

March 19, 1985

MEMORANDUM FOR: Hugh L. Thompson, Jr., Director  
Division of Licensing

THRU: Gus C. Lainas, Assistant Director  
for Operating Reactors

James R. Miller, Chief  
Operating Reactors Branch #3  
Division of Licensing

FROM: E. G. Tourigny, Project Manager  
Operating Reactors Branch #3  
Division of Licensing

SUBJECT: PM ADMINISTRATIVE DUTIES

As you know, we met with the Omaha Public Power District representatives on February 11, 1985 to discuss the status of Fort Calhoun. In that meeting, among other things, you asked me what can you do to make my job easier? In my reply, I stated that the project manager had many administrative duties which should be looked at with the aim of having someone else perform these duties so that the project manager can devote more time to writing plant specific safety evaluations and to ensure safe operation of the plant including plant visits to walk down systems and review new modifications. I personally believe that over the years, these administrative duties have been increasing and no relief is in sight. Each administrative duty may not take much time, but the summation of them all requires significant time. We may get to a point when the project manager's whole day will be consumed by filling out forms. As such, you asked that I write you a memorandum on this with specific recommendations. This memorandum fulfills that request.

Regarding Sholly notices, if we are to continue the current practice, there is no reason why the project manager, who is typically at the 14 or 15 grade level, must write the notice. I recommend that each branch be allocated one person to write the notices for that branch. The project manager would still be responsible for its contents. A second licensing assistant may be one way to go. When this workload is low, the second licensing assistant can help out the branch's principal licensing assistant. An assistant project manager may be another way to go. There can be one "floating" assistant project manager per branch and the person can do this and learn to be a project manager at the same time.

Regarding license amendments, many times the project manager must hand carry the amendment through the system. Sometimes, he or she has to wait for a person to get a signature. There is no reason why the project manager must be spending time walking around buildings to carry an amendment. A second licensing assistant may be the way to go, and the project manager can be called if a problem arises. An assistant project manager could be an alternative.

CONTACT:  
E.G. Tourigny  
X27110

8503260576 850319  
PDR ADOCK 05000285  
P PDR

Regarding filling out reports, there are just too many. I have to fill out ORLAS update reports, lead project manager update reports, quarterly review reports, backfit reports (real and potential), etc. Some must be done at the same time, e.g. end of the month. In addition, by the time that these reports become final, much of the information is no longer valid. One report that is frankly a waste of my time is the monthly update for the grey book (copy enclosed). I get the update once a month. I must check it against the plant's monthly report, correct it, if necessary, and then send it back. I realize that management needs this information but I question the need for project managers at our grade levels having to do it. Again, a second licensing assistant or an assistant project manager may be the answer.

Regarding surveys, these are continually going on. There is no reason why the project managers must do every one. A second licensing assistant or an assistant project manager can do most of them by going to the project managers and obtaining the information.

In summary, if one looks at all the administrative duties outlined above, and these are the ones that readily come to mind, they represent a large amount of time on the part of the project manager who is at a fairly high grade. With any job, there has to be a trade-off on what should be done administratively by the project managers versus what should be done technically by the project manager. The administrative duties have been increasing over the years and since more resources are not being devoted to handling the administrative duties, the project manager is spending less time in writing plant specific safety evaluations and following his or her plant. Following his or her plant includes frequent plant visits and walking down systems and reviewing modifications. I don't believe that both can be accomplished satisfactorily and, in my opinion, the administrative duties have been overtaking the work that we really should be doing.

Original signed by:

E. G. Tourigny, Project Manager  
Operating Reactors Branch #3  
Division of Licensing

DISTRIBUTION

DOCKET FILE

NRC PDR            GCLainas  
L PDR  
HThompson  
EGTourigny  
PMKreutzer  
DEisenhut

