

72-26
72-41

From: <Pdbsongs1@cs.com>
To: <bwh@nrc.gov>
Date: 2/13/02 5:01PM
Subject: Dry Cask Storage at SONGS Unit 1 - Public Comment Period 02-12-02 to 04-29-02

Mr. Breck Henderson
NRC - Region 4 - Public Advisor

Today I asked why there will be no public meetings, or public hearings on NRC's proposed Dry Cask Storage Facility for SONGS Unit 1? (however a public comment period extends from 02-12-02 to 04-29-02).

You explained that SONGS Unit 1's Dry Cask Storage will operate under a General License (unlike a site specific license as at Diablo Canyon in San Luis Obispo). Under General License rules, those rules don't call for any public hearing, and the history of dry cask storage systems in US have enough technical merit, that there is no need to re-review approved cask designs, and the rules cannot be changed.

When I asked why Diablo Canyon has "site specific license", and SONGS has General License, you explained that Licensee at Diablo Canyon processed permits for site specific license. At SONGS, Licensee (SCE) processed permits for a General License, and that License decision cannot be undone, or reviewed again, or changed. I explained I felt that is unfair, because SCE's decision to seek a General License was done without public review/comments or public hearings, and public never had a chance to involved in decisionmaking, on the type of license sought.

I still think it's very unfair and inappropriate, and given all the technical debate and opinions by experts in the scientific community about the uncertainty of safety of dry cask storage systems and designs, I think it should be reevaluated very carefully. The public in highly populated communities where dry cask storage facilities may potentially become "permanent" have a huge stake in this problematic issue, and should be given every right to actively participate in decisionmaking. It's not only our own futures we're talking about its the future of many many generations, for thousands of years.

I think NRC should at the very least, as a start, convene some public info meetings in Orange County and San Diego County, to inform the public, and explain what the scope of cask design involves, and the scope of comments which NRC would accept from public during this comment period which ends 04-29-02.

Your email response would be appreciated.
Thank you in advance.

Patricia Borchmann

NMSSOI Public

From: <Pdbsongs1@cs.com>
To: <beckers@thegrid.net>
Date: 2/13/02 6:27PM
Subject: Fwd: NRC proceedings for SONGS

Rochelle,

I contacted Tim Kobetz earlier today (he was my Petition Manager on 2.206 Petition). He gave me phone number for Breck Henderson, and confirmed Henderson is who to ask at NRC about public comments/meetings on the Dry Cask Storage proposal at SONGS Unit 1 on cask design. He said there would be no required hearings, as far as he knows. FYI.

Who told you/and when that Tim Kobetz is the NRC contact?
(I don't think Kobetz knew that when we spoke).

Patricia

CC: <redfield@home.com>, <psrsm@psr.org>

From: Timothy Kobetz
To: Pdbsongs1@cs.com
Date: 2/19/02 1:31PM
Subject: Seismic info

Ms. Borchmann,

I forwarded your e-mail to Mr. Donohew. As I previously e-mailed you on January 30, 2002, the following are the five ADAMS accession numbers correspond to documents that you have requested. These documents were submitted by Southern California Edison regarding seismic evaluations for SONGS:

ML020100246
ML020100320
ML020100326
ML020100332
ML020100346

Obtaining the documents through ADAMS (available through www.nrc.gov) is the quickest and most efficient method for you to obtain them. Please contact the NRC Public Document Room (through www.nrc.gov) or by calling if you have trouble accessing the documents or need further assistance.

I will continue to pursue this issue with Mr. Donohew.

Tim