

## AP1000DCDCEm Resource

---

**From:** Dorlinda Chong [chong@sisp.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 23, 2011 6:31 AM  
**To:** Rulemaking Comments  
**Subject:** Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

There is no reason to force the public to subsidize nuclear reactors when we can find other, better, safer ways to boil water. Geothermal comes to mind. Wave turbines come to mind, as well. Wave turbines have only been placed in the ocean so far, but if you want to put venture capital in an emerging technology, you might invest in finding out if wave turbines could work in a river with a sufficient current. I guarantee, if something goes wrong with a wave turbine, that it won't pollute the planet with a radioactive cloud that could ruin the dairy industry.

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.

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.

Dorlinda Chong  
POB 697  
Lucerne Valley, CA 92356

**Federal Register Notice:** 76FR10269  
**Comment Number:** 9754

**Mail Envelope Properties** (1495588686.1303554680426.JavaMail.tomcat)

**Subject:** Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval  
**Sent Date:** 4/23/2011 6:31:20 AM  
**Received Date:** 4/23/2011 6:31:25 AM  
**From:** Dorlinda Chong

**Created By:** chong@sisp.net

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

**Post Office:** vweb3.salsalabs.net

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	2501	4/23/2011 6:31:25 AM

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