

From: [Dricks, Victor](#)
To: [Tannenbaum, Anita](#)
Subject: FW: SONGS loose parts monitor
Date: Monday, January 12, 2015 3:01:54 PM

Please enter my response to Tom Gurdziel into ADAMS

Victor Dricks
Senior Public Affairs Officer
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission / Region IV
1600 E. Lamar Blvd.
Arlington, Texas 76011
(817) 200-1128 (Office)
(817) 983-1992 (Cell)

From: Dricks, Victor
Sent: Monday, January 12, 2015 3:01 PM
To: Tom Gurdziel (tgurdziel@twcny.rr.com)
Subject: SONGS loose parts monitor

Dear Mr. Gurdziel: Thank you for your e-mail of Dec. 28, 2014, to Chairman Allison Macfarlane, regarding the loose part monitor at the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, on whose behalf I am responding.

The vibration and loose part monitoring system is designed for early detection of loose metallic parts in the primary system. Early detection can provide the time required to avoid or mitigate damage to, or malfunction of, primary system components. Due to the sensitivity of the monitors, spurious alarms occur on occasion. Operators are required to investigate the cause of these alarms to determine if there is an actual loose part in the steam generator.

The NRC resident inspectors were aware of the vibration and loose parts alarms during the operating cycle preceding the steam generator tube leak in January 2012, and identified this issue for follow-up to the [AIT](#) inspection. A follow-up inspection of the unresolved issues identified by the AIT was conducted from August 20 to September 28, 2012. That [inspection](#) determined that the licensee properly responded to and evaluated the loose part monitor alarms according to vendor recommendations.

The licensee also requested from Westinghouse an in-depth evaluation of the acoustical data. The results of that analysis were inconclusive because of limitations with the monitoring system. Specifically, because of sensor locations (lower portion of the steam generator below the tube sheet in the support structure) and sensitivity, it was not possible to determine the exact source of the Unit 3 alarms. Westinghouse engineering personnel performed an evaluation of acoustical data and determined from the shape and intensity of the particular responses that the acoustic source was not likely from the upper bundle of the replacement steam generator or related to the tube-to-tube wear.

Victor Dricks
Senior Public Affairs Officer

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission / Region IV
1600 E. Lamar Blvd.
Arlington, Texas 76011
(817) 200-1128 (Office)
(817) 983-1992 (Cell)

Good morning,

Tom Gurdziel <tgurdziel@twcny.rr.com>

Sunday, December 28, 2014 7:29 PM

CHAIRMAN Resource

Dricks, Victor; Screnci, Diane; Mitlyng, Viktoria; Michael Mulligan; Bridget Frymire
PWR Loose Parts Monitor: A Repeating Nuisance Alarm?

As I was throwing away my no longer useful, handwritten comments on the SONGS replacement steam generators, I noticed a problem that I do not believe has been addressed by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. According to my notes, the SONGS AIT report, (ML12188A748), describes about 30 "valid" vibration and loose parts alarms at San Onofre. My recollection is that these alarms were described as valid although no cause had been identified for any alarm.

Does it make sense to keep in service, inaccurate PWR monitoring equipment?

Thank you,
Tom Gurdziel

On page 22 of the referenced report, you will find that all the alarms apparently occurred between February 18, 2011 and January 31, 2012. (This would not be even one complete year.) Is there any NRC group responsible for seeing that PWR nuisance alarms get addressed? Is there any recommended response time?