EagleRockCEm Resource

From: Claudialee3@aol.com
Sent: Wednesday, June 17, 2009 7:50 PM
To: EagleRockEIS Resource
Subject: To the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)

June17th, 2009

Sir:

I would like you to consider my comments for the public meeting to be held on Docket No. 70-7015 for AREVA to build a power plant in Idaho. As the Nuclear Regulatory Commission must consider all the factors please consider these:

1. Areva's environmental and human rights record
Areva runs a reprocessing plant in La Hague, France. That single facility pours one million gallons of radioactive liquid into the English Channel each year and has contaminated the seas all the way to the Arctic Circle. How can we be assured its Idaho operation will be more responsible?

2. Nuclear waste-- The waste from nuclear power plants will be toxic for humans for more than 100,000 years. Its untenable now to secure and store all of the waste from the plants that exist. To scale up to 2,500 or 3,000 let alone 17,000 plants is unthinkable. No community should have to accept nuclear waste site, or even accept he risks of nuclear waste being transported through on route to it final destination. The waste problem alone should take nuclear power off the table.

3. National Security -- Nuclear reactors represent a clear national security risk, and an attractive target for terrorists. Robert Kennedy, Jr. found that there are at least 8 relatively easy ways to cause a major meltdown at a nuclear power plant.

4. Accidents--Forget terrorism for a moment, and remember that mere accidents -- human error or natural disasters -- can wreak just as much havoc at a nuclear power plant site. Chernobyl disaster there was thousands poisoned by radiation. Three Mile Island in 1979 cleanup lasted nearly 15 years, topping more than one billion dollars in cost.

5. Cancer--There are concerns that living near nuclear plants increases the risk for childhood leukemia. Look at Texas study since the Comanche Peak nuclear power plant was established in 1990, and the German study finding childhood leukemia clusters near several nuclear power sites in Europe.

6. Costs--New generation nuclear plant in Finland is already experiencing numerous problems and cost overruns of 25% of its $4 billion budget. The US government's current energy policy providing more than $11 billion in subsidies to the nuclear energy could be much better spent providing safe and clean energy that would give a boost to local communities, like solar and wind power do.

7. Private sector unwilling to finance--Private sector has largely chosen to take a pass on the financial risks of nuclear power, which is what led the industry to seek taxpayer loan guarantees from Congress in the first place. Unlimited loan guarantees--Yes, Senate voted to allow unlimited taxpayers loan guarantees to build new nuclear reactors, as part of the Gang of 20 oil drilling bill.

8. Even if nuclear waste, proliferation, national security, accidents, cancer, and other dangers of uranium mining and transport, lack of sites, increasing cost, and a private sector unwilling to insure a finance the projects weren't enough to put an end to the debate of nuclear power as a solution for climate change, the final nail in

nuclear coffin is time. We have the next 10 years to mount a global effort against climate change. It is simply isn't possible to build 17,000 in then years.

9. Idaho's most precious commodity and the life blood of agriculture is our Water. We depend on the Snake River for our food, livelihood, way of life, and just plane living. AEHI has estimated it's consume via evaporation about 30 million gallons of water per day. If heated water is pumped back into the river it will effect our ecology system and fill fish. and change the river so that it will not longer be good for agriculture use. Other reactors all over the US have been forced to shut down because of temperature of the river used for cooling were simply too hot due to the heat of the summer and the warming of the water from the nuclear reactor used for power.

Mr. Gillispie claims that the reactor will be dry cooled, my questions is how? Why are we when looking at a plant design that has yet to be approved by the NRC for use in the US?

AEHI statement is that all waste will be reprocessed or recycled. To what? Plutonium to make nuclear bombs? Do not risk Idaho's water, it is to valuable to us.

This is simply too much to risk. I am asking that you turn down this reactor.

Thank you for considering my statements.
Claudia Haynes
8830 Deersky Ranch Trail
Nampa, Idaho 83686
CFO of Bluth Co.
Member of Canyon County Alliance for Responsible Growth
President of HOA Deersky Ranch.

Dell Days of Deals! June 15-24 - A New Deal Everyday!

Federal Register Notice: 74FR20508
Comment Number: 64

Mail Envelope Properties (d34.4dc2e944.376adb42)

Subject: To the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)
Sent Date: 6/17/2009 7:50:26 PM
Received Date: 6/17/2009 7:51:23 PM
From: Claudialee3@aol.com

Created By: Claudialee3@aol.com

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

Post Office: aol.com

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	4916	6/17/2009 7:51:23 PM

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