

18016
United States of America
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Shirley Ann Jackson, Chairman, ET. AL.
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001



October 24, 1996

In the Matter of)	
)	
MEMORANDUM AND ORDER.)	DOCKET NO.(S)
)	70-7001/7002
U.S. ENRICHMENT CORPORATION)	
)	CLI-96-10
(Paducah, Kentucky and Piketon,)	
Ohio). CLI-96-10)	

Receipt of Memorandum and Order in the above-referenced matter by me on October 23, 1996 requires immediate response to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. I submit the following:

1. Denial of eligibility status of petitioners by the Commission to seek review on the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's findings published in federal register notice of September 19, 1996. Docket No.(s) 70-7001; 70-7002. Notice of Certification Decision for U.S. Enrichment Corporation To Operate Gaseous Diffusion Plants and Finding of No Significant Impact. FR/Vol. 61, No. 183, pp 49360-49362 published in Memorandum and Order CLI-96-10, served on October 18, 1996 is based upon "failure to meet the conditions. . .for the filing of a petition for review."

The Commission's determination is based upon terms set forth in 10 C.F.R. Section 76.62 (c). The Commission appears to have set forth terms of administrative procedure that exceed its authority; the pre-emption of federal laws governing the rights of interested parties and citizens from participation. I refer to APA Section 553 (e) which states that "any" citizen or "interested person" has the right to petition for the issuance, amendment, or repeal of a rule.

The actions of the Commission in this matter appear to be inconsistent with its own reluctance to act outside regulatory or statutory authority in other matters as in: August 29, 1996 response by Chairman, Shirley Jackson to July 2, 1996 request for technical assistance submitted by Carl Lischeske, Manager of the Low-Level Radioactive Waste Program for the California Department of Health Services (DHS). Chairman Jackson clearly acknowledges limitations to NRC authority to interpret and implement federal level laws in other matters. It would also seem reasonable and appropriate to assume that the Commission would be required to implement federal level laws consistent with letter, intent, and interpretation.

Your suggestion that NRC advise DOI that the development of Ward Valley is strictly within the purview of the NRC and its Agreement States does not take into account the fact that NRC authority and expertise to interpret and implement the AEA (Atomic Energy Act) and the LLRWPA (Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Act) does not extend to Federal law on public land transfer. Consequently we have taken no position on DOI legal authority in this regard. (LLWNOTES Volume 11, Number 6, August/September 1996. "NRC Chairman: No NRC Authority re Land Transfer," p. 5.)

Would the Commission please cite the statute of federal law which provides authority to the Commission to preclude any person, interested party, and/or citizen from full participation in agency findings publicly noted in the federal register.

2. NRC Memorandum and Order CLI-96-10 of October 18, 1996 is contradictory to NRC Notice of September 19, 1996 which was mailed directly by the NRC to me with the following:

TO: All persons Interested in Certification of Safe Operation of Gaseous Diffusion Plants (Attachment #1)

It hardly seems consistent or logical for the NRC to provide mail notice to interested parties of opportunity to petition and to later determine that the level of interest is not sufficient to require agency response when the right to petition the Commission is exercised.

3. Commission criteria of submission either oral or written comment to NRC during certification proceedings, as stated previously, appears to lack full implementation of rights granted in federal law. However, even by the Commission's limited interpretation in Memorandum and Final Order CLI-96-10, NRC received written comment from me regarding NRC Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) in 1994 by fax and mail on transfer from U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) oversight to NRC oversight which is the basis for all other NRC actions in the above-referenced matter. (Enclosure #2)

My interest in this matter can also be documented by my receipt of comments made by DOE from the NRC document contractor, Peter M. Coons Company sent to me on June 15, 1994. Please note that payment for the requested documents was made by me personally which indicates a level of personal interest by financial investment of my own. (Enclosure #3)

Please also note that comments were submitted by me to NRC on Environmental Review for Renewal of Operating Licenses for Nuclear Power Plants, 56 C.F.R. 47016, docketed by NRC as comment numbers 137 and 138. (Enclosure #4) It hardly seems reasonable or logical for the NRC to deny status of a petitioner identified by the NRC as an interested party who has submitted comments on the supporting document for agency action (FONSI) referenced above, and on agency actions which directly and indirectly affect production operations of the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant. Certification and finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) of the Compliance plan prepared by DOE and submitted by USEC represent actions on the TOTAL CERTIFICATION PROCESS OF THE TWO GASEOUS DIFFUSION PLANTS (emphasis added).

