April 14, 2005

Honorable B. John Garrick
Chairman
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board
2300 Clarendon Boulevard
Suite 1300
Arlington, VA 22201

Dear Mr. Garrick:

Attached are the follow up questions to the hearing titled, “Yucca Mountain Project: Have Federal Employees Falsified Documents?” on Tuesday April 5, 2005. Please answer the attached questions, furnish any information that was requested during the hearing and return this no later than Friday, April 29, 2005. Please be certain to attach a cover sheet to your answers and include your name on each page of your responses.

Please return your responses no later than Friday, April 29, 2005, to Reid Voss, Subcommittee on Civil Service and Agency Organization, B-373A Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515. Because of mail delays, we ask that you email responses to the questions for the record to reid.voss@mail.house.gov before the deadline above. Please mail all original documents as well. If you have any questions please call Reid Voss at 202-225-5147.

Thank you for your participation and cooperation.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jon Porter
Chairman
Subcommittee on the Federal Workforce and Agency Organization
“Yucca Mountain Project: Have Federal Employees Falsified Documents?”
Subcommittee on the Federal Workforce and Agency Organization
Chairman Jon C. Porter
Questions Submitted For The Record
Submitted April 8, 2005

John Garrick, U.S. Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board

- If the allegations are proven true, what is the impact the “sound science” of the project?

- We know for certain that the e-mails in question were written during the time that DOE was rushing to prepare and submit a license application to the NRC. How many times has DOE asked for an extension in filing the license application and what reasons were given in support of an extension of time?

- Based upon DOE’s persistent quality assurance failures and in light of the recent controversy documenting employee falsification of scientific studies, what is the Board’s position regarding the current state of the scientific credibility of the project?

- Should the allegations be proven true, what is the board’s recommendation regarding the continuation of the project?

- It is my understanding that this past February (February 8, 2005) the Board called for hearings in March to review concerns over the corrosion of the titanium drip shields that are intended to keep water from leaking into casks inside Yucca Mountain. Have you held those hearings and, if so, what were your findings?

- Given the fact that DOE is self-regulated and can chose not to implement the recommendations of the Board, has there ever been a feeling among the Board that DOE uses its privilege to hide information?

- Based upon your review, has DOE come up with a plan for safely transporting nuclear waste to the proposed repository?

- To your knowledge, what has DOE done to study the transportation issues?

- If scientific studies concerning the hydrology and geology of Yucca Mountain were falsified, and if falsified reports were used as the basis for other work, how would that affect the overall reliability of the scientific studies at Yucca Mountain?
- Based on the quality of the science seen in the e-mails we have released, can we be certain that the waste stored at the site can be safely contained for even several hundred years?

- Does the NWTRB plan any particular action in response to these charges? (Such as revisit previous conclusions or more aggressive review of DOE)