

February 1, 2010

MEMORANDUM TO: Patrice M. Bubar, Deputy Director
Environmental Protection and
Performance Assessment Directorate
Division of Waste Management
and Environmental Protection
Office of Federal and State Materials
and Environmental Management Programs

THRU: Andrea L. Kock, Chief **/RA/**
Environmental Review Branch
Environmental Protection and
Performance Assessment Directorate
Division of Waste Management
and Environmental Protection
Office of Federal and State Materials
and Environmental Management Programs

FROM: A. Christianne Ridge, Senior Project Manager **/RA/**
Environmental Review Branch
Environmental Protection and
Performance Assessment Directorate
Division of Waste Management
and Environmental Protection
Office of Federal and State Materials
and Environmental Management Programs

SUBJECT: TRIP REPORT FOR A SITE VISIT AND MEETINGS WITH STATE AND
LOCAL OFFICIALS TO SUPPORT DEVELOPMENT OF AN
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR A PROPOSED LASER-
BASED URANIUM ENRICHMENT FACILITY NEAR WILMINGTON,
NORTH CAROLINA

On May 18-21, 2009, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) and contractor staff conducted a site visit to support development of an Environmental Impact Statement for General Electric–Hitachi's proposed laser-based uranium enrichment facility to be located near Wilmington, North Carolina. NRC and contractor staff also met with representatives of the North Carolina State Historic Preservation Office in Kure Beach and Raleigh, North Carolina. In addition, NRC staff met with New Hanover County and City of Wilmington officials to discuss NRC's environmental review process for the proposed facility.

CONTACT: A. Christianne Ridge, FSME/DWMEP
(301) 415-5673

P. Bubar

2

This summary contains no proprietary or classified information.

Docket No.: 70-7016

Enclosure: Trip Report

cc: See next page

P. Bubar

2

This summary contains no proprietary or classified information.

Docket No.: 70-7016

Enclosure: Trip Report

cc: See next page

DISTRIBUTION:

DWMEP r/f	TJohnson/FCSS	CSafford/OGC	BSmith/FCSS
SEchols/FCSS	JWeil/OCA	DMcIntyre/OPA	CTaylor/RII
RHannah/RII	MLesser/RII	AGody/RII	JLedford/RII
JHenson/RII	RTrojanowski/RII	DSeymour/RII	AKock/FSME
HYilma/FSME	BShroff/FSME	GWoodruff/RII	JDavis/FSME
RVirgilio/FSME			

ML093350781

OFC	EPPAD/ERB	EPPAD/ERB	NMSS/FCSS	OGC	EPPAD/ERB
NAME	CRidge	AWalker-Smith	BSmith	CSafford	AKock
DATE	12/3/09	12/4/09	1/14/10	1/14/10	2/1/10

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

cc:

William Szymanski/DOE

Bruce Shell/New Hanover County

Patricia Campbell/GEH

Marty Lawing/Brunswick County

Robert Brown/GEH

George Brown/Pender County

Tammy Orr/GEH

Bill Saffo/Wilmington

AKennedy/GEH

Mike Giles/CFC

JOlivier/GEH

Malissa Talbert/Wilmington

Tom Clements/FOTE

Wanda Lagoe/NCOSH

Doug Springer/CFRW

Cameron Weaver/NCDENR

Stephen Rynas/NCDENR

Lee Cox/SLO

Emily Hughes/USACE

David Weaver/New Hanover County

Christopher O'Keefe/New Hanover County

Jennifer Braswell/New Hanover County

Trip Report for the Environmental Site Audit and
Meetings with State and Local Officials Regarding the
General Electric-Hitachi Proposed Global Laser Enrichment Facility

Meeting with Wilmington City Officials

Location: City Manager's Offices, Wilmington, North Carolina

Date: May 18, 2009

City of
Wilmington

Attendees: Sterling Cheatham, City Manager
Tony Caudle, Deputy City Manager

NRC

Attendees: Andrea Kock, Chief, FSME /DWMEP/ERB
Brian Smith, Chief, NMSS/FFLD/ECB
Timothy Johnson, Sr. Project Manager, NMSS/FFLD/ECB
Christianne Ridge, Sr. Project Manager, FSME/DWMEP/ERB

Purpose: The purposes of the meeting were to discuss the NRC safety and environmental reviews of the proposed General Electric-Hitachi Global Laser Enrichment Facility, to gather information about any local concerns, and to answer any questions.

