

29

Rulemaking Comments

From: Dylan Butler [Don\_villano@hotmail.com]  
Sent: Friday, April 22, 2011 11:37 AM  
To: Rulemaking Comments  
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

DOCKETED  
USNRC

April 27, 2011 (4:35 pm)

OFFICE OF SECRETARY  
RULEMAKINGS AND  
ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

Dear Annette,

My name is Dylan Butler, I am a Canadian, and thus understand I have little if any voice in your country, but sharing a border with your country, and being quite close neighbors, I must state how concerned I am about the implementation of nuclear power and the building of new highly untested nuclear power reactors. I understand that it is cost efficient, and meets the demand for non-polluting energy production, but the danger that it poses is too great. looking at the recent events in Japan, I think its safe to say, that a scenario that is unforeseeable will occur, causing public and economic hardship, if we rely on a form of energy generation that is so fickle as nuclear power. At this point in time we need to be looking to the future, and investing in power generation processes that are both safe and sustainable, which in my view Nuclear power is not. Please heed the voice of your people and your cousins to the north, we are asking you, in your stance of power to protect us from this looming threat.

Thank You For Your Time,

Sincerely,

Dylan Butler

(following is a letter pre-written by the group that notified me to this event)

We cannot afford to take any unnecessary risks when building nuclear reactors. Because disaster can occur at any nuclear reactor, the NRC needs to ensure that it has taken all possible precautions before moving forward with the new Westinghouse AP1000 reactor design considered for construction in Georgia, South Carolina and other states.

Especially considering the ongoing crisis in Japan and the review which will take place when the situation is brought under control, the current 75-day public comment period on the reactor design is insufficient for the new AP1000 reactor. I request that the NRC put the license application on hold until a thorough review of the Japanese accident has been conducted and weaknesses in the AP1000 design have been reviewed in light of the accident. To stick with the grossly inadequate 75-day rulemaking comment period would be the height of irresponsibility by the NRC.

Please accept the petition filed by the twelve environmental organizations of the AP1000 Oversight Group to suspend rulemaking. To ensure transparency, please include this comment and all others in the formal review proceedings and post them in the NRC's online library so the public can see any expressed concerns.

Addressing safety concerns, not satisfying the industry, should be the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's primary concern. NRC engineer John S. Ma's non-concurrence with the review of

Template = SECY-067

DS 10

the reactor raised the possibility that the AP1000's shield building could shatter "like a glass cup." It would be indefensible for the NRC to move forward without further addressing that weakness. Also, Westinghouse has not satisfactorily proved that the thin steel containment shell over the reactor would be effective during severe accidents or that the reactor could be properly cooled in conditions similar to those at Fukushima.

Dylan Butler  
Laurel Crescent  
Cawston, BC v0x1c2