

From: Bower, Fred
Sent: Wednesday, January 14, 2015 7:31 AM
To: aceactivists@comcast.net
Cc: Sheehan, Neil; Evan Brandt; Klukan, Brett; Thompson, Margaret; Pinkham, Laurie; Barber, Scott; Nieh, Ho; Scott, Michael; Sheehan, Neil; Screnci, Diane; Tifft, Doug; McNamara, Nancy; Ennis, Rick; Gray, Mel; DiPaolo, Eugene; Montgomery, Richard; Lin, Brian; Turilin, Andrey; Perkins, Leslie; Plasse, Richard; NRC - James Borchardt; Bower, Fred; MorganButler, Kimyata
Subject: RE: ACE Assertion - NRC's Failure to Address Public Concerns Before Relicensing Limerick
Attachments: ML14246A540.pdf

The Alliance For A Clean Environment (ACE)

Dr. Lewis and Donna Cuthbert (ACE),

I am writing to acknowledge receipt of your below email. I have conducted an initial review of your below email and noted that many of the issues you are raising again were previously addressed in a letter to you from Chairman Macfarlane or in previous emails from me. The Chairman's letter can be found on our website in in the NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) at accession number ML14216A340. However, I am attaching a copy of this letter for your convenience. I also noted that this letter contained useful information and references on how to raise issues through the NRC's 2.206 petition process, through the NRC's allegation process or through the NRC's Office of Inspector General (OIG).

Additionally, as I am sure that you are aware, comments received from you (ACE) and other external stakeholders, by the staff during scoping applicable to the Limerick Generating Station (LGS) environmental review for license renewal, along with the NRC responses, are presented in writing in Appendix A, Comments Received On The Limerick Generating Station, Units 1 and 2, Environmental Review, to the Generic Environmental Impact Statement (GEIS) For License Renewal Of Nuclear Plants, Supplement 49 Regarding Limerick Generating Station, Units 1 and 2 (SEIS). If you have not already received these documents, Appendix A of the SEIS can be located in ADAMS at accession numbers: ML14238A559, ML14238A584 and ML14238A588. The Public Electronic Reading Room is accessible at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. The comments that are outside the scope of the environmental review for LGS are not included in Appendix A of the SEIS but can be found in the scoping summary report, which can be accessed through ADAMS Accession No. ML12131A499.

Notwithstanding the above, my initial review of your email did not identify any immediate nuclear safety concerns; therefore, we will respond to your email as soon as we are able to do so, likely within 30 days.

By the way, I observed that you sent a carbon copy of this email to Bill Borchardt. Mr. Borchardt was formerly the Executive Director for Operations of the NRC, but has retired from the agency. He has been succeeded in this position by Mr. Mark A. Satorious.

Sincerely,

Fred Bower

Chief | Projects Branch 4 | Division of Reactor Projects | Region I | U.S. NRC

2100 Renaissance Boulevard, STE 100, King of Prussia, PA 19406 | ☎: (610) 337-5200 | BB: (610) 731-1920 |

✉: Fred.Bower@nrc.gov

From: aceactivists@comcast.net [<mailto:aceactivists@comcast.net>]

Sent: Monday, January 12, 2015 11:24 AM

To: Bower, Fred

Cc: NRC - James Borchardt; Sheehan, Neil; Evan Brandt

Subject: Failure to Address Public Concerns Before Relicensing Limerick

1-12-14

To: Fred Bower, NRC

Chief | Projects Branch 4 | Division of Reactor Projects | Region I | U.S. NRC

From: The Alliance For A Clean Environment

Dr. Lewis and Donna Cuthbert

RE: NRC'S EVASIVE RESPONSES HAVE FAILED TO DIRECTLY ANSWER ACE QUESTIONS OR ADDRESS CONCERNS

THIS ACE RESPONSE TO YOU IS ABOUT YOUR EVASIVE RESPONSES WHICH FAILED TO ACTUALLY ANSWER OUR QUESTIONS.

