

AP1000DCDCEm Resource

From: Susan Hathaway [susanhathaway@earthlink.net]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 5:59 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

I really can't believe I have to write this letter.

In the wake of the crisis at Fukushima, it has become clear to everyone except, apparently, our government that we cannot afford to continue taking 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. Given our government's recent track record on requiring dangerous facilities to be made as safe as possible (the Gulf of Mexico will never fully recover), I have no reason whatsoever to believe that these nuclear power plants will be built or maintained to the highest safety standards possible.

Addressing safety concerns, not satisfying the industry, should be the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's primary concern. A regulatory body is emphatically NOT supposed to be an industry mouthpiece. 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 is indefensible for the NRC to move forward without 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.

This is unacceptable. Radiation from Fukushima is reaching the U.S. Do you want to be responsible for a nuclear meltdown within our own borders?

Especially considering the ongoing crisis in Japan and the review that is promised to 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--THOROUGH--review of the Japanese accident has been conducted and weaknesses in the AP1000 design have been reviewed in light of that accident. To stick with the grossly inadequate 75-day rule-making comment period is 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 rule-making. 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.

In other words, do your job, not the nuclear industry's job.

Susan Hathaway
5107 Passons Boulevard #313
Pico Rivera, CA 90660

Federal Register Notice: 76FR10269
Comment Number: 6984

Mail Envelope Properties (28096020.1303423157491.JavaMail.tomcat)

Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)
Sent Date: 4/21/2011 5:59:17 PM
Received Date: 4/22/2011 5:12:45 AM
From: Susan Hathaway

Created By: susanhathaway@earthlink.net

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

Post Office: web2.salsalabs.net

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2735	4/22/2011 5:12:45 AM

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