

## AP1000DCDCEm Resource

---

**From:** Kenneth Gibson [kennethgibson@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 21, 2011 9:32 PM  
**To:** Rulemaking Comments  
**Subject:** Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

Just say no! I am fundamentally opposed to nuclear fission technology for the generation of electric power. It is obvious that this is a failed technology for commercial purposes. The Utility industry and the builders of these plants refuse to shoulder the evident operational liabilities without federal government protection from the federally established and underwritten risk "pool." The industry cannot manage its own waste nor does the federal government have a sound plan for the management of nuclear waste product in the form of spent fuel. Research in the area is essentially fatuous or non-existent.

In the wake of the crisis at Fukushima, it has become super-abundantly clear that we cannot afford to take any more risk by building more nuclear reactors. Because disaster can occur at any nuclear reactor, the NRC needs to terminate any plans to approve the new Westinghouse AP1000 reactor design considered for construction in Georgia, South Carolina and other states.

Addressing safety concerns, by shutting down existing plants on an economically realistic schedule within existing licensed operating periods, not satisfying this government-utility-industrial complex, should be the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's primary concern.

In any case, 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.

Kenneth Gibson  
5090 Kearney Avenue  
Oakland, CA 94602-2607

**Federal Register Notice:** 76FR10269  
**Comment Number:** 5602

**Mail Envelope Properties** (31867013.1303435905078.JavaMail.tomcat)

**Subject:** Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)  
**Sent Date:** 4/21/2011 9:31:45 PM  
**Received Date:** 4/22/2011 2:10:57 AM  
**From:** Kenneth Gibson

**Created By:** kennethgibson@gmail.com

**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	2762	4/22/2011 2:10:57 AM

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