

PRM-26-5
(75FR65249)

DOCKETED
USNRC

January 4, 2011 (11:00am)

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
RULEMAKINGS AND
ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

28

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

As of: January 04, 2011 Received: December 30, 2010 Status: Pending_Post Tracking No. 80bc2044 Comments Due: January 05, 2011 Submission Type: Web

Docket: NRC-2010-0304
Nuclear Energy Institute - Fitness-for-Duty Programs

Comment On: NRC-2010-0304-0001
Anthony R. Pietrangelo on Behalf of the Nuclear Energy Institute; Receipt of Petition for Rulemaking

Document: NRC-2010-0304-DRAFT-0018
Comment on FR Doc # 2010-26715

Submitter Information

Name: Comments (Part 1)

General Comment

I have been an Operator at a nuclear plant for over 20 years and have been licensed for over 10 years. I believe the 10 CFR Part 26 rules, as they currently exist, do help to minimize fatigue. The rules provide a good balance of allowing extra hours to be worked during planned outages while at the same time not allowing facilities to overwork their Operators by working them excessive hours for the entire year. I feel the 54 hour a week average over a cycle during non outage periods provides the facility with the ability to have Operators work overtime for special projects, system outages, vacation coverage, etc. but at the same time isn't so much overtime that would cause burnout of the Operator. If the facility finds they need to work Operators more than an average of 54 hours per week over the cycle then one must question if staffing levels are adequate. The likely answer would be "No" and thus the facility should hire more people rather than excessively work the Operators they do have.

In reviewing the proposed changes, I strongly disagree with the proposed change to average the work hours over a quarter rather than a shift cycle as well as the removal of the definition of shift cycle and specific talk for 8, 10, or 12 hour schedules. As one who is required to work these schedules, I can say with certainty that averaging the hours over a quarter will greatly reduce the effectiveness of 10 CFR Part 26. Averaging the hours over a shift cycle does not allow weeks with excessive back to back hours being scheduled. THIS is what helps to prevent fatigue. However, allowing the average to take place over an entire quarter would allow the facility to "front load", so to speak, a schedule for a couple months then back off to normal work hours for the last month. After two to three weeks of excessive hours, a person is already fatigued. Example being, working 72 hours a week for two months then taking a vacation for a month. (See part 2)

Attachments

NRC-2010-0304-DRAFT-0018.1: Comment on FR Doc # 2010-26715

Template = SECY-067

DS 10

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

As of: January 04, 2011
Received: December 30, 2010
Status: Pending_Post
Tracking No. 80bc2046
Comments Due: January 05, 2011
Submission Type: Web

Docket: NRC-2010-0304
Nuclear Energy Institute - Fitness-for-Duty Programs

Comment On: NRC-2010-0304-0001
Anthony R. Pietrangelo on Behalf of the Nuclear Energy Institute; Receipt of Petition for Rulemaking

Document: NRC-2010-0304-DRAFT-0019
Comment on FR Doc # 2010-26715

Submitter Information

Name: Comments (Part 2)

General Comment

Part 2 -

The month long vacation period after the two months of 72 hours a week does not help the fatigue experienced during the first two months.

However, if there is something that should be changed, it would be the definition of "shift cycle". Currently defined as "Shift cycle means a series of consecutive work shifts and days off that is planned by the licensee or other entity to repeat regularly, thereby constituting a continuous shift schedule." I believe the definition is fine as is, however, it is not being used as written. We are on a 5 shift rotation as are most nuclear plant Operators. However, at least at one facility (and I have heard others as well) the average for calculating Part 26 limitations is being calculated over 6 weeks. No matter how you slice a 5 shift rotation schedule, you cannot get it to repeat continuously every 6 weeks. Thus, the facilities on 5 shift rotation schedules should be performing the calculation over 5 weeks and not 6 weeks. This is because the calculation specifically mentions using "shift cycle" here: "(3) Licensees shall ensure that individuals have, at a minimum, the number of days off specified in this paragraph. For the purposes of this subpart, a day off is defined as a calendar day during which an individual does not start a work shift. For the purposes of calculating the average number of days off required in this paragraph, the duration of the shift cycle may not exceed 6 weeks." So, if it is deemed acceptable for all facilities (no matter their rotation) to use 6 weeks in this calculation then I suggest revising the definition of "shift cycle" to remove the conflict. If the intent is as written per the definition, then I suggest ensuring that all facilities are performing their calculations correctly as per the rule.