Also Commission requirement that interested parties attend specific hearings and submit comments on SPECIFIC ACTIONS ONLY in the total certification process would appear to imply that the Commission has allocated funding to assist interested parties in meeting agency requirements. Does the agency have funding available to assist interested parties in travel expenses to attend required meetings, travel to public document rooms and obtain copies required for well-considered written comment? The Portsmouth NRC Public Reading Room (PRD) is located some 60 miles travel, a distance somewhat farther than the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant located in Piketon, Pike County or Ohio.

4. USEC submitted initial certification application to NRC on April 18, 1995 with requests for public comment. Upon receipt of letter of May 5, 1995 from NRC indicating that the initial application did not contain enough information to address C.F.R. Part 76, I contacted USEC by both mail and telephone requesting more detailed information at my own expense in order to be able to offer informed comment to NRC. I received no information from USEC other than written response that no information would be provided to me.

Specific requirements of prior participation of agency actions would seem to require considerable cumulative expense and time by interested parties to avoid exclusion from participation and pre-emption of legal rights by the Commission as referenced in CLI-96-10.

5. Commission Memorandum and Order of October 18, 1996. CLI-91-10 states: "USEC or any person whose interest may be affected. . .were eligible to file a petition with the Commission within 15 days after publication of the Director's decision." Since United States Enrichment Corporation is backed by United States Treasury Bonds ANY PERSON WHOSE INTEREST MAY BE AFFECTED (emphasis added) would

include both citizens of the United States and taxpayers of the United States. Evidence of citizenship and filing of income tax returns can be provided to the Commission for verification, if requested, to substantiate my status as a qualified petitioner in both respects above-referenced.

Please note that "letter dated October 3, 1996, Diana Salisbury" was sent via the United States Postal Service, priority mail ON OCTOBER 3, 1996 (emphasis added) from the Sardinia, Ohio post office. Customary priority mail delivery time from the Sardinia post office to Washington, D.C. is next day or two day delivery. Amendment to petition of October 4, 1996 was sent via priority mail on October 4, 1996 to the Commission from the post office located in Georgetown, Ohio with customary delivery of next day or two day delivery. NRC docketing time procedures are not known to me. Mrs. Colley's petition dated September 30, 1996 was docketed on October 4, 1996 which would indicate four day mail and docketing time. Mark Donham and Kristi Hanson submitted a petition dated October 2, 1996 which was docketed on October 9, 1996 which indicates a seven day docketing time. Docketing time on my correspondence of October 3, 1996 and October 4, 1996 indicates docketing time of four and five days respectively.

It is also my understanding that if information directed to a federal agency during federal register notice and response period contains significant data, appropriate agency response is required.

5. NRC threshold matters addressed as Petitioners' Eligibility to Petition for Review states the "USEC or any person whose interest may be affected," as one category AND emphasis added "who had submitted comments in response to prior federal register notice under 10 C.F.R. Section 76.37, or provided oral comments at an NRC meeting held on the application or compliance plan under 10 C.F.R. Section 76.39," as a second category for eligibility. The grammatical structure of two categories for right to petition, set off by commas, consistent with proper grammatical structure uses the plural verb "are" eligible to file. It would appear that NRC has created two categories of eligibility by its specific wording. Any person whose interest might be affected has been stated by the Commission as applying to USEC.

6. It is my understanding that USEC MAY (EMPHASIS ADDED) be subject to Price-Anderson Act which provides subsidy with

federal dollars for insurance. Any person whose interest MAY (emphasis added) be affected, in my belief, would apply to U.S. taxpayers who provide the source of federal funds.

