

OCT 5 1976

DISTRIBUTION  
Docket Files  
NRC PDRs  
LOCAL PDRs  
ORB#1 Reading  
VStello  
TJCarter  
ASchwencer  
SMSheppard  
DNeighbors  
OELD  
DJaffe  
OI&E (3)  
DEisenhut  
TBAbetnathy  
JRBuchanan  
ACRS (16)

Dockets Nos. 50-263  
~~50-270~~  
and 50-287

Duke Power Company  
ATTN: Mr. William O. Parker, Jr.  
Vice President  
Steam Production  
Post Office Box 2178  
422 South Church Street  
Charlotte, North Carolina 28242

Gentlemen:

RE: OCONEE STATION, UNITS 1, 2 & 3

The NRC considers Loose-Parts Monitoring Systems (LPMS) to be valuable and proven tools for detecting foreign, misplaced, or loose objects in reactor coolant systems. To assist us in preparing Regulatory Guides regarding installation and operation of LPMS, we would appreciate the benefit of your experience with LPMS. The information you provide will directly contribute to the accuracy and usefulness of these Regulatory Guides.

Accordingly, it would be appreciated if you could provide us written responses to the enclosed questions in the near future, and if at all possible, prior to November 1, 1976.

This request for generic information was approved by GAO under a blanket clearance number B-180225 (R0072); this clearance expires July 31, 1977.

Sincerely,

Original signed by

A. Schwencer, Chief  
Operating Reactors Branch #1  
Division of Operating Reactors

Enclosure:  
Request for Information

cc w/encl:

	See next page				
OFFICE >		DOR:ORB#1	DOR:ORB#3	DOR:ORB#1	
SURNAME >		DNeighbors:lb	DJaffe	ASchwencer	
DATE >		10/05/76	10/ /76	10/ /76	

Duke Power Company

- 2 - October 5, 1976

cc: Mr. William L. Porter  
Duke Power Company  
P. O. Box 2178  
422 South Church Street  
Charlotte, North Carolina 28242

Mr. Troy B. Conner  
Conner & Knotts  
1747 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20006

Oconee Public Library  
201 South Spring Street  
Walhalla, South Carolina 29691

REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION ON  
OPERATING EXPERIENCE WITH LOOSE-PARTS  
AND LOOSE-PARTS MONITORING SYSTEMS (LPMS)

1. Please briefly describe any events in which a loose-part was found in your primary loop. Discuss, for each such event, the procedures used to discover the loose-part, its safety consequences and the measures taken to remove it. Assess the usefulness of a LPMS for each of the occurrences described above.
2. Please describe briefly: your LPMS and its operation, the length of time it has been in operation, and the extent of monitoring (e.g., continuously, automatic actuation, etc.).
3. Please describe the operating experience to date including any false alarms or spurious signals. If either have occurred, please describe each event. Similarly, has any event occurred that should have, but did not, cause a noise indication? If so, please describe each event.
4. Discuss the cost/benefit considerations of your LPMS, and your degree of confidence in such systems.