

From: Matthew Cain [mcain@foe.org]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 1:54 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

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.

1

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.

2

3

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.

4

5

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.

6

7

8

Matthew Cain

Arlington, VA 22202

From: Alexandra Gordon [alixg1@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 4:53 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

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.

1

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.

6

7

8

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.

2

3

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.

4

5

Alexandra Gordon
11701 SW 80 Rd
Miami, FL 33156

From: Daphne T Stevens [daphnetstevens4@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 7:21 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Urgent, Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

I am not totally against nuclear power but we must solve a few major problems before we can move ahead on building. Fuel rod containment is, perhaps, the largest dilemma. 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.

Daphne T Stevens
15 Arnold Rd.
Fiskdale, MA 01518

From: David Holman [dashndog@q.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 04, 2011 3:05 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

As a former nuclear reactor operator please give serious consideration to the following:

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.

Based on the Fukushima Diaster, the current "risk assessment" process is totally unrealistic. There is no "safe" nuclear power plant because we cannot provide a design to protect against a natural diaster.

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.

David Holman
1602 E. 15th Ave
Spokane, WA 99203

From: David Walker [walkercreations@verizon.net]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 5:07 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

No more nuke plants. Remember, as conservationist David Brower told us, "The peaceful atom is a bomb!"

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.

David Walker
907 Vista Del Rio
Santa Maria, CA 93458

From: Deborah Weinschke [traillflyer@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 5:57 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

It is blatantly obvious that nuclear energy is neither safe, clean, or efficient. In the aftermath of Fukushima, anyone can see 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. Personally, I would like to see NO nukes anywhere.

| 1
| 2

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.

Deborah Weinschke
POB 602
Floyd, VA 24091

From: Dennis Kish [dkish3883@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 5:18 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

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.

I'd like to add a comment here about the re-licensing application for units 1&2 of the Diablo Canyon plant in California. I live near the plant and I cannot understand why the NRC is entertaining renewal apps. from PG&E for plants that each have more than a decade until their current licenses expire, especially in light of new geologic evidence of numerous earthquake faults near the plant. Halt the licensing until a thorough 3d mapping of the Hosgri, Shorline and adjacent faults is completed, and insist that all seismic reports filed by PG&E are subjected to a thorough peer review before deciding whether to re-license these plants. -Dennis Kish

Dennis Kish
35,22nd.st.
22nd.st.
Cayucos, CA 93430

From: denise p. [dmperez0950@att.net]
Sent: Saturday, April 23, 2011 12:12 AM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

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.

Also on a personal note from myself, i dont know much about nucular energy pro's vs. con's . if you do happen to get the ok to build these plants do you have independant information from non-government sources that state the safety and the long term implanments of building these plants using this technology ? is there any question to there safety in the shortterm or longterm of their usage? is that information public and if it is where can i find it to see it for myself the safety reports? will this plant have any effects on water quality , or to the general public living in the area where you plan on building this /these plants? what are the effects on the human popualtion ,especialy women of child bearing age or their childrens children? sence nucular energy is really a new technology and we all remember chernoble in russia when there nucular plant went down how do you know if this new untested nucular device is any safer then the technology that we are using now? we are now only coming on to the knowledge of the damage that coal burring plants have done to our planet , ourselves and the enviroment. who's to say this is any safer?

1
2
4 | 3
5
6
7

denise p.
5005 old cheney hwy apt #4
orlando, FL 32807

From: Donald & Deanna Barnett [Exprof97@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Friday, April 22, 2011 11:54 AM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

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.

We have been active in insisting that the nuclear industry provide safeguards to many of the various stages in the process of creating electric energy using nuclear energy since 1975. We are appalled at the lack of any real progress in addressing so many of the safety concerns surrounding nuclear power, all the way from production of the fuel pellets, to the reactors, and, at the end, waste disposal. Currently the cooling ponds in Hanford, Washington, are critically overloaded with spent fuel rods awaiting either reprocessing or disposal despite assurances throughout the intervening 36 years that all the technical problems have been solved. Those promoting nuclear power generation cannot be trusted to tell the truth. We must not proceed to build any more facilities until it is conclusively and publicly demonstrated that all of their claims are true. This they cannot do. Recent events in Japan and what happened at Three Mile Island and later at Chernobyl are warnings about what can and will go wrong with the current technology.

| 1
| 2

Donald & Deanna Barnett
5638 Strawflower Lane
San Jose, CA 95118

From: Dorothy Staby [seniorteacherdot@verizon.net]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 6:03 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

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.

Until you know how to handle problems and how to safely store the waste--NO NEW PLANTS.

Dorothy Staby
700 Hickory Dr.
Aliquippa, PA 15001-1136

From: Dorothy Varellas [djvarellas@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 6:58 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

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.

No AP1000, no new nuclear plants anywhere, anytime! The technology does not exist to protect life on earth from accidents and spills. There does not exist any truly safe long term method of dealing with nuclear waste. | 1
| 2

The American people must not be ignored. We demand and deserve protection from this extremely costly and unsafe method of producing power! | 3

Dorothy Varellas
35 Carr st
San Francisco, CA 94124

From: Dr.Eng. hassan sadek mohamed Morsi haikal [hssnsadek@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, April 22, 2011 10:34 AM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

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.

Proposals in the field of nuclear applications

- The future of nuclear energy, non-permanent and non-security, so you must search for alternative sources of safe, durable and energy.
- Lack of safety and the safety of all non-safety standards and safety in all reactors and nuclear power plants in all countries of the world.
- Non-economics of nuclear energy in the long run and on the security level and community level.
- Nuclear power less expensive to produce electrical energy, but more dangerous and destructive to the environment and humans.
- Nuclear energy sources of energy a short life span being linked to the presence of the extraction of nuclear fuel, uranium.

Risk of reactors and nuclear plants, as follows:

The absence of nuclear safety standards for the permanent and Almithalip reactors and nuclear plants, Lack of supervision and inspection on the permanent nuclear reactors and nuclear plants, The absence of control systems, automatic and manual standard in reactors and nuclear plants, The absence of cooling systems standard in the permanent and safe reactors and nuclear plants, The absence of standard design reactors and nuclear plants, The absence of experts and professionals working in the fields, and applications of nuclear

reactors and nuclear plants, Non-observance of the end of the Alaamr span of reactors and nuclear plants, Many disasters, earthquakes, volcanoes, natural, and others.
So I ask by setting a timetable for the final disposal of all types of applications of nuclear reactors and not building new nuclear plants.

Dr.Eng. hassan sadek mohamed morsi haikal Email :hssnsadek@yahoo.com

Dr.Eng. hassan sadek mohamed Morsi haikal King Abdul Aziz Street Batha Street Riyadh, NY 11555

From: Dr. William 'Skip Dykoski [skipdykoski@usfamily.net]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 11:29 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

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.

The public should not get left holding the bag for un-insurable reactors - we need to shift away from uranium based power.

Dr. William 'Skip Dykoski
890 9th Ave NW
New Brighton, MN 55112-2662

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

From: frank karen [karen.frank@att.net]
Sent: Friday, April 22, 2011 5:01 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

You have been given a might responsibility and I expect you to act with caution and care. Do not rush this process! I live in Georgia and do not want to be exposed to the danger of any flaw in something as deadly and powerful as a nuclear reactor. Appologies mean nothing when you are losing your home, health and livelyhood. My understanding id the new Westinghouse AP1000 reactor design considered for construction in Georgia, South Carolina and other states is not the safest, but is less expensive than safer ones. Since my dollars will be paying for this I want the best. Preferably none at all!

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, please accept the petition filed by the twelve environmental organizations of the AP1000 Oversight Group to suspend rulemaking and include this comment and all others in the formal review proceedings, posting them in the NRC's online library.

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 thouroughly!

frank karen
155 three oaks dr
athens, GA 30607

From: Herschel Dosier [hersheld@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Friday, April 22, 2011 8:27 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

In the winter of 1811/1812 four of the greatest earthquakes ever known to strike North America occurred on the New Madrid fault line, shaking houses in Charleston, South Carolina and knocking plaster off houses in Columbia, South Carolina. Church bells rang in Boston, chimneys toppled in Maine, and homes were severely damaged in St. Louis. Much of the Eastern U.S. was sparsely populated, which is not the case now. Since last September there have been over 800 smaller quakes along the same fault line in Arkansas alone, possibly a precursor to another great and eminent earthquake disaster equivalent to the nightmare in Fukushima, Japan. There are over 17 million people within fifty miles of the Indian Point Power Plant, 38 miles north of New York City.

