



February 23, 2012

NRC 2012-0012
10 CFR 26.417
10 CFR 26.717

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
ATTN: Document Control Desk
Washington, DC 20555

Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2
Dockets 50-266 and 50-301
License Nos. DPR-24 and DPR-27

2011 Fitness for Duty Performance Data

Reference: (1) NextEra Energy Point Beach, LLC, letter to NRC, dated February 25, 2011
2010 Fitness for Duty Performance Data (ML110590429)

In accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR 26.417 and 26.717 enclosed is the 2011 Fitness-For-Duty (FFD) Program Performance Data for Point Beach Nuclear Plant. This submittal also contains the detailed information on the 2010 fatigue assessment that was submitted via Reference 1.

This letter contains no new Regulatory Commitments and no revisions to existing Regulatory Commitments.

Very truly yours,

NextEra Energy Point Beach, LLC

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "William J. Henery for J. Costedio".

James Costedio
Licensing Manager

Enclosures

cc: Administrator, Region III, USNRC
Project Manager, Point Beach Nuclear Plant, USNRC
Resident Inspector, Point Beach Nuclear Plant, USNRC

FITNESS FOR DUTY PROGRAM PERFORMANCE DATA

NextEra Energy Point Beach, LLC

2011

Company

Annual Reporting Period

Point Beach Nuclear Plant

Location

Donald C. Popp

(920) 755-7756

Contact Name

Phone Number

Cutoffs: Screen/Confirmation (ng/ml) & Alcohol (% BAC)

 X 10 CFR 26 Levels identified in Sections 26.103 and 26.163

| Testing Results | Licensee Employees | | Contractor Personnel | |
|--|--------------------|------------|----------------------|------------|
| Average number with Unescorted Access Total: 2316 | 690 | | 1626 | |
| Categories | # Tested | # Positive | # Tested | # Positive |
| Follow-Up | 19 | 0 | 169 | 1 |
| For Cause – Observed Behavior | 1 | 0 | *4 | 0 |
| For Cause - Post Event | 2 | 0 | 13 | 0 |
| Pre-Access | 58 | 0 | 3303 | 9 |
| Random | 394 | 1 | 868 | 1 |
| Total | 474 | 1 | 4357 | 11 |

During the reporting period of 2011, NextEra Energy Resources (NextEra) Point Beach Nuclear Plant (PBNP) conducted 4,831 drug and alcohol tests in accordance with 10 CFR Part 26. Random test rates are as follows:

| POOLS | Reporting Period |
|----------------------------------|------------------|
| | 2011 |
| Point Beach Nuclear Plant | 54% |

BREAKDOWN OF CONFIRMED POSITIVE TESTS

| Point Beach | Marijuana | Cocaine | Opiates | Amphetamines | Phencyclidine | Alcohol | Refusal to Test | |
|--------------------|-----------|---------|---------|--------------|---------------|---------|-----------------|----|
| Licensee Employees | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Contractors | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 0 | |
| Total | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 12 |

Management Actions

For the reporting period of 2011, twelve (12) workers were denied nuclear access after testing positive for drugs or alcohol. By test type, one (1) follow-up test was positive, two (2) random tests were positive, and nine (9) pre-access tests were positive.

Follow-up Positive Test

One (1) contractor employee tested positive for alcohol. This individual was denied access.

Random Positive Test

One (1) contractor employee tested positive for marijuana, and one (1) licensee employee tested positive for opiates. Both individuals were denied access.

Pre-Access Positive Test

One (1) contractor employee tested positive for amphetamines, three (3) contractor employees tested positive for marijuana, and five (5) contractor employees tested positive for alcohol. All individuals were denied access.

Additional Comments

1. There were no subversion attempts during the 2011 reporting period.
2. For the 2011 reporting period, all blind specimens submitted to PBNP's HHS-certified laboratory yielded expected results.
3. *On February 3, 2011, one (1) for-cause observed behavior (alcohol only) test was conducted on a contractor employee due to the smell of alcohol. The breath alcohol test was negative. No drug test was required, and the individual was allowed to go back to work in accordance with 10CFR26.77(b)(1).
4. On October 28, 2011, a contractor employee received an OSHA recordable injury. They were taken off-site for medical treatment, and did not return to the site. A for-cause test was not able to be conducted. Incident entered into the site corrective action program.

