

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20555-0001

July 19, 2007

NRC INFORMATION NOTICE 2007-24: SUMMARY OF FITNESS-FOR-DUTY PROGRAM PERFORMANCE REPORTS FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2006

## **ADDRESSEES**

All holders of operating licenses for nuclear power reactors and licensees authorized to possess, use, or transport formula quantities of strategic special nuclear material.

## PURPOSE

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is issuing this information notice (IN) to report the lessons learned by licensees as detailed in their 2006 fitness-for-duty (FFD) program performance reports. The agency expects that recipients of this IN will review the information for applicability to their reactor facilities and consider, as appropriate, taking corrective actions to improve the future performance of their FFD programs. However, suggestions contained in this IN are not NRC requirements and, therefore, no specific actions or written response is required.

## **DESCRIPTION OF CIRCUMSTANCES**

As required by Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR) Section 26.71(d), NRC licensees have submitted their FFD program performance reports to the agency within 60 days of the end of each 6-month reporting period (January–June and July–December). In the past, the NRC summarized and analyzed the performance data and published an annual volume, NUREG/CR-5758, “Fitness for Duty in the Nuclear Power Industry—Annual Summary of Program Performance Reports.” Currently, this information is now being published through the NRC’s generic communication program. The enclosure to this IN provides similar FFD program performance data information for 2006.

## DISCUSSION

The following four categories contain a summarization of problems and lessons learned, management initiatives and the associated corrective actions taken by licensees in 2006:

**(1) Certified Laboratories**

Some licensees continue to experience problems with laboratory performance involving equipment malfunctions and have identified potential weaknesses related to human error.

**ML071590308**

Several examples are provided below:

- One licensee reported that its medical review officer (MRO) identified a discrepancy with the primary laboratory's certifying scientist's notation on the Federal drug testing custody and control form (CCF) and the clinical laboratory report result. The certifying scientist recorded the specimen result on the Federal drug testing CCF as dilute, but the clinical laboratory report result was negative. Further examination determined that the specimen was negative and that the certifying scientist had made an administrative error when recording the result on the CCF. As a result, the certifying scientist was counseled regarding the accuracy of reported results.
- One licensee reported that the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS)-certified laboratory failed to submit monthly reports within 14 days of the end of the month. The laboratory had sent the results to the wrong plant because two plants were on the same account. As a result, the plants are now on separate accounts and maintain their own past and current reports.
- A second licensee reported a similar issue with a monthly statistical summary. The HHS-certified laboratory did not forward the monthly statistical summary to the licensee as required. Upon discovery, the laboratory was contacted and the monthly statistical summary was immediately faxed to the licensee's site. The licensee entered the incident into its corrective action program. The laboratory provided a written corrective action to ensure future compliance.
- One licensee reported that the HHS-certified laboratory conducted a random test using more stringent preemployment levels, resulting in a positive test result. The licensee instructed the laboratory to rerun the test, which subsequently came back negative. The laboratory implemented a retraining effort to prevent such an incident from happening in the future. The licensee's tests now require a signature when certified by the laboratory to verify the proper test protocol was utilized.

(2) Random Testing

No licensees reported problems related to the random drug and alcohol selection process.

(3) Policies and Procedures

Some licensees reported issues involving their program policies and procedures. These often included initiatives to help overcome current weaknesses, such as those described below:

- One licensee reported that an employee received a positive test result during a followup test (alcohol), which was then confirmed. The employee was offered a blood test, which was done. The laboratory found that the specimen was not sealed, and the MRO reported the result as a positive based on breath tests. Upon appeal, the internal management review board ruled the test fatally flawed and the results were removed from the record.