7. The United States Department of Energy (DOE) has historically identified health and environmental impacts to residents within a fifty mile radius of the two Gaseous Diffusion Plants as directly affected parties. Under "Summary Of Calculated Doses and Health Effects," from HISTORICAL RADIONUCLIDE RELEASES FROM CURRENT DOE FACILITIES of May 1988, OR-890, radiation dose is calculated to due effluents and background. Much discussion concerning whether measurement should be calculated in road miles versus air miles, and whether measurement should begin from center of the facility versus outside boundaries of facility in question has historically occurred regarding DOE and former DOE sites. Regardless of method of calculation and assuming measurement to be by the most limited definition of fifty road miles taken from the center of the facility, my home is located well within the fifty mile radius defined by DOE to be directly affected by emissions from the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant facility in Piketon, Ohio. (Section of map, Source: Ohio Department of Transportation, with scale in road miles provided, enclosure #5) DOE uses the same 50 mile radius to define directly affected populations in August 1995, DRAFT WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT, DOE/EIS-0200-D.

As a resident living within 50 miles of operations of the Portsmouth GDP, I am a person whose interests may be affected by certification of USEC by NRC and finding of No Significant Impact concerning the compliance plan submitted by USEC.

Most, but not all residents, living along Straight Creek (marked for reference on map enclosure #5) are within a fifty mile radius of the Portsmouth GDP while all residents living along Sycamore Run are within the fifty mile radius.

8. As an interested party in the preservation of Great Serpent Mound in Adams County of Ohio, my interests MAY (emphasis added) be affected, directly and indirectly, by the Commission's approval of the compliance plan and Finding of No Significant Impact in the above-referenced matter. It would appear that by family line of descent from previous private "owners" of Great Serpent Mound, I also have an interest.

For the above-listed reasons, and with appropriate consideration for full public participation in Commission proceedings, I respectfully request that the Commission reconsider its Memorandum and Order of October 18, 1996.

CLI-96-10 and review the petition of October 3, 1996 and amendment of October 4, 1996.

Respectfully submitted, .

Diana Salisbury
Diana Salisbury
7019 Ashridge Arnheim Road
Sardinia, Ohio 45171
(513) 446-3135 telephone and fax

cc: United States Civil Rights Commission
Office of the Ohio Attorney General

Attachments enclosed

Delivered this 24th day of October by facsimile transmission to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C., Office of the Director, (301) 415-7192 telephone, (301) 415-5370 facsimile

*Re transmitted by facsimile
to (301) 415-1672 for
legibility. Paper copy via:
U.S. priority mail, The United
States Postal Service*



#1

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

September 19, 1996

TO: All Persons Interested in Certification of Safe
Operation of Gaseous Diffusion Enrichment Plants

SUBJECT: ISSUANCE OF INITIAL CERTIFICATION DECISION
FOR GASEOUS DIFFUSION ENRICHMENT PLANTS

In accordance with the Energy Policy Act of 1992, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has issued its initial certification decision for the United States Enrichment Corporation to operate the two gaseous diffusion plants located near Paducah, Kentucky, and Piketon, Ohio. The NRC intends to assume regulatory jurisdiction over these plants from the Department of Energy (DOE) on March 3, 1997, after a transition period. During this period DOE will retain oversight of the plants.

Enclosed is a copy of the Federal Register Notice containing the certification decision, and describing the opportunity for certain persons who provided comments to NRC during the certification process to submit a petition for Commission review of the decision. Any petitions must be submitted within 15 days of publication of the Federal Register Notice.

Copies of the proposed Certificates of Compliance and supporting documentation are available in the Commission's Public Document Room in Washington, D.C., and the Local Public Documents Rooms in Paducah, Kentucky and Portsmouth, Ohio. Unless the Commission grants any petition or otherwise acts within 60 days of publication of the Federal Register Notice, the certification decision will become effective and final.

Questions may be directed to the NRC Enrichment Branch in Washington, DC at (301) 415-7192.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "John W. N. Hickey", is written over the typed name.


John W. N. Hickey, Chief
Enrichment Branch
Division of Fuel Cycle Safety
and Safeguards

Enclosure: Federal Register Notice

Docket Nos. 70-7001 & 70-7002

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

OFFICIAL BUSINESS
PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE, \$300



Ms. Diana Salisbury
Political/Legal Action Committee Chair
Serpent Mound/Ohio Brush Creek Coalition
7019 Ashridge Arnheim Road
Sardinia, OH 45171

45171-3742 01



Is your RETURN ADDRESS completed on the reverse side?

