

## AP1000DCDCEm Resource

---

**From:** Margo Krindel [sanf\_sara@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 21, 2011 9:43 PM  
**To:** Rulemaking Comments  
**Subject:** Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

Relying on nuclear power to provide electricity is like firing a gun to punch holes. It should only be used with strict safety precautions, and as Fukushima demonstrates, the worldwide nuclear industry has not taken sufficient precautions.

The 75-day period for comment is not sufficient time to process new information about how to prevent nuclear disasters which we will learn after studying the Fukushima disaster. 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. Doing otherwise would endanger the livelihoods, health, and lives of the people of Georgia and South Carolina and the rest of the United States.

I must remind you of the 1886 Charleston earthquake. There WILL be another major earthquake in the region, and a nuclear plant should only be built there if utmost caution has been taken, including making a containment layer much more robust than the one in the current AP1000 design. Dry cask storage should also be mandatory, as storing all fuel in pools would guarantee that, should an earthquake or other major disaster occur, a Fukushima would happen in the United States.

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.

Margo Krindel  
1237 2nd Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94122

**Federal Register Notice:** 76FR10269  
**Comment Number:** 3091

**Mail Envelope Properties** (1554591.1303436586719.JavaMail.tomcat)

**Subject:** Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval  
**Sent Date:** 4/21/2011 9:43:06 PM  
**Received Date:** 4/21/2011 9:43:12 PM  
**From:** Margo Krindel

**Created By:** sanf\_sara@yahoo.com

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

**Post Office:** web4.salsalabs.net

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	2289	4/21/2011 9:43:12 PM

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