On the West Coast, two nuclear plants in California alone would incapacitate most of Southern California, including the entire Los Angeles and San Diego metropolitan areas of 23 million people, and possibly affecting over 6 million more people in the San Francisco Bay Area as well. One of these plants, the Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant at San Luis Obispo, California, - halfway between Los Angeles and San Francisco - is located FOUR BLOCKS from a fault line. The tsunami resulting from the Sendai, Japan quake struck Hawaii and California, doing tens of millions of dollars worth of damage, though neither of the power plants were damaged - this time. The entire Pacific region was on tsunami alert, and a tsunami could have struck on any Pacific coast, including where the two California reactors are located.

It is the height of insanity to build any new nuclear power plants in the entire Eastern region of the United States, and in fact no new reactors should be approved at this time anywhere in the nation - and all nuclear facilities in the United States should be closed.

2
3
4

We cannot afford to take any unnecessary risks when building nuclear reactors. Because disaster can occur at any nuclear reactor, the NRC needs to completely reconsider before moving forward with the new Westinghouse AP1000 reactor design considered for construction in Georgia, South Carolina and other states.

Mankind has already proved that there is no safe place for nuclear waste. There have already been nuclear accidents in South Carolina and other places like Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania and Chernobyl, in the Ukraine. In my high school 45 miles from the nuclear bomb plant in the Texas Panhandle, the Geiger counter in my high school was over the maximum allowable amount of radiation every second of the year. An unusual number of people in that area died from cancer, including two of my grandparents. I myself am a liver cancer survivor, which I suspect was brought on by radiation exposure.

5

Especially considering the ongoing crisis in Japan and the review which will take place if 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.

Nature has always proven stronger than anything man can design. Nuclear reactors should be replaced with non-lethal safer alternative energy sources such as wind power, solar energy, and wave energy. Mankind has never proven to be able to design a fail-safe nuclear facility. Mankind has never proven itself able to outsmart Nature or provide a permanent counter to any disaster which Nature can provide. Even the reactors in earthquake-prone California are only built to withstand more than a 7.0 quake (San Onofre) or 7.5 (Diablo Canyon) – yet 9.0 (or greater) earthquakes are happening more and more in the past few years. Earth changes are happening with more frequency – world-wide. To shut our eyes to the increasing frequency of natural disasters would be to needlessly invite our own destruction.

6

7

Just because mankind can think of some idea like nuclear energy doesn't mean that the idea should be done, or that mankind is the master of that idea – or indeed, ever can be the master of its own fate. A wise Nuclear Regulatory Commission should recognize what any wise person should realize – and that is that humanity must recognize its own limitations in order to survive. To ignore its own limitations, to pretend that ignorant mankind is more powerful or more intelligent than Nature, is to destroy humanity – and possibly all life on this Earth. NASA has provided pictures of buildings and even canals on Mars – yet there are evidently no people there. What happened to them? What obvious fact of nature did they ignore?

Please reconsider nuclear energy in our country – and find it lacking. Please close existing plants and reactors and forbid new ones. Please choose survival.

8 | 9
10

Thank you for your prompt, exacting, and wise consideration in this serious matter.

Herschel Dosier
1025 Fillmore St
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: Herschel Dosier [hdosier@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, April 23, 2011 8:35 AM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

I find it very alarming, especially in light of the unprecedented nuclear disaster at Fukushima, that the nuclear industry wants to build a new, untested, unlicensed reactor design - the Westinghouse AP1000 - in South Carolina, Georgia and several other sites around the country. It is also alarming that the industry wants to fast track this process with a very limited 75-day public comment period. There are serious safety concerns about the AP1000, but the industry is pushing the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) to approve the design without asking important questions.

In the winter of 1811/1812 four of the greatest earthquakes ever known to strike North America occurred on the New Madrid fault line, shaking houses in Charleston, South Carolina and knocking plaster off houses in Columbia, South Carolina. Church bells rang in Boston, chimneys toppled in Maine, and homes were severely damaged in St. Louis.

Much of the Eastern U.S. was sparsely populated, which is not the case now. Since last September there have been over 800 smaller quakes along the same fault line in Arkansas alone, possibly a precursor to another great and eminent earthquake disaster equivalent to the nightmare in Fukushima, Japan. There are over 17 million people within fifty miles of the Indian Point Power Plant, 38 miles north of New York City.

On the West Coast, two nuclear plants in California alone would incapacitate most of Southern California, including the entire Los Angeles and San Diego metropolitan areas of 23 million people, and possibly affecting over 6 million more people in the San Francisco Bay Area as well. One of these plants, the Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant at San Luis Obispo, California, - halfway between Los Angeles and San Francisco - is located FOUR BLOCKS from a fault line. The tsunami resulting from the Sendai, Japan quake struck Hawaii and California, doing tens of millions of dollars worth of damage, though neither of the power plants were damaged - this time. The entire Pacific region was on tsunami alert, and a tsunami could have struck on any Pacific coast, including where the two California reactors are located.

It is the height of insanity to build any new nuclear power plants in the entire Eastern region of the United States, and in fact no new reactors should be approved at this time anywhere in the nation - and all nuclear facilities in the United States should be closed.

We cannot afford to take any unnecessary risks when building nuclear reactors. Because disaster can occur at any nuclear reactor, the NRC needs to completely reconsider before moving forward with the new Westinghouse AP1000 reactor design considered for construction in Georgia, South Carolina and other states.

Mankind has already proved that there is no safe place for nuclear waste. There have already been nuclear accidents in South Carolina and other places like Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania and Chernobyl, in the Ukraine. In my high school 45 miles from the nuclear bomb plant in the Texas Panhandle, the Geiger counter in my high school was over the maximum allowable amount of radiation every second of the year. An unusual number of people in that area died from cancer, including two of my grandparents. I myself am a liver cancer survivor, which I suspect was brought on by radiation exposure.

Especially considering the ongoing crisis in Japan and the review which will take place if 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.

Nature has always proven stronger than anything man can design. Nuclear reactors should be replaced with non-lethal safer alternative energy sources such as wind power, solar energy, and wave energy. Mankind has never proven to be able to design a fail-safe nuclear facility. Mankind has never proven itself able to outsmart Nature or provide a permanent counter to any disaster which Nature can provide. Even the reactors in earthquake-prone California are only built to withstand more than a 7.0 quake (San Onofre) or 7.5 (Diablo Canyon) – yet 8.0 and 9.0 (or greater) earthquakes are happening more and more in recent years all over the world; earth changes are happening with more frequency world-wide. To shut our eyes to the increasing frequency and intensity of these natural disasters would be to needlessly invite our own destruction.

6
7

Just because mankind can think of some idea like nuclear energy doesn't mean that the idea should be done, or that mankind is the master of that idea – or indeed, ever can be the master of its own fate. A wise Nuclear Regulatory Commission should recognize what any wise person should realize – and that is that humanity must recognize its own limitations in order to survive. To ignore its own limitations, to pretend that ignorant mankind is more powerful or more intelligent than Nature, is to destroy humanity – and possibly all life on this Earth. NASA has provided pictures of buildings and even canals on Mars – yet there are evidently no people there. What happened to them? What obvious fact of nature did they ignore?

To fast track the new Westinghouse AP1000 reactor design in the midst of an unprecedented nuclear crisis caused by a short-sighted design of nuclear reactors in Japan is utter madness; this fast track process is not only questionable but seems to be unduly influenced by a nuclear industry focused only on its own profits at the expense of public health and safety. This fast tract process is tainted and must be halted in its tracks. Please reconsider nuclear energy in our country – and find it lacking. Please close existing plants and reactors and forbid new ones. Please choose survival.

8,9
10

Thank you for your prompt, exacting, and wise consideration in this serious matter.

Herschel Dosier
1025 Fillmore St Apt 2-L
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: James Koontz [jekoo2@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 11:07 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

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 rule-making 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.

There are too many unanswered questions about the design and construction of Nuclear Power Plants. Please do not be hasty in approving anything designed in the past or the future, or constructed with past or present construction methods. The dangers are too real, the results of any problems are too extensive, and too long lasting to take any chances. America can pursue other power plant alternatives.

1
2
3
4

Please closely examine all present Nuclear Power Plants to absolutely determine if they are capable of full containment in case of accident or natural disaster.

5

appreciatively,

James Koontz
438 La Costa Ln.,
Johnstown, CO 80534

James Koontz
438 La Costa Ln.,
Johnstown,, CO 80534-9066

From: jim adams [thetravelingmasseur@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 7:43 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

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.