HOWEVER, BEFORE ADDRESSING YOUR EVASIVE RESPONSES, WE FEEL COMPELLED TO ADDRESS NRC'S INEXPLICABLE RELICENSING OF LIMERICK NUCLEAR PLANT WITHOUT PROVIDING WRITTEN RESPONSES WE REQUESTED.

1. IN OCTOBER 2011, ACE PRESENTED SUBSTANTIAL WRITTEN TESTIMONY FOR LIMERICK'S ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT PUBLIC HEARINGS.

In spite of multiple specific requests for written responses from NRC, since 2011, ACE never received any response to our massive written testimony presented to NRC related to Limerick's Environmental Impact Statement for Relicensing.

2. IN MAY, 2014 (OVER 6 MONTHS AGO), AT AN NRC MEETING IN LIMERICK, ACE SUBMITTED TO YOU AND OTHER NRC OFFICIALS, A 20-PAGE SUMMARY ANALYSIS THAT CONTAINED LONG LISTS OF SERIOUS UNRESOLVED HEALTH AND SAFETY CONCERNS ABOUT LIMERICK NUCLEAR PLANT OPERATIONS.

At the 5-7-14 NRC meeting, ACE handed directly to you and other NRC officials, up-to-date summaries of Limerick's unresolved health and safety issues, as well as other serious unresolved concerns. We remind you the concerns expressed in that packet are about Limerick's unprecedented threats and harms and the impacts to millions of people over the next 30 years because of Limerick relicensing.

➤ **ACE RECEIVED NO RESPONSES ADDRESSING ISSUES WE RAISED IN THE DOCUMENTS LISTED ABOVE. NRC NEVER ANSWERED US ABOUT THE BROAD RANGE OF EXTRAORDINARILY SERIOUS THREATS AND HARMS WE REPEATEDLY LISTED, INCLUDING LIMERICK'S**

1. THREAT OF A DRINKING WATER DISASTER
2. UNRESOLVED DEADLY HIGH-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE ISSUES
3. INHERENT DESIGN FLAWS
4. UNPRECEDENTED, UNFIXABLE EARTHQUAKE FAULT RISKS

➤ **IN OCTOBER 2014, NRC NEGLIGENTLY RELICENSED LIMERICK NUCLEAR PLANT, FURTHER JEOPARDIZING THE HEALTH, SAFETY, AND FINANCIAL INTERESTS OF MILLIONS OF RESIDENTS IN THE GREATER PHILADELPHIA REGION.**

➤ **THE UNRESOLVED UNPRECEDENTED THREATS AND HARMS OUR DOCUMENTS SUMMARIZED SHOULD BE SUFFICIENT TO CLOSE LIMERICK. WE BELIEVE NRC FAILED TO ANSWER US BECAUSE RELICENSING IS INDEFENSIBLE.**

NRC'S REPEATEDLY EVASIVE RESPONSES APPEAR TO BE SMOKESCREENS THAT DISGUISE REALITY AND AVOID FULL AND ACCURATE DISCLOSURE.

NUMEROUS NRC OFFICIALS, INCLUDING YOU, REPEATEDLY SEND RESPONSES THAT RESULT IN CONFUSION, DECEPTION, AND MISDIRECTION. NRC RESTATES NRC REQUIREMENTS WHICH IS NOT THE SAME THING AS REQUIRING COMPLIANCE.

Instead of direct answers, NRC cites regulations, uses many unexplained acronyms (industry and regulatory speak), and provided ACE with NRC website links which sometimes did not work. This misdirection failed to directly answer our questions or respond to our concerns.

➤ When Limerick fails to comply with NRC regulations and its operating license, NRC attempts to hide the fact that NRC has granted approval to Exelon for dangerous license amendments, exemptions from regulations, loopholes, and long delays for compliance with NRC regulations and requirements.

YOUR RECENT RESPONSES DID NOT ANSWER OUR QUESTIONS.

