

# URGENT FAX

To: Cindy Bladey - U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

From: Angelia Baldwin V.P. Nemsi Books & Winnetou Productions

Fax: 605-325-3393

Pages: 3 - Including cover page

Contact Phone: 605-325-3392

Date: January 8, 2013.

Re: Docket NRC-2012-0277, Proposed Dewey-Burdock Project

*11/26/2012*  
*77 FR 70486*

*62*

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

2013 JAN -9 AM 9:17

RECEIVED

SUNSI Review Complete  
Template = ADM - 013  
E-RIDS= ADM-03  
Add= *H. Yilmaz (hxx)*

Cindy Bladey, Chief, Rules, Announcements and Directives Branch  
Division of Administrative Services  
Office of Administration, Mailstop TWB-05-B01M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001

Phone Number: 1 800 368-5642

Re: Docket NRC-2012-0277, Proposed Dewey-Burdock Project

January 6, 2013

Dear Cindy Bladey;

I am writing you today with opposition to the proposed Dewey-Burdock uranium mining project and the recent submission of the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS). Since I just purchased a large ranch to relocate my family and my businesses to the area of this proposed project, I have a great deal of concerns, which are as follows.

1. The SEIS was submitted before all relevant information was available and for the public to consider all the impacts of this project. The Atomic Safety and Licensing Board (ASLB), a three judge panel established by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to hear a legal challenge to the licensing action for Dewey-Burdock, issued an order granting a 25-day extension to the intervening parties of the Oglala Sioux Tribe and the "Consolidated Intervenors". The order extends the filing date for any contentions based on the DSEIS from December 31, 2012 to January 25, 2013.
2. Cultural and historical impacts are not considered properly because the relevant information is still not available. The SEIS should not have been issued until a thorough study of the cultural and historical sites on the proposed project area was completed and considered by the American Indian communities. I am an American Indian that holds a bachelors degree in science and know the risks of such project to our scared Black Hills. Since there is still a legal dispute over the Black Hills between the Sioux Indians and the US government due to violations of the Fort Laramie Treaty (1861) this is an attempt to circumvent the law. Legally this land should not be allocated to any corporation, company or individual for such purpose by the state of South Dakota or any US governing body. This land is relevant to our people since it has significant historical relics and the remains of our ancestors are buried in this area, which are not being considered. Allowing this project to move forward is a clear violation of United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.
3. The environmental impacts of wildfires, which are common in the immediate area of the proposed project, should be considered, including potential impacts if a fire strikes mining, pipelines, overhead powerlines, and processing buildings.
4. The SEIS does not consider the impact on bald eagles, sage-grouse, whooping cranes, and black-footed ferrets that are all threatened or endangered wildlife species which will

be negatively impacted by the proposed project. Wildlife is simply expected to disperse and go elsewhere which is totally unrealistic. Every year, hundreds of thousands of tourist come to the Black Hills to get a glimpse of this pristine area and a chance to see the rare species of wildlife that inhabit this wilderness, however if this project is allowed to go through, it will not only impact the wildlife but the tourist business which this whole area and the state relies on.

5. Last but certainly not least, the SEIS does not address the contamination of the acquirers by the In-Situ leaching process and contamination of airborne yellowcake dust. The SEIS attempts to minimize the risks to the public, however considering that the EPA states several risk factors to this type of operation, this cannot be dismissed as the SEIS attempts to do. The EPA in its report titled "Occupational and Public Risks Associated with In-Situ Leaching, Appendix III" states, "In Situ leaching for uranium poses several possible environmental and health related concerns. The leaching process poses the risk of contaminating neighboring aquifers which, in turn, might affect significant water supply sources. In Situ leaching poses a problem from a restoration standpoint. Although there are multiple techniques to restore the mined aquifer to its preoperational state, in many cases the lixiviant can never be completely purged from the site."

One of the reasons I purchased the property in Hot Springs was because of the clean drinking water, its pristine wilderness and the abundance of wildlife. This project would put all of this in jeopardy for my family and my businesses. I am what the doctors call chemically sensitive and have a weakened immune system, which this project would not only put my own health at risk, but risk the health of my children, grandchildren, my workers and the community, which I am not willing to gamble with. Regardless of all the precautions that are put into place there is no absolute guarantee that contamination will not occur. The SEIE is not addressing any of these concerns for the population of the proposed project area.

These are just a few reasons why your office should reject the SEIE and not approve the applicant to move forward with this project. No government body has the right to put its people's lives at risk! I as a mother, grandmother, business owner and respected member of my community, I cannot or will not, put a price on the health of my family and community.

Respectfully,



Angelia D Baldwin

V.P. of Nemsi Books and Winnetou Productions

PO Box 191

Pierpont, SD 57468

Email: [winnetouproductions@yahoo.com](mailto:winnetouproductions@yahoo.com)

Phone: 605-325-3392