I agree with Tom Clements' concerns about lack of testing and his safety concerns. IF --if you want to test a new design, you should say so up front, and ask the people in the service area of the to-be-tested reactor: are they willing to be the population of people who test a new design?

There should also be a rider of a decade long moratorium against using this design anywhere else until it is finished it's testing period. Fukushima has demonstrated that the fail-safe dependability the industry used to brag about is valid in low stress situations, but when Mother Nature hiccups (smaller than a cough), the nuclear plants become a clear and present danger.

Is NRC aware that Fukushima radiation is reaching dangerous levels on this side of the Pacific? And when will they pass on to the rest of us that this is so in the world and the United States?

jim adams

jim adams
3115 yanceyville road
louisa, VA 23093

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.

1
2
4
5
5
3

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

From: John Grillo [grillojohn42@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, April 22, 2011 11:25 AM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

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.

My thoughts go beyond the catastrophe in Japan on Friday, March 11, 2011 where unprecedented, historic, and multiple events ensued. First, and more specifically, the 9.0 Richter scale earthquake generating a 30 to 127 foot tsunami (the latter causing great damage to the Fukushima nuclear power plant sites and enormous loss of human life as known), and a volcanic eruption occurred all on the same day. Tragic as it was, and is, to the people and infrastructure of Japan, in seismic events; the tsunami in Japan big as it seemed to be, was much smaller in its amplitude compared to the biggest tsunami that has ever been recorded by Man in geological history; I'm referring to the 1,720 foot tsunami that struck Lituya Bay, Alaska on July 9, 1958. Go to www.geology.com and reference the U.S. Geological Survey FMI. This tsunami was generated by a magnitude earthquake between 7.7 and 8.4 on the Richter scale resulting in a massive mountain "rock slide" that collapsed into the bay near the Gulf of Alaska.

Could such a massive tsunami of this height that occurred in Lituya Bay, Alaska happen again? It's very possible, and in another geographical and geological location at an unknown disclosed fault line! MY argument is that I DON'T BELIEVE human scientists whom argue that through modern science and technology Man is capable of building earthquake and volcanic eruption proof power plants in their infrastructure. That is what Japanese scientists thought, and they admitted they were slow to repond, and were not ready for the natural disaster on March 11, 2011. Moreover, their water (tsunami) walls failed to do what they were supposedly designed and built for, that is, stop the water surge! I'm also in opposition to underground propped nuclear waste storage sites! Nature, in generating a 1,720 foot tsunami is formidable beyond words of description.

John Grillo

1
3
2

P.O. Box 119
Northeast Harbor, ME 04662-0119

From: Kate Marsh [litlefox99@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, April 22, 2011 12:55 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

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.

Its time to phase out nuclear power, deal with the nuclear waste that threatens our environment and put money into renewable, clean, green energy.

Please do the right thing.

Kate Marsh
10095 View
Chemainus, BC V0R1K2

From: kathleen milano [kmilano@hotmail.com]
Sent: Friday, April 22, 2011 5:04 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

Dismantle the existing ones and stop building nuclear reactors. They are dangerous to operate and the toxic waste can never be eliminated. Should have done fission instead of fusion. Insane. Should have done solar, wind, biomass and geo-thermal long ago. STOP NUCLEAR POISON FROM SPREADING FURTHER - WE ARE STILL SUFFERING FROM CHERNOBYL AND FUKASHIMA.....THE SEA....THE GULF.....FOR OUR GRANDCHILDRENS SAKE.....STOP

1,2,3
4
5

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.

kathleen milano
130 Hill Rd
Erie, PA 16508

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

| 1

| 2
3, 4

From: Katrina Barron [kbarron@nd.edu]
Sent: Friday, April 22, 2011 4:12 AM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Please Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

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.

Other countries, like Germany have a plan to phase out its remaining nuclear power plants, and as we traveled around Germany this year we saw all the many wind farms and solar panels that are allowing them to do this. We installed solar powers in one of our houses in the US and now have plans for another. This is what we should be spending or time and money on.

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.

Katrina Barron
1097 Riverside Drive
South Bend, IN 46616

From: Kenneth Gibson [kennethgibson@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 9:32 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

Just say no! I am fundamentally opposed to nuclear fission technology for the generation of electric power. It is obvious that this is a failed technology for commercial purposes. The Utility industry and the builders of these plants refuse to shoulder the evident operational liabilities without federal government protection from the federally established and underwritten risk "pool." The industry cannot manage its own waste nor does the federal government have a sound plan for the management of nuclear waste product in the form of spent fuel. Research in the area is essentially fatuous or non-existent.

In the wake of the crisis at Fukushima, it has become super-abundantly clear that we cannot afford to take any more risk by building more nuclear reactors. Because disaster can occur at any nuclear reactor, the NRC needs to terminate any plans to approve the new Westinghouse AP1000 reactor design considered for construction in Georgia, South Carolina and other states.

Addressing safety concerns, by shutting down existing plants on an economically realistic schedule within existing licensed operating periods, not satisfying this government-utility-industrial complex, should be the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's primary concern.

| 1
| 2

In any case, 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.

Kenneth Gibson
5090 Kearney Avenue
Oakland, CA 94602-2607

From: kevin smith [kevin3363@att.net]
Sent: Monday, April 25, 2011 1:37 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

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. I live fairly close to the fermi reactor, which has had at least 2 incidents that i am aware of. It is time to explore new areas of energy, and end this dangerous one. | 1,2

kevin smith
1954 cicotte
lincoln park, MI 48146

From: kit crosby-williams [kit@reninet.com]
Sent: Sunday, April 24, 2011 11:46 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

As we all know now; nuclear power is not safe, to the contrary. It is beholden to the NRC to make every possible assessment to ensure that any and every plant is safe. Not most likely safe. ABSOLUTELY SAFE. That is the burden of the NRC. If it cannot perform those assessments which show absolute safety then it is clear that this country needs to turn to safe, and less expensive, sources of power such as sun, wind, water and geothermal.

| 1
| 2
| 3

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.

kit crosby-williams

CA 95521

From: Leland D. Randall [lrandallhome@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, May 07, 2011 8:56 AM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

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 rule making 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 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 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.

In a recent (May 1, 2011) piece in the New York Times, Dr. Helen Caldecott stated about the reactor damage at the Fukushima Daiichi plant in Japan that had "any of the containment vessels or fuel pools exploded, it would mean millions of new cases of cancer in the Northern Hemisphere." She also points out that "that there is no such thing as a safe dose of radiation, and that radiation is cumulative. The mutations caused in cells by this radiation are generally deleterious. We all carry several hundred genes for disease: cystic fibrosis, diabetes, phenylketonuria, muscular dystrophy. There are now more than 2,600 genetic diseases on record, any one of which may be caused by a radiation-induced mutation, and many of which we're bound to see more of, because we are artificially increasing background levels of radiation."

She also commented, "As we know from Hiroshima and Nagasaki, it takes years to get cancer. Leukemia takes only 5 to 10 years to emerge, but solid cancers take 15 to 60. Furthermore, most radiation-induced mutations are recessive; it can take many generations for two recessive genes to combine to form a child with a particular disease, like my specialty, cystic fibrosis. We can't possibly imagine how many cancers and other diseases will be caused in the far future by the radioactive isotopes emitted by Chernobyl and Fukushima."

"During the 25th anniversary... of the Chernobyl disaster, some commentators asserted that few people died in the aftermath, and that there have been relatively few genetic abnormalities in survivors' offspring. It's an easy leap from there to arguments about the safety of nuclear energy compared to alternatives like coal, and optimistic predictions about the health of the people living near Fukushima. But this is dangerously ill informed and short-sighted; if anyone knows better, it's doctors like me. There's great debate about the number of fatalities following Chernobyl; the International Atomic Energy Agency has

predicted that there will be only about 4,000 deaths from cancer, but a 2009 report published by the New York Academy of Sciences says that almost one million people have already perished from cancer and other diseases. The high doses of radiation caused so many miscarriages that we will never know the number of genetically damaged fetuses that did not come to term. (And both Belarus and Ukraine have group homes full of deformed children.)"

"Nuclear accidents never cease. We're decades if not generations away from seeing the full effects of the radioactive emissions from Chernobyl."

"Nuclear power is neither clean, nor sustainable, nor an alternative to fossil fuels — in fact, it adds substantially to global warming. Solar, wind and geothermal energy, along with conservation, can meet our energy needs." | 2

It is reckless and irresponsible to promote nuclear energy as a solution of our future energy needs, especially in light of the unresolved Westinhouse AP1000 containment design deficiencies. The risks involved far outweigh any energy produced. Let's learn the lessons from the disaster at Fukushima and cease production of nuclear power plants immediately. | 3
4

Leland D. Randall
3098 Alexander Lane
Mound, MN 55364-9301

From: Lillian E Goodman [amagood@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, April 23, 2011 1:57 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

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 rule making comment period would be the height of irresponsibility by the NRC.

Simply put, "If you can not get rid of the waste, do not create it' and 'If you can not guarantee sustainability and safety of the plant, do not build it'.

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.

Lillian E Goodman

Mercer Island, WA 90040

From: Linda Lacelle [llacelle@hamilton.edu]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 4:59 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

This is not the way to go. This is not safe green energy.

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.

Linda Lacelle
8484 STATE ROUTE 20
WATERVILLE, NY 13480-2416

From: Lori Mallams [mallamsl@mchsi.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 7:04 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

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.

Nuclear energy is not clean energy. Americans want clean renewable energy both for our cars and homes.
No more meltdowns!

Lori Mallams
142 S. Front St.
North Liberty, IA 52317

From: Madonna Starr [mkstarr@rcn.com]
Sent: Friday, April 22, 2011 2:58 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

We know that the US has to lessen our reliance on dirty fossil fuels and nuclear is relatively clean. Unless disaster strikes...

| 2

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.

The other thing about nuclear is that large government funds must subsidize its creation. If the risks were non-existent and the profits so likely, why do tax- and rate-payers have to subsidize its construction?

| 3

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.

Please suspend this rulemaking until all risks are carefully considered.

| 1

Madonna Starr
333 East 55th Street
No. 12F
New York, NY 10022

From: Margaret Wilkinson [margylw@earthlink.net]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 5:01 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

In the wake of the crisis at Fukushima, it has become clear that we cannot afford to take any risks when building nuclear reactors. Because disaster can occur at any nuclear reactor, no more nuclear plants should be built and the focus should become how to safely dismantle those that currently exist.

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."

Enough! No more nuclear plants. Energy needs must be met safely and in ways that do not threaten the future of our planet. | 1, 2

Margaret Wilkinson
3025 Ellis St
Berkeley, CA 94703

From: Marian Schwarzenbach [marianschwarzenbach@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, April 22, 2011 12:32 AM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

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.

Now that we all are aware of more of the dangers of nuclear energy, and of taking short cuts, we have the benefit of national attention, public awareness, and our object lessons in the extreme folly of "fast track" nuclear planning. There are no second chances to get it right if sufficient care and planning have not gone into the original decisions and design.

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.

Marian Schwarzenbach
4542 Stanford Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98105

From: Mariann Kaye [katytx@myway.com]
Sent: Friday, April 22, 2011 11:04 AM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

Intelligent people would learn an important lesson from Japan and their on-going tragedy. Germany is moving completely away from Nuclear energy. Green Energy is the way to go: Save Our Planet. It is the only one we have and we have pretty much decimated it already. EARTH DAY; GREEN ENERGY.

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.

Mariann Kaye
3903 S. Mason Rd. #810
Katy, TX 77450

From: Marie Leven [marieleven@att.net]
Sent: Sunday, April 24, 2011 6:31 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

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.

There are still too many safety issues regarding nuclear power to go ahead with more reactors. We still have no place to store the waste and have too much stored at nuclear reactor sites. We need to solve waste storage problems first.

Marie Leven
321 Bellewood Drive
Flushing, MI 48433

1
2

From: Marilyn Wadden [mjwadden@mchsi.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 6:49 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

Until someone gets a handle on how to dispose of nuclear waste safely and until we are sure that nuclear accidents can't poison our water and soil, there is no reason to invest in nuclear energy.

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.

Marilynn Wadden
3401 SW 33rd Street
Des Moines, IA 50321

From: Maris Arnold [Maris1000@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 26, 2011 1:10 AM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

It's clear to all who have no vested interest in nuclear plants that they pose too great a risk to all life and the environment.

Especially considering the ongoing crisis in Japan and the review which will take place when the situation is brought under control, if ever, 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. It's one thing not to know. Now we know. You must lead not follow. There's also the little problem of nuclear waste. We must think of future generations not just the short-term buck.

Maris Arnold
1824 Virginia St.
Berkeley, CA 94703

From: Mark Tolpin MD, FAAP, Lt. Cdr. (ret.): USPHS/NIH/NIAID/LID [marktolps@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, April 22, 2011 12:22 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

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.

In short, using nuclear power for electricity generation is one heck of an expensive and dangerous way to heat and/or boil water! The public would be far better served by concentrating on the development of non-polluting natural resource (wind, solar, geothermal, etc.) to drive all electrical power production in future and by using natural gas (of which we have plenty domestically and to which existing coal- and oil- burning generators can be easily converted) as both a stop-gap power source while the needed infrastructure for pollution-free generators is put into place and, thereafter as the back-up resource for electricity generation in cases of local failure/inadequacy of the primary systems.

| 1
| 2

Mark Tolpin MD, FAAP, Lt. Cdr. (ret.): USPHS/NIH/NIAID/LID
256 Glen Avenue
Millburn, NJ 07041-1620

From: Marla Bottesch [snowbook@kynd.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 5:27 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

Please stop this rush to construct MORE nuclear reactors. There is not yet a solution for what to do with nuclear waste. The people of the United States are shouldering this burden, not the companies making the money. This is both a financial burden and a safety burden. We here in Maine have spent fuel rods just sitting above ground down in Wiscasset. They are essentially unprotected from any number of threats. The plants are still un-insurable. The people of the United States are still shouldering this burden, not the companies making money. People living "downstream" of nuclear plants still are many times sicker than those who live free of a nuclear reactor. You do not know even the beginning of the full story of the Fukushima disaster. That disaster will take years to play out, but you are really being foolish to OK any new nuclear plants here before learning everything you can from the Japan disaster.

1 2
3
4

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.

Marla Bottesch
P.O.Box 458
Norridgewock, ME 04957

From: Martha Abell [marticat.martha@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 8:54 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

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.

Wow, can't we just put things on hold.? How about figuring out what to do with the spent nuclear rods?

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.

Martha Abell
390 Pleasant St.
RR 3 Box 3000-G
Rome, PA 18837-9431

From: Mary Ferm [dfirm@bainbridge.net]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 7:23 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

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.

In particular, we need to have safe storage for spent fuel rods in place before we create any more spent fuel. The UCS states there are many nuclear plants with spent rods stored in water, more densely packed than those in Japan. We solid storage.

We need to be prepared for extended power outages. The crisis in Japan was created not just by the tsunami, but by the power outage. Some backup batteries here in the US only provide power for 4 to 8 hours! As a resident of Western Washington State, I know that the power can be off for days.

How can leakage of contaminated water be prevented from spilling into the sea?

This need to be taken into consideration when planning new plants. And we need to bend over backwards to reassure the public that we have learned from Japan's fiasco, and that changes have actually been made here. This takes time, and not fast-tracking. Otherwise you will not have the public support for expanding the nuclear program.

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.

Mary Ferm
5062 New Sweden Rd
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110

1
2
3
4

From: Mary Madigan [black@satlink.com.au]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 9:56 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

Are you kidding ! Why would you build a nuclear reactor in 2011. We have safer, better technology without the risks of meltdown. Did we learn nothing from Chernobyl or Japan ?

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.

Mary Madigan
Australia
Langwarrin
Langwarrin, ot 03910

From: Mary McBride [mary-mcbride@uiowa.edu]
Sent: Friday, April 22, 2011 12:03 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

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.

In short, Nuclear Power is the most expensive way to produce energy and it is the most dangerous! It would be nothing short of insanity to build more nuclear power plants in this country in light of what's happened to the power plants in Japan since their massive earthquake.

Mary McBride
2537 Otis Rd SE
Cedar Rapids, IA 52403

1
2

From: Michael Reich [mareich@excite.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 11:38 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

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.

There is absolutely no valid reason for "fast-tracking" anything about new nuclear plant construction.

Michael Reich
1916 Deere Lane
Glendale Heights, IL 60139

From: Michael Strawn [mjs55@juno.com]
Sent: Friday, April 22, 2011 11:47 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131 - Do not approve the AP1000

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

Because disaster can occur at any nuclear reactor, the NRC should ensure that it has taken all possible precautions before moving forward with the new untested, unlicensed Westinghouse AP1000 reactor design being considered for construction in Georgia, South Carolina, and other states. There are serious safety concerns about the AP1000, but the industry is pushing to get the design approved without answering important questions.

Even though the NRC has pledged to review all U.S. reactors in the wake of the crisis, the AP1000 licensing process continues to barrel along. If the NRC is truly concerned about safety, it ought to put the AP1000 -- and all new reactor applications -- on hold until it has learned the lessons from Fukushima.

In view of 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 this new AP1000 reactor. I urge the NRC to put the license application on hold until a thorough review of the Japanese accident can be conducted and weaknesses in the AP1000 design have been reviewed in light of the accident.

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.

Addressing safety concerns should be the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's primary concern, not satisfying the industry. 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 irresponsible for the NRC to move forward without further addressing that weakness.

Also, Westinghouse has not satisfactorily proven that the thin steel containment shell over the reactor would hold during severe accidents or that the reactor could be properly cooled in conditions similar to those at Fukushima.

Therefore I urge the NRC to extend the 75-day comment period and to suspend approval of the AP1000 design until lessons learned from the nuclear event in Fukushima, Japan can be incorporated.

Michael Strawn
29631 Palomino Dr.
Warren, MI 48093

From: Michele Church
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)
Date: Thursday, April 21, 2011 6:25:10 PM

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

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.

We've had our own reactor problems, remember Three Mile Island? Have we improved our reactors or made them safer. No. So lets stop mucking around with some thing that we don't understand and is very dangerous. Put our money and time into wind and solar power.

Michele Church
2200 Mars Ave.
Apt. 1
Las Cruces, NM 88012-8533

1
2

From: Mike Little [mentalfloss1@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 11:26 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

I'm all for nuclear power IF it's financed, cradle to grave, by private money. No federal backing. The private money has to be responsible for the waste and for any expenses related to accidents or disasters. When that happens, when we make the entire thing a Capitalist endeavor, no Socialism, then I say we do it. Until then, no more nuclear power.

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.

Mike Little
22760 Clark
West Linn, OR 97068

From: Milt Honel [mrhonel@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Friday, April 22, 2011 12:04 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

There should be NO ROOM on the surface of the EARTH for nuclear reactors. INSTEAD, there should be INTENSE EFFORT to urge EVERY person living in industrialized countries to CONSERVE energy... every kind of energy. 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.

Milt Honel
167 E. Jackson
Elmhurst, IL 60126-5145

From: morris sandel [mosandel@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 5:18 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

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.

Isn't it OBVIOUS? Nuclear power will be safe when we have eradicated ALL error from human endeavor ergo NEVER! Please start to dismantle ALL nuclear devices NOW! Build NO MORE!

-Morris Sandel
1611 Holly Street
Austin TX 78702
5124699298

morris sandel
1611 holly st.
austin, TX 78702

From: nicholas vanderborgh [n.vanderborgh@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, May 05, 2011 1:20 AM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

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.

You really need to get in the cradle to grave planning mode. A reactor has a 25 year or so "working lifetime", but the actual lifetime is 1000 years or more. When we calculate profits, we subtract costs from income. However, income occurs during the operational lifetime. Costs persist for centuries. It is totally unjust, criminal I suspect, to dump these costs on those who come next to this part of the planet. We realize that Nations seldom last as long as 300 years; the US will be no exception. Can we really leave a toxic sludge behind? Do we really think we can clean that up? Rocky Flats is a good case in point. It took many billions of dollars to get that part of the earth into a condition that was good enough for "wild life sanctuary", but not farm or housing estate. You know about the half like of Pu.

Just because we can do something, does not mean that we should do everything.

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.

nicholas vanderborgh
4
boulder, CO 80304-0573

From: Nina Lozano [njlo@cox.net]
Sent: Saturday, April 23, 2011 1:59 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

The nuclear industry's rush to get a new design approved before the Fukushima disaster can be analyzed is most suspicious. Are they trying to slide in before stricter regulations are enacted, or are they genuinely interested in learning from the mistakes and assumptions of the past?

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.

Nina Lozano
25421 McIntyre St.
Laqguna Hills, CA 92653

From: Quinn Montana [cowgrrlquinn@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, April 22, 2011 9:26 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

Are we INSANE??

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 should be dismantling all nuclear reactors.

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.

Are we going to wait until we are all dying of nuclear radiation from some inevitable disaster?

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.

Quinn Montana
POB 934
Huntsville, AR 72740

From: Randall Gloege [rgloege@msubillings.edu]
Sent: Friday, April 22, 2011 3:20 AM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

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.

Personally, I am opposed to the developing of new nuclear power facilities. The risks are too great, and the technology, no matter how sophisticated, demands human and technological perfection, neither of which is possible.

Randall Gloege
343 North Rimrod
Billings, MT 59102

From: Rhonda Lawrence [rml1949@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, April 22, 2011 9:16 AM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

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.

I must personally add, man has no business using nuclear "anything" because he clearly does not know what he is doing. The risks are too great.

Rhonda Lawrence
14030 Drexel Dr;
Magalia, CA 95954

From: Richard Fisel [crfpub@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 6:20 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval pending further study

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

As the nuclear disaster in Japan shows, nuclear reactors can be very dangerous, even when engineered well according to current standards. We cannot afford to take any more unnecessary risks. 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 the unforeseen character of the Japanese crisis, the current 75-day public comment period is insufficient for the new AP1000 reactor design. 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.

Sincerely,

C. Richard Fisel
Ph.D Physics, Stanford University

Richard Fisel

95991

From: Richard Keicher [whereits@invegasbaby.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 11:21 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket.ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

Nuclear is not safe for the citizens of Georgia or South Carolina. 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.

Richard Keicher
140 Greenbriar Townhouse Way
Las Vegas, NH 89121

From: Richard Placone [rcplacone@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Saturday, April 23, 2011 9:20 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

I DO NOT WANT TO LIVE IN A NUCLEAR POWERED WORLD. WE HAVE SEEN WHAT CAN HAPPEN IN RUSSIA AND NOW JAPAN. WE HAVE HAS SEVERAL NEAR MISSES IN THE USA. USING NUCLEAR POWER TO GENERATE ELECTRICITY HAS BEEN SHOWN TO BE COUNTER PRODUCTIVE AND TOO COSTLY.

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.

Richard Placone
601 Chimalus Drive
Palo Alto, CA 94306

From: Rinaldo S. Brutoco [RINALDO@SHANGRILAGROUP.NET]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 7:30 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

As the author of two major books on nuclear energy (one published by the college textbook division of Simon & Schuster), I am certain beyond any reasonable doubt that further examination of the AP1000 should be conducted. And, in addition to the safety issues, long-term water issues need to be analyzed given the many questions that occur regarding access to appropriate amounts of water if fresh water is intended, and the long term issues associated with being located at or near sea level if ocean water is to be used. Also, no new nuclear facility should be constructed until the long term storage issues associated with spent fuel rods and other medium and high grade nuclear waste material. Finally, it is a proven fact that EVERY NUCLEAR POWER PLANT IN THE USA emits carcinogenic levels of Strontium 90 in "normal" operation. Until we can be certain that the AP1000 will not similarly emit highly toxic levels (i.e. it can't be allowed to emit more Strontium90 over a 29 year cycle than would prove to be a toxic amount for a human to be exposed to -- 29 years being the half life of Strontium 90) we can not permit it to be built as to do so would cause and immediate and present danger to the public health.

In addition I believe 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.

Rinaldo S. Brutoco
308 E Carillo St
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

From: Rita Gentry [ritagentry@cybermesa.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 9:22 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

I write to ask that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) suspend review of the untested AP1000 in the US at this time. 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. | 1

Addressing safety concerns, rather than 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. I am also concerned that there is no plan to deal with spent rods in the US. | 2

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.

Rita Gentry
2202 N. Norton Ave.
Tucson, AZ 85719

AP1000DCDCEm Resource

16972

From: Robb Sauerhoff [robbs@optonline.net]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 6:06 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

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.

Nuclear energy may offer an abundance of energy, it comes at a grave, expensive cost and threat to all living things and while natural disasters like the recent Japanese earthquake and tsumani may be devastating, they cannot and do not compare with the extremely long-term environment disaster caused by an "radiation event" leak from a nuclear reactor.

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.

