



RDB received  
12/1/04 (2)

9/17/04

69FR56104

97

E-RTSS  
ADM-03

STP Review Complete

AdL = <sup>W.</sup> Modified

United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission (FHB2)

Template ADM-013

T. Johnson (TCJ)

Through out the whole document there are statements made regarding the construction, operation and decommissioning of said plant National Enrichment Facility. Although the report does summarize the effects of the different phases of the plant and according to the NRC the impacts of the operations and construction and decommissioning would have a small impact on the environment, I find that all one has to do is easily look up the subject and find the summary following. In many of the different situations involving information, many references are made to the properties of the UF6 uranium hexafluoride and the feed gas as well as the depleted uranium waste byproduct. In all occurrences involving accidental release of the UF6 I find dangerous situations arise. A ruptured container can cause death and excessive radioactive materials are release to the air and surrounding environment. What would happen if at some point all 15727 containers ruptured due to a possible terrorist attack . This is an item not covered under the EIS.

This is a state and national security issue. Who will address this and give a reply as to the consequence of such a thing happening? Does this fall under Safety and Security which is identified as being outside the scope of the EIS and NRC?

What about the disposition of the waste? The viable options are discussed; unfortunately, nothing is solid or contingent upon completion of this plant. Where is the proof that the waste will be gone? I have heard all politicians say that the governor wants the waste gone but final disposition has only been in outlines as possible options available. No contract means no guarantee.

The State of NM Environmental Dept and Atty General's office is being left out of the legal process and this is concerning to me. The 2 state government entities filed contentions that should be addressed during the NRC hearing starting 2005, but it appears as though nothing is happening yet. The Gov of NM has requested the admittance of the 2 offices but it looks like the governor has no real say in this matter. This is very serious and we in this community will be lacking support if they are not admitted as important Interested Parties to this process. Who will assure us that the waste is removed as soon as possible? Who will stand up for Eunice? Our city government should be asking these same questions, why aren't they? Who will protect us with the necessary laws in place should something like environmental contamination or death occur?

The water issue is still of concern as well, we know that communities in NM are adopting water conservation policies required to be in place by next year. We know our 40-year water plan indicated a possible shortage of water within 40 years and yet we will allow this plant to use all the water they need and want and then at some point a possible deconversion plant may be built and that plant will use our water as well. When will our needs be considered for the 40 yr plan? My community still has much work to do, according to the water study engineers recommended that new water wells be drilled and water conservation be addressed. Water is an important and crucial part of our future here in Eunice and I am very concerned that this is not being taken seriously enough. Other issues that concern me are in the scoping summary reports are identified as being outside the scope of this environmental impact statement drafted by the NRC but I do intend to submit written comments in addition to these.

I personally do not support this project. I do not believe that this facility should be constructed in Eunice. Our community already has more than it's share of a hi-risk and polluting industry with the Oil and Gas Industry. We are exposed daily to hydrogen sulfide gas and other oil related pollutants. We have more than our fair share of cancer and in this DEIS there are constant references to Latent Cancer Fatalities. Excessive exposure to radioactive emissions and waste cannot be good for anyone. Why must the community of Eunice be the one to suffer the ill effects which are bound to occur and the surrounding areas will profit by our misery? I live here and I intend to be here a long time if God is willing. I ask you as Christian brothers and sisters, would you want this done to you? I would not want this for anyone regardless of the monetary profit potential. It is an unhealthy environment that you supporters of this project are wanting to subject the community of Eunice to and I will vigorously oppose the planning of this plant. I am a member of Public Citizen and Nuclear Information Resource Services and am very glad that most of our contentions were admitted by the NRC. We will have our day in court and at the end of the day, who knows what might happen.

I request that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission deny the license application for Urenco, Louisiana Energy Services, National Enrichment Facility.

*Rose Gardner*  
10-14-04      B4514  
Eunice NM  
88231