

From: "Phil Silberman" <phil@poetrycardsusa.com>  
 To: <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
 Date: Wed, Dec 15, 2004 1:35 AM  
 Subject: Attention: Anna Bradford

Re: Docket No. 70-3103

Dear Ms Bradford,

I am writing to express my grave concerns about the proposed Nuclear Enrichment Facility in Eunice, New Mexico. As I understand it, if it is constructed, about 3 shipments per day of raw, enriched and waste depleted uranium and other wastes would be shipped via truck and train right up I-25 through Denver. With all of the concern about the terrorist attacks using "dirty bombs", is it not ironic to allow the transport of THREE truckloads per day of such deadly materials right through the middle of a major US metropolitan area?

As a citizen and father to be this is quite disconcerting. Will these trucks travel with a military escort? Has the Dept. of homeland security submitted any comments on this project? Given all the discussion regarding dirty bombs of late, has adequate attention been devoted to the question of potential terrorist activity relating to these shipments? What assurances can the NRC provide a pregnant mother-to-be that this possibility has been addressed? Can the NRC demonstrate that DHS has even been notified for comment on the project? What training or information/disclosures have been made to notify first responders along these routes of the special problems associated with accidents or attack.

Thinking on the project seems at best incomplete and at worse horribly misguided. How is it possible for a thorough or even adequate environmental review to be accomplished on a project that has so many "options" and variables still under consideration. More importantly, given the excess supply of nuclear materials available on the black market that can be blended down for electrical purposes, we should question whether adequate attention is being paid to the "no action" alternative, i.e. not building the facility at all, while keeping the stuff out of the hands of terrorists. If the plant is to be built, is it not necessary to fully evaluate each and every contingency of operation that is still on the table here?

Given that the project hinges on an LES promise that waste won't stay in New Mexico, what gives New Mexico and the NRC the right to assume the project can go ahead without a comprehensive management plan in place, with firm contractual arrangements as to where all the wastes will go?

This plan has numerous built in potential disasters and should be halted.

Thank you.

Phil Silberman

*RDB received  
10/17/04  
D*

*9/17/04*

*69FR56104*

*99*

*E-RIDS = ADM-03*

*Call = A. Bradford (AHB1)  
D. Johnson (TJ5)*

*SISP Review Complete*

*Template = ADM-013*

Denver, Colorado

**Mail Envelope Properties (41BFDB44.0C4 : 10 : 37060)**

**Subject:** Attention: Anna Bradford  
**Creation Date:** Wed, Dec 15, 2004 1:35 AM  
**From:** "Phil Silberman" <[phil@poetrycardsusa.com](mailto:phil@poetrycardsusa.com)>

**Created By:** [phil@poetrycardsusa.com](mailto:phil@poetrycardsusa.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
twf2\_po.TWFN\_DO  
NRCREP

**Post Office**  
twf2\_po.TWFN\_DO

**Route**  
nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	2434	Wednesday, December 15, 2004 1:35 AM
TEXT.htm	12646	
Mime.822	17205	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**Reply Requested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard