

REGULATORY INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (RIDS)

ACCESSION NBR: 8102120284 DOC. DATE: 81/02/06 NOTARIZED: NO DOCKET #
 FACIL: 50-206 San Onofre Nuclear Station, Unit 1, Southern California 05000206
 50-361 San Onofre Nuclear Station, Unit 2, Southern California 05000361
 50-362 San Onofre Nuclear Station, Unit 3, Southern California 05000362

AUTH. NAME: ARUNDEL, F.H. AUTHOR AFFILIATION: Affiliation Unknown
 RECIP. NAME: Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, Director

SUBJECT: Comments on environ impact rept re installation & licensing of facilities. Hazards & potential environ impact resulting from hypothesized enemy attack not addressed in NRC rept. Response invited.

DISTRIBUTION CODE: C002S COPIES RECEIVED: LTR 1 ENCL 1 SIZE: 3
 TITLE: Environ. Comments.

NOTES: 1 cy each: SEP Section Leader & J Hanchett (Region V) 05000206
 Send all FSAR & ER amends to L Chandler. 05000361
 1 cy: J Hanchett (Region V). D Scaletti, 1 cy of all envir info
 Send all FSAR & ER amends to L Chandler. 05000362
 1 cy: J Hanchett (Region V). D Scaletti, 1 cy of all envir info

	RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME	COPIES		RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME	COPIES	
		LTTR	ENCL		LTTR	ENCL
ACTION:	CRUTCHFIELD 17	7	7	MIRAGLIA, F. 17	7	7
	NONICKI, S. 05	1	1	ROOD, H. 05	1	1
INTERNAL:	ACCIDENT EVAL BR	1	1	EF TREAT SYS BR	1	1
	ENV ENG BR 09	1	1	HYD/GEO BR	1	1
	HYDRO-GEO BR	1	1	I&E 07	2	2
	NRC PDR 02	1	1	DELD	1	0
	RAD ASSESSMT BR	1	1	REG FILE 01	1	1
	SIT ANAL BR 10	1	1	UTIL FINANCE BR	1	1
EXTERNAL:	ACRS	1	0	LPDR 03	1	1
	NATL LAB 20	5	5	NSIC 04	1	1

FEB 18 1981

1A

ENV 3

TOTAL NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED: LTR 40 ENCL 30

Oceanside, California
February 6, 1981

Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20535

Gentlemen:

I wish to comment on the environmental impact report your organization supplied on the installation and licensing of the nuclear installations at San Onofre which are practically in our back yards:

1. - From what I read in the Oceanside Blade-Tribune no mention was made re. the extreme hazards and the potential of submarines from an enemy action shelling these huge nuclear concrete domes, shattering them thereby releasing that deadly nuclear radiation which could wipe out this entire area. We think this is a tremendous oversight and needs to be studied along with earthquake consideration.
- 1a. - A remedy in the area of earthquakes and war-time action would be to pipe some of that 100 trillion cubic feet of natural gas that CBS's '60 Minutes' said exists under the U.S. continent. (President Reagan's own people admit to this). And fire the San Onofre steam boilers with this gas and eliminate all of the dangers on which you debate. I pray to God that you consider this alternative and act upon it. People's lives and health are more important than corporate profit.
2. - We believe that due to the fact that SD G&E will control only 20% of the nuclear output and Southern California Edison will control 80% and by grid move all of this 80% of this generated power to areas that are not threatened by radiation that there should be (if these plants are activated) from 60% to 30% rate discounts for people who live close to this operation. This proposal is now before the Calif. Public Utilities Commission. If you license these plants we would appreciate your recommendation to the PUC. France and Japan presently are allowing this type of discount due to the hazards of nuclear energy. So the proposal does have precedent.

8102110 284

H

February 6, 1981

- 3.- To be complete and legally valid, we believe that all elements relating to the subject need to be included in the EIR. Apparently the subject of potential enemy action on these nuclear plants was not included and it needs to be discussed.

In closing, may I request an answer to the positions expressed in this letter. I will be extremely grateful. I remain

Very sincerely

Frank H. Gurdell
1888 Blackhawk St
Oceanside, Calif 92054

C-4 TIMES-ADVOCATE, ESCONDIDO, CA., SUNDAY, JAN. 25, 1981

Nuclear neighbor asks for discount

By DICK PHILLIPS
T-A Staff Writer

OCEANSIDE — An Oceanside man is working to achieve a considerable reduction in utility rates for those living near the San Onofre nuclear power plant.

Frank Arundel, 1888 Blackhawk St., proposed the compensation for those residents he thinks live in a danger zone — near San Onofre. He thinks they should get a 60 percent discount in electrical rates.

Residents within 30 miles should receive 50 percent rate reduction, he says, and those within a 30- to 40-mile radius a 40 percent rate reduction; people living in a 40- to 50-mile radius should have their rates cut by 30 percent.

"People here are being gouged to death by utility rates," said Arundel, 73. "With this plan, the next time they build a nuclear plant, they'll put it out of the umbrella of people where it wouldn't be troublesome in case of earthquake or war. They wouldn't put these plants at our backdoor.

"If we have to live here and bear the brunt of nuclear power, we should be beneficiaries of cheap electricity, particularly if 80 percent of the energy produced there will be transmitted outside this area anyway."

Arundel's plan did not impress the Public Utilities Commission, which has indicated there is little chance of seeing the policy implemented statewide.

The "chances of this plan flying are slim" because it would be discriminatory ratemaking, one PUC spokesman said.

San Onofre, 10 miles north of Oceanside, has one operating nuclear plant, which was shut down for repairs through most of 1980. Units 2 and 3 are nearing completion, at a cost of \$2.3 to \$5 billion. Both are designed to produce 1,100 megawatts of electricity.

Southern California Edison, based in Los Angeles, holds 80 percent interest in the nuclear plant and SDG&E has 20 percent. The SDG&E service area consumes about 2,300 megawatts of electricity.

Martin Mattes, legal adviser to John Bryson, PUC chairman, said copies of Arundel's proposal have been given to the commissioners for study. "But, I don't know of any action planned on the subject," Mattes said.

He said the commission reaches decisions in three ways. Under one, a consumer may apply for a rate change. "This is one way Arundel could intervene and advocate his proposal," Mattes said.

"Or, he could file a complaint against a utility for discriminatory rates, for example. But, the burden of proof is upon the complainant and it's difficult to win a case this way," Mattes said.

The commission can also initiate an investigation into an area of interest. "It's possible the PUC may decide to pursue this and investigate," Mattes said.

In his reply to Arundel, Mattes said he discussed several problems with the discounted rate plan. "If the PUC adopts rate discounts based on unfavorable aspects of having a utility



Frank Arundel:

'We bear the brunt'

company in the neighborhood, people will make other demands based on similar situations," the adviser said.

For example, those living near an operating fossil fuel plant suffer because of pollution, he said. Transmission lines may be another unfavorable aspect. "The commission is already faced with substantial complications in ratemaking procedures," Mattes said.

Arundel disagrees: "If we're going to put up billions of dollars for these plants and they're going ahead and build them anyway, we should be the beneficiaries." He said 220,000 area residents would fall under the discount plan.