

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Lynn Houston <lehouston@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:54 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP -5 PM 4: 54

(175)

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Lynn Houston  
211 PRINCE WILLIAM CT  
SATELLITE BCH, FL 32937

E-R105 = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (TRP)

B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5F90E.67C : 8 : 38524)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:53 PM  
**From:** Lynn Houston <lehouston@yahoo.com>

**Created By:** lehouston@yahoo.com

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3048	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 6:53 PM
Mime.822	4231	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07  
72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Marguerite Winkel <pegartista@earthlink.net>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:55 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(176)

2007 SEP -5 PM 4: 54

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in-situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Marguerite Winkel  
2012 W 3rd  
SPOKANE, WA 99201

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VonTill (RWV)

SUNS1 Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5F94D.68A : 22 : 38538)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:54 PM  
**From:** Marguerite Winkel <[pegartista@earthlink.net](mailto:pegartista@earthlink.net)>

**Created By:** [pegartista@earthlink.net](mailto:pegartista@earthlink.net)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3035	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 6:54 PM
Mime.822	4244	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled



7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USMPC

**From:** Terry Pitt <t.pitt@sbcglobal.net>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:55 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP -5 PM 4: 54

(177)

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Terry Pitt  
5726 N.E. Detroit  
Kansas City, MO 64119

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-03

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5F96C.68D : 0 : 38541)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:55 PM  
**From:** Terry Pitt <[t.pitt@sbcglobal.net](mailto:t.pitt@sbcglobal.net)>

**Created By:** [t.pitt@sbcglobal.net](mailto:t.pitt@sbcglobal.net)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3039	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 6:55 PM
Mime.822	4220	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Dona van Bloemen <agataterra@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:56 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(178)

2007 SEP -5 PM 4: 54

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Dona van Bloemen  
 1117 3rd. Street Apt. 5  
 Apt. 5

E-RIDJ = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (GRP)

B. VanTill (RWU)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

Santa Monica, CA 90403

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5F98B.693 : 6 : 38547)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:56 PM  
**From:** Dona van Bloemen <agataterra@yahoo.com>

**Created By:** [agataterra@yahoo.com](mailto:agataterra@yahoo.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3059	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 6:56 PM
Mime.822	4276	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Connie McCue <virago317@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:56 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

179

2007 SEP -5 PM 4: 54

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Connie McCue  
3020 Bentwood Cir. S. Dr., Apt. 2C  
Indianapolis, IN 46268

E-RID5 = ADM-03

Add: J. Pork (JRP)

B. Vo-Till (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5F9AA.699 : 12 : 38553)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:56 PM  
**From:** Connie McCue <[virago317@yahoo.com](mailto:virago317@yahoo.com)>

**Created By:** [virago317@yahoo.com](mailto:virago317@yahoo.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3059	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 6:56 PM
Mime.822	4241	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Carol Soroos <soroos@mindspring.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:57 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP -5 PM 4: 54

180

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Carol Soroos  
2876 Wycliff Road  
Raleigh, NC 27607

E-105 = Adm-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VonTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = Adm-013



**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5F9C9.69B : 14 : 38555)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:56 PM  
**From:** Carol Soroos <[soroos@mindspring.com](mailto:soroos@mindspring.com)>

**Created By:** [soroos@mindspring.com](mailto:soroos@mindspring.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3037	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 6:56 PM
Mime.822	4225	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USMFC

**From:** Andrew Ausman <drewausman@hotmail.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:58 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP -5 PM 4: 54

181

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Andrew Ausman  
3130 N 7th Ave  
#236

E-RIDS: ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VonTill (RDV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-03

Phoenix, AZ 85013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5F9E7.6A2 : 21 : 38562)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:57 PM  
**From:** Andrew Ausman <drewausman@hotmail.com>

**Created By:** drewausman@hotmail.com

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3040	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 6:57 PM
Mime.822	4236	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07  
72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USI/PC

**From:** Andrea Zuckerman <alz@comcast.net>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:58 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

182

2007 SEP -5 PM 4: 54

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to express my opposition to the NRC's proposed GEIS for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining (Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007). The reasons are many.

