

## AP1000DCDCEm Resource

---

**From:** Paula Yates [piby44@earthlink.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 21, 2011 10:43 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 can NOT afford to take any unnecessary risks when building or managing 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. Is this new design the one that was used in those reactors of Japan involve in meltdown?

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.

Nuclear reaction is NOT something to be complacent about in the least. Frankly, we need to find safer, renewable, clean energy that does NOT have the least capability of destroying our planet and everything on it. Would you allow your family to live near a reactor of this new design, or any of the old designs of nuclear reactors?

Especially considering the ongoing crisis in Japan and the review which will take place when the situation is brought under control [who really knows how long that will be; hopefully some humans will be around at that point], the current 75-day public comment period on the reactor design is NOT sufficient for the new AP1000 reactor. I STRONGLY 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 recent and past accidents. 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 ALL expressed concerns.

Personally, I think that the writing is on the wall that nuclear power on this planet is on its way out. It is far too dangerous and unpredictable; it has the distinct capability to destroy our planet and everything and everyone on it. That kind of destruction can NEVER BE UNDONE.

Paula Yates  
9974 Township Road 49  
Mount Perry, OH 43760

**Federal Register Notice:** 76FR10269  
**Comment Number:** 3689

**Mail Envelope Properties** (7604755.1303440184400.JavaMail.tomcat)

**Subject:** STOP the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)  
**Sent Date:** 4/21/2011 10:43:04 PM  
**Received Date:** 4/21/2011 10:43:13 PM  
**From:** Paula Yates

**Created By:** piby44@earthlink.net

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

**Post Office:** web3.salsalabs.net

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	2861	4/21/2011 10:43:13 PM

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