- One licensee reported that a sample was collected by a supplemental employee in training and the collector section of the CCF was not completed. Another sample was collected, and the trainer was instructed to independently review all CCFs before they are sealed by the trainee.
- One licensee reported that an employee returned to work after a positive (alcohol) FFD test, but had not been placed in the FFD followup testing program as required by procedure. Upon discovery, the individual was immediately placed into the followup testing program.
- One licensee indicated that a donor did not date and initial a specimen bottle. The specimen was discarded and another collection performed. The licensee determined that the root cause for this issue was the collector's failure to use human performance tools.
- One licensee reported that a plant submitted two blind samples to the HHS-certified laboratory during the second quarter, instead of the required four samples. The mistake resulted from a lack of communication during a personnel changeover, combined with inadequate procedural controls. To compensate for the mistake, the plant sent six blind samples the next quarter. In response, the licensee revised the blind sample submission program and created a new implementation procedure.
- One licensee reported that a temporary outage worker fractured his right middle finger while moving equipment on a cart. The initial determination was that the injury was caused by an error in judgment, but a chemical test was not completed. Three days later, the event was reviewed and a for-cause chemical test was administered. The issue was entered into the plant's corrective action program.
- In a similar incident, one licensee reported that an employee was injured, but was not immediately tested. Instead, the employee was tested several hours later. The supervisor was retrained.
- One licensee revised an FFD procedure to reinforce compliance with for-cause testing as discussed in Regulatory Information Summary 2005-28, "Scope of For-Cause Fitness-For-Duty Testing Required by 10 CFR 26.24(a)(3)," issued November 2005.
- One licensee reported that contraband (marijuana and paraphernalia) was discovered in a contract employee's vehicle in the owner-controlled area. The contract employee's work was nonsafety sensitive.
- One licensee self-identified an improper administration of an FFD drug test result. A nonnegative drug test result, which was below regulatory confirmation cutoff levels, was inadequately reviewed. As a result, the nonnegative drug result was entered as a negative result into the site access authorization system.

The licensee entered this incident into its corrective action program. The investigation identified the cause for this inadequate review as improper use of human performance tools to ensure proper implementation of the established process.

(4) Program and System Management

In general, most licensees continue to report improvements in their overall FFD program management, as demonstrated by the following examples:

- Fourteen licensees reported more restrictive cutoff levels for marijuana.
- Three licensees reported testing for marijuana at a more restrictive cutoff level (20 nanograms per milliliter).
- Two licensees reported more restrictive cutoff levels for amphetamines.
- One licensee reported testing more restrictive cutoff levels for opiates.
- One licensee reported testing for barbiturates and benzodiazepines in addition to the required drug testing.
- One licensee reported testing for methamphetamine in addition to required drug testing. This testing yielded two positive results.
- One licensee reported testing for barbiturates, benzodiazepine, methadone, and propoxyphene in addition to required drug testing. This testing resulted in one positive test result for benzodiazepine.
- One licensee reported more restrictive cutoff levels for alcohol because of the range of extrapolation.
- One licensee reported implementing the FFD evaluation form. The FFD evaluation process provides a consistent method to evaluate personnel who are involved in plant events, accidents, near misses, or who exhibit aberrant behavior. During the reporting period, the licensee continued to provide education and guidance to site supervision in the use of this process.
- One licensee reported changing its policy to rescreen specimens with creatinine levels less than 20 milligrams per deciliter.

## CONTACT

This information notice requires no specific action or written response. Please direct any questions about this matter to the technical contact listed below.

*/RA by TQuay for/*

Michael J. Case, Director  
Division of Policy and Rulemaking  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Technical Contact: Timothy McCune, NSIR  
(301) 415-6474  
Email: [fitnessforduty@nrc.gov](mailto:fitnessforduty@nrc.gov)

Enclosure:  
Summary of Fitness-for-Duty Program Performance Reports for 2006

Note: NRC generic communications may be found on the NRC public Web site at  
<http://www.nrc.gov> under Electronic Reading Room/Document Collections.

## CONTACT

This information notice requires no specific action or written response. Please direct any questions about this matter to the technical contact listed below.

*/RA by TQuay for/*

Michael J. Case, Director  
Division of Policy and Rulemaking  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Technical Contact: Timothy McCune, NSIR  
(301) 415-6474  
Email: [fitnessforduty@nrc.gov](mailto:fitnessforduty@nrc.gov)

Enclosure:  
Summary of Fitness-for-Duty Program Performance Reports for 2006

Note: NRC generic communications may be found on the NRC public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov> under Electronic Reading Room/Document Collections.

