

Allen, William

From: Allen, William
Sent: Friday, December 20, 2019 12:53 PM
To: Oceansiders Against San Onofre Corruption
Subject: 2.206 Petition Initial Assessment Notification

The Petition Review Board (PRB) has evaluated the 2.206 Petition you submitted on August 3, 2019 regarding loading of spent fuel at the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station (SONGS) and the use of the UMAX independent spent fuel storage installation design. The PRB assessed whether the petition meets the applicable acceptance criteria in NRC's Management Directive (MD) 8.11. Based on the PRB's initial assessment, it appears that all of the issues raised in your petition either have already been the subject of NRC staff review and do not raise concerns that the NRC staff has not considered and resolved or are not appropriately addressed in the 2.206 process. Accordingly, as discussed further below, our preliminary decision is not to accept the petition for review.

The NRC staff has continued to carefully regulate the licensee's decommissioning activities at SONGS, including through its review of the fuel storage facility design, inspections (encompassing the physical facility as well as the licensee's operational performance), and appropriate enforcement actions. More specifically, NRC staff performed a thorough review of the UMAX Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation (ISFSI) design used at SONGS, a design the NRC approved in 2017 through a public rulemaking. In addition, NRC Staff from Headquarters and Region IV continually perform oversight to ensure that the storage of spent nuclear fuel at SONGS does not pose a threat to public health and safety. NRC inspections of decommissioning activities at SONGS are documented in inspection reports that are publicly available. Inspections at SONGS have specifically considered events described in your petition regarding the licensee's fuel loading operations, potential scratching of the fuel canisters, and training of SCE employees (see for example, ADAMS ML19190A217). The NRC's regulatory response included a detailed assessment of the significance of the events, specific enforcement actions, and subsequent consideration of the licensee's corrective actions.

As a result, the NRC Staff remains confident that reasonable assurance of adequate protection of the public health and safety is maintained for as long as fuel is stored in accordance with the requirements of the SONGS license, the certificate of compliance for the Holtec system (and any other licensed systems that may be implemented in the future at the SONGS site), and other applicable requirements. The agency is committed to ensuring the continuation of its ongoing regulatory oversight of the facility, as reflected in the NRC's rigorous review of the fuel storage design used at SONGS, together with its well-documented inspection and enforcement activities at the site.

Regarding your concern about the siting of the facility and environmental impacts of the decommissioning activities, NRC Staff concluded in the review of the SONGS Post Shutdown Decommissioning Activities Report (ML15204A383) that these activities are bounded by the previously issued NUREG-0586, "Final Generic Environmental Impact Statement [GEIS] on Decommissioning of Nuclear Facilities" (and its supplements) and did not find any deviations from the previously issued Environmental Statement for SONGS (ML18239A414). Having considered the results of recent inspections and the NRC's environmental review, the PRB's initial assessment is that your petition does not meet the criteria in MD 8.11 Section III.C.1(b) to be accepted for review because the issues raised in the petition have been "the subject of a facility-specific or generic NRC staff review" and none of the circumstances in Section III.C.1(b)(ii) apply.

You also requested that the NRC relocate spent fuel away from a military base. The staff has concluded that pursuant to MD Section II.A.2(d)(vi), this request is not appropriate for the 2.206 process because it is outside the NRC's jurisdiction. Public Law 88-82, referenced in your petition, vests authority in the Secretary of the Navy to determine the appropriateness of granting an easement to SCN for the purpose of siting a nuclear

power plant, including all its “appurtenances.” Therefore, the NRC lacks the jurisdiction to take the specific action the Petitioner requests.

However, in accordance with MD 8.11, we wish to offer you the opportunity to clarify or supplement the petition in a public meeting with the PRB. If accepted, your meeting with the PRB would be conducted consistent with the format described in MD 8.11 Section III.F (in part - you may provide any relevant additional explanation and support for your request either in person or via another agreed-upon arrangement). The PRB will consider your statements made at the meeting or teleconference, along with the original petition, in making its final recommendation on whether to accept the petition for review according to the criteria in MD 8.11, Section III.C.1.

Please indicate by January 6, 2019, whether you wish to have this public meeting before we close the petition.