UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION (MSHA)

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING ON THE USE OF OR IMPAIRMENT FROM
ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUGS ON MINE PROPERTY

+ + + + +

October 24, 2005

Little America Hotel

500 South Main Street

Salt Lake City, Utah

The above-entitled public meeting convened, pursuant to notice, at 9:00 a.m., REBECCA J. SMITH, Acting Director, Office of Standards, Regulations and Variances, MSHA, presiding.

ALSO PRESENT:

EDWARD SEXAUER, Chief, Regulatory Branch,
Office of Standards, Regulations and
Variances
TOM McCLOUD, Training Policy Organization,
MSHA
GENE AUDIO, Metal and Non-metal Division,
MSHA

2

I-N-D-E-X

		PAGE
I.	Introductory Comments by Ms. Smith	3
II.	Public Comment	10
III.	Audience Comments	15

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

2

1

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(time not provided)

MS. SMITH: Good morning. My name is Becky Smith. I am the Acting Director of the MSHA Office of Standards, Regulations and Variances. And on behalf of David Dye, who is the Acting Assistant Secretary for Mine Safety and Health, I'd like to welcome you all to this public meeting today.

The purpose of this meeting is to discuss -- have you discuss with us the use of, or impairment from, alcohol and other drugs on mine property.

I'd like to also introduce others who are with the panel here today. On my right is Ed Sexauer. Ed is the Chief of MSHA's Regulatory Development Division, and he is the -- leading this effort for the On my left is Tom McCloud. Tom is with agency. MSHA's training policy organization, and on his left is Gene Audio, who is with MSHA's metal and non-metal organization.

This is the first of seven of these public meetings, and these meetings were announced in the advance notice of proposed rulemaking, which published in the Federal Register on October 4, 2005. The other meetings will be held in St. Louis, Missouri; Birmingham, Alabama; Lexington, Kentucky;

Charleston, West Virginia; Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; and Arlington, Virginia.

The Federal Register document lists the dates and exact locations for the remaining meetings, and there are extra copies in the back if you'd like to have an extra copy.

The purpose of these meetings is to obtain information about the use of, or impairment from, alcohol and other drugs on mine property. We'll use the information from these public meetings and from written comments to help us make decisions about whether we need to change our existing rules, develop new rules, or provide training or other assistance to the mining community on these issues.

Because we believe there may be a variety of approaches to address the problems of alcohol and other drugs on mine property, we are seeking information to -- related to both regulatory and nonregulatory solutions. The data and factual information we obtain from these public meetings and from written comments will help us to develop a more informed understanding of the problem and its solutions.

Our preliminary review of our fatal and non-fatal mine accident records revealed a number of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

instances in which alcohol and other drugs or drug paraphernalia were found or reported or in which the post-accident toxicology screen revealed the presence of alcohol or other drugs.

However, our accident investigations do not routinely include an inquiry into the use of alcohol or other drugs as a contributing factor. There may be instances in which alcohol or other drugs were involved in accidents and either are not reported to us or we do not uncover during our investigations.

Because we are concerned that alcohol and other drugs can create risks to minor safety, we have initiated a number of education and outreach efforts to raise awareness in the mining industry of the hazards stemming from the use of alcohol and other drugs.

These efforts include alliances with four international labor unions, production of awareness videos on the hazards of alcohol and other drugs, monetary grants to states to provide substance abuse training, and stakeholder meetings at the local level to discuss these issues and raise awareness of these problems.

Additionally, during a one-day summit we conducted with the states of Kentucky, Virginia, and

West Virginia, in 2004, several coal mine operators described the effectiveness of their drug-free workplace programs and expressed their concern that such programs were not universal in the industry.

The significance of the problem of alcohol and other drugs in the workplace has been recognized by the Federal Government, and a number of programs have been implemented and various statutes enacted with the goal of reducing the use of alcohol and other drugs in the workplace.

For example, the Anti-drug Abuse Act of 1986 allows the Secretary of Labor to initiate efforts to address these issues. The Omnibus Transportation Employee Testing Act of 1991 requires the transportation industry employers to conduct drug and alcohol testing for employees in safety-sensitive positions.

The Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1998 establishes grant programs that assist small business in developing drug-free workplace programs, and the Department of Labor's working partners for an alcoholand drug-free workplace, of which we are a partner, is a public outreach campaign raising awareness and assisting employers to implement these programs.

On the regulatory side of this issue, MSHA

currently has a safety standard for metal and nonmetal mines that addresses the use of alcohol and
narcotics at these mines. The rule language is the
same for both surface and underground metal and nonmetal mines, and the rule language states as follows,
and I quote, "Intoxicating beverages and narcotics
shall not be permitted or used in or around mines.

Persons under the influence of alcohol or narcotics
shall be -- shall not be permitted on the job."

Between January 2000 and June 2005, we issued 75 violations of the metal and non-metal surface regulation and three violations of the metal and non-metal underground regulation. But currently we don't have a similar regulation for coal mines.

Using drugs or alcohol at a mine site can impair a miner's judgment significantly at a time when miner needs to be alert and aware. Even prescription medications can affect а worker's perception and reaction time.

Mining is a complicated and hazardous occupation, and a clear focus on the work at hand is a critical component of workplace safety. Therefore, through these public meetings and written comments, we are seeking data and information about six general topics that are outlined in the Federal Register

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 notice, and these six topics are as follows. Number 1, the nature, extent, 2 and the 3 impact of substance abuse at the workplace, including how to measure the extent of the problem. 4 5 Number 2, the types of prohibited substance and use and the problems they present. 6 7 Number 3, the impact of effective training 8 to address substance abuse. investigations 9 Number 4, how of our 10 accidents could address alcohol and other drugs. 11 Number 5, the components of a drug-free 12 workplace program and how well they work. And, number 6, the costs and benefits of 13 14 addressing substance abuse at mines. 15 The Federal Register document 16 several questions about each of these six issues, and 17 you're encouraged to respond to these questions 18 specifically as they relate to the mining community. 19 The procedure for each of these public 20 meetings will be the same. Those who have notified us in advance of their intent to speak or have signed up 21 today will make their presentations first. After all 22 23 scheduled speakers have finished, others are free to speak, and we will conclude this public meeting when 24 25 the last speaker has finished.

This meeting will be conducted in an informal manner, and formal rules of evidence will not apply. This MSHA panel may ask questions of the speaker for the record to clarify statements made, but there will be no cross examination of speakers.

Ιf to present any written you want statements or information today, please identify those and give them to me before conclusion of this meeting. I will identify the material for the record by the title as you have submitted it.

You may also submit comments following this meeting, but you must submit them by November 27th, which is the close of the comment period. You may submit comments to us by electronic mail, fax, or regular mail at the addresses listed in the Federal Register notice.

A transcript of this meeting is being made, as I've mentioned, and will be available on our website within a few days. If you want a personal copy of this transcript, you can make those arrangements with the Court Reporter today.

Thanks for your patience to these introductory remarks, and we will now begin with those who have requested to speak. To ensure that we get an

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 accurate record, if you could say and spell your name and your organization for the record, please. 2 Our first speaker will be Steven Rex. 3 4 Good morning. Please. 5 MR. REX: Good morning. Again, my name is Steven with a V, R-E-X is the last name. Steven Rex. 6 I work for Pittsburgh and Midway Coal Mining Company 7 8 at the Kemmer, Wyoming, Kemmer mine. And I do not 9 have any lengthy prepared statements. I do hope to be 10 able to submit something in writing, but would like to 11 thank you for the privilege of being able to just say 12 a word or two at this hearing. We, at our mine -- I think we're universal 13 14 in our concern to preserve and create the safest 15 environment possible for our coal miners there. We have some of the programs that you have mentioned in 16 17 the document that you just read from, and we probably are on the way to establishing a little bit more. 18 Throughout company, our different 19 our 20 mines -- we have a mine in New Mexico and a mine in 21 Alabama as well -- and I won't try and speak for them, 22 because I expect that they may well want to have input 23 perhaps when you conduct your hearings over in that state. 24

However, I do know that at the mine in

Alabama that they have a very comprehensive anti-drug and alcohol program, and they do also in New Mexico.

At our mine, we are probably not quite as comprehensive, but we do have many of the components, and we have just begun random testing among salaried employees. And we're looking at some point in the future to be able to extend that to all of our miners.