Your 12-8-14 Responses To ACE 11-9-14 Questions Provide Examples Of Deception And Evasion.

1. Concerned About **Embrittlement And Degradation Of Limerick's Inherently Defective Reactors,** We Asked You:

- ✓ Has NRC or Exelon ever done **borehole testing** on Limerick's reactors?
- ✓ Was that a **requirement for relicensing?** If not, why not.

You Failed To Directly Answer Those Questions.

- If borehole testing for Limerick's reactors was done, why wouldn't you simply answer the questions stated above?
- Are we to assume it has never been done?
- If it was not done, we can't understand why it was not required BEFORE relicensing,
- **Both Failure of NRC to Require This Testing for Relicensing and Your Failure To Directly Answer Our Questions Are Indefensible.**

2. We Also Expressed Concern Related To Elimination Of Testing For Limerick's Aging Management Program For Relicensing (Commitment No. 46).

➤ Your Response Failed To Disclose That NRC Allowed Exelon to Eliminate Vital Testing For Safety Required By Commitment No. 46 Of Limerick's Relicensing Application.

- References you provided confirm that NRC accepted Exelon's substitute for aging equipment testing as a condition for relicensing.
- It is ridiculous for NRC to relicense Limerick without this testing.
- As NRC stated when Exelon asked to amend Limerick's relicensing application to omit this actual testing requirement for Limerick relicensing:
- **There Is No Way For NRC To Verify Whether Limerick's Aging Equipment Is Safe.**

- **NRC Should Have Required Actual Testing Of Limerick's Aging Equipment, Prior To Relicensing.**
- **NRC Allowed Exelon To Delay Limerick's Aging Equipment Testing For At Least A Decade.**

IT IS INEXPLICABLE AND UNACCEPTABLE THAT NRC PROVIDED AN AMENDMENT THAT ELIMINATED ACTUAL TESTING FOR RELICENSING.

➤ **IN NO WAY DID YOU ADDRESS THE POTENTIAL CONSEQUENCES OF ELIMINATING NRC'S ORIGINAL REQUIREMENT FOR TESTING LIMERICK'S AGING EQUIPMENT BEFORE RELICENSING (ORIGINAL COMMITMENT NO. 46).**

- Because NRC Allowed Exelon to avoid this testing prior to relicensing Limerick, NRC cannot prove Limerick's equipment deterioration is not occurring faster than aging models predicted. In reality, without testing NRC has no actual idea how fast equipment deterioration is occurring at Limerick.
- Your tactic of asking us for more information instead of answering specific direct questions with specific direct answers is evasive and unacceptable. You are responsible for oversight of Limerick's safety and should know where to find NRC records.

3. In your 12-8-14 response you claimed "Exelon is required to insure that both Limerick Units 1 and 2 meet requirements throughout the plant's operating lifetime. YOUR STATEMENT DOES NOT REFLECT LOGIC OR REALITY. NRC HAS NO VALID PROOF THAT NRC CAN INSURE LIMERICK'S SAFE OPERATIONS, EVEN UNTIL LIMERICK'S CURRENT LICENSES EXPIRE (2024 AND 2029).

➤ This Suggests To Us That You Could Not Have Taken The Time To Adequately Evaluate NRC's Safety Evaluation Reports And Related Correspondence To Exelon From NRC Regarding Limerick Nuclear Plant Operations.

➤ Your Own Staff Found Evidence That NRC, And Everyone Else, Should Be Very Concerned About Corrosion, Thinning, Pitting, And General Deterioration Of Limerick's Aging Equipment. Don't Ask Us For Records From NRC Files.

Additionally: Meeting NRC requirements has never insured safety. Historic evidence suggests Limerick's inherently defective reactors have NEVER met original NRC requirements for licensing. NRC weakened its requirements so that Limerick could "meet" them. NRC's regulations have been changed repeatedly from the start in order to license this dangerous nuclear plant.