After introductions Mr. Cheatham noted that there had been several newspaper articles covering a workshop GEH had held recently regarding the proposed enrichment facility. The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff indicated that NRC would hold two public meetings on May 19, 2009, regarding its environmental review of the proposed enrichment facility. NRC staff described the topics covered in its environmental and safety reviews and described how the reviews differ. Mr. Johnson then explained the hearing process and the difference between the mandatory hearing and a potential contested hearing. Mr. Johnson indicated that the hearing could involve issues from both the environmental review and the safety review. He then provided background information regarding the hearings held for the Louisiana Enrichment Services National Enrichment Facility.

Mr. Johnson indicated that the NRC had changed the definition of construction in 10 CFR 51 to limit the term "construction" to refer only to activities with a direct connection to radiological safety and security activities under NRC jurisdiction. He indicated that GEH would be able to begin site preparation activities, such as clearing land, without approval from NRC. He emphasized they would still need to obtain all other applicable local, State, and Federal permits.

In response to questions NRC staff indicated that it expected GEH to apply for a 40-year license, and that the license could be renewed for up to an additional 40 years. NRC staff stated that, if the proposed facility is licensed, NRC inspectors would observe facility construction. NRC staff explained that, if the facility is licensed, NRC would conduct a performance review of its operations every one to two years, depending on the facility performance.

Enclosure

Mr. Johnson asked if there were any specific concerns the city officials would like to see covered in the NRC Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Mr. Cheatham noted an increase in interest among his constituents related to development in the region. He noted that there had been significant local concern about the proposed Titan America, LLC, cement facility in Castle Hayne, North Carolina. NRC staff indicated that the scope of the environmental review is broad and includes factors such as socioeconomic impacts, noise, and impacts on cultural resources in addition to traditional environmental concerns such as impacts on air and water.

NRC staff provided background about the gaseous diffusion and centrifuge technologies for enriching uranium and indicated that, if built, the proposed facility would be the first commercial laser-enrichment facility in the world. NRC staff noted that many elements of the proposed technology are classified and would present a potential nuclear proliferation concern if made public. NRC staff then described the test loop facility GEH has built to test the new technology. Mr. Caudle asked if reviewing a new technology would present particular challenges. NRC staff indicated that many of the areas NRC would review, such as chemical safety and criticality safety, would be the same as in reviews for other enrichment facilities.

Meeting with New Hanover County Officials

Location: County Manager's Offices, Wilmington, North Carolina

Date: May 18, 2009

New Hanover
County

Attendees: Bruce Shell, County Manager
David Weaver, Assistant County Manager
Chris O'Keefe, Planning Director
Paul Marlow, Environmental Programs Manager

NRC

Attendees: Andrea Kock, Chief, FSME/DWMEP/ERB
Brian Smith, Chief, NMSS/FFLD/ECB
Timothy Johnson, Sr. Project Manager, NMSS/FFLD/ECB
Christianne Ridge, Sr. Project Manager, FSME/DWMEP/ERB

Purpose: The purposes of the meeting were to discuss the NRC safety and environmental reviews of the proposed General Electric-Hitachi Global Laser Enrichment Facility, to gather information about any local concerns, and to answer any questions.

After introductions NRC staff indicated that NRC would hold two public scoping meetings regarding the proposed facility in Wilmington on May 19, 2009, and described the purpose of the scoping meetings. NRC staff indicated that NRC had received the applicant's Environmental Report and that it expected to receive the safety-related portion of the license application within approximately one month.