I don't have any hard evidence as to -- as to the extent of usage. Obviously, there are the comments and questions that employees have, but you mentioned the study that was done by the Health and Human Services people in your document, and we don't have any evidence that would indicate that we're any better than what that study has revealed.

Therefore, it is a concern to us, and we feel that we would like to do a little bit more, and also we encourage any cooperation that can be put together between government and industry and labor and safety organizations in order to improve the safety regarding the potential use of drug and alcohol in mining operations in our country.

It is my personal belief that if additional regulatory action is looked at that we need to take a real hard look at the behavior side and make a very personal -- and I guess the one little analogy

that I would use is while I'm driving home this afternoon and I get pulled over for going 90 miles an hour, and when the patrolman asks me for my driver's license I say, "Oh no, you don't write that to me. You write it to the company." That probably won't be a whole lot of deterrent on my part for me to be careful in the future.

I guess what I'm saying is, as an individual, I would expect to be held accountable a little bit more for my personal behaviors regarding safety in this regard. I believe that would be something that we ought to look at.

I don't know exactly what that would look like or how it would be implemented, but I think it's something that should be considered, especially in light of the fact that the bulk of the incidents that occur are behavior-based, somewhere between 85 and 95 percent, and not based on conditions.

And I think that's an area that we could look at to kind of maybe help get us to the next level in safety, and any work that's done in this area should consider that element. There may well be other elements also.

That's really all I have to say today, but just appreciate the opportunity to be here and

1 appreciate the focus and the attention. I know that not only in MSHA but also in our communities there is 2 3 a lot of attention on this. Even in our school, I have just learned 4 5 this past week that our school, for their sports programs, have gone to a random testing program. 6 7 in the public hearing that they held it was probably 8 about 90 percent in favor and 10 percent against amongst the parents of these children who participate 9 10 in high school athletics and other activities. 11 applaud that. I applaud that effort and hope to see 12 something that will help us be better. We need to do 13 a little better than we're doing. 14 And that's all I have to say. 15 MS. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Rex. 16 appreciate any information you care to submit for the 17 And, again, the close of the comment period 18 is November 27th. Experiences from your participate mine about your program would be helpful to us. 19 20 MR. REX: Very good. 21 MS. SMITH: If you care to share. You bet. We'll share what we 22 MR. REX: 23 have. MS. SMITH: Cost information, implementing 24 25 data about accident injury rates, all of a program,

1	that kind of information
2	MR. REX: Okay.
3	MS. SMITH: would be very helpful to
4	us. If you care to share that, that would be
5	MR. REX: Okay. And we started trying to
6	put that together, but just we didn't I
7	personally didn't have time to get it all together to
8	bring today.
9	MS. SMITH: No, that's fine. But we would
LO	appreciate that kind of information. If you are
L1	willing to share that with us for the record, that
L2	would be great.
L3	MR. REX: Okay.
L4	MS. SMITH: Thank you very much.
	MS. SMITH: Thank you very much. MR. REX: Thank you.
L4 L5 L6	
L5	MR. REX: Thank you.
L5 L6 L7	MR. REX: Thank you. MS. SMITH: Do the panel members have any
L5 L6	MR. REX: Thank you. MS. SMITH: Do the panel members have any questions for Mr. Rex or anything you'd like to
L5 L6 L7 L8	MR. REX: Thank you. MS. SMITH: Do the panel members have any questions for Mr. Rex or anything you'd like to mention?
L5 L6 L7	MR. REX: Thank you. MS. SMITH: Do the panel members have any questions for Mr. Rex or anything you'd like to mention? PARTICIPANT: There's a lot of information
15 16 17 18 19	MR. REX: Thank you. MS. SMITH: Do the panel members have any questions for Mr. Rex or anything you'd like to mention? PARTICIPANT: There's a lot of information I know that's out there, and you shared information
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. REX: Thank you. MS. SMITH: Do the panel members have any questions for Mr. Rex or anything you'd like to mention? PARTICIPANT: There's a lot of information I know that's out there, and you shared information with us this morning. I'm looking forward to getting
L5 L6 L7 L8	MR. REX: Thank you. MS. SMITH: Do the panel members have any questions for Mr. Rex or anything you'd like to mention? PARTICIPANT: There's a lot of information I know that's out there, and you shared information with us this morning. I'm looking forward to getting your submittal, your written submittal.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. REX: Thank you. MS. SMITH: Do the panel members have any questions for Mr. Rex or anything you'd like to mention? PARTICIPANT: There's a lot of information I know that's out there, and you shared information with us this morning. I'm looking forward to getting your submittal, your written submittal. MR. REX: Okay.

