

RDB received
10/28/04

Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Mail Stop T6-D59,
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001

9/17/04
69FR56104

RE: Public Comments, Docket No. 70-3103 National Enrichment Facility, Eunice NM

121

To whom it may concern:

I recently read in the Denver Post (11/28/04) about the N.E.F project and the plans to ship nuclear materials through the front range and mountains of Colorado. Being a part-time resident of Canon City, Colorado, I am familiar with the negative consequences of having a "legally permitted" nuclear waste facility as a neighbor. In fact, I continuously hear about my friends and neighbors who have succumbed to various forms of cancer—a seemingly common fate around the Canon City area.

My initial reaction after reading the article was to investigate the facts, myself. You should know that in my first search of the NRC website, I was frustrated to learn that the public comment period for this project had already been closed (on November 6th), so I gave up my search. By chance, I learned yesterday from a friend that the comment period had been changed to December 18th. Accordingly, I submit the following abbreviated commentary for your consideration.

Living first hand with the consequences of the Cotter Corporation in my community, I find it wholly inconceivable that any project the size of the NEF can be adequately evaluated based solely on the irresponsible notion that the wastes generated will be deposited "somewhere" outside the State of New Mexico. I question the fundamental competency of the existing environmental review, which seems to have successfully divorced the project from responsibility for the wastes it will generate. Is it, in fact, legal to permit a project without concrete knowledge of the ultimate fate of these wastes? Will other States have any authority to assert in such cases?

I am disturbed by comments such as those of LES spokesperson April Wade concerning the fact that actual supply and waste transport routes for the project still remain to be concretely determined. Being a resident of a State "somewhere" other than NM, I think it is only fair that the applicant be compelled to disclose complete and definitive plans for regional nuclear transportation, as well as comprehensive waste management plans. Obviously, only after affected communities become aware of the plans will they be able to undertake a truly complete review of the potential environmental and economic impacts involved.

Lastly, I am aware that other shipments of radioactive materials are a relatively common occurrence in the front range. Regardless of this fact, I do not believe that any adequate investigation has been conducted regarding the potential diversion of these existing and future shipments intentionally in terrorist situations, or even the more likely eventuality of a derailment or other vehicle accident. I see no reason to exclude these very possible contingencies from environmental review.

Thank you for the opportunity to send my comments.

Sandy Rogers
Sandy Rogers

E-RDS-ADM-03
Add = A. Bradford (AHB1)
T. Johnson (TCS)

STSP Review Complete

Transmittal = ADM-013