**DISTRIBUTION:**

IN File  
DSO r/f

**ADAMS ACCESSION NUMBER: ML071590308**

OFFICE	NSIR/DSO/LPSB	Tech Editor	NSIR/DSO/LPSB	NSIR/DSO/LPSB
NAME	JCurry/CCollins	HChang, via email	TMcCune	GWest
DATE	07/02/2007	6/30/2007	07/03/2007	07/03/2007
OFFICE	DD:NSIR/DSO	D:NSIR/DSO	NSIR	LA:PGCB
NAME	RWay	DDorman (RWay for)	RZimmerman	CHawes
DATE	07/05/07	07/05/2007	07/10/2007	07/11/2007
OFFICE	PGCB	BC:PGCB	D:DPR	
NAME	JRobinson	MMurphy	MCase	
DATE	07/16/2007	07/18/2007	07/19/2007	

**OFFICIAL RECORD COPY**

## Summary of Fitness-For-Duty Program Performance Reports for 2006

Since the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) published its fitness-for-duty (FFD) rule (Title 10, Part 26, "Fitness for Duty Programs," of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR Part 26)), licensees have submitted program performance reports to the agency as required by 10 CFR 26.71(d). In the past, the NRC published a summary and analysis of calendar year data submitted by the licensees in an annual volume of NUREG/CR-5758, "Fitness for Duty in the Nuclear Power Industry—Annual Summary of Program Performance Reports." The tables below provide the information for calendar year 2006 and summarize data from 1990 to 2005.

**Table 1**  
**2006 Test Results for Each Test Category**

TEST CATEGORY	NUMBER OF TESTS	POSITIVE TESTS	PERCENT POSITIVE
Pre-Access	79,980	747	0.93
Random	52,557	132	0.25
For-Cause	1,621	109	6.72
Followup	4,766	37	0.78
Other	1,305	66	5.06
<b>TOTAL*</b>	<b>140,229</b>	<b>979</b>	<b>0.72</b>
<b>TOTAL without OTHER Category</b>	<b>138,924</b>	<b>932</b>	<b>0.69</b>

\*These totals include test results from the "Other" test category. This category encompasses results from the periodic testing done by some reporting units during annual physicals or similar periodic activities. Although some reporting units specified the nature of the other tests (e.g., return to work), most reporting units did not provide this information.

**Table 2**  
**Test Results for Each Test Category and Work Category**  
**(January through December 2006)**

TEST CATEGORY	LICENSEE EMPLOYEES	LONG-TERM CONTRACTORS	SHORT-TERM CONTRACTORS	TOTAL
<b>Pre-Access</b>				
Number Tested	9,336	528	70,116	<b>79,980</b>
Number Positive	24	7	716	<b>747</b>
Percent Positive	0.26	1.33	1.02	<b>0.93</b>
<b>Random</b>				
Number Tested	34,818	1,437	16,302	<b>52,557</b>
Number Positive	55	5	72	<b>132</b>
Percent Positive	0.16	0.35	0.44	<b>0.25</b>
<b>For-Cause</b>				
Number Tested	701	45	875	<b>1,621</b>
Number Positive	25	2	82	<b>109</b>
Percent Positive	3.57	4.44	9.37	<b>6.72</b>
<b>Followup</b>				
Number Tested	2,364	57	2,345	<b>4,766</b>
Number Positive	14	0	23	<b>37</b>
Percent Positive	0.59	0.00	0.98	<b>0.78</b>
<b>Other</b>				
Number Tested	714	58	533	<b>1,305</b>
Number Positive	9	1	56	<b>66</b>
Percent Positive	1.26	1.72	10.51	<b>5.06</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>				
Number Tested	<b>47,933</b>	<b>2,125</b>	<b>90,171</b>	<b>140,229</b>
Number Positive	<b>127</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>949</b>	<b>1,091</b>
Percent Positive	<b>0.26</b>	<b>0.71</b>	<b>1.05</b>	<b>0.78</b>
<b>TOTAL without OTHER Category</b>				
Number Tested	<b>47,219</b>	<b>2,067</b>	<b>89,638</b>	<b>138,924</b>
Number Positive	<b>118</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>893</b>	<b>1,025</b>
Percent Positive	<b>0.25</b>	<b>0.68</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.74</b>