Attachments

NRC-2010-0304-DRAFT-0019.1: Comment on FR Doc # 2010-26715

I have been an Operator at a nuclear plant for over 20 years and have been licensed for over 10 years. I believe the 10 CFR Part 26 rules, as they currently exist, do help to minimize fatigue. The rules provide a good balance of allowing extra hours to be worked during planned outages while at the same time not allowing facilities to overwork their Operators by working them excessive hours for the entire year. I feel the 54 hour a week average over a cycle during non outage periods provides the facility with the ability to have Operators work overtime for special projects, system outages, vacation coverage, etc. but at the same time isn't so much overtime that would cause burnout of the Operator. If the facility finds they need to work Operators more than an average of 54 hours per week over the cycle then one must question if staffing levels are adequate. The likely answer would be "No" and thus the facility should hire more people rather than excessively work the Operators they do have.

In reviewing the proposed changes, I strongly disagree with the proposed change to average the work hours over a quarter rather than a shift cycle as well as the removal of the definition of shift cycle and specific talk for 8, 10, or 12 hour schedules. As one who is required to work these schedules, I can say with certainty that averaging the hours over a quarter will greatly reduce the effectiveness of 10 CFR Part 26. Averaging the hours over a shift cycle does not allow weeks with excessive back to back hours being scheduled. THIS is what helps to prevent fatigue. However, allowing the average to take place over an entire quarter would allow the facility to "front load", so to speak, a schedule for a couple months then back off to normal work hours for the last month. After two to three weeks of excessive hours, a person is already fatigued. Example being, working 72 hours a week for two months then taking a vacation for a month. The month long vacation period after the two months of 72 hours a week does not help the fatigue experienced during the first two months.

However, if there is something that should be changed, it would be the definition of "shift cycle". Currently defined as "Shift cycle means a series of consecutive work shifts and days off that is planned by the licensee or other entity to repeat regularly, thereby constituting a continuous shift schedule." I believe the definition is fine as is, however, it is not being used as written. We are on a 5 shift rotation as are most nuclear plant Operators. However, at least at one facility (and I have heard others as well) the average for calculating Part 26 limitations is being calculated over 6 weeks. No matter how you slice a 5 shift rotation schedule, you cannot get it to repeat continuously every 6 weeks. Thus, the facilities on 5 shift rotation schedules should be performing the calculation over 5 weeks and not 6 weeks. This is because the calculation specifically mentions using "shift cycle" here: "(3) Licensees shall ensure that individuals have, at a minimum, the number of days off specified in this paragraph. For the purposes of this subpart, a day off is defined as a calendar day during which an individual does not start a work shift. For the purposes of calculating the average number of days off required in this paragraph, the duration of the shift cycle may not exceed 6 weeks." So, if it is deemed acceptable for all facilities (no matter their rotation) to use 6 weeks in this calculation then I suggest revising the definition of "shift cycle" to remove the conflict. If the intent is as written per the definition, then I suggest ensuring that all facilities are performing their calculations correctly as per the rule.

Rulemaking Comments

From: Gallagher, Carol
Sent: Tuesday, January 04, 2011 9:55 AM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Comment on PRM-26-5
Attachments: NRC-2010-0304-DRAFT-0018.pdf

Van,

Attached for docketing is a comment from an anonymous person on PRM-26-5 that I received via the regulations.gov website on 12/30/10.

Thanks,
Carol

Received: from HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov ([148.184.44.79]) by TWMS01.nrc.gov
([148.184.200.145]) with mapi; Tue, 4 Jan 2011 09:55:44 -0500
Content-Type: application/ms-tnef; name="winmail.dat"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: binary
From: "Gallagher, Carol" <Carol.Gallagher@nrc.gov>
To: Rulemaking Comments <Rulemaking.Comments@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, 4 Jan 2011 09:55:04 -0500
Subject: Comment on PRM-26-5
Thread-Topic: Comment on PRM-26-5
Thread-Index: AcusH16phJspD+KGRYu/dMpRqsJU8A==
Message-ID:
<6F9E3C9DCAB9E448AAA49B8772A448C55EE2C8D447@HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov>
Accept-Language: en-US
Content-Language: en-US
X-MS-Has-Attach: yes
X-MS-Exchange-Organization-SCL: -1
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:
<6F9E3C9DCAB9E448AAA49B8772A448C55EE2C8D447@HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov>
MIME-Version: 1.0