

## AP1000DCDCEm Resource

---

**From:** Gerrit Crouse [gerritcrouse@snet.net]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 04, 2011 9:34 PM  
**To:** Rulemaking Comments  
**Subject:** Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval

Dear Secretary Vietti-Cook,

Because the nuclear industry, captured by its own internal culture of group think, does not have the technological competence to safely build reactors anywhere on this tectonic planet, or deal in any way other than temporarily with always-accumulating nuclear waste, we cannot afford to take any unnecessary risks when building nuclear reactors. Really, we cannot afford to build nuclear reactors, but we do it anyway.

The ongoing crisis in Japan, & the review which will take place if the situation there is brought under control, has awakened us again from our consensus trance of forgetfulness & denial of Chernobyl & 3 Mile Island. The current 75-day public comment period on the reactor design is insufficient for the new AP1000 reactor considered for construction in GA, SC, & other states.

As an emeritus member of the American Institute of Biological Sciences (AIBS), I request that NRC put the license application on hold until review of the Japanese accident has been conducted, & the weaknesses in the AP1000 design have been emphasized in light of that accident. Because of the ongoing Japan crisis, the 75-day rulemaking comment period now becomes grossly inadequate.

Accept the petition filed by the 12 environmental organizations of the AP1000 Oversight Group to suspend rulemaking. To ensure transparency, include this comment & all others in the formal review proceedings. Post them in NRC's online library so the public can see any expressed concerns.

Addressing our present & future safety concerns, not satisfying the self-entranced industry, should be the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's primary concern. NRC engineer John Ma's nonconurrence with the review of the reactor raised the possibility that the AP1000's shield building could shatter "like a glass cup." NRC must not move forward without fully addressing that weakness. Westinghouse has not demonstrated, because it can't, 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.

Reference:

"Summary for Decision-makers", /Millennium Ecosystem Assessment Synthesis/ (Washington, DC: Island Press, 2005).

Gerrit Crouse  
38 4th Avenue  
Nyack, NY 10960

**Federal Register Notice:** 76FR10269  
**Comment Number:** 12400

**Mail Envelope Properties** (10628598.1304559232686.JavaMail.tomcat)

**Subject:** Docket ID NRC-2010-0131: Suspend the AP1000 approval  
**Sent Date:** 5/4/2011 9:33:52 PM  
**Received Date:** 5/4/2011 9:33:53 PM  
**From:** Gerrit Crouse

**Created By:** gerritcrouse@snet.net

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

**Post Office:** web1.salsalabs.net

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	2322	5/4/2011 9:33:53 PM

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