Reportable Events

Point Beach Nuclear Plant had one (1) reportable event as defined in 10 CFR Part 26.719 during this reporting period. On April 22, 2011, at 1321 (CDT) a 24-hour reportable FFD event report (EN 46777) was made in accordance with 10 CFR 26.719(b)(2)(ii).

| Facility Name | | Report Period | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--------|---|--------|--|--------|---|--------|--|--------|-----------------|--------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Point Beach | | 2011 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Summary of Waiver Issuance - 26.203(e)(1)(i)- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Number of Waivers Issued (Note: At least one of the cells in this table should have a non-negative value) | | | | | | | |
| Work Hour Controls | | Operating or on-site directing of the operations of systems as described in 26.4(a)(1) | | Performing health physics of chemistry duties as described 26.4(a)(2) | | Performing duties of a fire brigade member, as described in 26.4(a)(3) * | | Performing maintenance or onsite direction of maintenance, as described in 26.4(a)(4) | | Performing security duties as described 26.4(a)(5) | | Operating Total | Outage Total | Combined Total | | | | | | | |
| | | Operating | Outage | Operating | Outage | Operating | Outage | Operating | Outage | Operating | Outage | | | | | | | | | | |
| Daily Work Hours 26.205(d)(1) | Exceed 16 work hrs in any 24 hr period | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | |
| | Exceed 26 work hrs in any 48 hr period | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 25 | | | | | | | |
| | Exceeded 72 work hrs in any 7 day period | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | |
| Rest Breaks 26.205(d)(2) | Less than 10 hr break b/t successive work periods (for 8 hr break accommodating scheduled transition b/t shifts) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | |
| | Less than 34 hr break in any 9 day period | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | |
| Minimum Days Off Per Shift Cycle 26.205(d)(3) | Avg of less than 1 day off per week for 8-hour shifts while operating | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | | | | | | |
| | Avg of less than 2 days off per week for 10-hour shifts while operating | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | | | | | | |
| | Avg of less than 2.5 days off per week for 12-hour shifts while operating | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | | | | | | |
| | Avg of less than 2 days off per week for 12-hour maintenance shifts | | | | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | 0 | | | | | | | |
| | Avg of less than 3 days off per week for 12-hour security shifts | | | | | | | | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | | | | | | |
| Minimum Days Off for Outage Activities 26.205(d)(4) and 26.205(d)(5) | Less than 3 days off per successive 15-day period | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | | | | | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | |
| | Less than 1 day off per 7-day period for maintenance personnel | | | | | | | 0 | | | | | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | |
| | Less than 4 days off per successive 15-day period for security personnel | | | | | | | | | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 25 | | | | | | | |

* NOTE: For individuals performing fire brigade duties and other duties, please count them only under the fire brigade column. Do not double count these indivi

| Facility Name | | Report Period | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|---|--|
| Point Beach | | 2011 | | | | |
| Distribution of Waiver for Individuals in Each Category - 26.203(e)(1)(iii) | | | | | | Summary of Corrective Actions - 26.203(e)(2) |
| Number of Employees Issued Waivers | | | | | | Analysis of Waiver Assessment Data: |
| Number of Waivers | Operating or on-site directing of the operations of systems, as described in 26.4(a)(1) | Performing health physics or chemistry duties as described in 26.4(a)(2) | Performing duties of a fire brigade member as described in 26.4(a)(3) * | Performing maintenance or onsite directing of maintenance as described in 26.4(a)(4) | Performing security duties as described in 26.4(a)(5) | <p>There were 25 waivers required by Security, while working online hours, due to a blizzard. The waivers were necessary to meet minimum staffing requirements. All individuals requiring a waiver received a face-to-face fatigue assessment by their supervisor who determined the individuals were not fatigued. Preventive measure were put in place to monitor fatigue.</p> <p>Analysis of Fatigue Assessment Data: Not including the 25 face-to-face fatigue assessments for waivers, there were a total of 24 fatigue assessments performed during 2011.</p> <p>There were ten "for cause" assessments and 14 "post event follow-up" assessments performed.</p> <p>See attached for details</p> |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 11-20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| More than 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | |
| Total Number of Employees Issued Waivers | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | |
| Most Waivers Provided to a Single Individual | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| <p>*Note: For individuals performing the fire brigade duties, please count them only under fire brigade column. Do not double count these individuals.</p> | | | | | | |
| <p>Conclusions: Because of a blizzard during 2011, there were 25 Security Officers held over to meet the minimum staff requirements. Thus, there were 25 individual waivers for working greater than 26 hours in any 48 hour period. Face-to-face fatigue assessments were conducted and preventative measures were put into place to monitor for fatigue.</p> <p>There were a total of 24 fatigue assessments performed for either post event follow-up or for cause testing. Of the 24 assessments, 18 were during the outage. During online operations there were a total of six fatigue assessments, five of the six fatigue assessments were for post event follow-up.</p> <p>There were no self declarations of fatigue.</p> | | | | | | |
| <p>Summary of Status of Corrective Actions: There were no corrective actions required based on the use of waivers or fatigue assessments.</p> | | | | | | |