1 MR. REX: Okay. Thank you. 2 PARTICIPANT: Thank you. 3 MS. SMITH: Thank you. 4 We currently don't have any other speakers 5 signed up to speak this morning. Is there anyone in the audience who would like to make a few remarks at 6 this point in time? 7 Please. 8 MR. COOPER: Yes. My name is Mike Cooper, C-O-O-P-E-R. I'm Health and Safety Director 9 10 Skyline mine here in Utah. My concern, and I do agree 11 with the following gentleman on behavior of employees, 12 we -- we have randomly drug tested for many years now. 13 We have caught one or two. But our sister mines, one 14 in particular, has had recent problems where they 15 thought they were doing very well, and come to find 16 out they weren't. 17 So my point is is we need -- I think we need more help and better training from MSHA. We can 18 19 see that there is so much available to the employees 20 and to those who are -- the employees that are drug 21 users to hide, to cover up their drug use. I myself 22 have always been quite leery of the phrase that an 23 employee -- or an employer or a supervisor/foreman should have known. 24

When you are dealing with somebody that's

1	an alcoholic or a drug user, they know how to hide it.
2	They know how to lie very well, know when to use,
3	when not to use. Part of the area that I would think
4	we need help on is on how to, you know, do random drug
5	tests properly, what are what laws say we how
6	far we can go, can we use something like a locker or
7	lockdown where we have professionals come in and help
8	us locate drugs.
9	Or I guess I'm just saying the employer is
10	in, you know, a negative position where drug users can
11	hide and can be very sneaky, and we need help on how
12	to to combat that. That's my concern, that we need
13	help in that way. That's the comments I have.
14	MS. SMITH: Thanks. Thank you, Mr.
15	Cooper. Do you plan to submit written comments on
16	behalf
17	MR. COOPER: Yes.
18	MS. SMITH: of your organization?
19	Okay.
20	MR. COOPER: Yes, I do.
21	MS. SMITH: That would be great. We would
22	appreciate whatever questions you'd like to pose of us
23	that you would like for us to solve in this as we move
24	forward. That would be helpful.
	· ·

Thank you, Mr. Cooper.

1	MR. COOPER: Thank you.
2	MS. SMITH: Anyone else who would like to
3	offer comments at this time?
4	PARTICIPANT: Can we go off the record
5	just for a minute, please?
6	(Whereupon, the proceedings in the
7	foregoing matter went off the record
8	briefly.)
9	MS. SMITH: What we're going to do at this
10	point in time, since we have no other speakers at this
11	point, we're going to go off the record for about an
12	hour, until about 10:30, see if we have late arrivals
13	who have an interest in offering some comments, and
14	we'll come back on the record and check at that point
15	in time to see if we have additional interest.
16	Yes, sir. Before we go off the record,
17	you have something you want to say?
18	MR. ADAIR: I guess.
19	MS. SMITH: Okay.
20	(Laughter.)
21	We're still on the record.
22	MR. ADAIR: My name is Laine Adair. I'm
23	with Andalex, L-A-I-N-E, A-D-A-I-R, and the company is
24	Andalex, A-N-D-A-L-E-X, Resources Incorporated.
25	We have a zero tolerance program at our

operations. We run three mine companies down in Carbon-Emery County, and we use pretty much the NIDA guidelines for limits on narcotics and things of that nature.

For alcohol, we use a .02 cutoff limit for considering under the influence. We do preemployment drug screens. When we transfer people from one mine to another, we do drug screens. We do post-accident drug screens, and we have done random drug screens, but I have found between transfers of people and post-accident and for cause -- this last two years we have randomly tested over 33 percent of our workforce, and we found 2.6 percent of that to be positive.

That amounted to about 16 people. About half of that was marijuana, there was one alcohol, and the rest were methamphetamines and cocaine.

