

RULES AND DIRECTIVES
BRANCH
USNRC

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

2013 MAY 14 PM 3:16

As of: May 14, 2013
Received: May 09, 2013
Status: Pending_Post
Tracking No. 1jx-8584-gfxy
Comments Due: May 16, 2013
Submission Type: Web

Docket: NRC-2013-0070

Application and Amendment to Facility Operating License Involving Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination

Comment On: NRC-2013-0070-0001

Application and Amendment to Facility Operating License Involving Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination; San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 2

Document: NRC-2013-0070-DRAFT-0033

Comment on FR Doc # 2013-08888

RECEIVED

Submitter Information

Name: Leah Cole

Address:

P.O. Box 8126

Rancho Santa Fe, CA, 92067

Submitter's Representative: Diegueno Country School

Organization: Diegueno Country School

4/16/2013

48 FR 22576

117

General Comment

I am writing regarding our concerns about your staff's shocking preliminary finding of "No Significant Hazard" for SoCal Edison's proposal to restart a defective nuclear reactor at San Onofre. We vehemently support an adjudicated License Amendment Hearing process prior to any restart of these admittedly defective nuclear reactors. As well, we would like to express our grave concern over the just-released report of the CA Independent System Operator (Cal-ISO) that "...the summer assessment notes the reliability risks to southern Orange and San Diego counties are 'marginally more challenging' this summer, but still within planning standards".

My husband and I own a private elementary school with a population of 150 students and 25 teachers in Rancho Santa Fe, where we have been in operation for forty years. We are outraged at the possibility of any reactor at the San Onofre plant reopening, in view of the fact that it has been proven that it would unsafe to reopen even at 70% capacity with the tubes eroding as they have. We are in strong agreement with those who claim that the reopening of any portion of this plant would be a careless "science experiment," which has not taken into consideration the potential loss of lives in this land of earthquakes. Afterall, the plant sits next to two faults, one with the probability of an 8.0 earthquake when it is designed to sustain a 7.0.

Without question, there should be a license review.

The safe operation of the plant has already been compromised. Safety modifications were rejected, and we have already witnessed the shortcuts that resulted in damage to hundreds of steam generator tubes that carry radioactive water. Do we really want to risk becoming the next Fukushima? Please, we implore those who are reviewing the reopening of the plant to look through the eyes of integrity rather than financial consideration.

SONSI Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = B. Benney (b5b)