In response to questions about effluents and waste generated by the proposed facility, NRC staff indicated that the primary effluents would be uranium and fluorine. NRC staff noted the primary solid waste would be depleted uranium hexafluoride, and that the facility also would generate a low-level radioactive waste stream including items like used gloves and cloth. NRC staff indicated that the depleted uranium would be disposed by the Department of Energy unless a commercial business could be found to dispose the waste. NRC staff indicated that the depleted uranium primarily posed a chemical hazard rather than a radiological hazard. Mr. Johnson noted that General Electric has been using uranium hexafluoride, the form of uranium that would be used in the proposed facility, in its fuel manufacturing operation on its Wilmington site since 1967.

Mr. Marlow asked if the site would have a limit on waste storage. NRC staff indicated that he thought GEH may propose to store 40 years of depleted uranium on site, but that the staff would not know until it received the license application. In response to questions, Mr. Johnson indicated he expected the waste to be shipped by road.

New Hanover County officials asked several questions about potential accidents and emergencies. NRC staff indicated that the Department of Transportation and NRC both had requirements for transportation packages that hold uranium hexafluoride and that these packages must pass tests of their resistance to fire and impact (i.e., drop tests). NRC staff indicated that the emergency notification system would be similar to the system that exists on the site for the fuel manufacturing operation, and that it would be different from the more extensive system used for nuclear reactors because the facility poses a smaller potential hazard. NRC staff indicated that there would be a system in place to notify downwind populations (e.g., schools) of any unexpected air release. NRC staff indicated that uranium decays by alpha radiation but that its daughters decay by beta and gamma radiation.

Mr. Weaver asked if NRC was aware of any significant opposition to the project. NRC staff indicated that it was not aware of any significant opposition, and that it would learn more about public concerns at the two public scoping meetings. Mr. O'Keefe noted that he was aware of some concern about existing groundwater contamination at the site. Mr. Johnson indicated that there was some groundwater contamination from previous operations on site that was under control and being monitored with monitoring wells. Mr. Johnson noted that Global Nuclear Fuel—Americas (GNF-A), which is located on the Wilmington Site, had changed its process and that the new process had less potential to cause groundwater contamination. Mr. Shell noted that the proposed Titan cement facility had encountered significant local opposition.

NRC staff then described the hearing process. In response to questions NRC staff indicated that in the past contentions had been filed about topics such as water usage and financial assurance for depleted uranium disposal.

NRC staff indicated that one enrichment facility currently operates in the United States and that two others are being built. NRC staff indicated that the proposed facility, if built, would be the first laser-based system operating commercially. In response to questions NRC staff described the test loop GEH built to test the technology and indicated that NRC would not be involved in evaluating the commercial viability of the project.

Mr. Marlow indicated he had been asked if the proposed facility would make the community more of a target for terrorist attack. NRC staff noted that the proposed facility would have more security than the fuel manufacturing operation on the Wilmington site. In response to questions NRC staff described how the depleted uranium waste and enriched uranium product would be stored. NRC staff noted storage of product would be limited by possession limits imposed by NRC.

Mr. Shell noted that GEH had given a tour of the site to elected officials. Mr. Johnson noted that New Hanover County government should contact him if it had any trouble coordinating with GEH regarding emergency management.

NRC staff then indicated NRC had changed the definition of construction in 10 CFR 51 to limit the term "construction" to refer only to activities with a direct connection to radiological safety and security activities under NRC jurisdiction. He indicated that although the definition had not yet been changed in NRC regulations relevant to the proposed facility (10 CFR Part 70), NRC had granted GEH an exemption to allow it to begin site preparation activities, such as clearing land, before NRC makes a licensing decision. He emphasized they would still need to obtain all other applicable local, State, and Federal permits. In response to questions NRC staff indicated that it granted the exemption because it recognized that certain site preparation activities were outside of its regulatory purview. NRC also indicated that any site preparation activities GEH performed prior to NRC making a licensing decision would be performed at the company's own risk.

Site Visit and Technical Meetings with GEH Staff and Contractors

Location: GEH Offices, Wilmington, North Carolina

Date: May 18 to 20, 2009

Attendees:	JOlivier/GLE	TOrr/GLE	AKennedy/GLE	AMarshall/GLE
	EAnderson/GE	KGivens/GLE	HKnight/GNF	PMathur/GNF-A
	MLeik/GEH	SSeibel/ESI	PPeterson/RTI	JAlexander/RTI
	AKock/NRC	CRidge/NRC	HYilma/NRC	BShroff/NRC
	HAvci/ANL	KFischer/ANL	SKamboj/ANL	WVinikour/ANL
	KPicel/ANL	JQuinn/ANL	YChang/ANL	DO'Rourke/ANL
	BBiwer/ANL			

Purpose: The purpose of the environmental site audit was to tour the proposed site and potentially affected area, review documents, and discuss specific technical issues with the GEH staff. The document reviews and discussions with GEH technical staff were intended to refine the NRC staff's Request for Additional information (RAI).

Discussion:

A site visit agenda and detailed meeting schedule are included as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively. The site visit included a general site tour, specialized tours, and technical

discussions. The general site tour included areas of interest with respect to ecology, hydrology, and air quality. Specialized tours were conducted of the GNF-A Fuel Manufacturing Operation

and of historic and cultural resource areas on site. Technical discussions were held on the following topics:

- General information
- Accidents
- Air quality, meteorology, and noise
- Cultural resources
- Cumulative impacts
- Ecology
- Human health – non-radiological
- Human health – radiological
- Hydrology and geology
- Socioeconomics and environmental justice
- Transportation
- Waste management

A table of information needs on these topics had previously been transmitted to GEH staff. This table was updated with the outcomes of the technical area discussions and is included as Attachment 3.

NRC staff received the following documents at the site visit in response to its information needs:

1. Schimek, J. (2007) "Commercial Fisheries on the Northeast Cape Fear River Inquiry." E-mail from J. Schimek to A. Wesley (ML091470563)
2. Campbell, M. and Johns, M. (2008) "Habitat Fragmentation and Birds." North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission. (ML091470568)
3. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (2003) "Shortnose Sturgeon in North Carolina." <http://www.fws.gov/nc-es/fish/shortst.html>. Accessed on March 25, 2008 at 7:38 AM. (ML091470549)
4. Matthews, K. (2007) "Commercial and Recreational Fisheries on the Northeast Cape Fear River Inquiry." E-mail from K. Matthews to A. Wesley. (ML091470560)
5. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources (1995) "Fourth Version Guidance for Rating the Values of Wetlands in North Carolina." North Carolina Department of Environment, Health, and Natural Resources Division of Environmental Management Water Quality Section. (ML091670144)
6. New Hanover County (2002) "2002 Watershed Plan Summary." New Hanover County Local Watershed Planning Group. (ML091520182)

7. Ashley, K. and Rachels, R. (2005) "Cape Fear River Basin Recreational Angler Creel Survey, 2003-2004, Final Report." North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission Division of Inland Fisheries, Raleigh, North Carolina. (ML091470556)
8. Coastal Zone Resources Corporation (1973) "Bio-Physical Stetting of the General Electric Company Lands, New Hanover County, North Carolina" (ML091470569)
9. North Carolina Division of Water Quality (2005) "Identification Methods for the Origins of Intermittent and Perennial streams, Version 3.1." North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Division of Water Quality. Raleigh, North Carolina. (ML091470581)
10. Schafale, M. and Weakley A. (1990) "Classification of the Natural Communities of North Carolina: Third Approximation." North Carolina Natural Heritage Program, Division of Parks and Recreation, Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Raleigh, North Carolina (ML091520177)
11. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (2006) "Direct and Indirect Impacts of Urbanization on Wetland Quality Wetlands & Watersheds Article #1." Center for Watershed Protection Ellicott City, Maryland. Prepared for: Office of Wetlands, Oceans and Watersheds U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Washington, District of Columbia. (ML091520194)
12. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries (2006) "Rules: Fishery Nursery Areas. North Carolina Fisheries Rules for Coastal Waters 2005 and North Carolina Fisheries rules for Coastal Waters – Supplement – July 1, 2006." North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources. (ML091520220)
13. GEH (2009) "Measurements Requested for Information Needs Human Health HH/R-9." (ML092220624, ML092220625, ML092220626, ML092220627, and ML092220628)
14. U.S. Department of Interior (2008). "Action ID # SAW-2007-00073, Carolina Cement Company (Titan America), New Hanover County, North Carolina." Letter from P. Benjamin to H. Wicker, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. (ML091530550)
15. GNF-A (2007) "Semi-Annual Effluent Report for GNFA, August 28, 2007." Letter from S. Murray to W. Travers, NRC. (ML091530554)
16. North Carolina Environmental Management Commission (2004) "Air Permit Number 1161R19 for the General Electric Company." Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Division of Air Quality. (ML091530553)
17. North Carolina Environmental Management Commission (2004) "Air Permit Number 1756R17 for Global Nuclear Fuel—Americas." Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Division of Air Quality. (ML091530552)
18. NRC (2008) "Request for Information Regarding Tribal Historic and Cultural Resources Potentially Affected by the Proposed 40-Year License Renewal for Global Nuclear

Fuel—Americas, L.L.C., in Wilmington, North Carolina.” Letter from G. Suber to Waccamaw-Siouan Tribe. (ML073610507)

19. Waccamaw-Siouan Tribe (2008) “Response to: Request for Information Regarding Tribal Historic and Cultural Resources Potentially Affected by the Proposed 40-Year License Renewal for Global Nuclear Fuel—Americas, L.L.C., in Wilmington, North Carolina” Letter from P. Jacobs to G. Suber, NRC. (ML081350250)
20. RTI international (2009) “CANDA/A Model Inputs and Outputs.” (ML093280706)
21. RTI International (2008) “Documentation of Radiation Dose Modeling: Memo to File” (ML091530547)
22. GEH (2009) “Inputs and Outputs to COMPLY Model: Response to Information Need HH/R-7” (ML091490114)
23. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources (NCDENR) (2004) “State of North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Division of Water Quality Permit No. NC0001228 to Discharge Wastewater under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System for Global Nuclear Fuel—Americas.” (ML091490113)
24. NCDENR (2007) “State of North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Division of Water Quality Permit No. NCS000022 to Discharge Stormwater under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System for the General Electric Company.” (ML091490112)
25. RTI International (2009) “Summaries of Telephone Conversations Regarding Socioeconomic and Environmental Justice Impacts of the Proposed General Electric–Hitachi Global Laser Enrichment Commercial Facility.” (ML091490111)
26. North Carolina Department of Environment, Health, and Natural Resources (1991) “Notice of Violation 15A NCAC 2L Groundwater Quality Violations.” Letter from A. Howard to B. Wolfe, General Electric Nuclear Energy, October 30, 1991. (ML091490115)
27. North Carolina Department of Environment, Health, and Natural Resources (1991) “Notice of Violation 15A NCAC 2L Groundwater Quality Violations.” Letter from A. Howard to B. Wolfe, General Electric Nuclear Energy. December 6, 1991. (ML091490129)
28. NCDENR (2009) “Inactive Hazardous Waste Sites Priority List.” NCDENR, Division of Waste Management. Letter from C. Jesneck to H. Strickler, General Electric Company. January 15, 2009. (ML091490132)
29. North Carolina Environmental Management Commission (2007) “Wastewater Treatment and Reclaimed Water Utilization System Permit WQ0031317 for Global Nuclear Fuel—

Americas.” North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources.
(ML091530549)

30. RTI International (2008) “2006-2007 Report of Organic Compounds in Groundwater, December 2008.” RTI Project No. 0600002.000.003. (ML091820023)
31. RTI International (2008) “Northwest Site Area 2006-2007 Monitoring Report, December 2008” RTI Project No. 0600002.000.005 (ML091820027)

These documents are publicly available from the NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) using the indicated accession numbers. The ADAMS Public Electronic Reading Room is accessible at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. In addition, the staff received electronic files of model inputs and, in some cases, outputs, for the GENII, RADTRAN, TRAGIS, XOQDOQ, CANDAA/A, AERMOD, AERMET, and MODFLOWMT3D models.

At the conclusion of the technical discussions NRC and GEH staff discussed the outcomes of the site visit. NRC staff reiterated that the purpose of the visit was to review information that GEH had prepared in the development of its Environmental Report (ER) to refine any necessary RAI. GEH staff indicated that additional information that had been prepared during the development of the ER would be supplied in a follow-up letter. NRC staff noted that any information needs that could not be satisfied with information GEH already had prepared would be reflected in an RAI.

NRC and GEH staff then discussed the following five key items from resulting from the site visit.

1. NRC staff noted that it needed more information to separate radiological and air quality impacts of the proposed facility from the impacts of the existing GNF-A facility. GEH indicated it had performed this analysis and could supply the necessary information.
2. NRC staff noted that it would require additional information to separate the impacts of site preparation activities authorized by exemption from the impacts of construction activities. GEH staff indicated it would prepare a supplement to the ER to address this separation of impacts.
3. GEH staff indicated that information necessary to complete an analysis of the impact of accidents in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) would be supplied with the Integrated Safety Analysis (ISA). NRC staff indicated that, as a result, maintaining the anticipated EIS schedule would depend on timely submittal of a complete ISA.
4. NRC staff indicated it would request radiological monitoring data for the Wilmington Site from the State of North Carolina. GEH staff indicated that, if the data is not available from the State, GEH may be able to supply the information.
5. GEH staff informed NRC staff that it should expect a supplement to the EIS to reflect a change in the planned entrances to Wilmington site to accommodate the proposed facility.

Meeting with North Carolina Office of State Archaeology, Underwater Archaeology Branch Staff

Location: North Carolina Office of State Archaeology, Underwater Archaeology Branch,
Kure Beach, North Carolina

Date: May 20, 2009

State of
North Carolina

Attendees: Nathan Henry, Assistant State Archaeologist / Conservator

NRC/ANL

Attendees: Haimanot Yilma, NRC/FSME/DWMEP/ERB
Daniel O'Rourke, ANL

Purpose: The purpose of the meeting was to gather information about archaeological resources on the GLE facility that could be impacted as a result of the proposed action.

Mr. Henry acknowledged receiving an archaeology survey result from GEH. He indicated that based on the results of the survey, one site was identified as a prehistoric, short term habitation that maybe eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historical Places under Criterion D. Mr. Henry acknowledged that GEH plans to preserve the site and maintain its integrity by not performing construction near this site. However, he expressed a concern that, if not appropriately marked, this site could potentially be destroyed 10 to 20 years in the future. He indicated that, the best solution to this problem is to remove and relocate any items discovered from this site.

NRC staff received the following report:

Wilde-Ramsing, M. et al. (1978) "A Report on the New Hanover County Archaeological Survey: A C.E.T.A. Project" North Carolina Archaeological Branch. (ML091610400)

Publicly-available sections of this report are available from the NRC's ADAMS using the indicated accession number. The ADAMS Public Electronic Reading Room is accessible at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>.

