

August 9, 2010

1 of 2

Nuclear Regulatory Commission

I Am Sally Briggs, an air breathing, water and milk drinking native of Idaho...raised during a time when nuclear fallout drills consisted of sheltering under our desks at school Sometime later, grown with my own children, I received a postcard addressed to "Dear neighbor" and asking "Where were you between 1944 and 1972?" Informing me that I may have been exposed to radioactive material released into the air, water, and soil by the Hanford Nuclear Facility. Much I later learned in "secret" experiments. I have since become aware that in its 45 year history 1 million curies of iodine 131 have been released!

SUCH HUBRIS !

Do we think the scientists employed by Areva are smarter or have a greater moral sense than those at Hanford?

LESS HUBRIS?

At Stake is the very air we all breath and the water we receive from our amazing and priceless aquifer.

I urge you as regulators to apply a healthy dose of skepticism to these plans!

Do we really NEED domestic production ? Have All the RISKS been Addressed?

Please demonstrate courage in protecting our children, grandchildren and all those to follow.....

Thank you

Sally Dugga
1316 Harrison Boulevard
Boise, Idaho
83702

2 of 2

Where were you between 1944 & 1972?

If you lived or attended school or college in the Inland Northwest you may have been exposed to radioactive material released into the air, water and soil by the Hanford Nuclear Facility near Richland, Washington. This does not mean radiation harmed you. However, you may wish to know about possible exposures and radiation-related health issues.



Exposure extends beyond the indicated area.

Hanford Health Information Network	
Call us toll free :	
Idaho	1-800-793-6113
Oregon	1-800-248-4446
Washington	1-800-522-4446
Other States	1-800-959-7660
Tribal Service Program	1-800-798-0796

Boise Service Center • 707 N. Armstrong Pl. • Boise, ID 83704 • (208) 327-8524

Received by Sally Briggs



EIEDP
PO Box 451
Blackfoot, ID 83221

August 6, 2010

To Whom It May Concern:

On behalf of the Eastern Idaho Economic Development Partners (EIEDP) we wish to express support for the AREVA Project. The EIEDP represents a 13-county area surrounding the Eagle Rock Enrichment plant location, which is in the effective immediate impact area for the project. We have issued previous letters of support for the project. We feel confident that the NRC and AREVA have addressed all necessary safety and environmental concerns in the draft EIS. We urge the NRC to stay on scope and utilize scientific expertise to guide their decisions for issuance of the license and permit for the EREF plant. We feel that the NRC procedures for the licensing process have been very satisfactory, and thank you for your thoroughness.

Sincerely,

Kristen Jensen

Kristen Jensen
Co-Chair, EIEDP

Jolie Turek

Jolie Turek
Co-Chair, EIEDP



NRC PUBLIC MEETING FEEDBACK

Category

2

Meeting Date: 08/09/2010

Meeting Title: Public Meeting between the U.S. NRC and the Snake River Alliance regarding the Draft EIS

In order to better serve the public, we need to hear from the meeting participants. Please take a few minutes to fill out this feedback form and return it to NRC.

1. How did you hear about this meeting?

- NRC Web Page
- NRC Mailing List
- Newspaper
- Radio/TV
- Other _____

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u> (Please explain below)	<u>Somewhat</u>
2. Were you able to find supporting information prior to the meeting?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. Did the meeting achieve its stated purpose?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Has this meeting helped you with your understanding of the topic?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Were the meeting starting time, duration, and location reasonably convenient?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>unavoidable.</i>
6. Were you given sufficient opportunity to ask questions or express your views?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Are you satisfied overall with the NRC staff who participated in the meeting?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

COMMENTS OR SUGGESTIONS:

Thank you for answering these questions.

I do not feel that any Summary Statement on impact of a nuclear enriched uranium plant that does not account for any statements on the potential risk of exposure is a sound or unbiased summation on environmental impact. This concerns me greatly and presents a basic failure on the part of the NRC, whether unintentional or planned.

