

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGION III

Report No. 50-341/89022(DRSS)

Docket No. 50-341

License No. NPF-43

Licensee: Detroit Edison Company
2200 Second Avenue
Detroit, MI 48226

Facility Name: Enrico Fermi Atomic Power Plant, Unit 2

Inspection At: Plant Site and NRC Region III Office

Inspection Conducted: Between June 12 and September 14, 1989
Exit Interview conducted on November 8, 1989

Type of Inspection: Allegation Review Inspection

Inspector: J.R. Creed
for G.D.L. Pirtle
Physical Security Inspector

12/6/89
Date

Reviewed By: J.R. Creed
J. R. Creed, Chief
Safeguards Section

12/6/89
Date

Approved By: L. Robert Greger
L. Robert Greger, Chief
Reactor Programs Branch

12/6/89
Date

Inspection Summary

Inspection between June 12 and November 8, 1989 (Report No. 50-341/89022(DRSS))

Areas Inspected: Included review of information pertaining to the following specific allegations: (1) inadequate and improper actions were taken by licensee management in evaluating the potential effects a prescribed medication could have had on a security officer's duty performance therefore allowing an unsafe condition to exist; (2) security management deliberately provided inaccurate and incomplete information to NRC Region III in reference to a specified weapon-related incident; (3) two security supervisors advised a witness to the weapon-related incident to exclude information pertinent to the investigation; (4) an individual advised a security officer to falsify a drug screen form; and (5) a security officer was improperly subjected to a random drug test.

8912150160 891206
PDR AD0CK 05000341
PDC

Enclosure Contains
10 CFR 2.790 INFORMATION
Upon Separation This
Page is Decontrolled

Results: No violations of NRC requirements were noted during the inspection effort. Inspection conclusions for the specific allegations are: (1) Licensee management had taken action to evaluate the potential effects of the prescribed medication on the security officer's duty performance. No unanimous opinion was found concerning whether the medication caused the unsafe condition (weapon incident). (2) Our review showed that while the licensee did not provide the NRC inaccurate or incomplete information in an investigation report we received, the investigation was not in sufficient scope or depth to identify some weaknesses noted in resolving a fitness-for-duty issue. (3) The security supervisors did not advise a witness to a weapon-related incident to exclude pertinent information from the investigation process. (4) Although the information on the Drug Screen Referral form was falsified by a security officer, it would not impact on the drug test result. This issue goes beyond current NRC fitness-for-duty requirements, and therefore was not considered material in a regulatory sense. The reason the document was falsified could not be confirmed during the inspection. (5) The random drug testing program was not abused because a security officer made inquiries about drug test detection capabilities of the random drug test.

Weaknesses in the fitness-for-duty program were noted in reference to: a conflict between policy guidance and procedure requirements for consultation with the Medical Department for evaluation of prescribed drugs side effects; inadequate procedure guidance for the Employee Assistance Program (EAP) in reference to non-drug related fitness-for-duty issues; and lack of aggressiveness and timeliness by the Medical Department in resolving an identified non-drug fitness-for-duty issue. The licensee was also requested to evaluate whether additional management controls are needed in cases where medical opinions differ significantly.

The Report Details contain sensitive personal information which is considered exempt from public disclosure in accordance with 10 CFR 2.790.

(Details - 10 CFR 2.790 Information)

Enclosure Contains
10 CFR 2.790 INFORMATION
Upon Separation This
Page is Decontrolled