**Table 3**  
**2006 Test Results by Test Category**  
**(January through December 2006)**

TEST CATEGORY	FIRST SIX MONTHS	SECOND SIX MONTHS	YEAR
<b>Pre-Access</b>			
Number Tested	39,977	40,003	79,980
Number Positive	344	403	747
Percent Positive	0.86	1.01	0.93
<b>Random</b>			
Number Tested	26,811	25,746	52,557
Number Positive	60	72	132
Percent Positive	0.22	0.28	0.25
<b>For-Cause</b>			
<i>Observed Behavior</i>			
Number Tested	372	344	716
Number Positive	45	59	104
Percent Positive	12.10	17.15	14.53
<i>Postaccident</i>			
Number Tested	471	434	905
Number Positive	3	2	5
Percent Positive	0.64	0.46	0.55
<b>Followup</b>			
Number Tested	2,391	2,375	4,766
Number Positive	22	15	37
Percent Positive	0.92	0.63	0.78
<b>Other</b>			
Number Tested	604	701	1,305
Number Positive	38	28	66
Percent Positive	6.29	3.99	5.06
<b>TOTAL</b>			
Number Tested	<b>70,626</b>	<b>69,603</b>	<b>140,229</b>
Number Positive	<b>512</b>	<b>579</b>	<b>1,091</b>
Percent Positive	<b>0.72</b>	<b>0.83</b>	<b>0.78</b>
<b>TOTAL without OTHER Category</b>			
Number Tested	<b>70,022</b>	<b>68,902</b>	<b>138,924</b>
Number Positive	<b>474</b>	<b>551</b>	<b>1,025</b>
Percent Positive	<b>0.68</b>	<b>0.80</b>	<b>0.74</b>

**Table 4**  
**2006 Test Results for Licensee Employees and Contractor Personnel**  
**(January through December 2006)**

TEST CATEGORY	LICENSEE EMPLOYEES			LONG-TERM CONTRACTORS			SHORT-TERM CONTRACTORS		
	First Six Months	Second Six Months	Year	First Six Months	Second Six Months	Year	First Six Months	Second Six Months	Year
<b>Pre-Access</b>									
Number Tested	5,338	3,998	9,336	233	295	528	34,406	35,710	70,116
Number Positive	10	14	24	4	3	7	330	386	716
Percent Positive	0.19	0.35	0.26	1.72	1.02	1.33	0.96	1.08	1.02
<b>Random</b>									
Number Tested	17,780	17,038	34,818	701	736	1,437	8,330	7,972	16,302
Number Positive	26	29	55	3	2	5	31	41	72
Percent Positive	0.15	0.17	0.16	0.43	0.27	0.35	0.37	0.51	0.44
<b>For-Cause</b>									
<i>Observed Behavior</i>									
Number Tested	145	177	322	10	11	21	217	156	373
Number Positive	6	18	24	0	2	2	39	39	78
Percent Positive	4.14	10.17	7.45	0.00	18.18	9.52	17.97	25.00	20.91
<i>Post accident</i>									
Number Tested	215	164	379	10	14	24	246	256	502
Number Positive	0	1	1	0	0	0	3	1	4
Percent Positive	0.00	0.61	0.26	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.22	0.39	0.80
<b>Followup</b>									
Number Tested	1,156	1,208	2,364	41	16	57	1,194	1,151	2,345
Number Positive	8	6	14	0	0	0	14	9	23
Percent Positive	0.69	0.50	0.59	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.17	0.78	0.98

**Table 4**  
**2006 Test Results for Licensee Employees and Contractor Personnel, Continued**  
**(January through December 2006)**

TEST CATEGORY	LICENSEE EMPLOYEES			LONG-TERM CONTRACTORS			SHORT-TERM CONTRACTORS		
	First Six Months	Second Six Months	Year	First Six Months	Second Six Months	Year	First Six Months	Second Six Months	Year
<b>Other</b>									
Number Tested	341	373	714	32	26	58	231	302	533
Number Positive	6	3	9	0	1	1	32	24	56
Percent Positive	1.76	0.80	1.26	0.00	3.85	1.72	13.85	7.95	10.51
<b>TOTAL</b>									
Number Tested	24,975	22,958	47,933	1,027	1,098	2,125	44,624	45,547	90,171
Number Positive	56	71	127	7	8	15	449	500	949
Percent Positive	0.22	0.31	0.26	0.68	0.73	0.71	1.01	1.10	1.05
<b>TOTAL without OTHER Category</b>									
Number Tested	24,634	22,585	47,219	995	1,072	2,067	44,393	45,245	89,638
Number Positive	50	68	118	7	7	14	417	476	893
Percent Positive	0.20	0.30	0.25	0.70	0.65	0.68	0.94	1.05	1.00

**Table 5**  
**2006 Number of Confirmed Positives by Substance**  
**(January through December 2006)**

TYPE OF SUBSTANCE	FIRST SIX MONTHS		SECOND SIX MONTHS		TOTAL	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Marijuana	232	48.13	214	39.27	446	43.43
Cocaine	119	24.69	188	34.50	307	29.89
Opiates	5	1.04	9	1.65	14	1.36
Amphetamines	24	4.98	29	5.32	53	5.16
Phencyclidine	0	0.00	1	0.18	1	0.10
Alcohol	102	21.16	104	19.08	206	20.06
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>482</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>545</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1027</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 6**  
**2006 Confirmed Positive Test Results by Substance and Work Category**  
**(January through December 2006)**