- Limerick has already operated for 30 years. Relicensing means Limerick can operate for 30 more years, because 10 years are still left in Limerick's current licenses.
- It is unclear what you meant by Limerick's operating lifetime. Is it the original 40 years of its current license, or the combined 60 years resulting from NRC's relicensing?

OTHER NON-RESPONSIVE NRC ANSWERS PREVIOUSLY PROVIDED TO ACE:

1. HIGH-BURN NUCLEAR FUEL

High-Burn Nuclear Fuel Use At Limerick Significantly Impacts Our Health and Safety, Yet YOUR RESPONSE DID NOT ANSWER OUR QUESTIONS:

- When Limerick started burning high-burn nuclear fuel
- If it is being burned in both reactors.
- If NRC plans to continue to allow its use despite:
 - ✓ 2 to 3 times higher radioactive fission gas releases
 - ✓ Increased risk of fuel rod ruptures that can lead to radiation leaks in fuel pools, casks, and transport.

You Claimed, "IT (HIGH-BURN FUEL USE) IS INFORMATION THAT IS NOT NORMALLY COLLECTED BY THE NRC". HOW CAN THAT BE TRUE? NRC's Mission Is To Protect Us From This Kind Of Radioactive Risk.

➤ **NRC Should Be Tracking All Information On Limerick's Deadly Radioactive Wastes, Including High-Burn Fuel, Even From A Security Standpoint.**

➤ **The Public Has A Right To Know If Limerick Is Using Radioactive Waste That Releases More Radiation And Increases Risks For Storage And / Or Transport In Our Region.**

THE LINK BETWEEN CITIZEN RADIATION SPIKES (UP TO 30% HIGHER) AND 2 TO 3 TIMES HIGHER RADIOACTIVE GAS RELEASES DUE TO HIGH-BURN FUEL USE AT LIMERICK SHOULD BE CLEAR TO ANY INDEPENDENT OBSERVER.

➤ High-burn nuclear fuel use can result in 2 to 3 times higher radioactive fission gas releases. That is a far more plausible explanation for why we recently detected higher radiation spikes than previous years when we were taking regular readings.

You repeatedly tell us there is no problem at Limerick when we report our findings to NRC. We have refuted your UNSUBSTANTIATED explanations / suggestions.

NRC has NO PROOF that high-burn fuel use at Limerick is not what is causing higher than previous radiation spikes detected by residents.

NRC DOES NO INDEPENDENT RADIATION MONITORING.

Exelon's radioactive gas testing and reporting to NRC is unreliable!

- NRC allows a 36% margin of error in Exelon's radioactive reporting. That is hardly reliable, yet that is what you have used to claim you find no problem.
- When you claimed there was no problem at Limerick, we were initially relieved, since residents who contact ACE about radiation spikes are concerned about the beginning of a radiological accident / meltdown.

Citizen radiation monitoring was started because evidence from TMI, Limerick's March 19, 2012 radioactive spill into drinking water, and other examples that reveal NRC has no intention of immediately notifying the public in the event of radiation accidents. The public was not notified for 23 days after the 3-19-12 Limerick radiation spill.

2. THE VOLUME AND WEIGHT OF LIMERICK'S LOW-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTES (LLRW) IS NOT TRACKED BY NRC, EVEN THOUGH LLRW MUST BE KEPT AWAY FROM PEOPLE FOR UP TO 500 YEARS. ➤ WITHOUT TRACKING THE WEIGHT AND VOLUME OF LIMERICK'S LLRW, NRC CANNOT ACCURATELY DETERMINE HOW MUCH IS PRODUCED OR WHERE IT GOES.