Continue Comments on the reverse. ↩

OPTIONAL

Name Joey Schuele Organization Resident of Idaho
 Telephone No. (208) 724-7047 E-Mail joey.schuele@bgclubidaho.org Check here if you would like a member of NRC staff to contact you.

OMB NO. 3150-0197

Expires: 08/31/2012

Public Protection Notification: If a means used to impose an information collection does not display a currently valid OMB control number, the NRC may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, the information collection.

Please fold on the dotted lines with Business Reply side out, tape the bottom, and mail back to the NRC.



NRC PUBLIC MEETING FEEDBACK

Category

2

Meeting Date: 08/09/2010

Meeting Title: Public Meeting between the U.S. NRC and the Snake River Alliance regarding the Draft EIS

In order to better serve the public, we need to hear from the meeting participants. Please take a few minutes to fill out this feedback form and return it to NRC.

1. How did you hear about this meeting?

- NRC Web Page
- NRC Mailing List
- Newspaper
- Radio/TV
- Other Snake River Alliance

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u> (Please explain below)	<u>Somewhat</u>
2. Were you able to find supporting information prior to the meeting?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Did the meeting achieve its stated purpose?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Has this meeting helped you with your understanding of the topic?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Were the meeting starting time, duration, and location reasonably convenient?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Were you given sufficient opportunity to ask questions or express your views?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Are you satisfied overall with the NRC staff who participated in the meeting?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

COMMENTS OR SUGGESTIONS:

Thank you for answering these questions.

** Could the PowerPoint presentations be made public on your website? Also Speaker's Notes please.*

Why isn't there an United States Corporation capable and willing to build this type of enrichment facility?

Continue Comments on the reverse. ↩

OPTIONAL

Name Nicholas Molenaar Organization Snake River Alliance

Telephone No. 208-249-4492 E-Mail n-molenaar@msn.com Check here if you would like a member of NRC staff to contact you.

OMB NO. 3150-0197

Expires: 08/31/2012

Public Protection Notification: If a means used to impose an information collection does not display a currently valid OMB control number, the NRC may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, the information collection.

Please fold on the dotted lines with Business Reply side out, tape the bottom, and mail back to the NRC.



NRC PUBLIC MEETING FEEDBACK

Category

2

Meeting Date: 08/09/2010

Meeting Title: Public Meeting between the U.S. NRC and the Snake River Alliance regarding the Draft EIS

In order to better serve the public, we need to hear from the meeting participants. Please take a few minutes to fill out this feedback form and return it to NRC.

1. How did you hear about this meeting?

NRC Web Page

NRC Mailing List

Newspaper

Radio/TV

Other SR ALLIANCE MAILING LIST

	Yes	No <small>(Please explain below)</small>	Somewhat
--	------------	--	-----------------

2. Were you able to find supporting information prior to the meeting? Yes No Somewhat

3. Did the meeting achieve its stated purpose? Yes No Somewhat

4. Has this meeting helped you with your understanding of the topic? Yes No Somewhat

5. Were the meeting starting time, duration, and location reasonably convenient? Yes No Somewhat

6. Were you given sufficient opportunity to ask questions or express your views? Yes No Somewhat

7. Are you satisfied overall with the NRC staff who participated in the meeting? Yes No Somewhat

COMMENTS OR SUGGESTIONS:

Thank you for answering these questions.

1 VERY SUPERFICIAL - DID NOT ADDRESS CRITICAL ISSUES
 2 AS WITH CITY COUNCILS - YOUR MINDS HAVE ALREADY BEEN MADE UP.
 3 THEIR PLAN IS A VIABLE ALTERNATIVE, MAKING THIS TYPE OF ENRICHMENT OBSOLETE

Continue Comments on the reverse. ↩

OPTIONAL

Name FRANK NICHOLSON Organization _____

Telephone No. 208-343-2166 E-Mail Frank93562@hotmail.com Check here if you would like a member of NRC staff to contact you.

