AP1000DCDCEm Resource

From: Robert Robbind [bobrobbins2@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, April 22, 2011 12:34 AM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

Fast tracking nuclear reactors is exactly the wrong thing to do. After the Japanese experience is examined and applied to all our existing reactors it should be applied to all proposed reactors.

Nuclear power is mature enough that it should not need any special favors from the government. If private insurance is so worried about safety that they will not insure it, I do not want my dollars insuring it either.

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.

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.

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.

Robert Robbind
16231 Jarvis St NW
Elk River, MN 55330

Federal Register Notice: 76FR10269
Comment Number: 4632

Mail Envelope Properties (332268.1303446854356.JavaMail.tomcat)

Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval
Sent Date: 4/22/2011 12:34:14 AM
Received Date: 4/22/2011 12:34:15 AM
From: Robert Robbind

Created By: bobrobbins2@gmail.com

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

Post Office: web2.salsalabs.net

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	2367	4/22/2011 12:34:15 AM

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