

AP1000DCDCEm Resource

From: Rinaldo S. Brutoco [RINALDO@SHANGRILAGROUP.NET]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 7:30 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

As the author of two major books on nuclear energy (one published by the college textbook division of Simon & Schuster), I am certain beyond any reasonable doubt that further examination of the AP1000 should be conducted. And, in addition to the safety issues, long-term water issues need to be analyzed given the many questions that occur regarding access to appropriate amounts of water if fresh water is intended, and the long term issues associated with being located at or near sea level if ocean water is to be used. Also, no new nuclear facility should be constructed until the long term storage issues associated with spent fuel rods and other medium and high grade nuclear waste material. Finally, it is a proven fact that EVERY NUCLEAR POWER PLANT IN THE USA emits carcinogenic levels of Strontium 90 in "normal" operation. Until we can be certain that the AP1000 will not similarly emit highly toxic levels (i.e. it can't be allowed to emit more Strontium90 over a 29 year cycle than would prove to be a toxic amount for a human to be exposed to -- 29 years being the half life of Strontium 90) we can not permit it to be built as to do so would cause and immediate and present danger to the public health.

In addition I believe 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 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.

Rinaldo S. Brutoco
308 E Carillo St
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Federal Register Notice: 76FR10269
Comment Number: 1820

Mail Envelope Properties (24405288.1303428603472.JavaMail.tomcat)

Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval
Sent Date: 4/21/2011 7:30:03 PM
Received Date: 4/21/2011 7:30:04 PM
From: Rinaldo S. Brutoco

Created By: RINALDO@SHANGRILAGROUP.NET

Recipients:
"Rulemaking Comments" <Rulemaking.Comments@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: web2.salsalabs.net

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	3199	4/21/2011 7:30:04 PM

Options
Priority: Standard
Return Notification: No
Reply Requested: No
Sensitivity: Normal
Expiration Date:
Recipients Received: