

PR- 50, 52  
85 FR 28436

162

# PUBLIC SUBMISSION

<b>As of:</b> 8/3/20 9:58 AM
<b>Received:</b> August 01, 2020
<b>Status:</b> Pending_Post
<b>Tracking No.</b> 1k4-9i5f-rx7u
<b>Comments Due:</b> September 25, 2020
<b>Submission Type:</b> Web

**Docket:** NRC-2015-0225

Emergency Preparedness Requirements for Small Modular Reactors and Other New Technologies

**Comment On:** NRC-2015-0225-0171

Emergency Preparedness for Small Modular Reactors and Other New Technologies;  
Extension of Comment Period

**Document:** NRC-2015-0225-DRAFT-0254

Comment on FR Doc # 2020-15731

---

## Submitter Information

**Name:** David Johnson

---

## General Comment

Absolutely, consideration for adjusting regulations to suit these types of smaller installations need to be made, no question.

To not do so is to bury your head in the sand and assume that all nuclear power could equate 3 mile island or Fukushima disasters, which is categorically incorrect. Thinking needs to change and be cognisant of new technologies, and the only way to find out is to try.

Do this; put it to the proponent to build one of these facilities, with an targeted amendment to the regulation that allows for one proponent to build to a closer proximity to populations than 10 miles. Lets say 1 mile ... and then allow it to happen and test the heck out of it. Then solidify a new regulatory framework based on KWH of generation, and let the market vote. Let good, fundamentally sound ideas try, then morph it into practical regulations if it turns into a viable option.

I have a feeling that with the excessive build and infrastructure costs, it wont be a very

feasible short term or medium term solution, but the only way to find out is to try. The big part is to let go of the old school, fear mongered lethargy that the only way to be safe with nuclear energy is to disallow it.