

## AP1000DCDCEm Resource

---

**From:** DENNIS R. NELSON, Energy-Environmental Researcher [dennison987@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 03, 2011 9:00 PM  
**To:** Rulemaking Comments  
**Subject:** Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

As the President (and a Board Member) of the Chicago-based Nuclear Energy Information Service (NEIS), "Illinois' Nuclear Watchdog Group"=We CANNOT AFFORD to take any unnecessary risks when building nuclear reactors! Because a disaster can occur at any nuclear reactor, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (USNRC) needs to make sure 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 Fukushima nuclear 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 USNRC PUT THE LICENSE APPLICATION "ON HOLD" UNTIL A THOROUGH REVIEW OF THE JAPANESE ACCIDENT HAS BEEN CONDUCTED, AND WEAKNESSES IN THE AP1000 REACTOR DESIGN HAVE BEEN REVIEWED IN LIGHT OF THIS ACCIDENT. To stick with the grossly inadequate 75-day rulemaking comment period would be the HEIGHT OF IRRESPONSIBILITY by the USNRC.

Please accept the petition filed by the twelve environmental organizations of the AP1000 Oversight Group to SUSPEND RULEMAKING. To ensure "transparency," please include my comments (and all others) in the formal review proceedings, and post them in the USNRC's online library so that 'John and Mary Q. Public' can see our expressed concerns.

Addressing real safety concerns, NOT satisfying the nuclear industry, should be the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's primary concern. USNRC 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 USNRC 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.

DENNIS R. NELSON, Energy-Environmental Researcher  
19 East Ohio Street, 1204  
Chicago, IL 60611-2707

**Federal Register Notice:** 76FR10269  
**Comment Number:** 11790

**Mail Envelope Properties** (763231616.1304470810019.JavaMail.tomcat)

**Subject:** Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval  
**Sent Date:** 5/3/2011 9:00:10 PM  
**Received Date:** 5/3/2011 9:00:10 PM  
**From:** DENNIS R. NELSON, Energy-Environmental Researcher

**Created By:** dennisnelson987@yahoo.com

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

**Post Office:** vweb2.salsalabs.net

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	2270	5/3/2011 9:00:10 PM

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