- For Over A Year, NRC Went To Extraordinary Lengths To Avoid Full And Accurate Disclosure Regarding The Volume, Weight, And Destination Of Limerick's Low-Level Radioactive Wastes.
➤ **FINALLY, AN NRC OFFICIAL INFORMED US THAT NRC DOESN'T BELIEVE IT IS NECESSARY TO TRACK THE VOLUME AND DESTINATION OF LIMERICK'S LLRW.**
- Limerick Is Out Of Room To Store Its LLRW. Barnwell, S.C. would no longer take Limerick's LLRW in 2009. Exelon was permitted to send it to Peach Bottom in 2009. ➤ **NRC OFFICIALS TOLD ACE IT WAS GOING TO PEACH BOTTOM, YET ON-LINE RECORDS DO NOT REFLECT THAT.**
- NRC repeatedly refused to provide written responses to the ACE question: ➤ **GIVEN THE POTENTIAL PUBLIC HEALTH RISKS, WHY DOESN'T NRC TRACK THE VOLUME AND DESTINATION OF ALL LIMERICK'S LLRW?**
- Mr. Bower, your 3-1-14 e-mail to ACE was an attempt to avoid responding to our concerns on the record and avoid accountability. ➤ ***"This is the third response on this topic [LLRW]. Rather than submitting additional questions..., I request that you contact me on the phone."***

Your unwillingness to provide written answers is not only troubling, it is unacceptable. It avoids accountability for you, but it can lead to deception and misunderstanding.

3. NRC DEMONSTRATES DEFERENCE TO EXELON'S UNTIMELY REPORTS. THIS CAN DENY THE PUBLIC TIME TO REVIEW IMPORTANT DOCUMENTS IN TIME FOR NRC'S PUBLIC MEETINGS ABOUT LIMERICK.

➤ Example: Exelon's 2013 Radiological Monitoring Report for Limerick was due in March, 2014, yet the report was over 30 days late and not available in time for public review before NRC's 5-7-14 meeting on Limerick's 2013 operations.

We e-mailed you to ask why it was so late. In your 4-24-14 response you inexplicably refused to tell us **why** in writing. You stated: *"I suggest that you call me and I will explain the information I have regarding when I expect the 2013 (Radiological Monitoring) report to be submitted and why."* At a later date, you forwarded us a link to that radiation report, but the link would not open.

4. NRC OFFICIALS, INCLUDING YOU, HAVE FAILED TO TAKE LIMERICK'S UNPRECEDENTED EARTHQUAKE RISKS SERIOUSLY, EVEN AFTER THE FUKUSHIMA DISASTER.

➤ ACE provided NRC with documented evidence showing why Limerick Nuclear Plant should be considered at tremendous risk for multiple meltdowns from an earthquake. NRC should close Limerick to avoid the potential for such a catastrophe.

➤ Instead, NRC dismissed the evidence and allowed Exelon to wait until 2019 (another 4 years) to complete an earthquake risk study for Limerick, inexplicably classifying Limerick in NRC's least risky category for earthquake risk without accounting for:

- 1)
- 1) An earlier analysis ranking Limerick 3rd on the nation's earthquake risk list.
- 2) Limerick's construction directly over earthquake fault fractures.
- 3) Limerick's fuel pools built directly over reactors on top of earthquake fault zone fractures.
- 4) The fact that other vital Limerick structures, including the control room, turbine building and rad-waste storage building are also built over earthquake fault zone fractures.
- 5) Earthquake risks dramatically increasing at Limerick due to massive fracking in PA and surrounding states. USGS has determined that earthquakes can be triggered by fracking.

Due to NRC's repeated dismissals, deceptions, and denials of earthquake risks at Limerick, in 2014, ACE finally contacted NRC Chairman Macfarlane to close Limerick to eliminate such unprecedented risk for catastrophic meltdowns at Limerick from an earthquake.

- Ironically, at NRC's 5-7-14 public meeting, you appeared annoyed that ACE had contacted NRC Chairman Macfarlane.
- While your reaction was surprising, your dismissive attitude toward serious risks was not.
- December 9, 2013 you replied by e-mail to the 11-4-13 questions from ACE researchers.

We asked if Limerick had been included in the seismic hazard walkdown audit associated with the Near-Term Task Force Recommendation 2.3 that NRC requested on March 12, 2012. We asked if not, why not.