ATTACHMENT 1

2011 FATIGUE ASSESSMENT DETAILS

The following are the details of fatigue assessment performed for "for cause" testing:

- A maintenance contractor working outage hours was assigned to fill & vent transmitters. However, he did not show up to perform his duties. The individual made a decision to take a nap in a back room. A fatigue assessment was performed and the individual exhibited impairment and was required to take at least a 10 hour break prior to returning to work.
- An Engineer contractor supporting the power uprate outage activities, displayed uncharacteristic outbursts. The individual was relieved from his duties and a fatigue assessment was performed. It was determined that the individual exhibited impairment and was required to take at least a 10 hour break prior to returning to work.
- A maintenance contractor working outage hours standing fire watch was observed with his head down and his eyes closed. The individual was relieved from his duties and a fatigue assessment was performed. It was determined that the individual exhibited impairment and was required to take at least a 10 hour break prior to returning to work.
- A Security officer working outage hours performing compensatory measures at a vital area door was observed as inattentive during post switch. A fatigue assessment was performed and was determined that the individual exhibited impairment and was required to take at least a 10 hour break prior to returning to work.
- A maintenance individual performing outage activities was injured while checking and clearing a cart path. A fatigue assessment was performed and was determined that the individual did not exhibit impairment due to fatigue.
- A Security officer working online hours was performing gatehouse duties and was questioned by coworker who thought the officer looked tired. The Security officer stated that he was not tired, but was taking prescribed pain medication. A fatigue assessment was performed where it was determined the officer did not exhibit impairment due to fatigue.
- A maintenance contractor performing outage duties injured his hand while reinstalling grating. A fatigue assessment was performed and was determined that the individual did not exhibit impairment due to fatigue.
- A maintenance contractor working outage hours was sitting in a chair waiting to perform a walkdown. A security officer noticed the individual with his eyes closed, but stated the individual became alert during a plant announcement. A fatigue assessment was performed and was determined that the individual did not exhibit impairment due to fatigue.

Attachment 1

- A maintenance contractor performing outage duties operating a forklift struck a cable tray support with the forklift. A fatigue assessment was performed and was determined that the individual did not exhibit impairment due to fatigue.
- A maintenance contractor performing outage duties as a spotter for a forklift operator did not prevent the forklift operator from striking a cable tray support with the forklift. A fatigue assessment was performed and was determined that the individual did not exhibit impairment due to fatigue.

The following are the details of fatigue assessment performed for "post event follow-up":

- A maintenance contractor performing outage duties injured his thumb when he was hammering and grinding. A fatigue assessment was performed and was determined that the individual did not exhibit impairment due to fatigue.
- A maintenance contractor performing outage duties rigging and moving equipment experienced an industrial safety near miss when a rigging hook snagged a piece of equipment knocking it over and almost hitting the individual. A fatigue assessment was performed and was determined that the individual did not exhibit impairment due to fatigue.
- A maintenance contractor performing outage duties moving a feed pump via a powered saddle roller experienced an industrial safety near miss when a piece of equipment fell. A fatigue assessment was performed and was determined that the individual did not exhibit impairment due to fatigue.
- A maintenance contractor performing outage duties experienced an industrial safety near miss when a crate fell from a fork lift. A fatigue assessment was performed and was determined that the individual did not exhibit impairment due to fatigue.
- A maintenance contractor performing outage duties as a crane operator experienced an incident where the manipulator crane he was cooperating came into contact with the polar crane cable. A fatigue assessment was performed and was determined that the individual did not exhibit impairment due to fatigue.
- A maintenance contractor performing outage duties as the spotter for the manipulator crane operator that experienced an incident where the manipulator crane he was spotting came into contact with the polar crane cable. A fatigue assessment was performed and was determined that the individual did not exhibit impairment due to fatigue.
- A maintenance contractor working online hours lowered a garage door onto the back of a maintenance vehicle bumper causing damage. A fatigue assessment was performed and was determined that the individual did not exhibit impairment due to fatigue.

