

AP1000DCDCEm Resource

From: jim adams [thetravelingmasseur@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 7:43 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

In the wake of the crisis at Fukushima, 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.

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.

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.

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.

I agree with Tom Clements' concerns about lack of testing and his safety concerns. IF --if you want to test a new design, you should say so up front, and ask the people in the service area of the to-be-tested reactor: are they willing to be the population of people who test a new design?

There should also be a rider of a decade long moratorium against using this design anywhere else until it is finished it's testing period. Fukushima has demonstrated that the fail-safe dependability the industry used to brag about is valid in low stress situations, but when Mother Nature hiccups (smaller than a cough), the nuclear plants become a clear and present danger.

Is NRC aware that Fukushima radiation is reaching dangerous levels on this side of the Pacific? And when will they pass on to the rest of us that this is so in the world and the United States?

jim adams

jim adams
3115 yanceyville road
louisa, VA 23093

Federal Register Notice: 76FR10269
Comment Number: 1952

Mail Envelope Properties (21080090.1303429398397.JavaMail.tomcat)

Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)
Sent Date: 4/21/2011 7:43:18 PM
Received Date: 4/21/2011 7:43:19 PM
From: jim adams

Created By: thetravelingmasseur@gmail.com

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

Post Office: web2.salsalabs.net

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2894	4/21/2011 7:43:19 PM

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