

Don Frick



Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant Units 1 and 2  
Docket Nos. 50-315 and 50-316  
License Nos. DRP-58 and DRP-74

 $\sigma_{y+1}$ 

PRIORITY ROUTING

First	Second
✓ RL	✓ AS
✓ ORA	✓ AS
✓ DRP	✓ SA
✓ DRS	✓ L
✓ DNR	✓ L
	✓ L

FILE # 45

FILE 445

This letter is in response to your request of Aug. 9, 1989, to investigate allegation RIII-89-A-0093 which involves alleged drug use by an employee at the D. C. Cook Plant. The written response is contained in the attachment to this letter. The response contains no personal privacy, proprietary or safeguards information and can be released to the public and placed in the NRC Public Document Room.

This document has been prepared following Corporate and Plant Procedures which incorporate a reasonable set of controls to insure its accuracy and completeness prior to signature by the undersigned.

A. Alan Blair for  
W. G. Smith, Jr.

**Attachment**

cc: D. H. Williams, Jr.  
M. P. Alexich  
R. C. Callen, Lansing  
G. Charnoff  
NFEM Section Chief, Lansing  
NRC Resident Inspector

SEP 11 1989

8910020021 890922  
PDR ADOCK 05000315  
P PNU



Following is the response to NRC Allegation AMS RIII-89-A-0093:

ALLEGATION RIII-89-A-0093

An individual contacted the NRC Region III office with information concerning alleged drug use by an employee at the D. C. Cook Plant.

Allegation No. 1: The caller stated that an employee of a contractor at the Cook Plant used cocaine. The caller claimed to have seen the employee "high" on cocaine.

Allegation No. 2: The caller further stated that the employee was a supervisor in radiation control and has never been required to submit to a urine test for drugs because supervisory personnel are not included in the drug testing program.

The NRC requested that the Cook Plant's review of these allegations include as a minimum the following matters:

1. If this individual works at D. C. Cook, is he fit for duty?  
What is the basis for your determination?

RESPONSE

A review of Cook Plant's Access Authorization records revealed that the employee noted in the allegation has been employed by an on-site contractor from 5-16-88 to present.

Interviews conducted with the contractor and Indiana Michigan Power supervisory personnel directly responsible for observing the employee's activities on a daily basis revealed no fitness for duty concerns. One supervisor stated the employee's "performance and appearance were above reproach". Another expressed a desire that all radiation personnel would emulate his work ethics and performance.

A physical search of the employee's personal automobile was conducted on site by security personnel including the use of a trained drug dog. The search revealed no controlled substances or other contraband items.

Employee attendance records for the employee indicated no unusual absences or tardiness.

2. Are supervisors, company or contractors, exempted from your fitness for duty testing program? Has the employee been tested for drugs?

RESPONSE

All personnel with unescorted access to Cook Plant's protected area, including company and contractor supervisors are subject to the Plant's Fitness for Duty testing program.

Copies of drug screening records obtained from the contractor revealed the following:

1. The employee submitted to a pre-employment drug test on 5-19-88. Results of the test were negative.
2. The employee submitted to a random drug test initiated by the contractor on 6-5-89. Results of the test were negative.

In addition to the above tests for drugs, the employee willingly submitted to a drug test after being informed of the allegation. Results of the test were negative.

SUMMARY

A thorough investigation of this allegation revealed no reason to question the employee's fitness for duty. During the course of the investigation, the employee volunteered that the allegation may have resulted from a recent break-up with a girl friend, who remained upset with him.