



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
REGION II
101 MARIETTA STREET, N.W., SUITE 2900
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30323-0199

May 6, 1996

[REDACTED]

TC

SUBJECT: RII-95-A-0093 - QUESTIONABLE OPERATOR AND OVERTIME PRACTICES

Dear [REDACTED]

This refers to our letter dated January 23, 1996, in which you were informed that we were continuing our review of the concerns you expressed on [REDACTED] with [REDACTED] of our staff related to operations and overtime practices at the Harris Nuclear Plant.

TC

Our review regarding this matter has been completed, and our findings are documented in the enclosures to this letter. Based on the information provided, we were unable to substantiate the allegation.

This concludes the staff's activities regarding this matter. If you have any questions, you may contact at 1-800-577-8510 or (404) 331-5535 or by mail at P.O. Box 845, Atlanta, GA 30301.

Sincerely,

M B Shymlock

Milton B. Shymlock, Chief
Reactor Projects Branch 4
Division of Reactor Projects

- Enclosures: 1. Allegation Evaluation Report
2. Report No. 50-400/96-01

Certified Mail No. Z 238 513 605
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

D/18

ALLEGATION EVALUATION REPORT

ALLEGATION NUMBER RII-95-A-0093

ABNORMAL AMOUNTS OF OVERTIME

CAROLINA POWER AND LIGHT

SHEARON HARRIS NUCLEAR PLANT UNIT 1

DOCKET NUMBER 50-400

ALLEGATION:

7C On [REDACTED] the CIs contacted the resident inspector and told him that management regularly schedules [REDACTED] for abnormal amounts of overtime to achieve adequate shift coverage and/or to support other plant activities.

EVALUATION:

The inspector reviewed a random selection of time sheets for Operations personnel to determine whether overtime usage complied with requirements in the plant's Technical Specifications. This review included time sheets for auxiliary operators, licensed reactor and senior reactor operators, Shift Supervisors, and Senior Technical Advisors. Time sheets from May 1995 through November 1995 were reviewed to include those months affected by the recent refueling and forced outages. Time sheets for nearly 30 [REDACTED] were reviewed. The review is documented in Inspection Report 400/96-01. AC

The review found that the majority of [REDACTED] charged time within the Technical Specification limits. In very few cases, charged time exceeded the limits. In those situations, as allowed by Technical Specifications, deviations were usually pre-approved by the Plant General Manager or his designee. The inspector found four questionable cases where overtime limits appeared to be exceeded without management approval. These cases involved longer than usual shift turnovers, or in one case, attendance at a post-shift meeting prior to departing for two days off shift. Shift turnover hours were explicitly excluded from the limitations by Technical Specifications. The special meeting case was determined by the inspector not to violate the intent of the Technical Specification requirement.

In months leading up to and during the last refueling outage, [REDACTED] worked 7C large amounts of overtime. Technical Specification limits were heavily challenged - but not exceeded - during this period. A review of year-end overtime statistics showed that the average overtime per [REDACTED] was between 20 and 25 percent of the total time worked, with the majority of these hours to support the refueling outage. Overtime usage in 1995 exceeded the usage in previous years.

CONCLUSIONS:

The concern that management normally schedules [REDACTED] for abnormal amounts of overtime to achieve adequate shift coverage and/or to support other plant activities could not be substantiated in that no violations of Technical 7C

Specification overtime requirements and no safety concerns with overtime practices in 1995 were identified. However, overtime for 1995 was higher than in previous years.