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Disclaimer

The information in this presentation is provided as a public service and solely for informational purposes and is not, nor should be deemed as, an official NRC position, opinion or guidance, or "a written interpretation by the General Counsel" under 10 CFR 26.7, on any matter to which the information may relate. The opinions, representations, positions, interpretations, guidance or recommendations which may be expressed by the NRC technical staff during this presentation or responding to an inquiry are solely the NRC technical staff's and do not necessarily represent the same for the NRC. Accordingly, the fact that the information was obtained through the NRC technical staff will not have a precedential effect in any legal or regulatory proceeding.
Discussion Topics

- Fitness-for-Duty (FFD) Program Objective
- FFD Program Performance Test Results
- Rulemakings & Guidance
  - Part 26, HHS Guidelines
  - Part 50-52, Lessons Learned
  - Part 53, Advanced Reactors
- Items of Possible Interest
FFD Program Objective

Provide reasonable assurance that personnel subject to 10 CFR Part 26 (e.g., nuclear power plant personnel) are trustworthy, reliable, and not under the influence of any substance, legal or illegal, or mentally or physically impaired from any cause, which in any way adversely affects their ability to safely and competently perform assigned duties or be afforded unescorted access to the protected areas of nuclear power plants, sensitive information, or strategic special nuclear material (SSNM).

An FFD program developed under 10 CFR Part 26 is intended to create an environment which is free of drugs and alcohol, and the effects of such substances.
## FFD Program Performance, 2018-2020

### Summary Results

*Positive = Positive drug and alcohol tests, adulterated and substituted validity test results, and refusals to test

All results in presentation are MRO verified

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020 (draft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Facilities Reporting</strong></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individuals Tested</strong></td>
<td>145,797</td>
<td>131,417</td>
<td>124,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individuals Testing Positive</strong>*</td>
<td>1,187</td>
<td>1,085</td>
<td>1,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified at Pre-access Testing</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified at Random Testing</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industry Positive Rate, All Tests</strong></td>
<td>0.81%</td>
<td>0.83%</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensee Employee (LE)</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td>0.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor/Vendors (CVs)</td>
<td>1.06%</td>
<td>1.10%</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industry Positive Rate, Random Tests</strong></td>
<td>0.37%</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE Positive Rate</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV Positive Rate</td>
<td>0.68%</td>
<td>0.86%</td>
<td>0.92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Licensee Employees
(40,001 tested; 127 individuals positive)

- Marijuana: 34.8%
- Alcohol: 37.8%
- Amphetamines: 12.6%
- Cocaine: 5.2%
- Refusal to Test: 5.9%
- Opiates: 3.7%
- Other: 0.2%

n = 135

Contractors/Vendors
(84,397 tested; 918 individuals positive)

- Marijuana: 43.9%
- Alcohol: 16.3%
- Amphetamines: 9.8%
- Cocaine: 5.9%
- Refusal to Test: 22.8%
- Opiates: 1.1%
- Other: 0.2%

n = 972
Subversion Attempt Trends (2016-2020)

**Subversion attempt:** Any willful act or attempted act to cheat on a required test (e.g., refuse to provide a specimen, alter a specimen with an adulterant, provide a specimen that is not from the donor’s body)

**Subversion attempt sanction:** Permanent denial unescorted access, 10 CFR 26.75(b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020 (Draft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Subversion Attempts</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Drug Testing Violations</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified at Pre-access Testing</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed by Contractor/Vendors</td>
<td>98.0%</td>
<td>97.7%</td>
<td>95.6%</td>
<td>97.4%</td>
<td>96.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Sites Reporting At Least One Subversion</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rulemaking & Guidance

- Part 26, HHS Guidelines
- Part 50-52, Lessons Learned
- Part 53, Advanced Reactors
Rulemakings & Guidance

Part 26, HHS Guidelines
(RIN 3150-AI67; Docket NRC-2009-0225)

Aligns Part 26 drug testing requirements more closely with U.S. Department of Health and Human Services’ 2008 and 2017 Mandatory Guidelines for Federal Workplace Drug Testing of urine specimens

• The proposed Final Rule has been provided to the Commission.

• Substantive changes from the Proposed Rule
  
  o Align drug testing panel to 2017 HHS Guidelines (adding hydrocodone, hydromorphone, oxycodone, oxymorphone)

  o Optional oral fluid testing for observed collection conditions
Rulemakings & Guidance

Part 50-52, Lessons Learned
(RIN: 3150-AI66; Docket: NRC-2009-0196)

Better aligns licensing requirements of Parts 50 and 52 and incorporate lessons learned from recent new power reactor licensing reviews

• Regulatory Basis completed and issued
• Working to issue the proposed rule (9/22)

FFD Topics:
  o “Full program” implementation date - initial core load
  o Escorting individuals
  o MRO review of dilutes
  o Clarifications
Part 53, Advanced Reactors

Highlights

A new regulatory paradigm

Risk-informed requirements
  • drug/alcohol testing may not be required
  • HHS-certified labs are required
  • oral fluid and urine testing
  • point of collection testing

Objective-based requirements
  • fewer prescriptive requirements
  • framework conforms to other Parts

Performance-based requirements
  • change control process
  • performance monitoring

Technical Considerations

Human performance – small staff sizes

Accidents – designed mitigation

Radiological consequences – minimized
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