

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20565-0001

October 19, 1998

50-324/325

Mr. J. S. Keenan, Vice President Carolina Power & Light Company Brunswick Steam Electric Plant Post Office Box 10429 Southport, North Carolina 28461

SUBJECT:

FITNESS FOR DUTY TESTING UNDER UNIQUE MEDICAL CONDITION -BRUNSWICK STEAM ELECTRIC PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2 (TAC NO. M99047)

Dear Mr. Keenan:

This is in response to Carolina Power & Light Company's (CP&L's) letter of May 15, 1997, proposing, for a specific employee, the use of blood analysis as an alternative to urinalysis in the fitness-for-duty (FFD) evaluation process. The proposal addresses a situation where a certified Medical Review Officer has performed an evaluation of the employee's medical condition and determined that there is a medical reason for the individual's inability to produce a urine specimen consistent with the FFD testing guidelines in Appendix A to 10 CFR Part 26.

In lieu of a urine specimen, the proposed alternative calls for the collection and processing of a blocd specimen in accordance with 10 CFR 26, Appendix A, Section 2.4, as applicable. CP&L believes that the blood specimen analysis achieves FFD evaluation results comparable to those produced by urinalysis for illegal drugs. CP&L states that it is aware of the limitations present with analyzing a blood specimen (i.e., a shorter half-life limits detection and no correlation exists to the thresholds established for urinalysis), but believes that this alternate evaluation process in conjunction with the current Continual Behavioral Observation Program, which the individual has been and continues to be subject to, provides reasonable assurance that a violation of the FFD program would be detected.

The NRC recognizes that there are medical conditions that may make the collection of urine specimens difficult or hazardous to the patient. Also, there are medical problems, such as super obesity, that could result in abnormal specimens of body fluids. As a result, the NRC has previously provided guidance regarding acceptable actions to be taken for individuals unable to provide urine specimens as a result of medical conditions. The NRC expects that the licensee's medical staff, in consultation with the Medical Review Officer, will evaluate these problems, on

9810230184 981019 PDR ADOCK 05000324 F PDR 1/0

a case-by-case basis, to determine the appropriate alternative to urinalysis and that the results of these evaluations will be appropriately documented. On this basis, the NRC staff concludes that the above-described alternative, as proposed by CP&L, is acceptable and consistent with the intent of both 10 CFR Part 26 and the FFD testing guidelines in Appendix A to 10 CFR Part 26. Thus, pursuant to paragraph 1.1 of 10 CFR Part 26, Appendix A, the NRC approves the use of blood analysis as an alternative to urinalysis in the FFD evaluation process in the specific case described by CP&L in its letter of May 15, 1997.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact Mr. David Trimble at (301) 415-2019.

Sincerely,

151

John A. Zwolinski, Acting Director Division of Reactor Projects - I/II Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-325 and 50-324

cc: See next page DISTRIBUTION: Docket File PUBLIC PD II-1 Reading File

J. Zwolinski

OGC

PT Kuo

D. Trimble

E. Dunnington

ACRS

A. Chaffee

L. Bush

M. Ernstes

C. Patterson

L Plisco

FILENAME - G:\BRUNSWIC\BR99047a.ltr

\*See previous concurrence

OFFICE	PM:PDII-1	LA:PDII-1*	PSGB*	ogc.	D:PDII-1*	D:DRPE
NAME	DTrimble	EDunnington	LBush	STreby	PTKuo	JZwolinski
DATE	10/13/98	10/3/98	10/6/98	10/6/98	10/9/98	1019/98
COPY	YesyNo	Yes/No	(Yeş/No	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

a case-by-case basis, to determine the appropriate alternative to urinalysis and that the results of these evaluations will be appropriately documented. On this basis, the NRC staff concludes that the above-described alternative, as proposed by CP&L, is acceptable and consistent with the intent of both 10 CFR Part 26 and the FFD testing guidelines in Appendix A to 10 CFR Part 26. Thus, pursuant to paragraph 1.1 of 10 CFR Part 26, Appendix A, the NRC approves the use of blood analysis as an alternative to urinalysis in the FFD evaluation process in the specific case described by CP&L in its letter of May 15, 1997.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact Mr. David Trimble at (301) 415-2019.