Robb Sauerhoff
78 Bartram ave
Bridgeport, CT 06605

From: Robert Bauer [backfrdead@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, April 22, 2011 12:58 AM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

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. I am not totally against nuclear energy but we must do everything we can to ensure that it is done responsibly since the potential for disaster is very high and fast-tracking is NOT the way to go.

Robert Bauer
2552 E. Bayshore Dr
Dickinson, TX 77539

From: Robert Means [rob.means@electric-bikes.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 05, 2011 11:08 AM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

Nuclear power is bad for human beings and other living things. Unfortunately, that may be difficult for people who work in the industry to understand. As Upton Sinclair said: "It is difficult to get a man to understand something, when his salary depends upon his not understanding it!"

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.

Robert Means
1421 Yellowstone Ave.
Milpitas, CA 95035

From: Robert Mihaly [gumbohead47@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 8:17 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

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.

We just don't know if this design is up to the task. Before we commit the significant resources it will take to build it, that question must be answered. Putting approval on a fast track doesn't give us the answers we need.

| 1
| 2

Robert Mihaly
1611 Rosewood Avenue
Lakewood, OH 44107

From: Robert Mueller [4dbob@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 6:10 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

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.

While I am impressed with the spirit of Westinghouse in working to create a safer nuclear reactor design, there is no way these projects should move forward until the potential weaknesses in the system cited above are empirically shown to not be of concern.

Additionally, I wish to say we should be designing Thorium reactors, and never build another Uranium or Plutonium Reactor again. If the AP1000 is indeed designed to utilize this abundant element, bravo. If not, send Westinghouse back to the drawing board.

A few weeks before the tsunami struck Fukushima's uranium reactors and shattered public faith in nuclear power, China revealed that it was launching a rival technology to build a safer, cleaner, and ultimately cheaper network of reactors based on thorium.

China's Academy of Sciences said it had chosen a "thorium-based molten salt reactor system". The liquid fuel idea was pioneered by US physicists at Oak Ridge National Lab in the 1960s, but the US has long since dropped the ball.

Hazardous waste will be a thousand times less than with uranium. The system is inherently less prone to disaster. "The reactor has an amazing safety feature," said Kirk Sorensen, a former NASA engineer at Teledyne Brown and a thorium expert. "If it begins to overheat, a little plug melts and the salts drain into a pan.

There is no need for computers, or the sort of electrical pumps that were crippled by the tsunami. The reactor saves itself," he said.

"They operate at atmospheric pressure so you don't have the sort of hydrogen explosions we've seen in Japan."

As a happy bonus, it can burn plutonium and toxic waste from old reactors, reducing radio-toxicity and acting as an eco-cleaner.

http://www.telegraph.co.uk/finance/comment/ambroseevans_pritchard/8393984/Safe-nuclear-does-exist-and-China-is-leading-the-way-with-thorium.html

Please consider this:

- * a ton of thorium can produce as much energy as 200 tons of uranium, or 3,500,000 tons of coal.
- * reduces the storage of nuclear waste by up to 50 percent.
- * no possibility of a meltdown.
- * helps sever the link between nuclear power generation and nuclear weapons.
- * produces 10 to 10,000 times less long-lived radioactive waste.
- * comes out of the ground as a 100% pure, usable isotope, which does not require enrichment.
- * there is enough thorium in the United States alone to power the country at its current energy level for over 1,000 years.

Robert Mueller
7247 NE 171st LN
Kenmore, WA 98028

2

From: Robert Poignant, Jr. [socjusticeadvocate@verizon.net]
Sent: Saturday, April 23, 2011 2:03 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

It seems that NRC is performing less like a regulatory body than a promoter of the reactor industry. My judgement is based upon my 2010 review of reactor incidents and NRC actions (often slow to investigate and respond to concerns by knowledgeable persons and groups And when it does, NRC levies minimal sanctions against repetitive company behaviors that could endanger lives). I note NRC and industry failures to examine recent European reactor problems and to enact better equipment design, modifications, and operator training and operating procedures.

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.

Dr. Robert V. Poignant, Jr., Ph.D.
Chemical physicist and holder of a patent in radiation physics

Robert Poignant, Jr.
300 Lansing Ave
Lynchburg, VA 24503

From: Robert Robbind [bobrobins2@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, April 22, 2011 12:34 AM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

Fast tracking nuclear reactors is exactly the wrong thing to do. After the Japanese experience is examined and applied to all our existing reactors it should be applied to all proposed reactors.

1

Nuclear power is mature enough that it should not need any special favors from the government. If private insurance is so worried about safety that they will not insure it, I do not want my dollars insuring it either.

2

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.

Robert Robbind
16231 Jarvis St NW
Elk River, MN 55330

From: ROBERTMARY SWAIN [marygswain@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 8:51 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

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.

UNTIL THE PROBLEM OF NUCLEAR WASTE IS PROPERLY SOLVED AND SAFETY IS
ADDRESSED..WE DO NOT WANT NUCLEAR POWER.. THE SWAIN FAMILY

ROBERTMARY SWAIN
514 LAKESIDE DR. S.E.
Grand Rapids, MI 49506

From: Robert San Socie [sanscare@bellsouth.net]
Sent: Friday, April 22, 2011 10:25 AM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

From GE to Monsanto we have been told these things can not happen--yet all of our fears are coming true. We need to end these plants before they end us. The age of cheap energy is over. Work the other end of the problem. Be conservative. Conserve. Stop building. Move us to Wind, Solar, Geo & 12v!

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.

Robert San Socie
4450 Timber Hollow Way
4450 Timber Hollow Way
Jacksonville, FL 32224

From: Robert Singleton [robertscottsingleton@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 5:46 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

I believe untested nuclear reactors built in South Carolina or anywhere in the United States would be a big safety risk for our children and their children. Please do the right thing. We can do better than nuclear if we just look into it.

Robert Singleton
2801 Los Flores Blvd.
Lynwood, CA 90262

From: Rosemary Lerario [rmlerario@msn.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 9:23 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

Nuclear energy is not clean, safe or economical. Did we learn nothing from three mile island, Chernobyl or Japan?

1,2,3

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.

Rosemary Lerario
2 Woodhurst Court
Eastampton, NJ 08060

From: Rudy Bacich [rudy.bacich@verizon.net]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 8:35 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

I am not a scientist but it seems the hazard of just the left over nuclear waste to the generations to come should be reason enough to find an alternative to ever building another nuclear facility again yet in the wake of the crisis at Fukushima, it has become even clearer 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.

Rudy Bacich
5 denman pl
Cranford, NJ 07016

From: Russell Grindle [rgrindle@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, April 23, 2011 2:49 AM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

I find myself on the fence at times about nuclear power. My biggest concern is over what to do with the waste. Fukushima demonstrates how dangerous even temporary storage is. The issue is too important to allow any project to be fast-tracked through to approval. All safety questions must be considered and answered before any new project begins.

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.

Russell Grindle
2442 E Atlanatic Ave
Fairfield, CA 94533-1680

From: Russell Serra [res555@msn.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 6:12 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

Also dont forget we are shutting down Vermont Yankee come March, no matter how much money they put in your pocket

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.

Russell Serra
B street
189 Stratton road
WRJ, VT 05001

From: Ruth Stambaugh [deemare@juno.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 5:01 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

Who will sacrifice their town, their city, their wild lands, their agricultural lands, their health some day? That some day will come. If we continue to operate and keep building nuclear power plants, it's not a matter of "if" but "when" there will be a monumental catastrophe like the recent one in Japan. Why are we so blinded to the huge irreversible destruction that one of these power plants will cause some day? Why are we so willing to play Russian Roulette with lives and our land just to get some temporary electricity?! Please read the following form letter and let it speak for me. Thank you. Ruth Stambaugh

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.

Ruth Stambaugh
93 Bird Creek Estate Rd
Black Mountain, NC 28711

From: Ryan Sdano [ryanattitude2001@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 6:21 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

As a liberal citizen of faith who is against building more nuclear reactors, because of the disaster in Japan.

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.

Ryan Sdano
240 E. Main St.
Whitewater, WI 53190

From: s lawrence [smallfish@shaw.ca]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 10:02 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

I am a Canadian neighbour. Your nuclear plants affect me.

Disaster can occur at any nuclear reactor - the NRC needs to stop building nuclear plants and invest in SOLAR technologies.

There are no guarantees nor current precautions and back-up plans which are 100% effective.

Plutonium is forever. The earth is not.

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.

S. Lawrence

s lawrence
8381 w saanich rd
saanichton, BC v8m 1s5

From: S. Lawrence Dingman [ljdingman@msn.com]
Sent: Monday, May 02, 2011 8:15 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

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.