While you stated that Limerick was NOT one of the sites audited, the reasons you cited for Limerick not being audited are exactly the reasons that LIMERICK SHOULD HAVE BEEN AUDITED. NRC's guidance is clearly flawed and not an acceptable measure of earthquake risk at Limerick. You irrationally claimed that Limerick was not chosen because it was not a site with higher than average seismic risk. However, with Limerick's reactors, fuel pools, control room, turbine building, and rad-waste storage building built directly on top of an earthquake fault zone, and four other fault zones within 17 miles, LIMERICK SHOULD QUALIFY AS VERY HIGH RISK:

- 3-17-11 - Our local newspaper reported that Limerick Nuclear Plant was identified as 3rd on the nation's earthquake risk list, according to a USGS report. It is impossible to understand that NRC selected only six plants out of 66 in the U.S., and Limerick was not one of the six.

8-24-11 - The article in our local newspaper, "Earthquake Jolts Region" reported that Limerick was impacted by the 9-23-11 Virginia earthquake.

- ✓ NO walkdown can reveal the magnitude of Limerick's earthquake risks.
- ✓ NRC's review of Exelon's seismic walkdown response report is meaningless.
- ✓ Limerick has the 2nd most densely populated evacuation zone in the U.S. Yet, you inexplicably stated that Limerick was not chosen because it was not representative of the larger population of US nuclear plants. Dense population around Limerick is a major reason Limerick should have been selected.
- ✓ NRC's selection of generic criteria to determine Limerick's earthquake risk is clearly flawed.
- ✓ NRC's Seismic Walkdown Audit appears to be designed to eliminate the perception of earthquake risks at nuclear plants, especially high-risk plants like Limerick.
NRC clearly didn't dismiss the earthquake fault risk at Limerick because there was little or no earthquake risk. We believe NRC chose to dismiss the earthquake fault risk at Limerick in order to relicense Limerick.
- ✓ NRC's regulations, had they been followed at the time of original licensing, would have prohibited Limerick's operations. NRC's regulations were weakened to permit Limerick licensing, and they have continued to be weakened even further ever since.

CLEARLY, EARTHQUAKE FAULT FRACTURES DIRECTLY UNDER LIMERICK'S NUCLEAR REACTORS AND SPENT FUEL POOLS, AS WELL AS THE CONTROL ROOM, TURBINE BUILDING, AND RAD-WASTE BUILDING PRESENT UNACCEPTABLE EARTHQUAKE RISKS, WHICH YOU AND OTHER NRC OFFICIALS CONTINUE TO DISMISS AND MINIMIZE.

5. At NRC's 5-7-14 Meeting, you made it clear you prefer phone conversations rather than written responses to our questions and concerns, stating that written responses require you to get approvals. But there can be no accountability without written responses. Written responses also avoid misunderstandings.

- **Written responses provide accountability and avoid misinterpretation and confusion.**
- **ACE refuses to accept phone responses in place of our requested written responses.**

BELOW ARE JUST TWO EXAMPLES OF OTHER NRC OFFICIALS WHO FAILED TO EVEN RESPOND:

- The most recent example is Neil Sheehan's failure to address statements he made in our local newspaper about Limerick's latest accidental toxic spill. We asked Mr. Sheehan for clarification of his 10--17-14 statements. ➤ He never responded. PR people should not make statements they can't or won't defend. Your response on behalf of his statements is unacceptable.
- NRC Commissioner William Borchardt never responded to the broad range of Limerick's unprecedented threats and harms we first raised with him in a 4-28-13 letter, followed up by a 21-page 8-5-13 letter. ➤ To date, 1-12-15, 21 months later, we have still had NO RESPONSE OR ACTION RELATED TO SERIOUS UNPRECEDENTED THREATS AT LIMERICK which we first identified for Mr. Borchardt 4-28-13. Instead of addressing issues, Mr. Borchardt's one response to us dealt only with NRC's process.

NRC'S CLAIMS OF RESPONSIVENESS AND TRANSPARENCY HAVE ZERO CREDIBILITY BASED ON ACE EXPERIENCES.

