United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Louisiana Energy Services
National Enrichment Facility

Public Information Meeting
on
Safety Evaluation Report
Final Environmental Impact Statement

August 2, 2005
Eunice, New Mexico

Attachment 4

United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Environmental Review

Jennifer Davis
Section Chief
Environmental Review Section

Overview

- The environmental review process
- Findings of the Final Environmental Impact Statement

United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Environmental Review Process
(Steps Completed)

1. License application submittal (December 2003)
2. Notice of intent to prepare an EIS (February 2004)
3. Scoping process and public meeting (March 2004)
4. Scoping summary report issued (April 2004)
5. Draft EIS issued (September 2004)

Environmental Review Process
(Steps Completed and Remaining)

6. Public comments on Draft EIS accepted (until January 7, 2005)

7. Final EIS issued (June 15, 2005)

8. NRC decision on application (expected in February 2006)

Areas Evaluated in Final EIS

- Water Resources
- Environmental Justice
- Ecological Resources
- Public and Occupational Health
- Air Quality
- Waste Management
- Noise
- Socioeconomics
- Land Use
- Historic and Cultural Resources
- Transportation
- Visual and Scenic Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Cumulative Effects

Evaluation of Impacts

- Impacts from construction, operations, decommissioning, and accidents were analyzed
- The possible impact categories were small, moderate, or large
- Impacts can be negative or positive
- No impacts were found to be large for the LES facility
- Mitigation measures are described
- Results are presented in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS

Categories of Environmental Impacts

- Small: Not detectable or are so minor that they would neither destabilize nor noticeably alter any important attribute of the resource
- Moderate: Sufficient to noticeably alter but not destabilize important attributes of the resource
- Large: Clearly noticeable and sufficient to destabilize important attributes of the resource

Small Impacts of the Proposed Action

- Land use
- Historical and cultural resources
- Visual and scenic resources
- Air quality
- Geology and soils
- Water resources
- Ecological resources
- Environmental justice
- Noise

Water Resources

- Analyzed surface water and groundwater
- Evaluated water management (for example, lined retention basins)
- No surface water present at the site
- The first well-defined source of groundwater is approximately 1000 ft below the surface
- Impact on water supply would be small because of excess capacity in the area
- No process waters would be discharged from the site

Small to Moderate Impacts of the Proposed Action

- Socioeconomics
- Transportation
- Public and occupational health
- Waste management

Socioeconomics

- Analyzed employment, population, housing, public services and finances
- Employment would increase moderately
- Finances of the State and County would increase moderately, due to increased tax revenue
- Impacts to population, housing, and public services would be small

Transportation

- Analyzed routine traffic and accidents
- Included truck and rail transport of materials
- Included radiological and non-radiological impacts
- Impacts during operations and decommissioning would be small
- Impacts during construction would be small to moderate, due to increased traffic on Highway 234
- Impacts of transportation accidents would be small to moderate
- Probability of severe transportation accident is very unlikely

Public and Occupational Health

- Analyzed non-radiological and radiological impacts for both the public and workers
- Non-radiological and radiological impacts for construction, normal operations, and decommissioning are small
- Radiological impacts during operations:
  - less than 1 mrem/yr for the nearest resident
  - maximum of 300 mrem/yr for some types of workers
- Impacts for accidents are small to moderate
  - safety procedures make large accidents highly unlikely

Waste Management

- Evaluated non-radiological and radiological waste
- Impacts from construction, operations, and decommissioning are small because there is adequate capacity at associated disposal facilities
- Impacts from storage of depleted uranium would be small to moderate because of the possibility that it could be stored onsite for up to 30 years

Public Comment Period

- Comments to the NRC were accepted until January 7, 2005
- All comments received during the public comment period, both oral and written, were considered
- Comments were addressed in the Final EIS

Technical Information

- NRC has LES project and gas centrifuge websites at:

http://www.nrc.gov/materials/fuel-cycle-fac/lesfacility.html

http://www.nrc.gov/materials/fuel-cycle-fac/gas-centrifuge.html

- Documents can be viewed in the "electronic reading room" on NRC's website (www.nrc.gov), at www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html

United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission

NRC Points of Contact

Tim Johnson
Safety Project Manager
1 (800) 368-5642, extension 7299

Jim Park
Environmental Project Manager
1 (800) 368-5642, extension 5835