Furthermore, failure to establish a policy for dealing with high-level nuclear waste makes any decision to build any nuclear plant irresponsible!

S. Lawrence Dingman
670 Massasoit Road
Eastham, MA 02642

From: Samuel Hathaway [yfdgjr@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 11:33 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

Nuclear energy is NOT safe!

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.

Samuel Hathaway
4329 Destinys Gate Dr
Austin, TX 78727

From: Sandrine Marten [cuji91307@hotmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 7:45 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

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.

How many more accidents do we need/ Nuclear energy is dangerous. Period.

Sandrine Marten
4104 Magna Carta Rd.
Calabasas, CA 91302

From: Sara Lourie
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval
Date: Thursday, April 21, 2011 6:28:15 PM

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

How can you, with a clear conscience even consider building a new nuclear reactor, let alone one that is untested? Please consider the following letter very carefully.

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.

Thank you for taking the long-term health of the nation into account as you make your decisions, and for taking the time to read this letter.

Sara Lourie

VT 05656

From: SARA MERIC [hypatia08@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 10:32 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

YOU WANT TO FAST TRACK A NUCLEAR REACTI

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.

DON'T PUT MONEY AHEAD OF HUMAN LIVES! TAKE THIS PROCESS SLOWLY AND THOROUGHLY.
LEAVE ENOUGH TIME FOR PROPER RULE-MAKING COMMENT.

SARA MERIC
1034 Pacific Street
Santa Monica, CA 90405-1414

From: sarah brownrigg [sabrownrigg@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, April 22, 2011 8:25 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

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.

INVEST YOUR TIME, TALENT, AND MONEY IN ALTERNATIVE SUSTAINABLE POWER; GET OUT OF THE NUCLEAR MIND-BENT.

sarah brownrigg
4821 solecito cir
santa fe, NM 87507

From: Scott Dulas [scottadulas@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, April 22, 2011 7:29 AM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

I don't think it's fair to ask taxpayers to fund startup loans and pay if there is an accident. When you can show me a structure built by human hands that holds structural integrity for 10,000 years, then I will believe we can contain spent radioactive materials and waste.

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.

Scott Dulas
5311 Greenwood Rd
Duluth, MN 55804

From: Sean Murphy [Dogmanproductions@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 6:53 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

We as a global society lack the capability to properly control and dispense Nuclear energy. We lack proper storage and/or disposal abilities for waste and disaster. 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.

Sean Murphy
1110 N Verdugo Rd #203
Glendale, CA 91206

From: shelley isom [somersaultpress@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 5:42 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

Are you people crazy to be actually planning to build more nuclear plants? What does it take to end this madness? Are corporate profits to be put ahead even of human survival?

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.

shelley isom
POB 845
Taos, NM 87571

From: Shoshana Wechsler [swechs@pacbell.net]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 5:05 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

We cannot afford to take any unnecessary risks when building nuclear reactors. Because disaster can occur at any nuclear reactor--anywhere, at any time--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 the ongoing crisis in Japan and the review that 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. Furthermore, 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.

For all the above reasons, the AP1000 license application needs to be put on hold.

Shoshana Wechsler
59 Kenyon Avenue
Kensington, CA 94708

From: Stanley Baker [bkrsrb@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 05, 2011 6:13 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

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 rule making 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 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 any expressed concerns. I do not know what your excuse is for not listening to over 75% of the Nations citizens but it is reprehensible to think that you continue on the road to more Fukushima like accidents. We have many reactors set on faults or in harms way yet you ignore the dangers and want to continue your insanity. We are a nation made up of people who make the rules in the long run and the NRC is begging to be sut down. Please do not make it any worse for this country than it already is. I understand the need for alternatives but we have many including Hydrogen and other non fossil fuels or Nuclear plants. Please do more with what we can before endangering another soul with your Nuclear plans.

Stanley Baker
343 Shears Street
Wrentham, MA 02093

From: Steve Howard [complicitnomore@peacemail.com]
Sent: Saturday, April 23, 2011 12:04 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

Not only should there be no reactors built at all, why are you letting something UNTESTED be built? | 1

Why do we even bother to have any regulatory agencies anymore?

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.

Steve Howard
Donegal Dr
Blue Ash, OH 45236

From: Steven Campbell [greenman@surfglobal.net]
Sent: Friday, April 22, 2011 7:17 AM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

DO NOT BUILD ANY MORE NUCLEAR REACTORS - PERIOD. EXCLAMATION POINT, ACTUALLY. HAVE AN IDEA FOR ONCE. HUMANS DON'T ACTUALLY NEED HALF THE ENERGY THEY USE. SAFE ALTERNATIVE ENERGIES ARE ALL AROUND US. IF SOME PEOPLE WOULD PULL THEIR HEADS OUT ONCE IN A WHILE THEY WOULD NOTICE THIS FACT AND NOT CONSIDER BUILDING MORE NUCLEAR REACTORS. HOW LAME IN THE BRAIN CAN YOU GET? LIFE IS NOT ALL ABOUT HUMANS AND MONEY, COMFORT AND CONVENIENCE, NOR CONTRACTS AND "PROGRESS". THINK ABOUT ALL THE INNOCENT LIFE ON EARTH IN THE FIRST PLACE. THINK OF ALL WHO WILL SUFFER WITHOUT MAKING A DOLLAR OR USING OR EVEN CARING ABOUT YOUR PRECIOUS ENERGY. USE SOME BRAIN ENERGY AND STOP THIS FOLLY BEFORE IT IS TOO LATE.

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.

Steven Campbell
255 Egypt Road
Presque Isle, ME 04769-6945

6984

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 Parsons Boulevard #313
Pico Rivera, CA 90660

From: susan pomeroy [susan.pomeroy@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 9:18 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

NOT ONLY IS THIS THE MOST DANGEROUS SOURCE OF ENERGY, IT'S ALSO THE DIRTIEST, NOT TO MENTION EXTREMELY EXPENSIVE. JUST WHAT DO YOU THINK HAPPENS TO THE WASTE? HOW SAFE IS THE DISPOSAL? WHAT IF IT LEAKS OUT OF CONTAINMENT? IF THERE IS AN ACCIDENT HOW LONG DO YOU THINK IT WILL TAKE FOR THE AIR AND LAND AND VEGETATION TO BE SAFE??? DO YOU KNOW THERE IS NO SAFE LEVEL OF RADIATION???

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.

susan pomeroy
9722 truscon dr
houston, TX 77080

From: Suzanne Schwartz [suzie@taosnet.com]
Sent: Friday, April 22, 2011 3:49 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

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. Further, there is no safe way to store or dispose of spent fuel rods which continue to accumulate and are deadly to all life on the planet for thousands of years. Until solutions for this aspect of the the real lifespan and consequences of nuclear power are fully addressed, all plans for new construction and deployment should be halted.

We look forward to your timely response on this very important rule making.

Sincerely,
Alexander and Suzanne Schwartz

Suzanne Schwartz
9 Eototo rd.
El Prado, NM 87529

From: Ms. Thera Jane Mercer
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval
Date: Thursday, April 21, 2011 6:24:14 PM

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

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.

I personally want the U.S. to take the reasonable stand that Germany has taken; no more nuclear reactors at all. Pour all that subsidy money into sustainable solar, wind and wave energy, that has no radiation problems at all. It's time to stop polluting people and the environment with the extraction of radium, the release of radiation gases and water from reactors yearly and the endless headache of where to put spent radioactive fuel. Such toxic processes and fuel to heat water to produce electricity. Really!! If we have future generations, they won't believe it. It will read like a bad science fiction novel. Make an enlightened stand--no more nukes.

Ms. Thera Jane Mercer
3752 Chatwin Ave.
Long Beach, CA 90808-2001

1
2
3

From: Toddy Perryman [tperryman@bitterroot.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 27, 2011 3:53 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

Now is not the time to fast-track any approval of new nuclear reactors. Citizens need to know that all regulations are being fully enforced and full inspections are being performed on a regular basis. These things did not happen at Fukushima's reactors, and I'm not sure you have the funding to allow for full inspections at the plants already under your oversight.

As you know, nuclear power is neither cheap nor clean. Waste issues are yet to be resolved and it would be irresponsible to permit new nuclear plants to be built before the waste issues is resolved. There is already too much contaminated material being stored in temporary dump sites near plants because of a lack of any appropriate long-term storage sites. Lets fix this mess before we make it worse.

1
2

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.

Toddy Perryman
1525 Silver Sage Ln
Corvallis, MT 59828

From: Toddy Perryman [tperryman@bitterroot.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 05, 2011 11:22 AM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

Nuclear power has always been risky, but now the Fukushima crisis has highlighted how quickly a nuclear accident could become a nuclear nightmare. It is imperative to address safety concerns about any proposed plant design. There need to be many layers of protection to reduce the likelihood of radiation leaks.

Siting any plant needs great care to avoid any known fault lines or flood zones. Multiple layers of protection for power supplies need to be available to protect critical systems.

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.

Toddy Perryman
1525 Silver Sage Lane
Corvallis, MT 59828

From: Virginia Johnson [vpovlakjohnson@earthlink.net]
Sent: Friday, April 22, 2011 11:07 AM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

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.

Hasn't anyone been paying attention to recent events in Japan? Hasn't anyone learned anything about the inevitable and unpredictable dangers of nuclear energy? Well, some of us have, and we mightily oppose the use of such energy and certainly adamantly oppose the opening of new nuclear plants! It's way past time to start thinking with our heads and hearts instead of our pocketbooks and greed.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Virginia Johnson
43-55 Kissena Blvd.
Flushing, NY 11355

Virginia Johnson
43-55 Kissena Blvd.
Flushing, NY 11355

From: Virginia J Miller [vjmopus@cybermesa.com]
Sent: Monday, April 25, 2011 4:31 AM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

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.

Please stop all applications for new Nuclear Reactors. They are dirty, unsafe, and very dangerous and expensive. All radiation is a health threat. Begin the process of closing the existing aging, leaking nuclear power plants using Hardened On-Site Storage for the radioactive waste and irradiated spent fuel where they can be monitored. Do NOT keep making new radioactive waste! We must practice efficiency and conservation and provide renewable energy NOW! Thank you.

1, 2
3
4

Virginia J Miller
125 Calle Don Jose
Santa Fe, NM 87501

From: Virginia Smedberg [virgviolin@hotmail.com]
Sent: Friday, April 22, 2011 3:09 AM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

You CANNOT in good conscience approve an UNTESTED, UNPROVEN Nuclear Reactor design - that was true before the Japan situation occurred; now we are reminded just how true it is!!!

1

Does the Nuclear Regulatory Commission consider itself a Production Department? or a Quality Control Department? Those 2 Depts have completely opposite functions and purposes and products. In my opinion, the Commission, with "Regulatory" in its name, should be the latter. Which means its purpose is to be SURE - CERTAIN - CONVINCED BY SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE that a given reactor will be safe and controllable BEFORE clearance is given to produce it. Then the production arm of the business can go into action. But not until then.

2

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. The Industry is the PRODUCTION Dept.

2

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.

RESPONSIBILITY - a key concept in this discussion: to whom is the Commission responsible - the industry? or the people on this planet?? I propose that the PEOPLE are its responsibility.

3

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. Open communication is essential to any issue that potentially affects so many PEOPLE. How many lives have been lost, or compromised, as a result of the problems that surfaced in Fukushima?!

4

Virginia Smedberg
441 Washington Ave

Palo Alto, CA 94301

From: Wendy Watson [wendyb_63@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, April 22, 2011 5:18 AM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

We are supposed to be spending on going GREEN and our Leaders keep making it worse and spending more on Nuclear Reactors, Oil, et al. It is cheaper and cleaner to be putting in Solar Panels, Wind Mills. It also would creat more jobs.

My beliefs are you wanting to destroy this country along with the living with it. OR!!!
When will you put a stop in destroying this country?

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.

Wendy Watson
8102 Logan Heights Cir.
Sanford, FL 32773

From: Will Martin [willm@virginia.edu]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 5:06 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

Three Mile Island and Chernobyl showed us what happens when nuclear power operators make mistakes. Fukushima showed us what happens when natural disasters strike a nuclear power plant. What we haven't seen yet is what happens when obsolete nuclear plants are never decommissioned as promised when built, and are used until they fail because corporations don't want to turn off profitable plants, even when they become dangerous, and they don't want to pay for decommissioning.

| 1

And then there's terrorists acts and potential future military attacks. Failed nuclear plants are long-term problems. Until the nuclear industry proves that it can be trusted to decommission their power plants like they promised before they built them, I don't trust them enough to want to let them build any more of them. Anywhere. Under any conditions.

| 2

Virginia has two power plants in Surry built in the late 1960s that were supposed to be decommissioned after 30 years. They are still operating.

| 3

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.

Will Martin
718 Blenheim Ave
Charlottesville, VA 22902

From: William Lewis [wblart@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, April 22, 2011 10:46 AM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

In the face of the potential for a full criticality in the crisis at Fukushima that existed and still exists, it has become clear that we cannot afford to take any 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. In truth, the challenge which ought to be the NRC's priority now would be to figure out how to decommission and replace or upgrade the currently operating plants of inferior design in the US and worldwide. Hundreds of plants pose the exact same risks as Fukushima, most if not all have other flaws which could lead to criticalities, and no plant has ever figured out how to stop the radiation from the contained nuclear chain reaction occurring in the 'spent' fuel rods nor any permanent and safe way to dispose of it.

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.

William Lewis
401 greenwich st
Ste 3
New York, NY 10013

From: winston mctague jr [wmctaguejr@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, April 22, 2011 9:11 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

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.

As Japan has shown the unknown danger of what will never happen and when what will never happen-happens it melts down and all hell breaks loose and all the used fuel cells that they produce that have no place to go is just more dangerous crap that we need no more of anyway, stop building these stupid old tech dangerous filthy trash producing power supplies and go with wind, solar, tidal, and green generation that will be free and unending forever power we can live with, stop the death machines and go green.

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 rule-making 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 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 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.

winston mctague jr
24 Highland Ave.
newport, ME 04953

1
2

From: Wolfgang Loera [WOLF57327@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 9:22 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

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.

F*CK NUCLEAR POWER!!! NO MORE NUKES!!!

Wolfgang Loera
2381 132ND AVE SE
Bellevue, WA 98005

From: RICHARD RALPH ROEHL [oldcoyoteknose@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 10:23 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

Nuclear power is "safe" and "clean"... and "too cheap to meter?"

Further pursuit of nuclear technology as a source for generating energy is not only irresponsible, but it is criminally insane. Only an misanthropic anarchist or a full blown Sociopath would advocate the continued use of this horrifying technology.

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.

RICHARD RALPH ROEHL
P.O. Box 2001
Clearwater, FL 33757

From: Ronald Hildebrand [ron3@hilstudio.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 6:06 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

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. After this disaster, and those that have come before it, is as obvious as it can possibly be that in virtually all instances of nuclear plant building in the US, expedience has been placed before safety--no matter what claims were made at the time plans were approved.

1

Of all possible scenarios for approving a new plant, any expedited approval would simply be foolish, as I'm sure the members of the commission would agree.

2

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.

Ronald L Hildebrand
Sparks NV

Ronald Hildebrand
2645 SUNNY SLOPE DR 4
SPARKS, NV 89434

From: Rev. Christian Colvin [cyrothendymion@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 7:09 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

In the wake of the crisis at Fukushima, we cannot afford to take any unnecessary risks when building nuclear reactors.

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. 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.

The recent BP oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico -- the largest one in history -- shows that a different energy corporation did not take safety issues seriously and government regulators did not enforce the laws requiring them to fine BP for its safety infractions. The recent tragedy in Japan shows how dangerous nuclear power is, even when all precautions are taken.

Richard A. Clarke's book "Your Government Failed You" lists dozens of times the terrorist attacks of September 11th, 2001 could have been foiled -- but ALL the safeguards failed. The potential catastrophe of a nuclear plant disaster is potentially far more dangerous. There is no excuse for cutting corners here.

Rev. Christian Colvin
2620 Dundee
San Pablo, CA 94806

1

2

From: Sarah Sesek [ameritakushoujo@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, April 23, 2011 10:05 AM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

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.

I am not anti-nuclear, but not taking steps to ensure the safety of new reactors is beyond foolish.

Sarah Sesek

OH 43210

From: Yolanda Stern Broad PhD [ybroad1326@earthlink.net]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 8:53 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Stop the AP1000 (Docket ID NRC-2010-0131)

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

I have a daughter living in Georgia, a niece, and two great-nieces. I would like to know they can continue living in a safe place.

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.

Yolanda Stern Broad PhD
215 N 4th St
Indiana, PA 15701