

From: [Paul Gunter](#)
To: [Lamb, John](#)
Cc: [Pearson/John](#)
Subject: Supplement to Petition to Revoke Mark I & II operating license / Columbia Station
Date: Monday, May 13, 2013 11:59:38 AM

Mr. Lamb,

Beyond Nuclear and Oregon and Washington Chapters of Physicians for Social Responsibility, on behalf of the joint petitioners, submit the following documentation and related questions in supplement to the March 21, 2013 emergency enforcement petition to revoke the operating licenses of all GE Mark I and Mark II boiling water reactors.

The supplemental information pertains specifically to external hazards to the Columbia nuclear generating station in Richland, WA that relies upon an unreliable Mark II pressure suppression containment system under certain to-be-anticipated severe accident conditions.

Scientific American <<http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=hanford-nuclear-cleanup-problems>> recently published an article regarding the clear and present danger associated with federal government operations at the Hanford Nuclear Reservation, Richland, WA.

In his statement to the Petition Review Board on May 2, 2013, Dr. John Pearson, representing the joint-petitioners through the Oregon and Washington chapters of the Physicians for Social Responsibility submitted that there exists a public health and safety hazard associated with the collocation of the Hanford Nuclear Reservation and Columbia nuclear power station.

The Scientific American article raises several more site-specific external hazard concerns for Columbia nuclear power station as pertains to the requested emergency enforcement action to revoke the operating license. The joint petitioners request that the PRB reconsider the emergency nature of the enforcement petition to cease power operation and place the reactor into cold shutdown. The Petitioners further request that these issues and questions raised by the Scientific American article be addressed and made part of the agency's on-going deliberations and accounted for in the NRC Director's Decision per Management Directive 8.11.

QUESTIONS:

1. The NRC Petition Review Board transmitted to the petitioners in the April 17, 2013 initial response to the emergency enforcement petition that it had met internally on April 8, 2013 *"to discuss if there was any need to take immediate action"* regarding the continued operation of Columbia nuclear power station and stated *"the NRC did not need to take immediate action, because there was no immediate safety concern to the licensed facilities, or to the health and safety of the public."*

Did the PRB consider any hazard analysis involving the collocation of Columbia

nuclear station and the Hanford Nuclear Reserve to determine and dismiss the need to take immediate site-specific action?

2. Where has the NRC conducted an external hazard analysis on the impact of fire, explosion and radiological release events at the Hanford Nuclear Reservation on the operation of the Columbia nuclear generating station?

3. Where has the NRC conducted an external hazards analysis on the impact of fire, explosion and radiological release events at the Columbia Nuclear Generating Station on the operation of the Hanford Nuclear Reservation?

The petitioners jointly request that an external hazard analyses be made part of this petition's public record regarding the Hanford/Columbia collocation and environmental impacts as part of the NRC petition review deliberations and decision making process as pertains to the site-specific license revocation of the Mark II boiling water reactor at Richland, WA.

Thank you,

Paul Gunter

Beyond Nuclear
Chapters

Dr. John Pearson, MD,

Physicians for Social Responsibility, OR & WA

