


GUARD



May 4, 1981



DOCKET NUMBER 50-361,362  
PROD. & UTIL. FAC.

DOCKET NUMBER PR-2 (701)  
PROPOSED RULE (46 FR 17216)

United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Docketing and Service Branch, Rule Change Proceedings  
Washington D.C. 20555 Docket 50-361,362

Dear Commissioners:

The enclosed petitions bear 1920<sup>+</sup> signatures of citizens of the San Onofre hazard zone in southern California. They were obtained in the 13 days since April 21, Earthday, initiation of our Safeguards Petition Campaign. 1569 of these are resident of the high-hazard 20 mile zone, the recommended evacuation zone of the California State Office of Emergency Services. Additional signatures will be sent to you in the next few days.

We ask that you docket this cover letter and a sample petition, 50-361,362, rather than incurring the tremendous expense of duplication and mailing of this large packet of almost 200 petitions.

We are seriously concerned that all existing procedural safeguards, established by our government to protect us, be retained. We urge you to preserve the appeals process of the licensing safety hearings. Edison has presented to you its case for licensing. The other side of the case is the arguments on issues on which intervenors contend Edison cannot meet the government requirements. The crucial San Onofre issues are seismic hazard and evacuation infeasibility.

In defending the proposal to change App. B, Part 2, Edison in effect takes the position that it has presented its case and would now like to prohibit its opponents from presenting theirs until after Edison receives the fruits of victory, interim licensing.

Evacuation planning is only in the beginning stages here re NUREG 0654, of 1980, criteria, and there are strong doubts that timely evacuation is possible. GUARD contends that applicants have not complied with 10 CRF 50, App.E,III, cannot "demonstrate that the plans provide reasonable assurance that appropriate measures can and will be taken in the event of an emergency, to protect public health and safety and prevent damage to property."

Michael L. Glaser, Chairman, Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, on May 14, on May 14, 1973, in construction stage hearings of San Onofre Units 2 and 3, judged, "it would be premature at this stage to discuss evacuation plans, TR pg.1870. Although Unit 1 of San Onofre had been in operation for five years, and evacuation plans seemed timely topic to those at risk, we had to accept the license stage of hearings as the time duly set for that discussion. We submit that to deny us, now, our day in court on this vital issue, would be unprincipled action to subvert the democratic processes.

Sincerely, for GUARD


*Leslie and Michael Davis*

Leslie and Michael Davis, GUARD Community Action Coordinators

NOTE from Docketing and Service Branch:

This letter transmitted 105 pages containing approximately 1,920 signatures. Only one of these pages is being served. The entire submittal

is in the Public Document Room and the Local Public Document Room.



DEDICATED TO POSSIBLE FUTURE GENERATIONS AND TO THE PRESERVATION OF THEIR NATURAL AND CULTURAL HERITAGE...

3908 CALLE ARIANA, SAN CLEMENTE, CALIFORNIA 92672 / TELEPHONE: (714) 492-5078

105220389

H


# GUARD



DOCKET NUMBER  
PROD. & UTIL. FAC. 50-364, 362

DOCKET NUMBER  
PROPOSED RULE PR-2 (701)  
(46 FR 17216)

CITIZENS ASK FOR PROTECTION



DEDICATED TO POSSIBLE FUTURE GENERATIONS AND TO THE PRESERVATION OF THEIR NATURAL AND CULTURAL HERITAGE.

3908 CALLE ARIANA, SAN CLEMENTE, CALIFORNIA 92672 / TELEPHONE: (714) 492-5078

WHEREAS the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is proposing to issue low power interim licenses to nuclear power plants before government required safety procedures have been completed, and

WHEREAS the Federal Government requires applicants for licensing to show "reasonable assurance" of protection for the citizens' lives and property, as a condition of licensing, which includes safe evacuation, and

WHEREAS evacuation planning in the high-hazard areas near San Onofre is only in the beginning stages, not even a first draft of school district plan completed, and

WHEREAS already some planners express strong concerns that they cannot evacuate the near populations in the times specified by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's new criteria resulting from the Three Mile Island nuclear accident, and

WHEREAS interim low-power operation of the reactor would contaminate the plant and equipment, thus adding unnecessary billions of dollars of costs, in the event licensing is ultimately denied,

Therefore, We the citizens of the San Onofre hazard zone request our local state and federal governing bodies to take action in opposition to interim licensing of San Onofre Unit II, to assure that the established safety requirements are met before any license is issued.

- | NAME                      | ADDRESS                               |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| ✓ 1. Karen E. Fuller      | 34372 Via San Juan C.B. 92624         |
| ✓ 2. Michael C. Fuller    | 34372 VIA SAN JUAN, CAPO BEACH. 92624 |
| ✓ 3. Burt & Doris E. Egan | 378 GALE RANCHO, S.C. 92672           |
| ✓ 4. Theresa W. Egan      | 378 GALE RANCHO SC. 92672             |
| ✓ 5. Lisa Uhl             | 212 Calle Cortez SC. 92672            |
| ✓ 6. James Uhl            | 212 Calle Cortez S.C. 92672           |
| ✓ 7. Lou Masquiba         | 34376 B Via San Juan C.A. 92624       |
| ✓ 8. Lou Masquiba         |                                       |
| ✓ 9. Margarita Teran      | 34361 Via San Juan C.B. 92624         |
| ✓ 10. Audrey C. Downing   | 26527 VIA SACRAMENTO, C.B. 92624      |
| ✓ 11. Dale S. Downing     | "                                     |