

NOV 02 1982

Docket No. 50-295

Docket No. 50-304

Commonwealth Edison Company

ATTN: Mr. Cordell Reed

Vice President

Post Office Box 757

Chicago, IL 60690

Gentlemen:

This refers to the investigation conducted by members of this office and our Headquarters between December 13, 1981 and June 15, 1982, of activities at Zion Nuclear Power Station authorized by NRC Operating License Nos. DPR-39 and DPR-48.

The investigation was conducted as a result of several allegations concerning the use of drugs and drug related operational problems, the conduct of your management during your own investigation into drug use, and other allegations such as sexual activities and alcohol use onsite.

While this report was being prepared other allegations were received in the regional office which required our efforts to be redirected, such as the investigation at the LaSalle County Station. This caused a delay in issuing this investigation report.

We did not substantiate the allegations of widespread use of drugs either onsite or offsite by Station and or guard personnel. However, we did conclude that marijuana was smoked onsite. We also have concerns about certain Station personnel who admitted using drugs offsite within the time frames and frequency determined as likely to have a potentially detrimental affect on job performance, and certain guards who admitted to offsite use of drugs. These individuals were previously identified to you. Requested corrective actions are detailed in Appendix B.

Other concerns identified in the findings of the investigation also involve Station personnel and guards who were identified by more than one of our sources of alleged use of drugs onsite and/or offsite, inattentiveness of

DMB:  
IE05

NOV 02 1982

some control room operators, quality of work performed by a contract QC inspector who allegedly used drugs offsite, and the extent of alcohol use onsite. Our concerns are also discussed in Appendix B, including our requested corrective action.

As you are aware, many Station employees and their attorneys expressed legal and administrative concerns with the conduct of our investigation in the area of offsite use of drugs. Those concerns, disagreements, questions, and delays hindered the investigation. Questions relating to offsite drug use were not being answered and investigation statements were not being attested to and signed. In early March 1982, the NRC established positions regarding the continuation of the investigation. It was intended and expected that these positions would overcome the objections and would enable the NRC to complete the investigation. The details concerning this matter are contained in Section 3 of the report. The interview process did continue and we did obtain relevant information except in the following instance: Two Station employees declined to sign written statements and to answer questions about offsite use of marijuana. We request specific corrective action on these individuals as detailed in Appendix B.

We feel that your new drug abuse policy and awareness program was responsive to this investigation and allegations and can be effective in establishing and maintaining a work environment that is reasonably free from the effects of drug abuse. As a result of the Zion drug allegations and similar allegations at certain other facilities, the NRC recognition of the problem was discussed in Information Notice No. 82-05, "Increasing Frequency of Drug Related Incidents," dated March 10, 1982. Also, the results of a special task group's survey of the nuclear industry was published in June 1982 as NUREG-0903, "Survey of Industry and Government Programs to Combat Drug and Alcohol Abuse." The NRC is also considering addressing the problem in two proposed rules in 10 CFR 50, "Fitness for Duty Rule" and 10 CFR 73.56, "Access Authorization Rule."

During this investigation, certain of your activities appeared to be in noncompliance as described in Appendix A. The investigation showed that action had been taken to correct the identified noncompliance and to prevent recurrence. Consequently, no reply to this noncompliance is required and we have no further questions regarding this matter at this time.

Certain areas examined during this investigation concern a subject matter which is exempt from disclosure according to Section 73.21(c)(2) of the NRC's "Rules of Practice," Part 73, Title 10, Code of Federal Regulations.

NOV 02 1982

This information must be handled and protected in accordance with the provisions of 10 CFR 73.21. Consequently, Appendix A to this letter and Attachment 3 to our report of this investigation will not be placed in the Public Document Room.

Sincerely,

Original signed by  
James G. Keppler

James G. Keppler  
Regional Administrator

Enclosures:

1. Appendix A, Notice  
of Violation  
(UNCLASSIFIED SAFEGUARDS INFORMATION)
2. Appendix B
3. Investigation Report No.  
50-295/81-32(DETP) and  
No. 50-304/81-30(DETP)  
w/UNCLASSIFIED SAFEGUARDS  
INFORMATION (ATTACHMENT 3)

cc w/encls:

Louis O. DelGeorge, Director  
of Nuclear Licensing  
K. L. Graesser, Station Superintendent  
IE Files  
IE/DRP/ORPB  
NMSS/SGPL  
NRR/DL/SSPB  
OI

cc w/encls, w/o UNCLASSIFIED SAFEGUARDS  
INFORMATION:

DMB/Document Control Desk (RIDS)  
Resident Inspector, RIII  
Karen Borgstadt, Office of Assistant  
Attorney General  
Mayor John B. Spencer, City of Zion  
G. Jones, First Assistant, U.S. Attorney,  
Chicago, IL  
C. Hill, U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration  
Chicago, IL  
R. Kozak, Illinois Department of Law Enforcement  
F. Foreman, Illinois State's Attorney Lake  
County, Illinois  
N. Lee, Chief of Police, Zion, Illinois

RIII

RIII

RIII

RIII

RIII

*JP*  
C/ed/jp  
11/1/82

*for file*  
Hilmer  
11/1/82

*Hand*  
Hill  
11/1/82

*S*  
Davis  
11/1/82

*JK*  
Keppler  
11/1/82

## Appendix B

During our investigation conducted between December 23, 1981, and June 15, 1982, certain matters which do not represent noncompliance but are considered serious were noted. We request that you take certain corrective actions on these matters and respond to each of these items within 30 days of your receipt of this letter. Please include a detailed description of the actions you have taken or plan to take. Your statement of corrective actions should include a description of the actions and a schedule for completing those actions.

1. Finding: Although widespread use of drugs onsite could not be substantiated, the investigation concluded that marijuana was smoked onsite. However, the identity of individual(s) involved was not determined. (Report Section 4.b.(1))

Requested Actions: The CECO drug abuse and awareness program addresses this finding. Please provide any current information as to the effectiveness of this program as it relates to this finding.

2. Finding: Six named employees were alleged to use drugs onsite and offsite by more than one source of information. Four named employees were alleged to use drugs onsite by more than one source of information. One named employee was alleged to use drugs offsite by more than one source of information. Each of these employees denied drug use. However, based on the information obtained, we do not believe an accurate determination of their use/non-use of drugs was made. The seriousness and implications of the possibility of drug use by these individuals requires that additional assurances be provided that they are fit for duty. (Report Sections 4.b.(1) and 4.b.(2))

Requested Action: Provide a description of how and when these named individuals' fitness for duty will be determined. Also provide the results of the determinations.

3. Finding: Two named employees declined to answer investigators' questions regarding their alleged offsite use of marijuana and/or other drugs within the criteria established as being possibly detrimental to job performance. They also did not provide written statements to address denial or confirmation of the allegations. Because these individuals did not provide adequate information to prove or disprove the information received by us, a determination of their involvement could not be made. (Report Section 4.b.(2))

Requested Action: Provide a description of how and when the two named individuals' fitness for duty will be determined. Also provide the results of that determination.

4. Finding: Two named employees admitted to offsite use of marijuana within the criteria established as being possibly detrimental to job performance. These individuals were previously identified to you, and we were informed that action for fitness for duty determinations had been initiated. (Report Section 4.b.(2))

Requested Action: Provide a description of how and when their fitness for duty was determined and the results of that determination.

5. Finding: The presence of empty alcohol containers strongly suggested that alcohol had been consumed onsite, although the time frame and identity of individuals involved could not be determined. (Report Section 4.b.(3))

Requested Action: Develop and/or describe a program and procedures for surveillance and monitoring to detect indications of alcohol consumption onsite. The program/procedures should include methods of surveillance and a description of management actions in the event unauthorized activities are noted.

6. Finding: A named contract Quality Control (QC) inspector who reviewed safety related welds allegedly used marijuana offsite. The extent or timing of his alleged use was not determined. Due to the safety related nature of the inspections he conducted in 1980, additional assurance of the adequacy of his job performance should be provided. (Report Section 4.b.(6))

Requested Actions: Determine the extent and number of welds inspected by the named individual. Verify that the work he did was adequate to ensure that proper quality control of the safety related welds was accomplished.

7. Finding: Although no information was developed which indicated control room nuclear station operators (NSO) were asleep, information did indicate instances of inattentiveness. This concern was addressed by the licensee as early as November 1, 1980, through the publication of the Nuclear Stations Division Vice President's Directive No. 13, "Conduct of Operators." The instances of inattentiveness developed during this investigation indicate that revision to that policy is needed along with appropriate management implementation. (Report Section 4.b.(8))

Requested Action: Review, revise, and strengthen the policy to reduce the types of incidents described in the report. The qualifiers described in the Directive relating to "habitual or chronic lack of attentiveness" conflicts with the necessity for on-duty control room operators to be attentive at all times.



8. Finding: Six named members of the contract security force admitted to recent offsite use of marijuana. Three of the six were also alleged to use drugs onsite by more than one source. These individuals were previously identified to you and we were informed that at your request, the contractor initiated actions relevant to the information provided. (Report Section 4.c.(1))

Requested Action: Provide a description of how your contractor has and will determine their fitness for duty to provide assurances that their admitted use of drugs has not nor will not affect their on duty performance including results of determinations which have already been made. Also, provide the details of the drug abuse policy and awareness program applicable to your contract guard force.

9. Finding: Two named members of the contract guard force were alleged to use drugs offsite by more than one source. Based on the information we were able to obtain, an accurate determination of their use/non-use could not be adequately made. The implication of the possibility of offsite drug use by individuals that could have a detrimental affect on onsite duty performance requires that additional assurance be provided that they are fit for duty. (Report Section 4.c.(1))

Requested Action: Provide a description of how and when the two named individuals' fitness for duty will be determined. Also provide the results of that determination.

10. Finding: It was possible to bring alcoholic beverage onsite without detection. The need to prevent alcoholic beverages from getting onsite, combined with the established information that alcoholic beverages have actually gotten onsite requires a review and upgrade of your practices and procedures to reduce the probability of future occurrences. Your stated policy prohibiting introduction of alcoholic beverages onsite is clear and adequate. (Report Section 4.c.(8))

Requested Action: Provide a description of practices you have or will implement to reduce the probability that alcoholic beverages will not be taken on site.