

Presentation at the Nuclear Energy Institute Access Authorization/ Fitness-For-Duty (FFD) Workshop

Operating Experience in 2016 FFD Programs - 10 CFR Part 26

"A Direct Contribution to Safety and Security"

Cleveland, Ohio July 17, 2017

Discussion Topics



- □ Performance reporting system updates
- □ Generic industry performance
- □ Site-specific positive result trends (pre-access, random, for-cause)

- Outage worker results
- Substance detection trends
- □ Results by Employment Type and Labor Category
- Subversion attempt trends
- □ 26.719 30 day reportable events



FFD Program Performance Information – Electronic Reporting



- E-reporting meets the annual FFD program performance reporting requirements in 10 CFR 26.417(b)(2) and 26.717
- 100% of licensees e-reporting since 2014 (system in use since 2009)
- E-reporting data used in:
 - NRC Summary Reports on FFD Program Performance
 - OMB Burden Statements (recordkeeping and reporting requirements)
 - Regulatory analyses, backfit analyses, and technical basis documents
- New e-forms released in December 2016 (version 1.7.0) <u>www.nrc.gov/reactors/operating/ops-experience/fitness-for-duty-programs/submit-ffd-reports.html</u>
- E-Reporting Best Practices Webinar (December 15, 2016) (ADAMS Accession No. ML16349A565)



- 73 FFD programs
- **153,950** Individuals drug & alcohol tested (down 5.8% from 2014)
- 1,163Individuals tested positive for a drug, alcohol, or refused a test
65.1% identified at pre-access testing (down by 1.9% from 2015)
22.3% identified at random testing (up by 3.0% from 2015)
- 0.76%
 Industry overall positive rate
 up from 0.73% in 2015

 0.22% LE positive rate
 down from 0.25% in 2015

 1.00% C/V positive rate
 up from 0.95% in 2015
- 0.42%
 Industry random positive rate
 up from 0.36% in 2015

 0.16% LE positive rate
 up from 0.14% (2013 2015)

 0.80% C/V positive rate
 up from 0.65% in 2015

LE = licensee employee; C/V = contractor/vendor All results in presentation MRO verified

Results by Test and Employment Categories, 2016 [DRAFT]

U.S.NRC United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission Protecting People and the Environment

Test Category	Licensee Employees			Co	ntractor/Ven	dors		% of Total		
	Tested	Positive	% Positive	Tested	Positive	% Positive	Tested	Positive	% Positive	Positives
Pre-Access	8,136	20	0.25%	74,854	737	0.98%	82,990	757	0.91%	65.1%
Random	35,970	57	0.16%	25,208	202	0.80%	61,178	259	0.42%	22.3%
For Cause	132	12	9.09%	969	62	6.40%	1,101	74	6.72%	6.4%
Post-Event	191	-	0.00%	1,064	13	1.22%	1,255	13	1.04%	1.1%
Followup	3,310	17	0.51%	4,116	43	1.04%	7,426	60	0.81%	5.2%
Total	47,739	106	0.22%	106,211	1,057	1.00%	153,950	1,163	0.76%	100.0%

	Licensee En	nployees	Contractor/Ve	endors
	Pre-access	17.0%	Pre-access	70.5%
	Random	75.3%	Random	23.7%
	Followup	6.9%	Followup	3.9%
		99.3%		98.1%
ere were m	ost drug and a	Icohol testin	ng violations identified in Contractor/Ve	n 2016 (> endors
	Pre Access	18.9%	Pre-access	69.7%
	Random	53.8%	Random	19.1%
	For Cause	11.3%	ForCause	5.9%
	Followup	16.0%		94.7%
		100.0%		

Positive Rates by Employment Category

(Pre-Access, Random, and For-Cause Testing) [Draft] Inited States Nuclear Regulatory Commission Protecting People and the Environment

RC



Pre-Access Testing [DRAFT] Distribution of Site-Specific Positive Rates by Employment Category, 2016



United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission Protecting People and the Environment

1 additional C/V site not on chart, positive of 16.67% (corporate office)

Pre-Access Testing Distribution of Site-Specific Positive Rates 2011-2014



Desitive Pote	Number of Sites by Year										
Range (%)	Licensee Employees				Contractors/Vendors						
0	56	57	50	53	7	9	13	12			
>0 - 0.5	5	4	3	4	17	16	13	19			
>0.5 - 1.0	10	8	15	11	33	34	33	26			
>1.0 - 1.5	2	3	5	2	8	9	11	7			
>1.5 - 2.0	2	1	1	2	6	2	3	8			
>2.0 - 2.5				2	2	3	3	2			
>2.5 - 3.0					1	1		1			
>3.0 - 3.5											
>3.5 - 4.0		1	1			1					
Total <u>Sites</u> (with at least 1 test)	75	75	75	74	74	75	76	75			

Random Testing [DRAFT] Distribution of Site-Specific Positive Rates by Employment Category, 2016



U.S.NRC United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission Protecting People and the Environment