SENDER:

- Complete items 1 and/or 2 for additional services.
- Complete items 3, and 4a & b.
- Print your name and address on the reverse of this form so that we can return this card to you.
- Attach this form to the front of the mailpiece, or on the back if space does not permit.
- Write "Return Receipt Requested" on the mailpiece below the article number.
- The Return Receipt will show to whom the article was delivered and the date delivered.

3. Article Addressed to:
Secretary Chalk
US Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C.
20555

5. Signature (Addressee)

6. Signature (Agent)

M. E. Rice

I also wish to receive the following services (for an extra fee):

1. ☐ Addressee's Address

2. ☐ Restricted Delivery

Consult postmaster for fee.

4a. Article Number

2 748 846 442

4b. Service Type

☐ Registered ☐ Insured

☒ Certified ☐ COD

☐ Express Mail ☐ Return Receipt for Merchandise

7. Date of Delivery

5-26-94


8. Addressee's Address (Only if requested and fee is paid)

Thank you for using Return Receipt Service.

2

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

Official Business



PENALTY FOR PRIVATE
USE TO AVOID PAYMENT
OF POSTAGE, \$30



Print your name, address and ZIP Code here

Diana Salisbury
7019 Ashridge Arnheim Rd
Sardinia, Ohio 45171



3

PROPOSED RULE PR 19-20-21 *etal*
(59 FR 6792)

The Secretary of Energy
Washington, DC 20585

DOCKETED
USNRC

(12)

April 12, 1994

94 APR 13 AM 1:46

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH


Mr. Samuel J. Chilk
Secretary
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555
ATTN: Docketing and Service Branch

Dear Secretary Chilk:

Enclosed are the Department of Energy's comments on the Proposed 10CFR76, Regulation of Gaseous Diffusion Enrichment Plants. We have provided general comments on the Supplementary Information in addition to proposed text changes in the rule. Text changes are provided by section including the current text, proposed text, and the justification for the proposed change.

If you have any questions regarding these comments, please contact Dr. Norton Haberman, Acting Director, Office of Uranium Programs, at 301-903-4321.

Sincerely,


Daniel A. Dreyfus
Acting Director
Office of Nuclear Energy

Enclosure

9404150135 940412
PDR PR
19 59FR6792 PDR

DS10

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

OFFICIAL BUSINESS
PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE, \$300

DIANA SALISBURY
7019 ASHRIDGE ARNHEIM RD
SARDINIA OH 45171

CMT DATE 08/05/96 156FR47 16 136

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

OFFICIAL BUSINESS
PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE, \$300

DIANA SALLSBURY
7019 ASHRIDGE ARNHEIM ROAD
SARDINIA OHIO 45171

CMT DATE 08/05/96 156FR47 16 136

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

OFFICIAL BUSINESS
PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE, \$300

DIANA SALLSBURY
7019 ASHRIDGE ARNHEIM ROAD
SARDINIA OHIO 45171

CMT DATE 08/05/96 156FR47 16 137

We have received your recent correspondence regarding the subject referred to below.
Please be advised that your correspondence has been forwarded for consideration by the
Commission. Thank you for your interest.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW FOR RENEWAL OF OPERA
LICENSES

PR-051
FEDERAL REGISTER CITE 56FR47016
COMMENT DATE: 08/05/96
COMMENT NUMBER: 136

Docketing & Service Branch
Office of the Secretary
of the Commission

We have received your recent correspondence regarding the subject referred to below.
Please be advised that your correspondence has been forwarded for consideration by the
Commission. Thank you for your interest.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW FOR RENEWAL OF OPERA
LICENSES

PR-051
FEDERAL REGISTER CITE 56FR47016
COMMENT DATE: 08/06/96
COMMENT NUMBER: 138


Docketing & Service Branch
Office of the Secretary
of the Commission

We have received your recent correspondence regarding the subject referred to below.
Please be advised that your correspondence has been forwarded for consideration by the
Commission. Thank you for your interest.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW FOR RENEWAL OF OPERA
LICENSES

PR-051
FEDERAL REGISTER CITE 56FR47016
COMMENT DATE: 08/05/96
COMMENT NUMBER: 137

Docketing & Service Branch
Office of the Secretary
of the Commission





OFFICIAL OHIO HIGHWAY MAP
COPYRIGHT 1993
BY OHIO DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

LEGEND

PRINCIPAL THROUGH HIGHWAYS

- Freeway, Access Fully Controlled
- Multilane Divided, Access Partially Controlled
- Two or More Lane
- Multilane Toll Road, Access Fully Controlled
- Future Location

OTHER THROUGH HIGHWAYS


- Multilane Divided
- Two or More Lane
- Good Connecting Road
- Future Location
- Interstate Route
- United States Route
- State Route
- County Boundary
- Scenic Highways
- Interchange and Interchange Number
- Separation - No Access
- County Seat
- Incorporated Municipality
- Unincorporated Municipality
- Approximate Mileage Between Centers of Incorporated Municipality and/or Intersections
- Amtrak Railroad and Passenger Stations
- Ferries
- Toll Bridge
- Dams
- Points of Interest
- Colleges or Universities
- State Hospitals or Institutions
- State Forest
- Parks or Reserves
- National Parks
- Roadside Rest Area
- Roadside Rest Area with Tourist Info. Center
- Roadside Rest Area with Facilities for the Handicapped
- Highway Patrol Posts and First Aid Stations
- Fairgrounds
- Military Airports
- Major Airports - Serving Airlines
- Business Airports - Over 3,000 Ft. Paved

GHWAY PATROL POST
ELEPHONE NUMBERS

CB Call Letters - KNN - 3083
tors CB Channel 9 - 24 hrs. a day

hway Emergency Hotline 1-800-525-5555

- 928-1185 Lisbon (216) 424-7783
- 289-0911 Mansfield (419) 524-3841
- 969-1155 Marietta (614) 374-8616
- 583-6611 Marion (614) 383-2181
- 732-1510 Marysville (513) 593-2075
- 234-2096 (513) 644-8811
- 562-8040 Massillon (216) 833-1055
- 439-1388 Medina (216) 725-4921
- 533-6866 Milan (419) 499-4808
- 286-6612 Mt. Gilead (419) 768-3955
- 775-7770 New Phila. (216) 339-1103
- 983-2538 Norwalk (419) 668-3711
- 587-4305 Piqua (513) 773-1131
- 466-2660 Portsmouth (614) 354-2888
- 890-1111 Ravenna (216) 297-1441
- 784-1025 St. Clairsville (614) 695-0915
- 363-1392 Sandusky (419) 625-6565
- 456-5533 Springfield (513) 323-9781
- 123-5494 Steubenville (614) 264-1641
- 123-1414 Swanton (419) 826-5871
- 32-8246 Toledo (419) 865-5544
- 46-2433 Van Wert (419) 238-3055
- 78-6191 Walbridge (419) 666-1323
- 27-0065 Wapakoneta (419) 738-9010
- 53-4606 Warren (216) 898-2311
- 17-2168 W. Jefferson (614) 879-7826
- 7-4311 Wilmington (513) 382-2551
- 6-4141 Wooster (216) 264-0575
- 4-1523 Xenia (513) 372-7671
- 2-4444 Zanesville (614) 453-0541
- 5-2421



N O P

6

SEPTEMBER 12, 1994

TO: JAN STRASMA
PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICE
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION


FROM: DIANA SALISBURY

RE: NRC MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 13, 1994 WITH SHERWOOD BAUMAN
AT REGION 3 OFFICE

DEAR MR. STRASMA:

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE IN DELIVERING MY QUESTIONS/
COMMENTS TO BE CONSIDERED AND, HOPEFULLY, ADDRESSED AT
DURING THE AGENCY'S MEETING WITH MR. BAUMAN.

SINCERELY,


DIANA SALISBURY
(513) 446-2763
Telephone and Fax

September 12, 1994

NRC Regional Office
Chicago, Ill.

Attention: Sherwood Bauman
SAVE THE WILLS CREEK WATER RESOURCES COMMITTEE
CUMBERLAND, OHIO
(614) 638-CLAY

Re: Questions/Suspicions/Site & Policy Concerns regarding
Nuclear Regulatory Commission policies and practices in
Ohio

POLICY/SITE CONCERNS:

1. What are the NRC's standards to protect worker and public health and safety in terms of allowable yearly dose exposure?
2. Why did the NRC set 25/REM as the allowable yearly (?) exposure at the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant in Piketon in 10CFR76?
3. What mechanism(s) does the NRC have for enforcement for sites it supervises when those sites are found to exceed standards (5/REM) normally required to protect the public health and safety?
4. What is the monitoring policy of the NRC for sites it supervises to insure that compliance is being met and that worker/public health and safety is being protected?
5. What funding is available for clean up of sites found to be out of compliance and threaten the public health and safety?
6. What is the NRC's "track record" in Ohio for sites it is responsible for monitoring, including ChemTron near Cleveland, and Cyprus Foote Metal/Shields Metal Alloy in Cambridge, Ohio?
7. Other than Congressional mandate to do so, what evidence has the NRC provided by past record to show that the protection of worker/public health and safety will be served by transfer of authority to NRC at the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant.

Diana Sallsbury
page 2, September 12, 1994

8. What standards does the NRC plan to "enforce" at the Portsmouth site considering that the Department of Energy has authority by Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies to rewrite standards based upon WHATEVER CONDITIONS ACTUALLY EXIST ON SITE, THEREBY MAKING COMPLIANCE WHATEVER CONDITIONS ACTUALLY EXIST (emphasis added).

9. Does the Hazardous Waste Facility Board in Ohio retain authority independent of the Ohio EPA after authority is transferred to NRC at the Portsmouth site?

10. DOES THE TRANSFER OF AUTHORITY TO NRC AT THE PORTSMOUTH SITE REPRESENT THE "SOLUTION" OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY TO ITS LOW/HIGH LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE DISPOSAL AT FORMER MILITARY PRODUCTION SITES ACROSS THE NATION (emphasis added)? Are Portsmouth/Paducah/Savannah River merely the first three sites in this process? (please see enclosure #1)

11. Does the NRC concur that Ohio should become a designated state with Ohio EPA as the lead agency? What policy changes would result from this designation? What funding changes to Ohio EPA would result?

12. What is the NRC's estimate of cost of clean up of contaminated sites it presently "oversees" in Ohio?

13. What procedures has the NRC taken to respond to health and safety concerns from citizens in proximity of these sites? Does the NRC have a TOLL FREE HOTLINE, EMERGENCY RESPONSE TEAM, STAFF AVAILABLE TO COLLECT SAMPLES OF SOIL, AIR, WATER, AND/OR CONTAMINATED MATERIALS OR DOCUMENTS/FILES READILY ACCESSIBLE TO THESE CITIZENS (emphasis added)?

14. What procedures/policies does the NRC have in place for appeals by citizens when concerns are not satisfactorily resolved by the NRC?

15. What practices are used by the NRC to assure that citizens are not denied access by lack of financial means for long distance telephone calls, document/file copying costs, lack of documents available locally, and attorney/court costs? Does NRC practice currently deny access to economically disadvantaged communities? How is the NRC complying with Civil Rights Act, Community Right to Know Act, and Freedom of Information Act?

16. If the NRC is truly interested in public participation, why was the comment period on 10CFR76 noted only in the Federal Registry in spite of attempts by Mr. Bauman and

Diana Salisbury
page 3, September 12, 1994

others to have the comment period reopened? Other than assuring that licensing authority transfer to NRC remained on schedule, what purposes were served by refusal to reopen this comment period?

17. What former actions/enforcement can the NRC cite to show its concern for worker/public health and safety in Ohio from sites it presently oversees in Ohio?

18. Considering the NRC's interest in the continued generation of commercial radioactive waste, particularly by the nuclear power industry, how can the public have confidence in the NRC to protect the public?

19. What interest does the nuclear power generators in the state of Louisiana have in the transfer of licensing of the Portsmouth/Paducah sites to NRC oversight?

20. Why is the NRC using the 25/REM dose standard for siting a reactor in 10CFR76? Does the NRC plan to site a reactor?

21. How many low level radioactive waste disposal facilities are actually needed nationally by the generators in the entire nation? Is Midwest Compact's facility actually being presented to the people of this state as a solution to a regional problem, while in fact Ohio is to host one of three or four dumps for the entire nation's radioactive waste crisis, including the sites operated under the DOE for the past 40 years?

22. Where on a map, has the NRC made inquiries/feasibility studies as to locating/building/operating a radioactive dump for Midwest Compact/private commercial operators/former DOE sites?