- NRC officials assigned to Limerick have made it extremely difficult for ACE to obtain full disclosure about the public's health and safety risks from Limerick's dangerous operations. Full disclosure is imperative to better understand Limerick harmful impacts of the health, safety, and financial interests of our region. It has become clear that the NRC process is designed to help Exelon disguise Limerick's unprecedented threats and harms.

- NRC officials, including you, have gone to extraordinary lengths to create the false impression in the minds of the public that Limerick's extremely risky operations have been carefully investigated by NRC and that NRC's drastically weakened regulations are protecting us. ACE's review of NRC / Exelon reports, permits, and other documents over the past 14 years refute NRC's PR tactics.
- NRC propaganda is sheer deception. Unless the public takes inordinate amounts of time to review all safety reports, permits, and other Limerick related documents, you would think Limerick was no riskier than a candy factory.
- NRC's failure to inform the public for 23 days about Limerick's March 2012 radioactive spill into the vital drinking water source for almost two million people from Pottstown to Philadelphia is just one example of NRC's utter failure of responsiveness. There are no filters to remove all Limerick's radionuclides at water treatment companies who withdraw their water from the river. Without immediate full disclosure, water companies could not warn their customers and families had no opportunity to avoid use of the even more radioactive water.
- NRC always declares Limerick's operations and accidents to be safe in every aspect, despite evidence to the contrary.
- NRC is repeatedly caving in to Exelon's requests to hide important information from the public, including details of the most recent security problem at Limerick.
- NRC fails to take its information security responsibilities seriously.

After 9/11 ACE attended NRC public meetings, expressing concerns about security and terrorist threats related to Limerick. To this day, NRC has failed to take our concerns seriously. Among those concerns are an airport only about one mile from Limerick and several others too close for comfort, a drunken pilot incident that revealed there is no way to shoot down a terrorist plane or missile before it strikes the fuel pools or other equipment that can trigger meltdowns, train tracks that travel right through the Limerick Nuclear Plant property, inattentive and inadequate security guards, and cyber attacks.

A new NRC Inspector General report shows we were right to worry and question NRC's oversight of Limerick security. It revealed that NRC is failing to perform required continuous monitoring measures and update other security weaknesses it has known about for years. It states that because NRC still lacks many vital security practices, "NRC cannot ensure the effectiveness of information security controls for NRC systems and cannot identify and control risk". These vulnerabilities, identified by the agency as actual weaknesses, require remediation.

CONCLUSIONS:

ACE is urging you to review and fully consider the body of evidence that we have submitted to NRC as official public hearing comments related to Limerick Nuclear Plant's unprecedented threats and harms to public health, safety, and financial interests. We ask this because you appeared unaware and dismissive about actual health and safety risks and harms related to Limerick when we expressed our sincere concerns at the 5-7-14 NRC public meeting and because you failed to answer to the issues in the packet we handed you at that meeting. In fact, five months later we learned that Limerick was relicensed, despite no responses from you related to issues that should have impacted Limerick relicensing.

Despite failing to provide us with full disclosure and direct answers to specific questions, we are still hopeful that you will meet your regulatory responsibilities to protect public

interests related to Limerick operations. We also urge you to consider moral and ethical responsibilities to the public.

At the 5-7-14 NRC meeting we requested your help to close Limerick to avoid a Fukushima-like catastrophe. It is imperative that you stop dismissing the well documented risks and harms and recommend closing Limerick as soon as possible to prevent an avoidable catastrophe.

Respectfully,
Dr. Lewis Cuthbert

CC: U.S. Senator Casey
U.S. Senator Toomey
U.S. Congressman Dent
U.S. Congressman Meehan
PA Senator Rafferty
PA Senator Dinniman
PA Representative Vereb
PA Representative Quigley
PA Representative Hennessey
NRC Chairman Burns
NRC Commissioner Borchardt
Neil Sheehan, NRC Public Relations
Pottstown Mercury