

December 1, 1981

Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555

Dear Chairman:

The City Council and the City of San Clemente have been wrestling with the problem of public notification in relationship to the San Onofre Nuclear Power Plant for approximately eighteen months now. Throughout our discussions of the alerting and warning system, we have been advised by the power company that the only means of warning and alerting that is found acceptable by the NRC in compliance with NUREG 0654 is a siren system.

Early in our discussions with the utility company, it was recommended to that company that instead of a siren being utilized as a primary mechanism, that it might be possible to use the federal government's NOAA system. At that time, the Edison Company advised us that the NRC would not authorize such utilization. A letter was directed to the power company and an answer sent back to our office indicating that this was Nuclear Regulatory Commission policy.

Currently, we have almost three dozen sirens installed in our community. However, we are facing a massive increase in population over the next ten years and have been giving serious consideration once again to the concept of using NOAA type radio alerting systems. One of our City Councilman asked the utility company to once again respond to the concept and we received a report from a consulting firm, Wiley Labs, that in essence, restates the position that this type of situation is still unacceptable.

However, at the Councilman's request, I contacted the NOAA office in Washington, D.C. and the office in Salt Lake City, Utah, and determined that the NOAA system is currently being approved and utilized around five other nuclear power plants in the United States. The information that was given to me by that office indicates that one of the systems will be operational around the 20th of next month.

Nuclear Regulatory Commission December 1, 1981 The purpose for this correspondence is to ask the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to give the City of San Clemente a direct answer as to whether or not the use of a NOAA system is prohibited for application as an alerting and warning system in the vicinity of a nuclear power plant. Secondly, we would like an official interpretation of who has the right to establish what type of wanning system is utilized for off site consequences in a local community: Is this the responsibility of the utility? Is it the responsibility of local government? Or is it the responsibility of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to varify and validate that the warning system is both practical and in concert with the needs of the community. The issue of the use of this radio system is currently a top priority with our City Council. It would be greatly appreciated if the NRC would provide us with a written answer to the above stated questions in as short a time period as possible. I am looking forward to your immediate consideration of this request. Sincerely, R. J. Coleman Director of Fire Protection RJC:ec

(12-	-	RM 56			_				АСТ	'ION	- T I I	ΈN	1 C	ראכ	RO	L FC	ט DRM		CLEA	AR RE	GULA	TOR'	YCOM	MISS	ION
A.	INIT	IATII	VG O	FFIC	E																				
01	ASSIGNED TRACKING NUMBER 01. SENDING 02. SEQUENCE NUMBER								03. 04. A/I				05. DATE OF REPORT				06. DATE OF TRANSACTION								
		ICE		- JEGOENGE NOMBER										MONTH			DAY YEAR		MONTH		D	DAY		YEAR	
田			0	C	2	5	7	5		<u> </u>)[1	2	0		8							
	07. FACILITY 08. REQUIREMENT OF COMPLETION										ETI	ON	N DATE 09. REQUESTER												
-	MONTH DAY YEAR																								
]]	7	13	Q۵	311	K			D	J۷	0	un	a			
10. DESCRIPTION																									
E	D	0	-		1	2		6	_	$\perp \mathcal{P}$			<u>C</u>	0		E	M	NA	1) -	$\cdot \mid \widehat{R}$) e		υ	S
و_		0	7		N	0	A	A		W	C	\	<u> </u>	n	i		1 9		7	. 0		•	2	<u> </u>	7
0	1	0	F	E	e	li	1	5	+	Q	(4	d		c	15	7	5	5 (e	_ 1	\ -	- W	4
۵		9	e	+	e	(3	,	2	و	5		•	h) L	\sqrt{i}	ح	1			3/2	1 2			
В. А	CTI	ON O	FFIC	Ε																			-		-
				01.F	RECEI	VING	OFFI	CE						-01	FO2	FO3	FO4	FO5	H06	H07	но8	н09	H10	H11	H12
G	GCinus (Check appropriate office code)																				X]			
																ESTABLISHED COMPLETION DATE					E				
	02. PERSON ASSIGN							INED	NED						03. V	ОМТН	DAY		YEAR]		04. CHANGE NUMBER	
										<u> </u>															
									4	TRAI	VSF	ERI	NFO	RMA	TION	一							ı	·····	
	05. TRANSFER ACTION 06									06. TRANSFER CODE					07. TRANSFER DATE										
	-	Γ	-г-	1 T T		1			- 			<u> </u>		955	Ub.	HAI	TANSFER (CODE		MONTH		DAY		٩R
CLOSEOUT INFORMATION																									
	08. CLOSEOUT ACTION										09. MAN- 10. CLOSE 11. CLOSEOUT DAT														

February 12, 1982

Docket No. 50-361/362

The Honorable Toby Moffett, Chairman Subcommittee on Environment, Energy

& Natural Resources

Committee on Government Operations

U.S. House of Representatives

Washington, D.C. 20515 Subject: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY, ET AL

SAN ONOFRE NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, UNITS 2 AND 3

The following documents concerning our review of the subject facility are transmitted for your information: Notice of Receipt of Application. Draft/Final Environmental Statement, dated _____ Safety Evaluation, or Supplement No. 4 dated January 1982 Notice of Hearing on Application for Construction Permit. Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Facility Operating License. Application and Safety Analysis Report, Vol. ___ Amendment No. _____to Application/SAR, dated _____ Construction Permit No. CPPR-_____,dated______. Facility Operating License No. DPR-_____, NPF-____, dated_____. Amendment No. _____ to CPPR-____ or DRR-____,dated ______.

Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosures: As stated

Representative Joel Deckard

bcc: OCA. OFFICE -SURNAME -

February 12, 1982

Docket No. 50-361/362

The Honorable Alan Simpson, Chairman Subcommittee on Nuclear Regulation Committee on Environment & Public Works United States Senate Washington, D.C. 20510

Subject: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY, ET AL

SAN ONOFRE NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, UNITS 2 & 3

Enclosures: As stated

cc: Senator Gary Hart

bcc: OCA

OFFICE - DL:1B#3

SURNAME - 2/12/82

February 12, 1982

Docket No. 50-361/362

The Honorable Richard Ottinger, Chairman Subcommittee on Energy Conservation & Power Committee on Energy and Commerce United States House of Representatives Washington, D.C. 20515

Subject: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY, ET AL

SAN ONOFRE NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, UNITS 2 & 3

As stated

cc: Representative Carlos Moorhead

bcc	: OCA	 		
OFFICE -	(DI): IB#3			
OT TOE				
SURNAME -	-JLèè	 	 	
DATE -	2/12/82	 <u> </u>	 	

February 12, 1982

Docket No. 50-361/362

The Honorable Morris Udall, Chairman Subcommittee on Energy and the Environment Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs United States House of Representatives Washington, D.C. 20515

Subject: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY, ET AL

SAN ONOFRE NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION. UNITS 2 & 3

The following documents concerning our review of the subject facility are transmitted for your information: Notice of Receipt of Application. Draft/Final Environmental Statement, dated _____ X Safety Evaluation, or Supplement No. 4 dated January 1982 Notice of Hearing on Application for Construction Permit. Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Facility Operating License. Application and Safety Analysis Report, Vol. ______. Amendment No. _____to Application/SAR, dated _____. Construction Permit No. CPPR-_____,dated______ Facility Operating License No. DPR-_____, NPF-_____, dated______ Amendment No. _____ to CPPR-____ or DRR-___,dated _____

Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosures: As stated

Representative Manuel Lujan

bcc: OCA DI): IB#3 OFFICE -