Attachment 1

- A security officer working online hours was performing a vehicle search when he stepped off the truck trailer and fell injuring his arms. A fatigue assessment was performed and was determined that the individual did not exhibit impairment due to fatigue.
- A supply chain individual working online hours was removing a muskrat from a warehouse and was bitten by the animal. A fatigue assessment was performed and was determined that the individual did not exhibit impairment due to fatigue.
- A maintenance employee performing outage duties removing an upper end bell from lube oil cooler, the hook became disengaged and the end bell dropped injuring the workers hand. A fatigue assessment was performed and was determined that the individual did not exhibit impairment due to fatigue.
- A maintenance employee working online hours conducting a work package walk down injured himself when he touched a hot pipe. A fatigue assessment was performed and was determined that the individual did not exhibit impairment due to fatigue.
- A maintenance contractor performing pre-outage activities performing scaffolding activities experienced an industrial safety near miss. A fatigue assessment was performed and was determined that the individual did not exhibit impairment due to fatigue.
- A maintenance contractor, performing pre-outage activities performing scaffolding activities experienced an industrial safety near miss. A fatigue assessment was performed and was determined that the individual did not exhibit impairment due to fatigue.
- A maintenance contractor supervisor performing outage duties moving plant equipment was involved in an industrial safety near miss. A fatigue assessment was performed and was determined that the individual did not exhibit impairment due to fatigue.

ATTACHMENT 2

2010 FATIGUE ASSESSMENT DETAILS

The following are the details of fatigue assessment performed for "for cause" testing:

- A maintenance contract supervisor working online hours keeping logs was found sleeping by security. A fatigue assessment was performed and was determined that the individual exhibited impairment and was required to take at least a 10 hour break prior to returning to work.
- A security officer working online hours performing vehicle searches was involved in an industrial safety near safety miss. A fatigue assessment was performed and was determined that the individual did not exhibit impairment due to fatigue.

The following are the details of fatigue assessment performed for "post event follow-up":

- A security officer working online hours performing routing security activities fell and was injured. A fatigue assessment was performed and was determined that the individual did not exhibit impairment due to fatigue.
- A contract warehouse supervisor working online hours was involved in a minor vehicle accident. A fatigue assessment was performed and was determined that the individual did not exhibit impairment due to fatigue.
- A maintenance contractor working online hours was involved in a minor vehicle accident. A fatigue assessment was performed and was determined that the individual did not exhibit impairment due to fatigue.
- A maintenance contractor, working online hours, was involved in a minor vehicle accident. A fatigue assessment was performed and was determined that the individual did not exhibit impairment due to fatigue.
- A radiation protection worker working outage duties performing surveys cut his finger. A fatigue assessment was performed and was determined that the individual did not exhibit impairment due to fatigue.
- A maintenance contractor working outage hours performing electrical duties pulling wire when an unprotected end of wire came in contact with a bare terminal. A fatigue assessment was performed and was determined that the individual did not exhibit impairment due to fatigue.
- A site operator working online hours performing field duties injured his finger. A fatigue assessment was performed and was determined that the individual did not exhibit impairment due to fatigue.

Attachment 2

- A maintenance worker working online hours damaged equipment while unloading a truck. A fatigue assessment was performed and was determined that the individual did not exhibit impairment due to fatigue.
- A maintenance contractor working online hours driving a platform lift, hit and bent a switch. A fatigue assessment was performed and was determined that the individual did not exhibit impairment due to fatigue.
- A maintenance worker working line hours snow plowing bumped a step to a platform in the switchyard. A fatigue assessment was performed and was determined that the individual did not exhibit impairment due to fatigue.
- A maintenance worker working online hours cut his finger while working on a grinder. A fatigue assessment was performed and was determined that the individual did not exhibit impairment due to fatigue.

The following are the details of fatigue assessment performed for a self-declaration:

- A security officer working online hours training when he stated he was tired and did not sleep well. The individual appeared drowsy. A fatigue assessment was performed and determined the individual exhibited impairment and was required a break of at least 10 hours prior to returning to work.