EagleRockCEm Resource

From: Cindy [climb10s@allidaho.com]
Sent: Sunday, June 14, 2009 11:40 PM
To: EagleRockEIS Resource
Subject: letter
Attachments: Letteron nuclear.doc

I may have sent this by mail but wasn't sure this email was the same as the address I had. I wanted you to have this. Thanks Cindy Cottrell

Federal Register Notice: 74FR20508
Comment Number: 80

Mail Envelope Properties (002a01c9ed6b$02ae9810$a3cde304)

Subject: letter
Sent Date: 6/14/2009 11:40:17 PM
Received Date: 6/14/2009 11:40:20 PM
From: Cindy

Created By: climb10s@allidaho.com

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

Post Office: home7oo0h3wong

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	139	6/14/2009 11:40:20 PM
Letteron nuclear.doc	23104	

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

Cindy Cottrell
1259 Holman Ave
Pocatello, ID 83201
(208) 238-0990

June 5, 2009

To Whom It May Concern:

I attended the hearing in Idaho Falls last evening about the application for Areva's Proposed Uranium Enrichment Facility in Idaho. I left wondering about the future safety of this State.

It seemed the only people who were in support of the project were people concerned about making jobs for a few people in the Idaho Falls area while this project would impact all of the thousands of people in this State. The goal of a few to make money and the State to get some tax money from the investment in the near future even though it would cost the State more in the distant future was being pursued. What happened to doing the right thing for all of Idahoans and caring about the long-term future of this State?

I heard many people say Areva was safe and clean. How can they honestly say that when Areva's pours one million gallons of radioactive liquid into the English Channel each year, contaminating the seas all the way to the Arctic Circle and the plant has had leaks in their new plants, besides ruining the lives of indigenous people mining uranium in third world countries. They call it clean energy when there is no commitment in this Country for storing waste, making Idaho the permanent dumping grounds. How clean is that? What kind of future does this State have if nuclear waste is here? Until there is some commitment from our Country to take waste, Idaho should not even be considering such a plant here.

Idaho is one of the few States who has the opportunity to never use nuclear energy with its risks and costs because we have all kinds of other options to create energy that other States do not have. We have hot water under the earth to use, dams, wind energy and many resources to create new and inventive ways to have energy that won't have long-term risks or cost as much as nuclear energy in the long run. We could be the leading State to teach others better ways of using waste-free and clean energy if the people would be more concerned about the distant future of Idaho instead of 300 jobs for a few in Idaho Falls.

At the hearing, they claim Areva's should come to Idaho Falls because the people in the area are trained in nuclear energy. That isn't a reason to bring risky energy to the State when there are other options that

will be better for Idaho in the long run. People can move for those kinds of jobs, but Idaho can't go back to the way it was once it's contaminated.

Any risky business for pollution should stay clear of inland areas where fresh water begins and is stored. Idaho is the last place to have risky businesses. If any contamination occurred, it will travel through several other States contaminating them and finally reaching the ocean. Nuclear plants need to stay away from areas where fresh water is.

I would be offended if even one of my tax dollars goes to helping nuclear energy be established in this State. I would not be offended if better long-term type of energy were given tax incentives, but never nuclear. I do not want Areva's to get any tax breaks.

People act like the State can enforce safety in a nuclear plant. Rules by the government can help increase the odds for safety, but it doesn't stop them. Even with the perfect rules, which no one ever can have, people still make mistakes or don't do their job and accidents can still happen. I have worked 25 years for the government and I have seen how rules work. I worked in licensing and it didn't stop all bad things from happening. When you are dealing with something as dangerous as nuclear energy and waste by products, you are talking about some serious long-term consequences for mistakes that will eventually happen.

Why not put our tax incentives into risk free energy and develop better ways that won't hurt the future of Idaho/ Stop pursuing something that may be a quick short-term way to make tax money with permanent long-term consequences. To accept Areva's will turn Idaho into a dumping ground for waste that will become more toxic over time and our children will have to deal with the problem. I'm not in favor of Areva's starting a plant in Idaho.

Sincerely,
Cindy Cottrell