

EagleRockCEM Resource

From: strata@one.myrf.net
Sent: Friday, June 05, 2009 1:56 PM
To: EagleRockEIS Resource
Subject: Areva, Docket No. 70-7015

Re: Docket No. 70-7015

Dear Sir or Madam:

Idaho Falls political and commercial leadership have rushed pell-mell into supporting the Areva facility. This is understandable during these type financial times, when the promise of jobs and prosperity are hard to find. But, when dealing with a very deadly product with an unfathomable life, short term thinking must give way to much longer term risks and impact.

Few facts regarding the risk of damage to citizen health and our long-term environment impact have been disclosed and aired publically in newspapers and by antagonists verbally on TV or radio. Thus, I believe, the so called broad based "community support" is somewhat a white-washed mirage due to pocket support of the vocal short-term few.

I am opposed to the Areva facility.

The uranium waste is very problematic and dangerous to all life. No matter the Areva-stated good intentions, major risks would be brought to the 18 mile doorstep of tens of thousands of people. Nuclear waste has been a major and ongoing problem on the Idaho desert (INL) for decades, so why add more? Good intentions, good political agreements have come and gone, and meanwhile, in fact, much deadly waste has remained a problem. This is no matter who said what or agreed how. In fact, nuclear waste is very, very difficult to deal with. Again, why add more?

A "permanent" nuclear waste depository facility does not exist domestically, so Areva's new waste would either reside in Idaho creating an on-going risk and subsequent problems, or be shipped with, again, major problems associated with such shipping.

Millions of gallons of water would apparently be needed by Areva's processing. This would be pumped from the aquifer, which is currently being depleted by existing civil, business and farm users. What truly long term justification is there that one company should consume so much of our remaining very precious asset of natural sweet water?

Once consumed, the contaminated water becomes waste and such waste is a large and further environmental problem, especially considering that the aquifer is below is heavily relied upon for human use and consumption. No matter the commercial guarantees (apparently backed up by the US taxpayer, not Areva and the French government), the substantial risks are just too great to take, no matter who it is that says, "they'll be under control". Experience shows the best of intentions fall short in reality and in this case we are dealing with a very deadly product, affecting up to ½ million people.

Again, I am opposed to the Areva facility.

Please provide me with ongoing copies of your decisions. Thank you.

John Willisch
565 N. Westridge Dr.
Idaho Falls, ID 83402

Federal Register Notice: 74FR20508
Comment Number: 20

Mail Envelope Properties (ED70736CBE3C4D5380A3475C75E453C4)

Subject: Areva, Docket No. 70-7015
Sent Date: 6/5/2009 1:55:53 PM
Received Date: 6/5/2009 1:55:58 PM
From: strata@one.myrf.net

Created By: strata@one.myrf.net

Recipients:
"EagleRockEIS Resource" <EagleRockEIS.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: strata73c0601

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2841	6/5/2009 1:55:58 PM

Options
Priority: Standard
Return Notification: No
Reply Requested: No
Sensitivity: Normal
Expiration Date:
Recipients Received: