

From: Matthew Blevins
To: Jennifer Davis
Date: Wed, Apr 12, 2006 8:27 AM
Subject: staff actions related to March 2006 cultural resource information and USEC EIS

Jennifer,

I wanted to summarize my actions regarding the recent cultural resource information received by Mr. Sea on March 3, 2006, Mr. Wilson on March 14, 2006, and others echoing similar concerns in subsequent emails.

On March 6, 2006, I received Mr. Sea's email about the West Access Road improvements and his recent discovery of an apparent earthworks on private property near the Route 23 off-ramp that serves the DOE reservation. I discussed with Polly Quick (ICF cultural resource contractor) and we determined that we needed to ascertain whether the road improvements were part of the "undertaking" (i.e., part of the proposed ACP). I contacted USEC and requested additional information on this interchange project, specifically whether USEC Inc. had requested such improvements as part of the proposed ACP. Additionally, I also contacted Kristi Wiehle at the Department of Energy to determine whether DOE had requested such improvements. Ms. Wiehle indicated that DOE had not requested the work and also elaborated on the other users of the West Access road including, United States Enrichment Corporation, Ohio Valley Electric Cooperative, UDS Tails Conversion Facility, contractors for the DOE infrastructure contract, and contractors for the environmental restoration projects. Ms. Wiehle also gave me the name of Gary Cochenour of ODOT.

On March 7, 2006, USEC responded that they did not request the West Access Road improvements and provided additional information as detailed in their March 7, 2006 email.

On March 7, 2006, I returned a phone call to Laura Dean of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation who had requested information about the NRC's January 27, 2006 letter to the Council. We spoke for some time about the NRC's undertaking, the proposed ACP, and the Department of Energy. Ms. Dean stated that she would be sending us a letter. I called Ms. Dean again on March 14 and 28, 2006 and she again said a letter was in the works.

On March 14, 2006, I spoke with Mr. David Snyder of the Ohio Historic Preservation Office. Mr. Snyder indicated that he had reviewed the ODOT specs for the road improvement. The road improvement entails replacing the bridge deck (i.e., is not directly the off-ramp Mr. Sea had indicated). Mr. Snyder also indicated that he was in agreement with the NRC's definition of "area of potential effect" (APE) though some members of the public were trying to stretch the APE to fit the interesting cultural resources of the area.

On March 15, 2006, I left a message with Paul Graham at ODOT requesting more information about the interchange project. On March 23, 2006, Mr. Graham indicated that ODOT characterized the apparent earthworks as an "earthwork remnant because there is no surface manifestation." Mr. Graham provided correspondence, maps, and photos of the related earthworks discussion at the Route 23 interchange.

As you know the final environmental impact statement (EIS) was in final concurrence and nearly ready for printing, however, we delayed the final EIS by several weeks to consider the new information. A summary of the new information (i.e., Mr. Sea's and Mr. Wilson, and others comments) was provided at the end of Appendix J in the final EIS.

Matthew Blevins
Senior Project Manager
Division of Waste Management and
Environmental Protection
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Phone: (301) 415-7684

Mail Envelope Properties (443CF228.CC9 : 2 : 11446)

Subject: staff actions related to March 2006 cultural resource information and
USEC EIS
Creation Date 04/12/2006 8:27:20 AM
From: Matthew Blevins

Created By: MXB6@nrc.gov

Recipients

nrc.gov
BJD1 (Jennifer Davis)

Post Office

Route
nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4423	04/12/2006 8:27:20 AM

Options

Expiration Date: None
Priority: Standard
ReplyRequested: No
Return Notification: None

Concealed Subject: No
Security: Standard

Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results

Message is not eligible for Junk Mail handling
Message is from an internal sender

Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered

Junk Mail handling disabled by User
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator
Junk List is not enabled
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled
Block List is not enabled