

Docket # 70-3103

From: PHILLIP BARR [mailto:pharb2@msn.com]
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2003 6:56 AM
To: teh@nrc.gov; 'Timothy Johnson'; info@nefnm.com
Cc: April Wade; Lee Cheney
Subject: Fw:

Good morning Ms. Wade

I would like to repeat my request. How does LES know their proposed plant will not seriously effect the water supply in LEA County?

There must have been some tests and studies done

Answer:

The following information was obtained from Mr. Tim Woormer of the city of Hobbs water supply system. He can be reached at 505-397-9315. Since Hobbs draws water from the same aquifer as Eunice, these figures also reflect the capacity available to Eunice, whose demand is lower than that of Hobbs.

Demand

Winter: 4.9 million gallons per day (MGD)

Summer: 12.5 MGD

Capacity

Production: 20 MGD

Storage: 12 MGD

Based on the preliminary plant design and studies, LES estimates that it needs about 70,000 gallons per day, a small fraction of the demand and the capacity.

LES has promised the Citizens in Lea County timely answers to our questions. If I ask their website, they refer me to you.

I would like to see those studies.

Our last water rate hike here in Hobbs was based on the need to conserve water because we were told we have a water shortage in Lea County.

Answer:

LES cannot comment on this; this should be directed to Mr. Woormer

=====

I have several additional questions for you Ms. Wade

1. How long will LES plan to store its waste in NM?

Answer:

As we committed to Governor Richardson in our letter dated August 6, 2003, we will temporarily store Uranium Byproduct Cylinders (UBC's) on site only for the license period of the plant. We are requesting that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) grant a 30 year license for the facility. All other radioactive waste will be disposed of during the operation of the facility by shipment to one or more licensed repositories.

2. Isn't it true that there is no facility on earth that is currently licensed to dispose of the waste LES will be producing? How then, can they or you give us any guarantees on how long it will be stored here?

Answer:

It is not true; there are a number of repositories in this country that can dispose of uranium byproduct once it is converted into the chemically stable oxide form. Currently, there are no conversion facilities in the US (however, there is one in France that has been operating since 1984). The US Dept. of Energy has contracted with a consortium, one of whom operates the conversion facility in France, to build two conversion facilities in the US, one in Paducah, KY and one in Portsmouth, OH. The Dept. of Energy is required by law to take our uranium byproduct once it is considered waste. Also, other companies involved in the uranium fuel cycle have expressed interest in building a conversion facility. On this basis, LES has committed to Governor Richardson that all uranium byproduct cylinders will not be stored on site any longer than the license period of the facility.

3. Since the only other uranium enrichment facility operating in the US (Paducah, KY) is such a human health and environmental disaster (so far, the US government has paid out \$68 Million to injured families in Paducah), how can you assure us the same thing won't happen here?

Answer:

The Paducah facility has been operating for about 50 years, almost all that time as a government run facility, which regulated itself. Our facility employs a completely different technology than the Paducah plant and will be licensed and regulated by the US Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the State of New Mexico. As such, these agencies will maintain oversight of all plant operation for the life of the plant. Furthermore, almost identical plants have been operating in Europe for nearly 30 years without any of the problems regarding human health and the environment that have occurred at the Paducah facility.

4 Why should we believe what LES is telling us when they have admitted to lying to the British government (regarding their Sellafield facility) as well as to the people of Louisiana and Tennessee when they were trying to site their facility there?

Answer:

LES never had any involvement in Sellafield. Sellafield is operated by BNFL, and while BNFL is one of three owners of Urenco, BNFL has no involvement in the direction or operation of Urenco. Urenco is one of the partners in LES. LES did not lie to the people of Louisiana or the people of Tennessee. An informed citizen should confirm any information by consulting unbiased sources, such as the International Atomic Energy Agency or Sandia National Lab here in New Mexico.

<http://archive.greenpeace.org/pressreleases/nucprocess/1998may24.html>

5. Why should we allow URENCO and BNFL to operate a dangerous nuclear facility in our community when their environmental record in the UK is so horrible?

Answer:

As noted above, Urenco, not BNFL, has operated facilities employing the same safe technology as is being proposed for the Lea County National Enrichment Facility for 30 years without any incidents of overexposure to workers or members of the public and no releases, liquid or gas, in excess of stringent government limits. In fact Urenco has an excellent environmental record in Europe as attested to by the governments and local populations.

Phillip Barr

Hobbs

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

From: April Wade

To: 'PHILLIP BARR'

Cc: 'Timothy Johnson'

Sent: Friday, October 24, 2003 12:23 PM

Subject: RE:

Mr. Barr,

We appreciate your inquiry about the National Enrichment Facility. We will be responding to your question shortly.

Thank you for your patience.

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

From: PHILLIP BARR [mailto:pharb2@msn.com]
Sent: Friday, October 24, 2003 9:14 AM
To: April Wade
Cc: Timothy Johnson
Subject: Fw:

Good Morning Ms. Wade,

"Both Eunice and Hobbs have indicated that they can supply our water needs with out impacting the water supply for their respective cities." " We have also looked at the aquifer in Hobbs and have come to the same conclusion independently."

Would you send the information you have that supports this claim

(Mr. Johnson, if I don't cc to the NRC, this company wont answer my questions.)

Phillip Barr

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

From: April Wade

To: 'PHILLIP BARR'

Sent: Wednesday, October 22, 2003 4:08 PM

Subject: RE:

Currently, we are investigating multiple sources of water for the plant. These sources include the city of Eunice and the city of Hobbs. These sources include potable water and waste water currently piped to Nadine from Hobbs. It is our understanding from discussions with representatives from Eunice and Hobbs that Eunice's source of water is a number of wells located in Hobbs. Both Eunice and Hobbs have indicated that they can supply our water needs with out impacting the water supply for their respective cities. We have also looked at the aquifer in Hobbs and have come to the same conclusion independently. We have also investigated the use of oil field water (brackish) preliminary conclusions indicate that the water's content of salt and hydrocarbons make it unsuitable for use in out application.

I also have attached a letter from the Lea County Water Association.

Thanks for your patience.

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

From: PHILLIP BARR [mailto:pharb2@msn.com]

Sent: Monday, September 22, 2003 7:07 AM

To: april@dwtturner.com

Subject: Re:

Good Morning,

As I understand it, the water supply at Eunice is contaminated. Eunice gets its drinking water from Nadine and Hobbs.

Will your plant use the contaminated Eunice water or Hobbs and Nadine fresh water. If its from Hobbs and Nadine, how much will you use.

Phillip Barr

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

From: April Wade

To: 'PHILLIP BARR'

Sent: Friday, September 19, 2003 9:53 AM

Subject: RE:

It was very nice to meet you last night. Please call Mayor Jim Brown's office in Eunice at 505-394-2576 for information on the water supply.

If you have any questions please let me know and I will do my best to get them answered in a timely manner.

Thanks

April Wade

CC: "Lee Cheney" <lee_cheney@leaco.net>