AP1000DCDCEm Resource

From: Duane Hunting [duane.hunting@zgf.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 6:02 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

The nuclear industry has not moved any further in provide a permanent storage for spent fuel rods. This deficiency was well known in the United States back in the 1970's. Why would anyone in their right mind continue to play with nuclear fire without a method to properly control it under any circumstance and/or desaster situation nature can throw at humans?

In the wake of the crisis at Fukushima, it has become clear that 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.

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.

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.

Duane Hunting
6703 SW 13th Avenue
Portland, OR 97219-2009

Federal Register Notice: 76FR10269
Comment Number: 6971

Mail Envelope Properties (31014490.1303423315485.JavaMail.tomcat)

Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)
Sent Date: 4/21/2011 6:01:55 PM
Received Date: 4/22/2011 5:12:43 AM
From: Duane Hunting

Created By: duane.hunting@zgf.com

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

Post Office: web1.salsalabs.net

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	2382	4/22/2011 5:12:43 AM

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