

Rulemaking1CEm Resource

From: RulemakingComments Resource
Sent: Thursday, April 17, 2014 2:12 PM
To: Rulemaking1CEm Resource
Cc: RulemakingComments Resource
Subject: FW: Comments on 10CFR Parts 50 and 52 FR notice March 24,2014.

**DOCKETED BY USNRC—OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
SECY-067**

PR#: PR-50 and PR-52

FRN#: 79FR16105

NRC DOCKET#: NRC–2008–0332, NRC–2012–0041, NRC– 2012–0042, NRC–2012–0043

SECY DOCKET DATE: 04/17/14

TITLE: Performance-Based Emergency Core Cooling Systems Cladding

Acceptance Criteria

COMMENT#: 02

-----Original Message-----

From: Marv Lewis [<mailto:marvlewis@juno.com>]

Sent: Thursday, April 17, 2014 12:01 PM

To: RulemakingComments Resource; Gallagher, Carol; Inverso, Tara; dgilmore@cox.net; Screnci, Diane; dianed@nirs.org; et@prop1.org; info@ieer.org; Rowley, Jonathan; Holonich, Joseph; kevin@beyondnuclear.org; Lois@ieer.org; maryo@nirs.org; nirsnet@nirs.org; nukenet@energyjustice.net; OPA Resource; Nguyen, Quynh; Auluck, Rajender; regulations.gov helpdesk@bah.com

Subject: Comments on 10CFR Parts 50 and 52 FR notice March 24,2014.

Dear NRC,

Here following are my comments on rule and draft guidance re Cladding acceptance criteria information collection aspects of this rule before April 23,2014. Information to be useful should be timely. I point to the table on Page 16110 of the FR Notice. This table goes back to October 8, 2002 and goes to February 17,2012. The Leyse father and son have been attempting to bring the Commission's attention to the very subjects now admitted to in this rulemaking on Page 16110 thru 16115 for many decades. This table is misdirecting in that the history of the Leyse's attempts are minimized and trivialized. If the Leyse's contentions prove correct, the each and every nuclear plant is a short LOCA from a disaster of Fukushima proportions. Some effort is needed to show the history of the Leyse intervention in a more complete light.

The author of this letter has attended many NRC public teleconferences. The issue of plugging is avoided thru many means. Usually the reasons go "We are not talking mechanistically ,but probablistically"or v.v., or that issue will be covered elsewhere, or some other legalistic or technical jargon. Many meetings and PRMs are going forward at this time without the reasonable and required need to await parts of this PRM herein that will affect those meetings and PRMs. Scheduling is inadequate to address many issues that are moving thru the NRC which will be affected when this PRM issues. I request that all actions on PRMs and licensing await the conclusion of this PRM before proceeding.

So far my comments have centered on actions or inaction in the past. I will present actions in the future that have a bearing on the information collection aspects for the future. The NRC requires a great deal of data and information from the licensees. Experience in Fukushima demonstrates that employees and independent suppliers tend to translate data in a light which is favorable to the licensee. One hundred employees were arrested in Japan and let loose with charges dropped. I do not want to see a Fukushima (very loosely translated: fairfield) here. I think that we should make sure that all in the nuclear industry know that the public will know all. I request that all licensees and subcontractors be required to be as open to the public as the NRC has been to me.

Although I have been in contact with the NRC for about 40 years, I have been seeing more energy and effort expended on keeping the public (me) and others 'in the loop' than I have ever seen previously.
I shall be sending more comments and I hope that the invitation to do so is continued.

Respectfully submitted,
Marvin Lewis, R. P. E.(Retired.)

Hearing Identifier: Secy_RuleMaking_comments_Public
Email Number: 988

Mail Envelope Properties (AF843158D8D87443918BD3AA953ABF78F552E3C44E)

Subject: FW: Comments on 10CFR Parts 50 and 52 FR notice March 24,2014.
Sent Date: 4/17/2014 2:12:11 PM
Received Date: 4/17/2014 2:12:13 PM
From: RulemakingComments Resource

Created By: RulemakingComments.Resource@nrc.gov

Recipients:

"RulemakingComments Resource" <RulemakingComments.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Rulemaking1CEM Resource" <Rulemaking1CEM.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR02.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	3566	4/17/2014 2:12:13 PM

Options

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