Sincerely,

151

John A. Zwolinski, Acting Director Division of Reactor Projects - I/II Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-325 and 50-324

cc: See next page DISTRIBUTION:

Docket File

**PUBLIC** 

PD II-1 Reading File

J. Zwolinski

OGC

PT Kuo

D. Trimble

E. Dunnington

ACRS

A. Chaffee

L. Bush

M. Ernstes

C. Patterson

L. Plisco

FILENAME - G:\BRUNSWIC\BR99047a.itr

\*See previous concurrence

OFFICE	PM:PDII-1	LA:PDII-1*	PSGB*	ogc*	D:PDII-1*	D:DRPE
NAME	DTrimble	EDunnington	LBush	STreby	PTKuo	JZwolinski
DATE	10/13/98	10/6/98	10/6/98	10/6/98	10/9/98	1019/98
COPY	YesiNo	Yes/No	Yeş/No	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

a case-by-case basis, to determine the appropriate alternative to urinalysis and that the results of these evaluations will be appropriately documented. On this basis, the NRC staff concludes that the above-described alternative, as proposed by CP&L, is acceptable and consistent with the intent of both 10 CFR Part 26 and the FFD testing guidelines in Appendix A to 10 CFR Part 26. Thus, pursuant to paragraph 1.1 of 10 CFR Part 26, Appendix A, the NRC approves the use of blood analysis as an alternative to urinalysis in the FFD evaluation process in the specific case described by CP&L in its letter of May 15, 1997.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact Mr. David Trimble at (301) 415-2019.

Sincerely,

John ♠. Zwolinski, Acting Director Division of Reactor Projects - I/II Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-325 and 50-324

cc: See next page

Mr. J. S. Keenan Carolina Power & Light Company

CC:

Mr. William D. Johnson Vice President and Senior Counsel Carolina Power & Light Company Post Office Box 1551 Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

Mr. Jerry W. Jones, Chairman Brunswick County Board of Commissioners Post Office Box 249 Bolivia, North Carolina 28422

Resident Inspector
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
8470 River Road
Southport, North Carolina 28461

Regional Administrator, Region II U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth Street, SW, Suite 23T85 Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Mr. Mel Fry, Director
Division of Radiation Protection
N.C. Department of Environment
and Natural Resources
3825 Barrett Dr.
Raleigh, North Carolina 27609-7721

Mr. J. J. Lyash
Plant Manager
Carolina Power & Light Company
Brunswick Steam Electric Plant
Post Office Box 10429
Southport, North Carolina 28461

Public Service Commission State of South Carolina Post Office Drawer 11649 Columbia, South Carolina 29211

Chief, Reactor Projects Branch 4 U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth Street, SW, Suite 23T85 Atlanta, Georgia 30303 Brunswick Steam Electric Plant Units 1 and 2

Ms. Karen E. Long Assistant Attorney General State of North Carolina Post Office Box 629 Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

Mr. Robert P. Gruber
Executive Director
Public Staff - NCUC
Post Office Box 29520
Raleigh, North Carolina 27626-0520

Director
Site Operations
Brunswick Steam Electric Plant
Post Office Box 10429
Southport, North Carolina 28461

Mr. William H. Crowe, Mayor City of Southport 201 East Moore Street Southport, North Carolina 28461

Mr. Dan E. Summers
Emergency Management Coordinator
New Hanover County Department of
Emergency Management
Post Office Box 1525
Wilmington, North Carolina 28402

Ms. D. B. Alexander
Manager
Performance Evaluation and
Regulatory Affairs CPB 9
Carolina Power & Light Company
Post Office Box 1551
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602-1551

Mr. K. R. Jury Manager - Regulatory Affairs Carolina Power & Light Company Post Office Box 10429 Southport, NC 28461-0429