

QUESTIONS FOR THE NRC

30 August 2012

- 1) Did you see the electronic version of the Johnson City Press article on the sinkhole that opened at Love Chapel Elementary? If so, did you note the comments that local readers posted regarding groundwater contamination by NFS? Did you notice how many concerned citizens criticized the NRC for being complicit in covering up the extent of the contamination of Erwin's groundwater?
<http://www.johnsoncitypress.com/News/article.php?id=101910>
- 2) Has the NRC analyzed the geology under NFS for karstic features like sinkholes, underground caves and springs? If so, how many underground caves, sunken creeks, faults and fractures cross under NFS? If NRC hasn't done this research, why hasn't it?
- 3) Has the groundwater contamination that NFS has caused found its way to the karst faults, caves and sunken creeks that underlay our entire region? If so, how far has the contamination traveled? If the NRC believes NFS contamination has not reached karst features, what research has NRC done to support this claim?
- 4) Did the NRC's EA or Safety Evaluation Report address geologic hazards to NFS like having a building, or waste storage, or chemical tanks fall into the earth by a sinkhole opening there? If not, why not?
- 5) Now that yet another sinkhole has opened in Erwin, and the dye poured into the sinkhole found its way rather quickly to surface water next to the linear trail, is the NRC convinced yet that the groundwater flow in our karst topography is changing? If so, when are you going to withdraw the EA & FONSI and do a proper EIS? Had NRC done its research right, might you have already found that karst topography is no place to site a nuclear waste dump like NFS? Given that 2 sinkholes have opened just up the road from NFS and both within the past 6 months or so, it is neither "remote" nor "speculative" – the Appeals Court's terms – that sinkhole openings will continue to happen in Erwin. When is the NRC going to conduct an EIS to address the dangers to our health and safety should a sinkhole open under NFS's operating buildings or mixed nuclear waste, chemical and SNM storage facilities?
- 6) And why didn't the NRC do an EIS on a major federal action like a 40-year licensing proposal? Was it because NRC would have had to do some work for the public rather than it's usual cut-and-paste jobs? Or was it because Staff wanted to sneak in a major license renewal before the Commission ordered you to abide by the US Court of Appeals' June 8th Decision to vacate NRC's Waste Confidence Findings? Or was it because Commissioner Ostendorff, who is being investigated now by the NRC's IG, pushed Staff in some way?
- 7) Under the 25-year license renewal that NRC recently granted, NFS will be allowed to have and process pyrophoric forms of Uranium and Plutonium. Did either the EA or SER find that "fire protection controls" at NFS are "adequate" should pyrophoric materials collapse into a sinkhole? Does NFS have IROFS for an "unplanned event" like a sinkhole opening under the pyrophoric U and Pu that NRC is now allowing in Erwin?
- 8) Given the fact that Babcock and Wilcox could not even protect the "Fort Knox of Uranium" from an 82-year old nun and her 2 slightly-less-elderly Ploughshares Activists, is NRC going to re-evaluate the security of this B&W facility (<http://www.charlotteobserver.com/2012/08/18/v-print/3463544/intrusion-embarrasses-fort-knox.html>) since even the DOE is forcing B&W to explain why it shouldn't be replaced at Y-12? If not, why not?

Thank you.

Linda Cataldo Modica
266 Mayberry Road
Jonesborough, TN 37659
lcmodica@aol.com
(423) 676-2925