Random Testing Distribution of Site-Specific Positive Rates 2011-2014



	Number of Sites by Year										
Positive Rate Range (%)	Lic	ensee Em	ployees			Contractors/Vendors					
3.()	2011	2012	2013	2014	2011	2012	2013	2014			
0	34	33	40	39	24	25	32	23			
> 0 - 0.25	21	20	20	20	5	7	1	2			
> 0.25 - 0.50	17	19	11	11	19	19	9	17			
> 0.50 - 0.75	2	2	3	3	5	7	15	18			
> 0.75 - 1.00	1	1	1	ļ	9	4	7	4			
> 1.00 - 1.25				1	4	6	3	3			
> 1.25 - 1.50				ļ	4	3	8	4			
> 1.50 - 1.75				ļ	3	3		3			
> 1.75 - 2.00				ļ	1			1			
>2.00 - 2.25					1		1				
Total Sites (with at least 1 test)	75	75	75	74	75	74	76	75			

For-Cause Testing [DRAFT] Distribution of Site-Specific Positive Rates by Employment Category, 2016



United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission Protecting People and the Environment

For-Cause Testing Distribution of Site-Specific Positive Rates 2011-2014



	Number of Sites by Year										
Positive Rate Range (%)	Lic	ensee Err	nployees		Contractors/Vendors						
5 (14)	2011	2012	2013	2014	2011	2012	2013	2014			
0	38	43	41	40	29	29	29	36			
> 0% - 10%	1		1		7	3	1	3			
> 10% - 20%	1	1	4	3	6	8	7	4			
> 20% - 30%	4	2	2	2	6	2	4	3			
> 30% - 40%	5	5	3	1	1	4	7	5			
> 40% - 50%	5		3	10	6	7	6	1			
> 50% - 60%						3					
> 60% - 70%				1		1	1				
> 70% - 80%			1								
> 80% - 90%											
> 90% - 100%	1	4	3	3	4	5	3	3			
Total Sites (with at least 1 test)	55	55	58	60	59	62	58	55			

Impact of Outage Workers on D&A Testing Violations [DRAFT]





Impact of Outage Workers on D&A Testing Violations 2016 [DRAFT]





Trends In Detection (NRC Testing Panel) Percentage of Total Positives by Substance Tested [DRAFT]



RC

United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission Protecting People and the Environment

Results by Employment Category, 2016 [DRAFT]





Results by Labor Category, 2016 [DRAFT]





Subversion Attempt Trends [Draft]

Subversion attempt – any willful act or attempted act to cheat on a required test (e.g., refuse to provide a specimen, alter a specimen with an adulterant, provide a specimen that is not from the donor's body)

Sanction for a subversion attempt – Permanent denial of unescorted access under 10 CFR 26.75

Subversion Attempt Trends

2012 – 177 of 1,114 violations (15.8% subversions) 2013 – 148 of 1,007 violations (14.7% subversions) 2014 – 187 of 1,133 violations (16.5% subversions) 2015 – 233 of 1,198 violations (19.2% subversions) 2016 – 302 of 1,163 violations (26.0% subversions)

Subversion Attempts in 2016:

- 53% of sites with at least 1 subversion attempt (39 of 73)
- 73% identified at Pre-Access testing (221 of 302)
- 98% by contractor/vendors





Characteristics of Subversion Attempts (2016) [Draft]



• 38 percent of subversion attempts (114 of 302) based on specimen testing (specimen collected under direct observation)

Substance(s) Identified	Pre-Access	Random	For Cause	Followup	Total
Marijuana	54	13			67
Cocaine	12	4		2	18
Cocaine; Marijuana	8	2			10
Amphetamine; Methamphetamine	4	2	1		7
Methamphetamine; Marijuana	2	1			3
Methamphetamine	1	1			2
Amphetamine		1			1
Amphetamine; Methamphetamine; Marijuana	1				1
Opiate: Morphine	2				2
Opiate: Codeine	1	1			2
Alcohol; Marijuana	1				1
Total	86	25	1	2	114

- 62 percent of subversion attempts were testing refusals (186 of 302) (did not provide a specimen, collector stopped process)
- Only 2 subversions identified by validity testing (substituted results)

HHS-Certified Laboratory Testing Errors (2016) 10 CFR 26.719 (30-day event reports)



- A blind performance test sample (BPTS) formulated as "dilute and negative" was reported by the laboratory as "negative." Manual aliquotting of the specimen resulted in the inaccurate test result, typically the laboratory uses an automated process for specimen aliquotting.
- A BPTS formulated as "adulterated" (with nitrite) was reported as "invalid" by the laboratory. The specimen was mistakenly left at room temperature over night and not tested until the next day. A deterioration study performed by the laboratory determined that if a specimen was stored at room temperature the nitrites concentration could degrade by up to 25 percent within 24 hours.
- A false positive for morphine was reported on a donor specimen. Based on information from the donor, the MRO requested testing at a second laboratory, which returned a negative result. The false positive was caused by the analyst pipetting one sample twice instead of pipetting the two different specimens in the confirmation batch.

NRC Fitness for Duty Program Staff



U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response

Paul Harris, Senior Program Manager Paul.Harris@nrc.gov (301-287-9294)

Brian Zaleski, Fitness for Duty Program Specialist Brian.Zaleski@nrc.gov (301-287-0638)