We've had one of those 16 was a postaccident. The rest of them were either from transfers
or -- we get an awful lot of anonymous phone calls
from employees. Typically, it's a wife, says she's
concerned about somebody that works with her husband.
And we act on anonymous phone calls, and we take the
people down and drug screen them. The next time they
show up for work, we take them down and drug screen
them at the hospital.

We have found that the anonymous phone calls, the people policing the workforce themselves, is because 80 to 90 percent of those anonymous phone calls have been positive on the drug screens, which was a big concern to us whether to act on the -- you know, the -- I've actually had a probation officer call me anonymously.

(Laughter.)

Later he caught me on the street and said, "I'm sure glad you acted on that." I said, "Why in the hell didn't you tell me your name?"

But it's -- we pay the people when they're off until the results of the drug screen comes back. So on your accident program, if you have an accident and you send a person down for a drug screen, you might be up to three days. And typically it's one day turnaround the data.

But if it's positive, we send it to a -- a different lab for the chromatograph testing, for a confirmation, and then it goes to a medical review officer who tests all the results, and then he comes back, he usually contacts the person and comes up with the -- you know, the positive or the negative on it.

Over the years, I've had one employee who tried to sue us over it, got a lawyer. And, you know,

NEAL R. GROSS

we got out of that pretty easy, but other than that we've had no outside legal problems.

I think that, you know, we're all after a safer workforce, and drugs and alcohol are a real problem. The alcohol -- you know, the .02 cutoff limit, about .01 is about the limit of their ability to really test for alcohol, and .02 is double that, and there's a lot of literature out there that at .02 your reflex times are slowing down and things of that nature. So our zero tolerance, we use the .02 and have been successful with that.

We've not had much alcohol problem, because with the smell of alcohol, any smell at all, .02 -- if you drink a beer, you -- if you work on night shift, you'd better not drink a beer when you get out of bed in the morning, because it'll still be with you at 3:00 in the afternoon. And we've not had much trouble with alcohol, but the other drugs are a problem.

I think our main concern is regulation is great for regulators, but we don't want to get to where, you know, typically we see MSHA citing the operator. And a lot of this activity by these people is off the job. Some -- it has been amazing to us some of the people that have come up positive on these

drugs. You had had no idea, other than they were caught on a random.

We've had people bring other people's urine. We've had people with drugs that they mix in with the tests when they go down to the lab, you know, and they keep these on their bodies all the time, so they're ready for this. So it's pretty hard for the operator to be totally responsible for this.

And, you know, my comment, more than anything, is that this regulation needs to be aimed towards the people. It's a national problem, and to be -- what I see out of this is MSHA just writing us another citation, because somebody was using drugs on our property. And we have a real -- what I consider a -- you know, with our preemployment, we've actually tested over 75 percent of our people in this last two years, with those types of drug screens.

So we've been very positive about this, but yet we're still getting -- we're finding positive results, and there's -- I know right now there's more people at our mines who are using drugs that we haven't caught. And -- but anyway, I'm just not looking for more citations from MSHA.

MS. SMITH: Does Andalex have a written program?

_	MR. ADAIR: Yes, we do.
2	MS. SMITH: It is written. If you would
3	like to share that with us, we would love to see it.
4	MR. ADAIR: I think that any other
5	comments we might make would be through the Utah Mine
6	Association. That's what our plan is.
7	MS. SMITH: How does your post-accident
8	drug screening program work? Do you the injured
9	individual obviously is tested. Are others working
LO	with that individual tested also?
11	MR. ADAIR: We've got in the policy that
12	we can test anybody that we suspect. So like if a guy
13	driving a piece of machinery hurts another person, we
L4	can test both the injured person plus the person
15	driving the piece of machinery, you know, as a result
16	of your investigation.
17	MS. SMITH: We have a lady in the audience
18	who is from the Department of Labor's Working Partners
19	for a Drug-Free Workplace. Ms. Carr would like to ask
20	a question if you don't mind.
21	MS. CARR: I just would be interested in
22	hearing about what happens based on a positive? Is
23	that person terminated, or are they referred for
24	treatment?
25	MR ADAIR: We have a zero tolerance. One

