2

يب س

11/26/2012 77FR 70486

Rodney Knudson PO Box 25 145 Bush Street Hulett, WY 82720 January 10, 2013

Cindy Bladey, Chief, Rules Announcements and Directives Branch Division of Administrative Services Office of Administration, Mailstop TWB-05-801M U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555-0001

Dear Ms Bladey,

I will be at the hearing in to be held at the American Legion in Hot Springs, SD at 7:00 pm today to voice my opposition to insitu-uranium mining, docket NRC-2012-0277, the proposed Dewey-Burdock project as described by the SEIS. The reasons for this opposition are in the following discussion.

I have read the 2007 NRC publication entitled "Consideration of Geochemical Issues in Groundwater Restoration at Uranium in-Situ Leach Mining Facilities" to gain further information about this mining process. From this perusal it is apparent that uranium, thorium, radium, radon and all their daughter nuclides as well as arsenic, selenium, vanadium et al are also mobilized when the lixiviant containing NaHCO3 or an acid like sulfuric acid (depending on the geologic circumstances) is used in combination with an oxidant to place these chemicals in solution. Uranium and these other elements once in solution are able to move with the flow of water in the aquifer, since without the iron pyrite roll front isolating these elements, these elements are free to migrate thereafter unless retrieved by the uptake pipe or experience a reducing environment. The roll front could have taken thousands of years to form in the first place.

Following the cessation of mining a prolonged period of sweeping with multiple pore volumes of water to wash out the lixiviant and the contaminating elements typically can last five or even ten years before the levels of these contaminants are brought down to concentrations close to previous levels. Unfortunately, not all of the lixiviant chemicals can be removed and coupled with recurring oxidations, uranium and the other radioactive an toxic chemicals are repeatedly put into solution long after the attempts at recovery and the millions of gallons of water are used to sweep the aquifer have been used. The example of the Highland (near Douglas) well field cited in the NRC publication mention above left arsenic levels at 30X, selenium at 70X and uranium at 70X baseline levels eight years after the cessation of mining operations.

If this were to happen in the mining area proposed by Powertech many more people would be affected than in the Highland area as the population density is far greater. And, because of the numerous bore holes from previous explorations, abundant possibilities exist for excursions from the mined aquifer into other aquifers both horizontally and vertically located. The results of this migration might not be known for months or even years. Since water tests are quite expensive many would be drinking this water possibly years before the long term repercussions would manifest themselves as cancer clusters and even possibly birth abnormalities. Without potable water land values would also plummet.

In summation, I see this mining operation being fraught with too many risks for the people living in this area and unless the bond is a significant amount of money in comparison to the value of the product mined, the corporation does not sufficiently share in the risk (as if the only risk was monetary).

SUNSI Review Complete Template = ADM - 013E-RIDS= ADM-03 Add= H. YiLMa (hxy2)