TYPE OF SUBSTANCE	LICENSEE EMPLOYEES		CONTRACTORS (Long-Term/Short-Term)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Marijuana	32	26.23	414	45.75
Cocaine	27	22.13	280	30.94
Opiates	2	1.64	12	1.33
Amphetamines	7	5.74	46	5.08
Phencyclidine	0	0.00	1	0.11
Alcohol	54	44.26	152	16.80
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>905</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 7**  
**Significant Fitness-for-Duty Events (1990–2006)**

Type of Event	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	Total
Reactor Operators	19	16	18	8	7	8	8	9	5	5	103
Licensee Supervisors	26	18	22	25	11	16	19	16	10	2	165
Contract Supervisors	12	24	28	16	11	10	8	10	10	12	141
FFD Program Personnel	1	5	0	0	1	0	2	0	3	2	14
Substances Found	6	8	6	2	0	5	5	4	0	2	38
Adulterated Specimen											0
<b>Total</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>461</b>

**Table 7**  
**Significant Fitness-for-Duty Events (1990–2006), Continued**

Type of Event	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Total
Reactor Operators	5	4	3	6	9	5	3	35
Licensee Supervisors	11	9	3	3	7	13	6	52
Contract Supervisors	8	12	12	8	4	14	6	64
FFD Program Personnel	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	4
Substances Found	3	0	1	2	9	9	2	26
Adulterated Specimen				9	23	29	60	121
<b>Total</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>302</b>

**Table 8**  
**Trends in Testing by Test Type (1990–2006)**

Type of Test	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	Total
Pre-Access											
Number Tested	122,491	104,508	104,842	91,471	80,217	79,305	81,041	84,320	69,146	69,139	<b>886,480</b>
Number Positive	1,548	983	1,110	952	977	1,122	1,132	1,096	822	934	<b>10,676</b>
Percent Positive	1.26	0.94	1.06	1.04	1.22	1.41	1.40	1.30	1.19	1.35	<b>1.20</b>
Random											
Number Tested	148,743	153,818	156,730	146,605	78,391	66,791	62,307	60,829	56,969	54,457	<b>985,640</b>
Number Positive	550	510	461	341	223	180	202	172	157	140	<b>2,936</b>
Percent Positive	0.37	0.33	0.29	0.23	0.28	0.27	0.32	0.28	0.28	0.26	<b>0.30</b>
For-Cause											
Number Tested	732	727	696	751	758	763	848	722	720	736	<b>7,453</b>
Number Positive	214	167	178	163	122	139	138	149	100	120	<b>1,490</b>
Percent Positive	29.23	22.97	25.27	21.70	16.09	18.22	16.27	20.64	13.89	16.30	<b>20.00</b>
Followup											
Number Tested	2,633	3,544	4,283	4,139	3,875	3,262	3,262	3,296	2,863	3,008	<b>34,165</b>
Number Positive	65	62	69	56	50	35	40	31	43	30	<b>481</b>
Percent Positive	2.47	1.75	1.61	1.35	1.29	1.07	1.23	0.94	1.50	1.00	<b>1.41</b>
<b>TOTAL*</b>											
<b>Number Tested</b>	<b>274,599</b>	<b>262,597</b>	<b>266,551</b>	<b>242,966</b>	<b>163,241</b>	<b>150,121</b>	<b>147,458</b>	<b>149,167</b>	<b>129,698</b>	<b>127,340</b>	<b>1,913,738</b>
<b>Number Positive</b>	<b>2,377</b>	<b>1,722</b>	<b>1,818</b>	<b>1,512</b>	<b>1,372</b>	<b>1,476</b>	<b>1,512</b>	<b>1,448</b>	<b>1,122</b>	<b>1,224</b>	<b>15,583</b>
<b>Percent Positive</b>	<b>0.87</b>	<b>0.66</b>	<b>0.68</b>	<b>0.62</b>	<b>0.84</b>	<b>0.98</b>	<b>1.03</b>	<b>0.97</b>	<b>0.87</b>	<b>0.96</b>	<b>0.81</b>

\*Does not include test results from the “Other” test category.

