

## AP1000DCDCEm Resource

---

**From:** Sigrid Asmus [essay@nwlinc.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, April 22, 2011 1:01 AM  
**To:** Rulemaking Comments  
**Subject:** Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

Because disaster can occur at any nuclear reactor we cannot afford to take any unnecessary risks, whether in siting them or building and running them.

Before going further with plans to set up a new type of reactor, the Westinghouse AP1000, in Georgia, South Carolina, and other states, I am asking the NRC to act to fully mandate and ensure that it has taken all possible precautions before moving forward.

The Westinghouse AP1000 is a new reactor design and with no background on its operation, its safety should not be accepted merely on the word of its manufacturers.

Keep in mind that reactors are customarily build along major waterways; as in Japan, when they malfunction they immediately and severely impact the local area -- but also a far wider area vulnerable to radioactive water pollution.

Radioactive pollution is lasting -- and terrifyingly destructive.

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 therefore 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.

Sigrid Asmus  
4009 24 Ave W  
Seattle, WA 98199

**Federal Register Notice:** 76FR10269  
**Comment Number:** 4736

**Mail Envelope Properties** (23668570.1303448449787.JavaMail.tomcat)

**Subject:** Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval  
**Sent Date:** 4/22/2011 1:00:49 AM  
**Received Date:** 4/22/2011 1:00:51 AM  
**From:** Sigrid Asmus

**Created By:** essay@nwlinc.com

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

**Post Office:** web4.salsalabs.net

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	2484	4/22/2011 1:00:51 AM

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