1 time and you're out, and we terminate. We've done a lot of study, and we find that one or two out of a 2 3 hundred -- 1 or 2 percent of people in programs with vocational rehab or these other federal agencies and 4 5 stuff -- one or two people out of a hundred turn it around. 6 And we don't -- for us to bring that 7 8 person back into the workforce and take that risk, we had -- I've had kids you can't believe what they'll do 9 10 to sneak through this. And once we catch them, we 11 don't -- that's it, and they understand that. 12 MS. SMITH: Okay. Thank you. 13 PARTICIPANT: I'm curious about 14 anonymous phone calls you get. Is that part of a 15 program, or is that something that just evolved by 16 happenstance? 17 ADAIR: It has just evolved. Our 18 workforce wants a safe workplace. We've had station attendants call us that such-and-such just 19 20 left here on his way to the mine drinking a beer. 21 PARTICIPANT: So it just started, and then 22 you obviously embraced it, because you've had profound 23 success in the testing from that. MR. ADAIR: Obviously, 24 we had real 25 concerns about that in the beginning, you know, with

	24
1	you know, with but we've only had a couple tat
2	were what we considered just nuisance or somebody
3	the guy always says, "Well, it's just my ex-wife
4	getting mad at me." But then he turns up positive.
5	So maybe she should have been mad.
6	(Laughter.)
7	PARTICIPANT: Have you more formalized
8	that program? Is there like a specific number that
9	people call, or is it still a random
10	MR. ADAIR: No.
11	PARTICIPANT: Okay. Thank you.
12	PARTICIPANT: One more question. You
13	refer to some NIDA guidelines.
14	MR. ADAIR: Well, it's just federal
15	guidelines the highway department, transportation,
16	things of that nature.
17	PARTICIPANT: Okay.
18	MS. SMITH: Thank you very much. We
19	appreciate your comments.
20	Others? Please.
21	MR. CHILDS: My name is Don Childs, C-H-I-
22	L-D-S. I'm with the Energy West Mining Company, a
23	subsidiary of Pacific Corps.
24	We have a policy in place presently. We
25	do not do random testing, but we do for cause and

post-accident testing. We -- and it's interesting, we have had -- over the last few years we've had a number of random calls to that. It seems to be something that occurs with other companies as well, and obviously we act on those people, too.

We haven't found anyone that has been positive in those situations. I think we just have mad ex-wives in our situations apparently, but --

MS. SMITH: Let's not blame all of this on ex-wives now.

(Laughter.)

MR. CHILDS: They were the ones that called, so -- a couple of I guess concerns or comments that I would make is that we have found -- or I guess the concern that we have as much as alcohol and illegal drugs -- would be prescription medication. That's an area that I think we have as much concern about as other type of drugs -- marijuana, cocaine, those type of things.

And, you know, we have -- we have found a couple of instances where we have had positive tests.

A couple of things have occurred where an individual has -- they're taking more than what the prescription calls for or they -- we found a couple of instances where they have been taking their wives'

prescriptions. And, you know, we have considered those as positive and dealt with them accordingly.

Our policy does provide, if we do find someone positive, that we do give them a one-time opportunity for rehabilitation, and they go through that. They have to complete that successfully, and --but if they are positive, then they would remain on a random test for a couple of years after that. And if they are positive a second time, then they would be --they would be terminated at that point.

The other area that we maybe would like to address or I have a concern about has to do with the collection. Someone goes down for an accident, a test is completed, either at the clinic or at the emergency room, and sometimes if it goes in for confirmation we're looking at, you know, two to three days to get that result back.

And, obviously, if it's -- if it's negative, then there is a potential of an employee missing, you know, several days of work, which obviously is a problem.

We have had a concern in the past about, you know, being accurate with the testing, but it would be real good to be able to do testing onsite, or at least the collection onsite potentially if it meant

1 all of the, you know, right legal criteria to do that, and that would eliminate the -- possibly the time, at 2 3 least the initial testing. And if it was positive, 4 then it would obviously go in for confirmation. 5 But I guess the one area that we would maybe have more concern about, or as much, would be, 6 7 again, the prescription drug area. That's something 8 that needs to be addressed as much as just the alcohol 9 and other drugs. 10 MS. SMITH: Has Energy West looked into 11 the legality of onsite collection authority in any 12 way? 13 MR. CHILDS: No. I can't say that we Now, we -- we are doing that. 14 have. We have an 15 individual that comes onsite and makes a collection 16 when we do -- some of our employees are involved with 17 the DOT regulations, and, of course, and we do random testing with those individuals. 18 And we do that onsite, as a collection at least onsite. 19 The testing 20 is not done, but the collection is done onsite. 21 And so -- and as far as we know, that is 22 something that is, you know, legal to proceed that 23 way. 24 MS. SMITH: Does Energy West have a 25 written program?

