

From: "Elisa Young" <elisay@earthlink.net>
To: "Matthew Blevins" <MXB6@nrc.gov>
Date: 4/26/05 9:28AM
Subject: Re: EIS meeting

Matt:

Thanks. I thought the DEIS meeting was originally supposed to be this spring and was concerned I might have missed it. I will continue to check the NRC website, but would appreciate it if you would please let me know when the meeting is scheduled so I can request that time off?

How long is the draft environmental impact study, and do we know when it will be available to stakeholders?

I work full time, as most of the other people do, and this reading has to be scheduled around already full days. Considering the length of the document and the abbreviated review time we were given with USEC's application, I would like to be sure that we are not put in the same position with the DEIS.

Who would be the appropriate person to direct questions to about the the memo that was sent earlier in April with the summary of the conference call between the NRC and the DRC regarding Envirocare's acceptance of depleted uranium and uranium oxide waste for permanent storage in Utah?

Two of the most immediate concerns that I had in reading the NRC document were that there are no limits set on the volume or concentration of waste they are agreeing to receive, and the amendment that was added allowing them to eliminate isotopic concentrations for those radionuclides as a consideration.

I'm confused about the fact that the DRC states cows and sheep occasionally graze in the region around the Envirocare landfill, but also claim exemption from agricultural intruder pathways since that part of the county has "been designated as Heavy Industry and Hazardous Waste Zones, which bars any such residential and/or farming uses." I'm not sure if it's something I don't understand about the designation, but in Meigs county grazing livestock is considered farming use.

I had heard before, and am checking into it, that there have been massive unexplained cattle and sheep die-offs in that area, and I'm curious if there is a connection. Are these animals sold for human consumption? Who is monitoring them for radioactive contamination and other contaminants they may be exposed to from the landfill? Who will monitor and pay for the monitoring of that area considering the incredible length of the half-life of the nuclides being stored there? In this memo the DRC said no special considerations "came to mind" regarding the storage of the uranium oxides, but it seems to me that long term monitoring is an obvious one, and the responsibility of this expense should not fall on taxpayers by default - it belongs to Envirocare and USEC.

It also appears that the DRC has side stepped the usual groundwater restrictions as high saline content of the water under the landfill makes it "non-potable," while also including calculations for radioactive discharges into the Great Salt Lake? I don't understand how they can claim this is an isolated pocket of water lying beneath the landfill and simultaneously be required to include calculations for discharges into the Great Salt Lake.

By their own admission in this memo, "it would be difficult to predict which contaminant would arrive at a well..." Groundwater and surfacewater are inseparably interconnected.

How we gain access to the geology and hydrology studies made reference to in this document? It says that these documents are available to the public, but does not give the contact information.

In light of Envirocare potentially accepting waste in Utah from Ohio (and potentially New Mexico), will the DEIS relating to USEC contain information about the routes, safety precautions, and emergency disaster information relating to these routes, or can you direct me to the appropriate source for this information? I believe long-distance transportation of this material poses significant environmental and health risk that should be required to be provided to us as part of the DEIS process for consideration.

Thank you,
Elisa
(740)-949-2175

----- Original Message -----

From: "Matthew Blevins" <MXB6@nrc.gov>
To: <elisay@earthlink.net>
Cc: "Linda Marshall" <LXG3@nrc.gov>; "Yawar Faraz" <YHF@nrc.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, April 26, 2005 7:00 AM
Subject: Re: EIS meeting

Elisa,
As I mentioned in my April 7 email to you, no firm date has been set for the next public meeting. We are planning for a meeting towards the end of August. A hard copy of the DEIS will be mailed to you prior to the meeting.

>>> "Elisa Young" <elisay@earthlink.net> 04/23/05 10:27AM >>>
I had sent a request to find out when the next EIS meeting will be held for USEC's proposal at Piketonm, but have not heard a date back yet.

I would like to get it on my calendar if a date has been selected.

Will community members be given adequate time to review the draft EIS prior to the meeting? How do we obtain a hard copy?

Thank you,
Elisa Young

CC: "Yawar Faraz" <YHF@nrc.gov>, "Linda Marshall" <LXG3@nrc.gov>

Mail Envelope Properties (426E41FB.9F5 : 6 : 14837)

Subject: Re: EIS meeting
Creation Date: 4/26/05 9:28AM
From: "Elisa Young" <elisay@earthlink.net>

Created By: elisay@earthlink.net

Recipients

nrc.gov

twf4_po.TWFN_DO

LXG3 CC (Linda Marshall)

YHF CC (Yawar Faraz)

MXB6 (Matthew Blevins)

Post Office

twf4_po.TWFN_DO

Route

nrc.gov

Files

MESSAGE

Mime.822

Size

4858

6077

Date & Time

04/26/05 09:28AM

Options

Expiration Date:

None

Priority:

Standard

Reply Requested:

No

Return Notification:

None

Concealed Subject:

No

Security:

Standard