23. Has the NRC any information on possible site locations for a radioactive waste disposal site in Franklin Township of Brown County, specifically on or property owned by Diana Salisbury/Robert I. Cahall/Vernon Creighton/Ida Huck near County Road 17/Fite Hauck Road/Alex Shaw Road/Tom Shaw Road/and/or, a mythical road, Stivers Road?

24. Does the NRC have any knowledge of/files/inquiries in regard to the feasibility of storage of radioactive waste from the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant formerly operated by the Department of Energy (waste prior to date of transfer of licensing in 1993) or waste generated under the operation of U.S. Government Enrichment Corporation ON OR NEAR THE SITE OF THE PORTSMOUTH GASEOUS DIFFUSION PLANT (emphasis added)?

Diana Salisbury
page 4, September 12, 1994

SPECIFIC CONCERNS OF NRC INTEREST/PLANS FOR RURAL SOUTHERN OHIO:

1. Why did the NRC contact the Ohio Historical Society/Ohio State Preservation Office in regard to historical cultural, archaeological resources in Southern Ohio? What specific sites were of concern to the NRC in this inquiry?
2. Did the NRC make specific inquiry from these two agencies in regard to Serpent Mound in Adams County?
3. Has the NRC conducted inquiry of these two agencies in regard to locations in Brown County, Ohio? What were the findings of the Ohio Historical Society/Ohio Preservation Office in regard to such inquiries?
4. What specific locations, marked on a map, in Brown County, Ohio has the NRC requested be evaluated as significant historic, cultural, or archaeological resources?
5. What specific correspondence/documents/future plans does the NRC have in regard to Waynoka Utilities, Inc., Waynoka Regional Water and Sewer District/or any other entity in Brown County, Ohio? (Timothy D. O'Farrell, agent/regional manager, 1 Waynoka Drive, Sardinia, Ohio 45171 probable contact)
6. What files/documents/correspondence/memos are in the NRC public record from the following agencies concerning future plans for "growth and development" in rural Southern Ohio, particularly in Brown, Adams, Pike, and Highland Counties?

Ohio Department of Natural Resources
Division of Water
Division of Dams and Mining
Division of Realty and Land Management
Division of Natural Areas and Preserves
Division of Oil and Gas
Division of Geological Survey
Fountain Square
Columbus, Ohio 43224

Jane Harf, Deputy Director
Ohio Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Low Level Radioactive Waste
1800 WaterMark Drive
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Diana Salisbury
page 5, September 12, 1994

Jeffery Spencer, Executive Director
Anita L. Sommers
Ohio Valley Resource and Development Commission
740 Second Street
Room 102
Portsmouth, Ohio 45662-4088

Roger L. Suppes
Midwest Compact Commissioner
Ohio State Board of Health
246 North High Street
Columbus, Ohio 43266-0118

Timothy D. O'Farrell
Waynoka Utilities, Inc.
One Waynoka Drive
Sardinia, Ohio 45171

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
180 East Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215-3793

Martha Potter Otto
Ohio Historical Society
1982 Velma Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43211-2497

David Snyder
Ohio State Preservation
1982 Velma Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43211-2497

Jerry Wray, Director
Ohio Department of Transportation
25 South Front Street
Columbus, Ohio 43216-0899

Michael Gheen, Chief
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Huntington District
502 8th Street
Huntington, W. Va. 25701

James T. Cogan
Farmers Home Administration/Rural Development Authority
740 Federal Building
200 North High Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Diana Salisbury
page 6, September 12, 1994

I would appreciate direct answers to my concerns/questions from your agency as a resident of Southern Ohio, downwinder of the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant, and directly affected party.

Respectfully submitted,

Diana Salisbury
Diana Salisbury
(513) 446-2763

10/24/96

cc: United States Senator Howard Metzenbaum
United States Senator John Glenn
U.S. Congressman Rob Portman
U.S. Congressman Ted Strickland

enclosures

TRANSMISSION VERIFICATION REPORT

TIME: 09/12/1994 15:07
NAME: DIANA SALISBURY
FAX : 5134462763
TEL : 5134462763

DATE, TIME	09/12 14:59
FAX NO./NAME	17085151096
DURATION	00:07:58
PAGE(S)	10
RESULT	OK
CHECK READABILITY OF TRANSMITTED PAGE(S)	09
MODE	STANDARD