	MR. CHILDS: Yes, we do.
2	MS. SMITH: It would be great if you
3	would like to share that with us, we'd like to see it.
4	MR. CHILDS: We can do it.
5	MS. SMITH: Does the policy have make
6	distinctions between prescription drug use and any
7	kind of manner that the employee would be dealt
8	with
9	MR. CHILDS: No.
10	MS. SMITH: in terms of
11	MR. CHILDS: There's no difference. If it
12	is felt by if they're reviewed by the MRO, the
13	medical review officer, if it is out of line, then it
14	would be considered a positive screen, and they would
15	go through a rehab program, irregardless of it being
16	prescription or otherwise.
17	PARTICIPANT: Do you have a preemployment
18	drug testing program?
19	MR. CHILDS: Yes, we do. I have also
20	preemployment, as they say, for cause and accident
21	testing. We do not have a random, other than for
22	individuals that are positive the first time.
23	PARTICIPANT: What's your experience
24	generally, or maybe someone else would like to address
25	this, with preemployment? And do you find with

_	initial screening that you do eliminate a number of
2	individuals?
3	MR. CHILDS: I can't say a number. We
4	haven't, you know, been hiring an awful lot of folks
5	the last little while. But I would say over the last,
6	oh, probably three years, I would say 5 percent maybe,
7	somewhere in that that we have eliminated as a
8	potential applicant.
9	PARTICIPANT: Okay.
10	MR. CHILDS: Not a lot, but there are, you
11	know, certainly a few. And that's a positive thing,
12	because it you know, that they would be eliminated
13	from the potential as an employee. And if that can be
14	done, that's a good thing.
15	MS. SMITH: Ms. Carr has a question of
16	you.
17	MS. CARR: Just a point of clarification.
18	In terms of your concern with prescription drugs, it
19	sounds like as long as someone is taking a
20	prescription according to the doctor's requirement,
21	that's not your concern. It's only the abuse or
22	misuse of prescription drugs?
23	MR. CHILDS: Yes. That would be correct.
24	We would also you know, we would obviously have a
25	concern if they are taking a prescription drug that

1	would be harmful to them as far as operating the
2	equipment, that type of thing. That's information
3	that we would like to know, but primarily those that
4	are abusing that, or using someone else's
5	prescription, those would be the concern.
6	MS. CARR: In terms of the appropriate use
7	that might affect your ability to operate safely, how
8	do you pose that in your
9	MR. CHILDS: Well, actually, I don't think
10	that we have really addressed that as far as I
11	don't think we have that information as far as from
12	our employees, that they would provide information,
13	that that would be a deterrent for them. But I think
14	it is a concern, something that we would like to
15	address.
16	MS. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Childs.
17	MR. CHILDS: Thank you.
18	MS. SMITH: We appreciate it.
19	Do we have anyone else who would like to
20	offer comments?
21	All right. I think what we'll do is we'll
22	go off the record for about an hour, until, say, about
23	quarter 'til 11:00, and we'll come back on the record
24	at that time and check to see if we have anyone else
25	who has come in who'd like to offer comments then.

1	Thank you.
2	(Whereupon, the proceedings in the
3	foregoing matter went off the record for
4	approximately one hour.)
5	MS. SMITH: All right. We're back on the
6	record.
7	I'd like to ask if there is anyone who
8	would like to give any additional statements or
9	testimony this morning. No one?
10	All right. Thank you. With that, we will
11	close the record on this public meeting, and we
12	appreciate all of the comments and input, and remind
13	all of you again that if you are going to submit
14	written comments for the records, materials/
15	information that would help us, we would appreciate
16	those by November 27th, which is the close of the
17	record.
18	And thank you all for coming.
19	(Whereupon, the proceedings in the
20	foregoing matter were concluded.)
21	
22	
23	