

AP1000DCDCEm Resource

From: Katrina Barron [kbarron@nd.edu]
Sent: Friday, April 22, 2011 4:12 AM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Please Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

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.

Other countries, like Germany have a plan to phase out its remaining nuclear power plants, and as we traveled around Germany this year we saw all the many wind farms and solar panels that are allowing them to do this. We installed solar powers in one of our houses in the US and now have plans for another. This is what we should be spending or time and money on.

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.

Katrina Barron
1097 Riverside Drive
South Bend, IN 46616

Federal Register Notice: 76FR10269
Comment Number: 6552

Mail Envelope Properties (25156733.1303459913784.JavaMail.tomcat)

Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Please Suspend the AP1000 approval
Sent Date: 4/22/2011 4:11:53 AM
Received Date: 4/22/2011 4:13:07 AM
From: Katrina Barron

Created By: kbarron@nd.edu

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

Post Office: web3.salsalabs.net

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2317	4/22/2011 4:13:07 AM

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