

**From:** Matthew Blevins  
**To:** Cecilia Kloecker  
**Date:** 1/12/05 8:25AM  
**Subject:** Re: USEC's ACP application for January 18 Piketon meeting

Ms. Kloecker,

I apologize for not replying sooner but I was out of town over the holidays. I believe there has been a misunderstanding as to the purpose of the scoping meeting. First, scoping is directed at the NRC's environmental review process. There is a parallel process that evaluates the safety and security of USEC's proposal; this review will be documented in a Safety Evaluation Report. Second, we do not expect the public to have completely reviewed the Environmental Report which is approximately 350 pages. One goal of scoping is to help identify issues early before we get too far into the review process (currently we have been reviewing the Environmental Report for approximately five months). Third, we are certainly interested in what you and the local citizens have to say. Holding a public meeting is not a regulatory requirement and as you can imagine these meetings involve a great deal of work. The reason we are holding the public meeting is that one of the NRC's strategic goals is openness.

Following are the details of scoping as taken from the NRC's regulations (Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 51, Section 29 or more succinctly referred to as 10 CFR 51.29).

Scoping occurs early in the EIS process and provides a means by which the scope of issues to be addressed in the environmental review are identified. Objectives of the scoping process include:

- Defining the scope of the proposed action that is to be the subject of the EIS;
- Determining the scope of the EIS and identifying alternatives and significant issues to be analyzed in depth;
- Identifying, and eliminating from detailed study, issues that are peripheral or are not significant;
- Identifying any EAs and other EISs that are being or will be prepared that are related to the EIS under consideration;
- Identifying other environmental review and consultation requirements related to the proposed action;
- Indicating the relationship between the timing of the environmental analyses and the NRC's tentative planning and decision making schedule;
- Identifying any additional cooperating agencies and, as appropriate, allocating assignments for preparation and schedules for completion of the EIS to the NRC and any cooperating agencies; and
- Describing the means by which the EIS will be prepared, including any contractor assistance to be used.

As you can see the scoping process has many parts. What the NRC hopes to gain from the public scoping meeting next week in Piketon is any additional information from the local public related to environmental issues of local concern, other alternatives, or other information/topics that local citizens feel is important for the NRC to consider in the environmental review. It is imperative that we have this meeting soon so we may fully consider any "new" issues. After we complete our initial review, we will publish a draft environmental impact statement (DEIS). This DEIS will contain a thorough analysis of the environmental impacts of USEC's proposed action, the no-action alternative, and any other alternatives identified. We will then put this DEIS document out for public comment. We will also hold another public meeting during the DEIS

comment period. After we've received comments on the DEIS we will go back and revise the document and produce a final environmental impact statement (FEIS). This FEIS along with the Safety Evaluation Report will then feed into the hearing process and eventually be presented to the NRC Commissioners for a vote on whether or not to issue a license.

Hopefully this helps clarify what we are looking for at the upcoming scoping meeting. There will most likely not be another scoping meeting, however, there will be another public meeting this summer. I am also discussing with my management and attorneys the possibility of extending the comment period, however, I do not anticipate an extension.

I look forward to meeting you next week in Piketon,  
Sincerely,

Matthew Blevins  
Senior Project Manager  
Division of Waste Management and  
Environmental Protection  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

>>> "Cecilia Kloecker" <kloecker@att.net> 12/29/04 09:37PM >>>  
Dear Mr. Blevins,

RE: Reviewing USEC's ACP application for January 18 Piketon meeting

Your department is not allowing sufficient time for any interested citizen to review the 1004 page USEC Inc.'s Application and Environmental Report for the American Centrifuge Plant(ACP) proposed to be built and operated in Piketon, Ohio. You have had one-year. Giving us less than three weeks speaks loudly that your department does not want informed public input. I hope that this is an oversight and that you will change this. I am requesting that there be a second meeting, 60-90 days from the date the application was made available, with no action being taken in the interim. I also want an extension for the NRC to accept written comments/concerns/questions regarding USEC's centrifuge application.

Mr. Blevins, please let me know what is decided. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Cecilia Kloecker

9264 Bluewing Terrace

Cinti, OH 45236

CC:

Yawar Faraz

**Mail Envelope Properties (41E52536.93C : 12 : 19709)**

**Subject:** Re: USEC's ACP application for January 18 Piketon meeting  
**Creation Date:** 1/12/05 8:25AM  
**From:** Matthew Blevins

**Created By:** MXB6@nrc.gov

**Recipients**

att.net

kloecker (Cecilia Kloecker)

nrc.gov

twf4\_po.TWFN\_DO

YHF CC (Yawar Faraz)

**Post Office**

twf4\_po.TWFN\_DO

**Route**

att.net

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	7608	01/12/05 08:25AM

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**Reply Requested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard