

RAS 6895

RELATED CORRESPONDENCE

DOCKET NUMBER

BYPRODUCTS 30-36239-ML

From: "Chris Pugsley" <cpugsley@athompsonlaw.com>
To: <rjsugarman@aol.com>, <dcurran@harmoncurran.com>
Date: 10/3/03 4:02PM
Subject: Disclosure of Certain Documents

DOCKETED
USNRC

Mr. Sugarman,

October 9, 2003 (2:19PM)

After consulting with my client, CFC objects to the dissemination of the documents referenced in your letters of September 30, 2003 and October 2, 2003. There has been no attempt to demonstrate that these documents are relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding (radiation health and safety issues) other than to say you believe they are relevant and, without such a demonstration, the disclosure of such documents is not warranted. Judge Biehn in the Bucks County case has seen fit to cover these documents with a Confidentiality Order and, without a showing of relevance, such documents should not be disseminated to any parties outside those included in that Order. We are faxing to all parties a copy of an October 1, 2003 letter from Dave Onorato, counsel for CFC in its Bucks County case, which includes CFC's position on this matter in the local court. Thank you for your time in this matter.

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
RULEMAKINGS AND
ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

Anthony J. Thompson, Esq.
Counsel for CFC Logistics, Inc.

PS This message is being CCed to all parties, including the Presiding Officer, in an effort to keep everyone informed. CFC is more than willing to discuss this with Petitioners' counsel but, as of this time, we have not heard from Petitioners' counsel in any manner other than through the September 30 and October 2 letters. In response to the Presiding Officer's e-mail message this afternoon, CFC submits that our e-mail message was merely a response to Mr. Sugarman's letter to the Presiding Officer and, as such, CFC believes its e-mail message should have been submitted to the Presiding Officer.

CC: <mcf@nrc.gov>, <cnk@nrc.gov>, <shl@nrc.gov>

Template = SECY-043

SECY-02