

# PUBLIC SUBMISSION

<b>As of:</b> January 07, 2013
<b>Received:</b> January 04, 2013
<b>Status:</b> Pending_Post
<b>Tracking No.</b> 1jx-82xb-zxy5
<b>Comments Due:</b> January 10, 2013
<b>Submission Type:</b> Web

**Docket:** NRC-2012-0277

Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for Proposed Dewey-Burdock In-Situ Uranium Recovery Project

**Comment On:** NRC-2012-0277-0001

Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for Proposed Dewey-Burdock In-Situ Uranium Recovery Project in Custer and Fall River Counties, SD

**Document:** NRC-2012-0277-DRAFT-0016

Comment on FR Doc # 2012-28425

(31)

11/26/2012

77 FR 70486

## Submitter Information

**Name:** Edward Harvey

**Address:**

1545 Albany ave  
Hot Springs, SD, 57747

**Submitter's Representative:** none

**Organization:** none

**Government Agency:** none

RECEIVED

2013 JAN -7 AM 9:35

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

## General Comment

The NRC , EPA, DOE and most state regulatory agencies have failed to protect existing water resources. No in situ uranium mine site has succeeded in returning an aquifer to baseline water quality values. Between Fall River and Custer counties you will be putting 2800 known wells at risk. Congress has just requested an accounting of the cost of remediation for existing uranium sites, why would you consider adding to this problem? As the authorizing agency what liability will you assume for problems created by your decision? Why has the NRC not demanded proven safe techniques specifically delineated in the SEIS? Why are materials not affected by the leaching chemicals not required? Similar SEIS statements have been disallowed by the courts for the same company in the state of Colorado, judged as being inadequate.

SUNSI REVIEW COMPLETE  
TEMPLATE = ADM-013  
E-RIDS = 03  
ADD = H. Yitna (hxy?)

ADM03