Meeting with North Carolina Office of State Archaeology Staff

Location: Office of State Archaeology, Raleigh, North Carolina

Date: May 21, 2009

State of

North Carolina

Attendees: Dolores Hall, Deputy State Archaeologist

NRC/ANL

Attendees: A. Christianne Ridge, NRC/FSME/DWMEP/ERB
Daniel O'Rourke, ANL

Purpose: The purpose of the meeting was to gather information about archaeological resources on the GLE facility that could be impacted as a result of the proposed action.

After introductions, NRC staff explained that NRC is preparing an EIS as part of its review of the proposed GLE facility. NRC staff also explained that NRC was consulting with the North Carolina State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) as part of its EIS preparation to fulfill its responsibilities under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). Ms. Hall indicated that the corresponding North Carolina Statute was North Carolina General Statute 121-12(a). Ms. Hall indicated that the North Carolina SHPO had begun its review of the action under Section 106 of the NHPA because of the Federal involvement in the project.

Ms. Hall indicated that contractors for GEH had sent archaeological surveys to the Office of State Archaeology and that the surveys had been reviewed by staff in the Underwater Archaeology Branch. Ms. Hall indicated that the SHPO would like to know how the potentially eligible site identified by GLE would be protected. She indicated that the SHPO would like to see the final plans for any road improvement that takes place near the potentially eligible site. Ms. Hall indicated that these issues would be reflected in the SHPO's reply to NRC's consultation letter. Ms. Hall provided NRC staff with a copy of relevant sections of the North Carolina General Statutes and contact information for Federally-recognized Tribes with ties to North Carolina and State-Recognized Tribes located in North Carolina (Attachment 4).

Ms. Hall then assisted NRC and Argonne National Laboratory staff in conducting a search of the records of the State Office of Archaeology for information related to archaeological resources near the proposed facility.

Attachment 1

GE-Hitachi Global Laser Enrichment
Site Visit

Agenda

Monday May 18

- 7:00 – 8:00 Team meeting at the TownPlace Suites Board Room
- 8:00 – 8:30 Travel to GEH and sign in
- 8:30 – 9:00 Opening Meeting (NRC)
- 9:00 – 9:30 Site overview and safety briefing (GEH)
- 9:30 – 12:00 Site Tour
- 12:00 – 1:00 Lunch
- 1:00 – 3:00 FMO Tour (ANL and NRC)
Offsite meetings for Ridge and Kock
1:00 City Manager Sterling Cheatham
3:00 County Manager Bruce Shell
- 3:00 – 5:00 Resource Area parallel meetings
- 5:00 – 5:30 NRC / ANL team review meeting
Managers meeting for Kock, Olivier, and Kennedy
- 5:30 – 6:00 End of day debrief (All)

Tuesday May 19

- 7:30 Meet at hotel to travel to site
- 7:30 – 8:00 Travel to GEH and sign in
- 8:00 – 8:30 Opening Meeting
- 8:30 – 10:30 Resource Area parallel meetings
- 10:30 – 12:00 Resource Area parallel meetings
- 12:00 – 1:00 Open House for First Public Meeting
- 1:00 – 4:00 First Public Scoping Meeting (NRC/ANL)
Onsite Document Review (certain ANL reviewers)

6:00 – 7:00 Open House for Second Public Meeting

7:00 – 10:00 Second Public Meeting

Wednesday May 20

7:30 Meet at hotel to travel to site

7:30 – 8:00 Travel to GEH and sign in

8:00 – 8:30 Opening Meeting

8:30 – Noon Off site visit with SHPO (Yilma, ANL)

8:30 – 11:30 Resource Area meetings on site

11:30 – 12:30 Exit Meeting

1:30 – 3:30 Cultural Resources Tour and Discussion (Ridge, ANL)

Thursday May 21

7:30 Meet to travel to Raleigh (Ridge, O'Rourke)

10:30 Meeting and Document Search at State Historical Preservation Office