

RAS # RR-162

Docket: Hearing

From: Julie Rieman [julie.rieman@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 02, 2011 11:03 PM
To: Boliwerk, Paul
Subject: NRC: No Need For Areva

Dear Atomic Safety and Licensing Board,

NRC regulations for the implementation of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) require the NRC to prepare a supplemental EIS in the event of "changed circumstances bearing on environmental concerns and bearing on the proposed action or its impacts." See 10 CFR 51.92(a). Three worldwide trends have combined to create just such changed circumstances with respect to the need for the proposed Areva uranium enrichment facility: a significant depression in the uranium market following the nuclear crisis in Japan, greatly increased cost estimates for new reactors, and a markedly reduced pace of new nuclear project construction. In light of these trends, the EIS' assertion that there is a need for the proposed Areva uranium enrichment factory - i.e., that its environmental impacts are justified -- is not supportable. Therefore, as required by 10 C.F.R. 51.92(f)(1), the NRC must revise the EIS and publish it in draft for public comment. If the EIS is not revised and re-published, the application must be rejected.

In addition, I feel that having the Idaho Nuclear Laboratory at the other end of the state is enough nuclear power in the state, with all of its potential danger to southwest Idaho's aquifer. We don't need more nuclear power in this end of the state.

Idaho has huge reservoirs of hydroelectric power and great potential for solar, wind and biofuels. I want to see this state be a leader in renewable energies, and not cave in to the fear-mongering and shortsightedness of supporting nuclear power.

Thank you,

Julie Rieman
5400 W. Hill Rd.
Boise, ID 83703

Template = SEC4038

DS03