

AP1000DCDCEm Resource

From: Joan Lawrence [jlaw75@peoplepc.com]
Sent: Friday, April 22, 2011 9:27 AM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

No, no, no. That is the way I feel about nuclear power in the US at this time of crisis in Japan with what was supposed to be a "Safe" nuclear reactor. There really is no safe reactor because the disposal problem has not been solved. Also to give fast-track approval for a brand new type of reactor is irresponsible to the nth degree. Both Westinghouse (and you) have no idea how this new system would react to a disaster. Remember BP's plan for a well blow-out in the deep well in the Gulf - they thought it could not happen and were amazed that it did. Certainly, an accident or disaster or terrorist attack to these new proposed reactors could be an even bigger disaster with much longer lasting negative consequences. Your job is to keep the American public safe - not appease the nuclear power industry. Especially since they need government money (read my money) to do it because no bank will touch a nuke loan.

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.

Joan Lawrence
325 Warren Pl
Ithaca, NY 14850

Federal Register Notice: 76FR10269
Comment Number: 7547

Mail Envelope Properties (6011995.1303478823650.JavaMail.tomcat)

Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)
Sent Date: 4/22/2011 9:27:03 AM
Received Date: 4/22/2011 9:27:05 AM
From: Joan Lawrence

Created By: jlaw75@peoplepc.com

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

Post Office: web3.salsalabs.net

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2934	4/22/2011 9:27:05 AM

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