**Table 8**  
**Trends in Testing by Test Type (2000–2006), Continued**

Type of Test	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Total
<b>Pre-Access</b>								
Number Tested	68,333	63,744	73,155	72,988	76,119	79,005	79,980	<b>513,324</b>
Number Positive	965	720	805	757	737	648	747	<b>5,379</b>
Percent Positive	1.41	1.13	1.10	1.04	0.97	0.82	0.93	<b>1.05</b>
<b>Random</b>								
Number Tested	51,955	50,080	49,741	49,402	51,239	50,286	52,557	<b>355,260</b>
Number Positive	204	148	114	132	127	147	132	<b>1,003</b>
Percent Positive	0.39	0.30	0.23	0.27	0.25	0.29	0.25	<b>0.28</b>
<b>For-Cause</b>								
Number Tested	883	730	1,072	1,052	1,159	1,161	1,621	<b>7,674</b>
Number Positive	138	101	112	126	139	106	109	<b>830</b>
Percent Positive	15.67	13.84	10.45	11.98	11.99	9.13	6.72	<b>10.82</b>
<b>Followup</b>								
Number Tested	2,861	2,649	2,892	3,142	3,752	4,057	4,766	<b>24,080</b>
Number Positive	49	35	21	42	31	31	37	<b>209</b>
Percent Positive	1.71	1.32	0.73	1.34	0.83	0.76	0.78	<b>1.02</b>
<b>TOTAL*</b>								
<b>Number Tested</b>	<b>124,032</b>	<b>118,730</b>	<b>128,321</b>	<b>127,785</b>	<b>132,269</b>	<b>134,509</b>	<b>138,924</b>	<b>903,625</b>
<b>Number Positive</b>	<b>1,356</b>	<b>1,036</b>	<b>1,091</b>	<b>1,094</b>	<b>1,034</b>	<b>932</b>	<b>1,025</b>	<b>7,563</b>
<b>Percent Positive</b>	<b>1.09</b>	<b>1,004</b>	<b>0.85</b>	<b>0.86</b>	<b>0.78</b>	<b>0.69</b>	<b>0.74</b>	<b>0.84</b>

\*Does not include test results from the "Other" test category.

**Table 9**  
**Trends in Substances Identified (1990–2006)**

<b>Substance</b>	<b>1990</b>	<b>1991</b>	<b>1992</b>	<b>1993</b>	<b>1994</b>	<b>1995</b>	<b>1996</b>	<b>1997</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>1999</b>
Marijuana	1153	746	953	781	739	819	868	842	606	672
Cocaine	706	549	470	369	344	374	352	336	269	273
Alcohol	452	401	427	357	251	265	281	262	212	230
Amphetamines	69	31	31	51	54	61	53	49	46	40
Opiates	45	24	8	13	11	17	14	39	19	16
Phencyclidine	8	11	4	5	1	7	2	0	1	2
<b>Total*</b>	<b>2433</b>	<b>1762</b>	<b>1893</b>	<b>1576</b>	<b>1400</b>	<b>1,543</b>	<b>1570</b>	<b>1528</b>	<b>1153</b>	<b>1233</b>

\*These totals do not equal the total number of positives for each year because some positives were for multiple substances and for substances other than those listed above.

**Table 9**  
**Trends in Substances Identified (1990–2006), Continued**

<b>Substance</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>
Marijuana	620	523	560	518	514	432	446
Cocaine	251	225	228	228	247	246	307
Alcohol	211	212	214	199	222	196	206
Amphetamines	50	50	47	64	60	59	53
Opiates	32	17	21	17	14	16	14
Phencyclidine	1	2	3	0	1	2	1
<b>Total*</b>	<b>1168</b>	<b>1029</b>	<b>1069</b>	<b>1026</b>	<b>1056</b>	<b>951</b>	<b>1027</b>

\*These totals do not equal the total number of positives for each year because some positives were for multiple substances and for substances other than those listed above.

Table 10  
Trends in Positive Test Rates for Workers with Unescorted Access (1990–2006)\*

Year	Positive Test Rate
1990	0.54
1991	0.47
1992	0.44
1993	0.37
1994	0.48
1995	0.50
1996	0.57
1997	0.54
1998	0.50
1999	0.50
2000	0.70
2001	0.53
2002	0.46
2003	0.56
2004	0.51
2005	0.49
2006	0.44

\*Includes random, for-cause testing results. The reduction in random test rate from 100 percent to 50 percent has been in effect since 1994.