

## AP1000DCDCEm Resource

---

**From:** Katie O'Neill [katieo@snowcrest.net]  
**Sent:** Sunday, April 24, 2011 10:53 PM  
**To:** Rulemaking Comments  
**Subject:** Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

As an RN, there is always the risk vs. benefit to be considered in any patient decision. With nuclear energy there is no question that the risk always outweighs the benefit, not only due to the generational exposure if safety measures fail, but also because of the continuous toxic waste polluting our earth forever. It is beyond comprehension that you would prioritize short-term corporate profits over long-term consumer health and safety. Much less to promote subsidizing building nuclear power plants by those same consumers' taxes at no risk to the corporations! By corporations who state the risks are too high to guarantee nuclear energy loans!

Especially considering the ongoing crisis in Japan and the review which will take place when the disaster 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 public 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." 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.

Chernobyl should have set off alarm bells; Fukushima should have brought all nuclear power to a screeching halt. No shield, containment shell, back-up generator, or cooling system is foolproof and radiation toxicity is deadly! There are so many alternative energy sources without this fatal risk.

Katie O'Neill  
4824 Rainbow Drive  
Weed, CA 96094

**Federal Register Notice:** 76FR10269  
**Comment Number:** 10725

**Mail Envelope Properties** (1526586304.1303699978769.JavaMail.tomcat)

**Subject:** Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval  
**Sent Date:** 4/24/2011 10:52:58 PM  
**Received Date:** 4/24/2011 10:52:59 PM  
**From:** Katie O'Neill

**Created By:** katieo@snowcrest.net

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

**Post Office:** vweb4.salsalabs.net

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	2473	4/24/2011 10:52:59 PM

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