

**From:** [Buckley, John](#)  
**To:** [Candace Head-Dylla](#); [members](#); [MASE](#); [Paul Robinson](#); [Peterkin, Lori \(Bingaman\)](#); [Curley, Calvert \(Tom Udall\)](#); [Chris Shuey](#); [Toni Flora](#)  
**Cc:** [Weil, Jenny](#); [Decker, David](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Response to June 15, 2012 Email  
**Date:** Wednesday, June 20, 2012 2:53:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [BVDA 6-15-2012.docx](#)

---

Candace, please see the attached response to your comments. A copy of this email and attachment will be made available to the public in NRC's Agency-wide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS).

-----Original Message-----

From: Candace Head-Dylla [<mailto:cheaddylla@gmail.com>]

Sent: Friday, June 15, 2012 5:07 PM

To: Buckley, John; members; MASE; Paul Robinson; Peterkin, Lori (Bingaman); Curley, Calvert (Tom Udall); Ken Martinez; Ken Martinez; Ron.Morsbach; Chris Shuey; Don Hancock; Miotla, Sherri; Toni Flora; Tohe, Robert; tmckinnon

Subject:

Here are the questions for which we didn't have time at our meeting June 7th.

EPA has spent almost 8 hours with us answering questions about the Third 5-Year Review.

Hopefully NRC can put forth a similar effort.

1. We would like to give NMED and EPA till August 31 to review the CAP and we would like our comments due September 31. You have given Homestake/Barrick Gold all the time it needed to prepare the CAP. Surely, the community can have a minimal chance to respond.
2. When HBG requested additional permitting from NMOSE for a large increase in wells, why wasn't this considered a major revision, triggering an EIS?
3. Has H/BG, NRC, EPA, NMED consulted with the Village of Milan in regards to how this failed remediation has affected the backup wells the Village acquired for future municipal use? Are the agencies all confident that the contamination will never reach the Village of Milan's current well?
4. What is the evacuation plan in case of major flooding? Who is responsible for this plan? Is the agency/entity responsible for a plan aware?
5. We are hoping you find the early well data from the first wells at the H/BG site in your old AEC files. We would like to know as soon as you find them, what the data says.
6. We're still unsure what is means that the CAP is to be the all-encompassing "guiding" document. We would like this spelled out more thoroughly. What happens to the Third 5-Year Review? What about the Risk Assessment? Please clarify the regulatory framework at the site for us again.
7. EPA has mechanisms for assisting communities in the form of TAG and TASC. Does NRC have a way to assist communities in obtaining technical assistance? If so, please provide details? If not, please explain.

8. What alternatives could NRC suggest so that H/BG is not forced to apply contaminated water to land in our community? Does the agency understand the argument that this is necessary to contain the plume? If so, how is the plume contained in the winter when water cannot be applied? Please discuss this problem so we understand your position.
9. Would NRC please make the Annual H/BG Reports and Comments available in our local libraries as well? We don't just mean going forward but past Reports and Comments so local citizens can become and stay informed.
10. Could you please send us the ppts. used at the June 7 meeting?
11. Isn't there a current role for the DOE in the H/BG site given that contamination from the Bluewater site is also moving in the direction of our community?
12. Our community does not have time to send you a letter for every set of minutes we read from your executive committee meetings. We would like to participate in those meetings so we are in a proactive rather than a reactive position.
14. We would like the NRC, EPA and NMED to do a very simple mathematical calculation. We would like you to add together the pounds of each COC HBG claims it has removed thus far. We would like you to convert those total pounds for each COC to volume. We would like you to then give us a total volume of contaminants removed and compare that to the volume of the current ponds.
15. The terms "making progress" "proactive" "successful" are value judgments which the community does not agree can be appropriately applied to this 30+ year remediation. Such terms should be omitted from the CAP. Please explain how you plan to address this problem.
16. Who, specifically, is responsible for the decision not to simply move directly to an EIS for the site? Could that person please lay out his/her argument for not doing so immediately?
17. When H/BG says it has spent \$100 million on this "remediation" is that their share or total spent including the taxpayer's share? Would you also please break that out into costs per year? And, then am I correct then that it took H/BG less than 9 days of this year's profit to pay for 30+ years of cleanup at this site? Could someone please do the math on this for us to see if this is correct?
18. We would like to follow the agency's review of BIER VII and how that might be changing regulations at the NRC for this site? How could maybe MASE monitor progress on this front?

You should be aware that we are aware the three agencies getting together to work on a united plan could be a good thing OR it could just mean a stronger front for thwarting the community's vision for the site.

We look forward to your responses.

Sincerely,  
Candace