

ENCLOSURE

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
REGION IV

Docket No.: 50-298
License No.: DPR-46
Report No.: 50-298/97-14
Licensee: Nebraska Public Power District
Facility: Cooper Nuclear Station
Location: P.O. Box 98
Brownville, Nebraska
Dates: August 4-8, 1997
Inspector: Thomas W. Dexter, Senior Physical Security Specialist
Plant Support Branch
Approved By: Blaine Murray, Chief, Plant Support Branch
Division of Reactor Safety

ATTACHMENT: Supplemental Information

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Cooper Nuclear Station
NRC Inspection Report 50-298/97-14

This was a routine, announced inspection of the licensee's fitness-for-duty program utilizing Inspection Procedure 81502, "Fitness-For-Duty Program," dated May 31, 1991.

Plant Support

- The licensee's policies and procedures were comprehensive and of sufficient detail to assure compliance with 10 CFR Part 26 (Section S1.1).
- There was strong management support and involvement for the fitness-for-duty program (Section S1.2).
- Training for the fitness-for-duty staff was current and well documented. The general employee training adequately covered the fitness-for-duty requirements for workers and supervisors (Section S1.3).
- The licensee had an effective drug and alcohol procedure in place that ensured random testing was conducted periodically, on backshifts, weekends, and holidays. Records of test results were maintained, and an appeal process was in the procedures (Section S1.4).
- Quality Assurance Audit 96-16 of the fitness-for-duty program was detailed, comprehensive, and identified program concerns and strengths. A member of the audit team was from another utility with expertise in the fitness-for-duty program (Section S1.5).
- The records and documentation required by 10 CFR 26 and plant procedures were on file and properly secured in a restricted access controlled area (Section 1.6).

Report Details

IV. Plant Support

S1 Fitness-For-Duty Program 81502

S1.1 Policies and Procedures (81502-02.01)

a. Inspection Scope

The inspector reviewed the licensee's written policies and procedures to assure that they were comprehensive and of sufficient detail to meet the requirements of 10 CFR Part 26.

b. Observations and Findings

The inspector confirmed by review and discussion with fitness-for-duty/access authorization staff that procedures had been developed that adequately communicated specific responsibilities of the staff. A program was in place that ensured policy changes were reviewed, approved, distributed, and retained as required. The inspector determined that the procedures covered program areas involving: (1) the random selection and notification of personnel for testing, specimen collection, testing for cause, and testing for personnel called in to work; (2) appeal process and procedures; (3) followup testing; and (4) medical review officer's responsibilities.

c. Conclusions

The licensee's policies and procedures were comprehensive and of sufficient detail to assure compliance with 10 CFR Part 26.

S1.2 Organization and Management Control (81502-02.02)

a. Inspection Scope

The administration of the fitness-for-duty program was evaluated to determine management involvement and support of the program, assignment of authority and responsibilities, availability of a medical review officer, and an employee assistance program.

b. Observations and Findings

Operational responsibility for the implementation of the fitness-for-duty program had been assigned to the Senior Manager, Safety Assessment/Site Support. The site security manager was responsible for the management of the program. The security services supervisor was responsible for the day-to-day implementation of

the program, which included selecting, training, and monitoring of persons responsible for administering the testing program. The inspector discussed the program with several plant supervisors and determined that they were very knowledgeable of their responsibilities and actively supported the program.

The inspector also confirmed that the medical review officer was a licensed physician under contract to the licensee. In addition, the licensee had contracted with an independent organization to administer the employee assistance program.

c. Conclusions

There was strong management support and involvement of the fitness-for-duty program.

S1.3 Fitness-For-Duty Training

a. Inspection Scope

The inspector interviewed three collection site persons, two security supervisors who performed "call-in" tests, and the plant general employee training supervisor. The general employee training lesson plan section pertaining to the fitness-for-duty program was reviewed.

b. Observations and Findings

From a review of the training records, interviews with the collection site persons, and observing them in the performance of their duties, the inspector determined that collection site personnel understood their responsibilities and were competent in their duties. Documentation of the training records for the collection site persons and the security supervisors assigned to conduct testing for "call-ins" were current.

The supervisor responsible for the general employee training program was knowledgeable of the fitness-for-duty program requirements. The inspector determined that the fitness-for-duty requirements for employees, supervisors, and escorts were clearly stated in the general employee training lesson plan. The inspector also observed requalification of one individual and an initial training class involving several others. The training program covered the appropriate expectations and requirements for all workers and supervisors under the fitness-for-duty rule. The licensee also ensured that the computer generated tests for general employee training had at least one question concerning the fitness-for-duty program.

c. Conclusions

Training for the fitness-for-duty staff was current and well documented. The general employee training adequately covered the fitness-for-duty requirements for workers and supervisors.

S1.4 Chemical Testing Program (81502-03.03)

a. Inspection Scope

The selection and notification process was reviewed to ensure that: (1) affected workers were subject to random testing, (2) the annual testing rate was at least 50 percent of the affected workforce each year, (3) adequate measures existed to prevent subversion of testing, and (4) that the licensee's program included testing, if necessary, of individuals called to work during off hours or emergencies.

b. Observations and Findings

Selection of individuals for random testing was conducted by the use of a computer-generated list. The computer software was designed to prevent access to or tampering with the selection process. Notification of personnel selected was accomplished by contacting their supervisor approximately 1 hour prior to the actual collection time. Collection of specimens was performed at three locations - Cooper Nuclear Station and the corporate offices in Columbus, Nebraska, and York, Nebraska.

The inspector confirmed, by a review of records, schedules, and discussions with the fitness-for-duty staff, that testing was conducted periodically on backshifts, weekends, and holidays. Records of drug testing results, including records of blind test performance samples, were maintained at the plant site.

The inspector confirmed by review of Nuclear Power Group Directive 2.3, "Fitness-For-Duty Program," Revision 9, that the licensee had an appeal process in place for anyone who tested positive for drugs or alcohol. When an individual was informed that they had tested positive they were also informed of their right to appeal the findings.

c. Conclusions

The licensee had an effective drug and alcohol procedure in place that ensured random testing was conducted periodically on backshifts, weekends, and holidays. Records of test results were maintained, and an appeal process was in the procedures.

S1.5 Fitness-For-Duty Audits (81502-03.05)

a. Inspection Scope

The 1996 fitness-for-duty audit was reviewed.

b. Observations and Findings

The licensee's 1996 quality assurance audit of the fitness-for-duty program was conducted during the period November 8-22, 1996. The inspector determined from a review of the audit and discussions with a quality assurance audit person and the security services supervisor that the audit was detailed, comprehensive, and identified program concerns and strengths. In addition, a technical specialist from another licensee was used to augment the audit team. Quality Assurance Audit 96-16 Report documented four problem identification reports, one strength, and eight recommendations.

c. Conclusions

Quality Assurance Audit 96-16 of the fitness-for-duty program was detailed, comprehensive, and identified program concerns and strengths. A member of the audit team was from another utility with expertise in the fitness-for-duty program.

S1.6 Document and Records Control

a. Inspection Scope

The inspector reviewed logs, records, and conducted interviews in order to determine if regulatory requirements were met in accordance with 10 CFR Part 26.

b. Observations and Findings

The following is a partial list of documents and records reviewed:

- (1) Records of the dates and times of random tests for the year 1997
- (2) Records identifying individuals who had been made ineligible for unescorted access as a result of drug and alcohol screening
- (3) The 1996 and 1997 Fitness-For-Duty Semi-Annual Statistical Report
- (4) Blind performance test records and test files

Fitness-for-duty records were correct and prompt entries were made at the time of testing. The inspector also noted that the documents were reviewed and closely monitored for completeness by management. Blind sample records were monitored and specific files properly maintained. Additionally, audit findings were maintained in a readily retrievable manner. All records containing information on individuals were properly secured in a restricted access controlled area.

c. Conclusion

The records and documentation required by 10 CFR Part 26 and plant procedures were on file and properly secured in a restricted access controlled area.

Management Meetings

X1 **Exit Meeting Summary**

The inspector presented the inspection results to members of licensee management at the conclusion of the inspection on August 7, 1997. The licensee acknowledged the findings presented.

ATTACHMENT

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

PARTIAL LIST OF PERSONS CONTACTED

Licensee

M. Bennett, Licensing Supervisor
P. Caudill, Senior Manager, Safety Assessment/ Site Support
J. Florence, Acting Training Manager
M. Hamm, Security Manager
J. Harrington, Security Services Supervisor
R. Sessoms, Senior Manager, Quality Assurance

NRC

C. Skinner, Resident Inspector

INSPECTION PROCEDURES USED

IP 81502 Fitness-for-Duty Program

PARTIAL LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

Corporate Policy/Procedure HR-40, January 6, 1995

Nuclear Power Group Directive 2.3, NPG Fitness-For-Duty Program, Revision 7,

Security Services Procedure SS 1.2, Collection Site Person and Collection Aide Training Procedure, Revision 2, January 28, 1997

Security Services Procedure SS 2.0, Fitness-For-Duty Program, Revision 2, July 3, 1996.

Security Services Procedure SS 2.1, Fitness-For-Duty Program Procedure Collection Instruction, Revision 5, August 22, 1996

Security Services Procedure SS 2.2, Calibration Procedure, Revision 1, July 16, 1996

Security Services Procedure SS 2.3, Random Selection Procedure, Revision 1, November 5, 1996

Problem Identification Report 2-02245, For Cause Testing Problem, January 31, 1997

Problem Identification Report 2-04737, FFD Program Practices and Requirements, April 15, 1997

Problem Identification Report 2-15949, Notification of Access Denial Letter, July 2, 1997

Problem Identification Report 2-0221, Chain of Custody Forms, June 30, 1997

Problem Identification Report 2-02277, Screening Records, July 22, 1997

Quality Assurance Audit 96-16, Fitness for Duty, December 27, 1996