AP1000DCDCEm Resource

From: jamie clemons [ghostlly@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 8:29 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

Nuclear energy is not clean, and it is not safe. We can not afford to risk all of our lives on a gamble that something will not go wrong. Just recently reactors in Virgina were shut down by a tornado and only the backup generators prevented a disaster. There have been too many incidents and too many close calls to think that it can not happen here is being irresponsible. There is also the problem of waste and tritium leaking from these reactors into our groundwater. Nearly 1/3 of all commercial reactors are leaking tritium right now in our country. We have a large number of reactors with the same design as the ones in Fukushima. The radiation from Fukushima has spread over nearly the entire planet and is being detected all over the globe. How many more disasters do we need before we realize that it is not worth the risk and that we can never make it safe enough to justify? Even if we make it perfectly safe we can not understate the potential for human error or the problem !
with

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.

jamie clemons
8 South Randall Road
Aurora, IL 60506

Federal Register Notice: 76FR10269
Comment Number: 2339

Mail Envelope Properties (1484923.1303432147940.JavaMail.tomcat)

Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)
Sent Date: 4/21/2011 8:29:07 PM
Received Date: 4/21/2011 8:29:08 PM
From: jamie clemons

Created By: ghostlly@yahoo.com

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

Post Office: web4.salsalabs.net

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	3015	4/21/2011 8:29:08 PM

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