nuclear Station
Docket Numbers 50-413 and -414

Attached is a report, as required by 10CFR 26, Appendix A,
of unsatisfactory performance test results.

If there are any questions, please contact G. A. Copp at
(704)382-5826.

Very truly yours,

M. S. Tuckman

M. S. Tuckman

Attachment

A0211/1

9706240230 970617
PDR ADDCK 05000269
F PDR

040018



U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
June 17, 1997
Page 2

Mr. Victor Nerses, Project Manager
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Mail Stop O-14 H25
Washington. D. C. 20555

Mr. Peter S. Tam, Project Manager
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Mail Stop O-14 H25
Washington, D. C. 20555

Mr. D. E. Lebarge, Project Manager
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
Mail Stop O-14 H25
Washington. D. C. 20555

Mr. L. A. Reyes, Regional Administrator
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission - Region II
Atlanta Federal Center
61 Forsythe St., SW, Suite 23T85
Atlanta, GA 30303

Duke Power Company
Health & Safety Division
P.O. Box 1006 (EC020)
Charlotte, NC 28201-1006



DUKE POWER

June 13, 1997

SUBJECT: False Negative Blind Performance Urine Drug Screen

One spiked positive blind performance urine drug screen for amphetamine was incorrectly identified as negative by the SmithKline Beecham Laboratory in Atlanta. The specimen was submitted on February 12, 1997.

Dr. Jerry McHan of Quality Assurance Associates notified me of the results on May 27, 1997. He investigated the test results with Dr. Feldman, the Technical Manager of Substance Abuse Testing at SmithKline Beecham.

The specimen should have been positive for amphetamine. The investigation revealed that the result was just under the cutoff for the EMIT test. It was 0.978 and the cutoff is 1.000. There had been some problems last year with the reagents supplied to SmithKline Beecham for detection of amphetamine alone. The reagents are primarily standardized for methamphetamine. We had a few false negative blind amphetamine in the past (see previous letter to NRC dated February 20, 1996). However, the reagents were changed in June, 1996 and we have had no false negative amphetamine until this one. It appeared the problem was corrected.

This specimen's EMIT value is extremely close to the cutoff and could just be random laboratory error. The laboratory did correctly identify all other specimens with amphetamine and methamphetamine in the first quarter of 1997 (4 for amphetamine and 7 for methamphetamine). However, additional blind amphetamine samples will be submitted to the laboratory for further evaluation. If there are further false negatives more investigation will be instituted.

W. E. Dukes, Jr., MD

W. E. Dukes, Jr., MD
Corporate Medical Director

Enclosure



SmithKline Beecham

Clinical Laboratories
3175 Presidential Drive, Atlanta GA 30340
(770)452-1590, FAX (770)936-5012

Dr. Gene Dukes
Corporate Medical Director
Duke Power Company
422 S. Church St.
Charlotte, NC 28242

June 9, 1997

Re: Blind QC Audit, 079045K

Dear Dr. Dukes:

The above specimen was reported as negative, based on an amphetamine screening result of 0.978 (1.000 is cutoff). The sample was discarded after seven days.

The reagent manufacturer has standardized their amphetamines kit (reagent lot # J1, calibration lot # J2) with d-methamphetamine and supplies us with d-methamphetamine as the calibrator. Our high and low controls contain d-methamphetamine, and gave acceptable results. Although the manufacturer claims to have equal response to d-amphetamine, there will always be some variability in the exact cross-reactivity. This is not uncommon with an immunoassay designed to target one analyte (d-methamphetamine) and cross react with another (d-amphetamine). I have spoken to the reagent manufacturer and they would be happy to assist with our investigation.

May I suggest that you provide us with 60 ml of the d-amphetamine-spiked urine pool that was used for this result so that we may investigate the possible cause of this result?

If you have any questions, call me.

Sincerely yours,

Michael S. Feldman, PhD
Technical Manager, Substance Abuse Testing

cc: J. McHan, PhD