ORB#3:DL  
PKreutzer  
3/14/85

ORB#3:DL  
ETourigny:dd  
3/11/85

ORB#3:DL  
JRMiller  
3/15/85

AD:OR:DL  
GCLainas  
3/18/85

Docket: 50-285 OPERATING STATUS

Reporting Period: 12/01/84 Outage + On-line Hrs: 744.0

Utility Contact: T. P. MATTHEWS (402) 536-4733

Licensed Thermal Power (MWh): 1500

Nameplate Rating (Gross MWe): 591 X 0.85 = 502

Design Electrical Rating (Net MWe): 478

Maximum Dependable Capacity (Gross MWe): 501

Maximum Dependable Capacity (Net MWe): 478

If Changes Occur Above Since Last Report, Give Reasons:  
NONE

Power Level To Which Restricted, If Any (Net MWe):           

Reasons for Restrictions, If Any:             
NONE

	MONTH	YEAR	CUMULATIVE
Report Period Hrs	<u>744.0</u>	<u>8,784.0</u>	<u>98,785.0</u>
Hours Reactor Critical	<u>715.7</u>	<u>5,386.3</u>	<u>76,000.2</u>
Rx Reserve Shtdwn Hrs	<u>.0</u>	<u>.0</u>	<u>1,309.5</u>
Hrs Generator On-Line	<u>701.5</u>	<u>5,264.9</u>	<u>74,617.5</u>
Unit Reserve Shtdwn Hrs	<u>.0</u>	<u>.0</u>	<u>.0</u>
Gross Therm Ener (MWH)	<u>944,281</u>	<u>7,427,054</u>	<u>94,186,768</u>
Gross Elec Ener (MWH)	<u>317,164</u>	<u>2,452,056</u>	<u>31,081,480</u>
Net Elec Ener (MWH)	<u>301,110</u>	<u>2,331,771</u>	<u>29,411,631</u>
Unit Service Factor	<u>94.3</u>	<u>59.9</u>	<u>75.5</u>
Unit Avail Factor	<u>94.3</u>	<u>59.9</u>	<u>75.5</u>
Unit Cap Factor (MDC Net)	<u>84.7</u>	<u>57.9</u>	<u>64.8*</u>
Unit Cap Factor (DER Net)	<u>84.7</u>	<u>55.5</u>	<u>62.3</u>
Unit Forced Outage Rate	<u>5.7</u>	<u>6.3</u>	<u>3.8</u>
Forced Outage Hours	<u>42.5</u>	<u>351.9</u>	<u>1,750.3</u>

Shutdowns Sched Over Next 6 Months (Type, Date, Duration):  
NONE

If Currently Shutdown Estimated Startup Date: N/A

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* FORT CALHOUN 1 \*  
\*\*\*\*\*

AVERAGE DAILY POWER LEVEL (MWe) PLOT

*December Report*  
*Rec'd 2/20 for Updating*

*Encl*

\* Item calculated with a Weighted Average

Report Period DEC 1984

UNIT SHUTDOWNS / REDUCTIONS

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* FORT CALHOUN 1 \*  
\*\*\*\*\*

No.	Date	Type	Hours	Reason	Method	LER Number	System	Component	Cause & Corrective Action to Prevent Recurrence
84-04	11/18/84	F	42.5	A	4		CB	VALVEX	UNIT WAS TAKEN OFF-LINE 1852 ON NOVEMBER 18, 1984 TO REPAIR A LEAKING PRESSURIZER SPRAY VALVE. WHILE DOWN FOR REPAIR, OTHER ROUTINE MAINTENANCE WAS PERFORMED. UNIT RETURNED TO SERVICE DECEMBER 2, 1984.

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* SUMMARY \*  
\*\*\*\*\*  
FORT CALHOUN 1 RETURNED ONLINE DECEMBER 2ND FROM AN EQUIPMENT REPAIR OUTAGE AND OPERATED ROUTINELY THE REMAINDER OF THE MONTH.

Type	Reason	Method	System & Component
F-Forced	A-Equip Failure	1-Manual	Exhibit F & H
S-Sched	B-Maint or Test	2-Manual Scram	Instructions for
	C-Refueling	3-Auto Scram	Preparation of
	D-Regulatory Restriction	4-Continued	Data Entry Sheet
	E-Operator Training	5-Reduced Load	Licensee Event Report
	& License Examination	9-Other	(LER) File (NUREG-0161)

REVIEWED BY MPA:

*APR*

MPA REVIEW DATE:

02/19/85

REVIEWED BY NRR:

NRR REVIEW DATE: