

**From:** [Tom Gurdziel](#)  
**To:** [RulemakingComments Resource](#)  
**Cc:** [Diane Screnci \(She/Her\)](#); [Dave Gasperson](#); [Chairman Resource](#); [Scott Burnell](#); [m.keller@hybridpwr.com](mailto:m.keller@hybridpwr.com)  
**Subject:** [External\_Sender] Advanced Reactor, Rule 53 Thoughts (Comments #26)  
**Date:** Friday, January 24, 2025 11:02:40 AM

---

Hello,

I am writing today to provide some thoughts that, although I do not believe were solicited, are especially appropriate, in my opinion. Up to now I have provided just over two dozen sets of thoughts that identified things from misspelled words to grammar changes to corrections to content, (both additions and deletions). However,

I do NOT believe this is the way to go.

What we need is a process that primarily makes use of a small panel of specialists/peers/experts in the specific type of reactor process being considered until that particular type has been manufactured/stick-built and has 5 to 7 years of operating experience. At that time I would be comfortable with the type of rulemaking presently being proposed, (but for that specific style of reactor only.)

What I am saying here is that I do not believe we can successfully predict the regulatory future, having NO operational experience to rely on.

Thank you,

Thomas Gurdziel

(I do not have the knowledge or experience to be considered one of those "specialists/peers/experts".)