

**OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
CORRESPONDENCE CONTROL TICKET**

Date Printed: Feb 19, 2013 15:21

PAPER NUMBER: LTR-13-0151

LOGGING DATE: 02/19/2013

ACTION OFFICE: OCAA

AUTHOR: Martha Sullivan

AFFILIATION: CA

ADDRESSEE: Chairman Resource, et al.

SUBJECT: Provides follow up questions from the NRC public meeting held on February 12, 2013 in Capistrano Beach, California, concerning the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station

ACTION: Appropriate

DISTRIBUTION: RF, SECY has Ack.

LETTER DATE: 02/15/2013

ACKNOWLEDGED Yes

SPECIAL HANDLING: Lead office to publicly release 24 hours after SECY's assignment, via SECY/OCAA/DPC.

NOTES:

FILE LOCATION: ADAMS

DATE DUE:

DATE SIGNED:

Joosten, Sandy

From: Martha Sullivan [marthasullivan@mac.com]
Sent: Friday, February 15, 2013 3:59 PM
To: Howell, Art; CHAIRMAN Resource; Collins, Elmo; Lantz, Ryan; Woollen, Mary; Dricks, Victor
Cc: Jif & John Massey; SCG-Team Team; Tom English; Ace Hoffman; Kendra Ulrich; David Weisman; Donna Gilmore; Michael Aguirre; Lila Garrett; Harvey Wasserman; Cecile Pineda; myla reson
Subject: Re: Follow-up Questions for Art Howell (San Onofre)

I'd like to append another question for Mr. Howell and his colleagues at the NRC, following up from Tuesday night. Pete Dietrich of SCE stated that the public has the opportunity to request a hearing in the NRC's normal process; I would like to know:

How many Requests for Hearings by parties other than the operator and NRC have been granted by the NRC?
I'll narrow it down a bit for you -- how many in the last 5 years?

Martha Sullivan
Coalition to Decommission San Onofre
San Diego CA
858/945-6273

On Feb 14, 2013, at 2:13 PM, myla reson wrote:

To:
Art Howell
SONGS Special Project Manager
Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Dear Mr. Howell,

This past Tuesday evening during the NRC public meeting in Capistrano Beach, San Clemente resident Jennifer Massey asked the NRC panel a question about safety within the context of beyond design basis events including earthquakes of greater magnitude than those which the plant is currently engineered to withstand and the potential for a tsunami of 45 to 65 feet in height to engulf the facility.

To the question "Can you honestly say this plant which sits on three earthquake faults can be operated safely?", you replied: "[The San Onofre nuclear power plant] won't be operated unless it can be operated safely, and it's our job to make that judgement."

So I have to ask:

- 1) What is your definition of "safe"?
- 2) When you make your determination about whether or not the San Onofre nuclear power plant can be operated safely, will the impacts of beyond design basis events like super quakes and tsunamis be factored in?
- 3) Has there been or will there be a seismic evaluation of the damaged replacement steam generators prior to making a determination about the safety of Edison's restart plan?

Please keep in mind that **Nelson Mar, PhD** (former Senior Engineer for the original design of San Onofre Units 2 & 3), said **San Onofre is not designed for current earthquake or tsunami risks**. See 3/27/12 Irvine City Council meeting video.

I look forward to your reply.

Sincerely,

Myla Reson

San Onofre Nuke Plant - What Could Possibly Go Wrong?

--

Myla Reson

Follow me on Twitter

What Part of Fukushima Do You NOT Understand?

~~~~~  
"A common denominator, in every single nuclear accident -- a nuclear plant or on a nuclear submarine -- is that before the specialists even know what has happened, they rush to the media saying, 'There's no danger to the public.' They do this before they themselves know what has happened because they are terrified that the public might react violently, either by panic or by revolt." ~ Jacque Cousteau, 1989