



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
REGION II
101 MARIETTA ST., N.W., SUITE 3100
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303

APR 06 1982

INQUIRY REPORT NOS. 50-280/82-06 and 50-281/82-06

SUBJECT: Virginia Electric and Power Company
Surry Power Station
Surry, Virginia

Review of Drug and Related Investigations Conducted by VEPCO

DATES OF INQUIRY: January 26 - March 3, 1982

INVESTIGATOR:

E. L. Williamson
E. L. Williamson, Regional Investigator
Enforcement and Investigations Staff

3/22/82
Date

REVIEWED BY:

Carl E. Alderson
Carl E. Alderson, Director
Enforcement and Investigations Staff

3/31/82
Date

SUMMARY OF INQUIRY

VIRGINIA ELECTRIC AND POWER COMPANY

SURRY POWER STATION

JANUARY 26 - MARCH 3, 1982

A. REASON FOR INQUIRY

On December 4, 1981, the Chief, Physical Protection Section, Region II, was notified by Virginia Electric and Power Company (VEPCO) security officials that they had initiated an investigation at the Surry Power Station, Surry, Virginia, based on information provided by an individual who alleged security force personnel were involved in the use of marijuana.

According to VEPCO security officials, VEPCO investigators had been dispatched to the site to conduct interviews of those people identified by the aleger as users of marijuana or as having knowledge of security force personnel using marijuana. The aleger had identified 14 guards and two guard supervisors. The allegations implicated the guards in both on-site and off-site use as well as sales and distribution of marijuana.

On December 7, 1981, a Region II Physical Security Inspector was sent to Surry to observe and verify the adequacy of the guard force during the VEPCO investigation which would reduce the number of guards available on site.

On the basis of the information provided by VEPCO officials an inquiry was initiated under the authority provided by Section 161.c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 as amended.

B. SCOPE OF INQUIRY

On January 26-28, 1982, a review of VEPCO's investigation was conducted to determine if VEPCO's investigative efforts were of sufficient depth and scope and to determine whether or not VEPCO had pursued all available leads, particularly with regards to control room personnel named in the investigation.

The inquiry included interviews of VEPCO corporate security supervisors and a review of the licensee's investigative case files including a review of the investigative notes maintained in the case file, all statements made by interviewees and recorded by the investigators, and the results of all polygraph examinations administered and permissive searches conducted. Case files on each individual interviewed were made by VEPCO investigators and cross-referenced with information obtained during subsequent or resultant interviews.

During the course of the inquiry, another individual alleged that: (1) marijuana had been found in the control room at Surry and VEPCO officials had tried to "cover it up", and (2) a security officer was forced to report to work while under the influence of alcohol. Specific details were obtained from the aleger, including the identities of the security officer allegedly involved and co-workers who possibly had information about the incident.

VEPCO conducted an investigation into these specific concerns and provided their results to the NRC. The investigator reviewed the VEPCO investigation into these allegations and conducted independent personnel interviews and review of investigative files.

C. FINDINGS

1. The review disclosed that VEPCO had adequately addressed, in both scope and depth, the drug issues raised by the original alleger.
2. All confirmed drug use had occurred off-site and no information was obtained to corroborate the alleger's claims of on-site use.
3. VEPCO followed established procedures for dealing with suspected marijuana. The suspected marijuana found in the control room was reported to the NRC when it was found, and disposition reported.
4. The VEPCO investigation concerning the guard allegedly being under the influence of alcohol disclosed the concern was addressed in sufficient depth and detail and based on that investigation and the independent interviews conducted by the NRC investigator, the allegation was unsubstantiated.