OMB NO. 3150-0197

Expires: 08/31/2012

Public Protection Notification: If a means used to impose an information collection does not display a currently valid OMB control number, the NRC may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, the information collection.

Please fold on the dotted lines with Business Reply side out, tape the bottom, and mail back to the NRC.



NRC PUBLIC MEETING FEEDBACK

Category

2

Meeting Date: 08/09/2010

Meeting Title: Public Meeting between the U.S. NRC and the Snake River Alliance regarding the Draft EIS

In order to better serve the public, we need to hear from the meeting participants. Please take a few minutes to fill out this feedback form and return it to NRC.

1. How did you hear about this meeting?

- NRC Web Page
- NRC Mailing List
- Newspaper
- Radio/TV
- Other _____

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u> (Please explain below)	<u>Somewhat</u>
2. Were you able to find supporting information prior to the meeting?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Did the meeting achieve its stated purpose?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Has this meeting helped you with your understanding of the topic?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Were the meeting starting time, duration, and location reasonably convenient?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Were you given sufficient opportunity to ask questions or express your views?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Are you satisfied overall with the NRC staff who participated in the meeting?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

COMMENTS OR SUGGESTIONS:

Thank you for answering these questions.

• NO Ads regarding meeting. Just articles or opinion pieces in local paper

• Information about meeting difficult to find.

• NO Actual EIS comment form

Official Comment -

• support licensing of facility.

Continue Comments on the reverse. ↩

OPTIONAL

Name Lance Giles Organization Citizen

Telephone No. _____ E-Mail _____ Check here if you would like a member of NRC staff to contact you.

August 9, 2010

To: Nuclear Regulatory Commission

My name is Kerry Cooke. I have been a member of the Snake River Alliance since 1981, including past tenure as Executive Director. I am currently a member of the Board of Directors for the Snake River Alliance.

I have studied nuclear activities in the United States and particularly in Idaho for several decades, and I have many concerns about the proposed Areva project. I will limit my testimony today to three areas: waste, need, and haste.

Nuclear waste: As one of the earliest sites for nuclear production, Idaho has gone through many cycles of promises, contracts, and deadlines about cleanup and removal of nuclear waste. What we increasingly know is that there is no good place for nuclear waste; nobody wants it, everybody fights it. One of the worst places anyone could think of for nuclear waste is above the Snake River Plain Aquifer. The nuclear waste quagmire is not going to go away any time soon – not during licensing of this project; not during construction; not during operation; and not during decommissioning. The depleted uranium and low level waste the Areva plant will create will be added to the nuclear waste burden Idaho already carries. This plan should go no further until realistic plans are in place that address the need to take care of nuclear waste for centuries to come.

Lack of need: The world already has redundancy in provision of enriched uranium for nuclear plants. With additional enrichment facilities already approved or under construction, the Areva facility would far exceed any expected need for more enriched uranium, in the U.S. and elsewhere. The idea that a new wave of nuclear reactors will demand increased enriched uranium is based on unsubstantiated and wishful prognoses by the nuclear industry. As is playing out every day in the financial market, financiers are shying away from this industry that is risky at all levels: cost, market need, and remuneration, to name three. This plan should be denied until and unless there is solid proof that there is a need.

Haste: What's the hurry? Why is the NRC allowing Areva to start a "preconstruction" phase this fall? During so-called preconstruction, the environment will be greatly disturbed. I appear before you today in good faith that a decision has not been rendered on this proposal, that all testimony will be considered, and that the EIS will be properly completed and vetted BEFORE a decision is reached. There is no emergency that demands that this project be fast-tracked, no national crisis dictating that rules be bent to allow early work. The haste shown by Idaho lawmakers in pushing through funding for a road to the Areva site, while not part of NRC domain, raises even higher my concern that decisions are being made by greed rather than science and sound energy and fiscal policy. There is no reason to start preconstruction before the EIS is released on final form.

Kerry Cooke
4002 Albion Street, Boise, ID 83705 208-345-3678



OPPOSING
VIEWS
CORPS
GOVT
SRA

Concern

Research

de positions