

ONE HUNDRED THIRTEENTH CONGRESS
Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE
2125 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6115
Majority (202) 225-2927
Minority (202) 225-3641
May 29, 2014

The Honorable William D. Magwood
Commissioner
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
11555 Rockville Pike
Rockville, MD 20852

Dear Commissioner Magwood:

Thank you for appearing before the Subcommittee on Energy and Power on Wednesday, May 7, 2014, to testify at the hearing entitled "The NRC FY 2015 Budget and Policy Issues."

Pursuant to the Rules of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the hearing record remains open for ten business days to permit Members to submit additional questions for the record, which are attached. The format of your responses to these questions should be as follows: (1) the name of the Member whose question you are addressing, (2) the complete text of the question you are addressing in bold, and (3) your answer to that question in plain text.

To facilitate the printing of the hearing record, please respond to these questions with a transmittal letter by the close of business on Thursday, June 12, 2014. Your responses should be mailed to Nick Abraham, Legislative Clerk, Committee on Energy and Commerce, 2125 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515 and e-mailed to Nick.Abraham@mail.house.gov.

Thank you again for your time and effort preparing and delivering testimony before the Subcommittee.

Sincerely,



Ed Whitfield
Chairman
Subcommittee on Energy and Power

cc: The Honorable Bobby L. Rush, Ranking Member,
Subcommittee on Energy and Power

Attachment

Additional Questions for the Record

The Honorable John Shimkus

1. The NRC has entered into a multi-year study on radiation impacts around nuclear power plants using National Academy of Sciences. In response to questions from the December 12, 2013, hearing, the Commission indicated “NRC staff realizes off-site radiation doses from licensed facilities are very low and uncertainties in the current scientific understanding of radiation risk at low doses are unlikely to be addressed by this study.” The Commission also indicated that one million dollars was spent on just the first phase of this National Academies study which: “confirmed the [NRC] staff position that, at the low offsite doses from these facilities, researchers would not expect to observe any increased cancer risks in the populations surrounding these facilities attributed to the regulated release of radioactive effluents.” The study itself confirmed that it will not advance understanding of radiation risk. Please explain why it is prudent for the NRC to spend upwards of another \$1.5 million to reconfirm what the staff and other studies already demonstrated.
 - a. Shouldn't NRC focus on the uncertainties the staff said are NOT addressed by these studies, to truly advance scientific and public understanding of radiation health effects?
 - b. Are operating reactor licensees ultimately required to pay for these studies?

The Honorable Lee Terry

1. You testified that you would be interested in potential legislative approaches to make fees more moderate. Please provide any suggestions you may have.