

PR 52
(76FR10269)

May 9, 2011 (3:30 pm)

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
RULEMAKINGS AND
ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

49

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

As of: May 09, 2011
Received: May 08, 2011
Status: Pending_Post
Tracking No. 80c428c4
Comments Due: May 10, 2011
Submission Type: Web

Docket: NRC-2010-0131
AP1000 Design Certification Amendment

Comment On: NRC-2010-0131-0001
AP1000 Design Certification Amendment

Document: NRC-2010-0131-DRAFT-0027
Comment on FR Doc # 2011-03989

Submitter Information

Name: Christopher Lish
Address:
Olema, CA,

General Comment

See attached file(s)

Attachments

NRC-2010-0131-DRAFT-0027.1: Comment on FR Doc # 2011-03989

Sunday, May 8, 2011

Secretary Annette L. Vietti-Cook
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
ATTN: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff
11555 Rockville Pike
Rockville, MD 20852

Subject: Stop the AP1000 -- AP1000 Design Certification Amendment (Document ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook and members of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,

In the wake of the Fukushima disaster in Japan, the US government should thoroughly review the safety of nuclear reactors in the United States. I am, therefore, deeply disturbed to learn that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is moving forward with a 75-day comment for the proposed AP1000 reactor before any review has been completed.

"It is horrifying that we have to fight our own government to save the environment."
-- Ansel Adams

It has become clear that 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.

"Our duty to the whole, including to the unborn generations, bids us to restrain an unprincipled present-day minority from wasting the heritage of these unborn generations. The movement for the conservation of wildlife and the larger movement for the conservation of all our natural resources are essentially democratic in spirit, purpose and method."
-- Theodore Roosevelt

Addressing safety concerns, not satisfying the industry, should be the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's primary concern. The NRC's own expert, John S. Ma, has made clear that there are serious concerns surrounding the safety of the AP1000 reactor, including its ability to survive a natural or man made impact or an earthquake. 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.

"As we peer into society's future, we—you and I, and our government—must avoid the impulse to live only for today, plundering for our own ease and convenience the precious resources of tomorrow. We cannot mortgage the material assets of our grandchildren without risking the loss also of their political and spiritual heritage. We want democracy to survive for all generations to come, not to become the insolvent phantom of tomorrow."
-- Dwight D. Eisenhower

In addition, concerns have been raised about the capability of the reactor's cooling mechanism to function in a disaster. These concerns are particularly relevant considering the failure to cool or contain the Fukushima reactors after a major natural disaster, resulting in widespread radioactive contamination. 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. In Japan, we can clearly see the devastating effects of design flaws, and the serious concerns being raised about the AP1000 reactor need to be thoroughly addressed.

"Then I say the Earth belongs to each generation during its course, fully and in its own right, no generation can contract debts greater than may be paid during the course of its own existence."

-- Thomas Jefferson

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.

"A thing is right when it tends to preserve the integrity, stability, and beauty of the biotic community. It is wrong when it tends otherwise."

-- Aldo Leopold

Also, 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.

"Do not suffer your good nature, when application is made, to say 'Yes' when you should say 'No'. Remember, it is a public not a private cause that is to be injured or benefited by your choice."

-- George Washington

The safety of the public should take precedence over the desire of industry to move forward quickly on a new reactor, especially when there are significant concerns over that reactor's safety. Again, I urge the NRC to engage in a thorough review process of the AP1000 that protects the public's safety.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments. Please do NOT add my name to your mailing list. I will learn about future developments on this issue from other sources.

Sincerely,
Christopher Lish
Olema, CA

Rulemaking Comments

From: Gallagher, Carol
Sent: Monday, May 09, 2011 2:56 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Comment on Proposed Rule - AP1000 Design Certification Amendment
Attachments: NRC-2010-0131-DRAFT-0027pdf.pdf

Van,

Attached for docketing is a comment from Christopher Lish on the above noted proposed rule (3150-AI81; 76 FR 10269) that I received via the regulations.gov website on 5/8/11.

Thanks,
Carol