RECEIVED

First of all, there was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best. It is evident that the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Andrea Zuckerman  
121 Mercer Street  
Jersey City, NJ 07302

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (GRP)

B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5F9E7.6A4 : 23 : 38564)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:57 PM  
**From:** Andrea Zuckerman <[alz@comcast.net](mailto:alz@comcast.net)>

**Created By:** [alz@comcast.net](mailto:alz@comcast.net)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	2964	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 6:57 PM
Mime.822	4153	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** kimberly didia <lnk1725@peoplepc.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:58 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

183

2007 SEP -5 PM 4: 55

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

kimberly didia  
14680 alma drive  
Suite 808

E-RIDS = ADM-013

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. Vortell (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

sterling heights, MI 48313



**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FA09.6B0 : 10 : 38576)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:58 PM  
**From:** kimberly didia <[lnk1725@peoplepc.com](mailto:lnk1725@peoplepc.com)>

**Created By:** [lnk1725@peoplepc.com](mailto:lnk1725@peoplepc.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3056	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 6:58 PM
Mime.822	4243	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07  
72 FR 40344RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Edward Waxman <erwaxman@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:58 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP -5 PM 4:55

184

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Edward R Waxman  
3646 Pleasant Valley Road  
York, PA 17406

E-RIS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VanTill (RWV)

SUN1 Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

717-751-0070

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FA09.6AF : 9 : 38575)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:58 PM  
**From:** Edward Waxman <[erwaxman@yahoo.com](mailto:erwaxman@yahoo.com)>

**Created By:** [erwaxman@yahoo.com](mailto:erwaxman@yahoo.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3059	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 6:58 PM
Mime.822	4265	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USFRC

**From:** Kristin Reed <sisterbluebrain@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:59 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

185

2007 SEP --5 PM 4:55

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing this letter in response to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best. Public comment should always be a part of any GEIS.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion. This is a terrible precedent.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Kristin Reed  
684 48th Ave, Apt 301

E-1103 = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VonTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

San Francisco, CA 94121

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FA47.6BA : 20 : 38586)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:59 PM  
**From:** Kristin Reed <[sisterbluebrain@yahoo.com](mailto:sisterbluebrain@yahoo.com)>

**Created By:** [sisterbluebrain@yahoo.com](mailto:sisterbluebrain@yahoo.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3151	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 6:59 PM
Mime.822	4390	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Todd Somodevilla <todd@tas-dp.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:59 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(186)

2007 SEP -5 PM 4:55

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in-situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Todd Somodevilla  
568 10th Street  
Brooklyn, NY 11215

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. Vo-Till (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013



**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FA47.6BB : 21 : 38587)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:59 PM  
**From:** Todd Somodevilla <[todd@tas-dp.com](mailto:todd@tas-dp.com)>

**Created By:** [todd@tas-dp.com](mailto:todd@tas-dp.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3040	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 6:59 PM
Mime.822	4203	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Stephanie Eads-Paul <seadspaul@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:59 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

187

2007 SEP -5 PM 4: 55

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Eads-Paul  
PO Box 1428  
McMinnville, OR 97128

E-ADS = ADM-63

Add: J. Park (GRP)

B. VonTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FA48.6BD : 23 : 38589)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:59 PM  
**From:** Stephanie Eads-Paul <[seadspaul@yahoo.com](mailto:seadspaul@yahoo.com)>

**Created By:** [seadspaul@yahoo.com](mailto:seadspaul@yahoo.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWD001  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWD001

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3043	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 6:59 PM
Mime.822	4259	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07  
72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
10/1/00

**From:** Vinita Anand <felizgirl@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:00 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

193

2007 SEP -6 PM 3:41

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Vinita Anand  
2829 Glendower Avenue  
Suite 808

E-RIDJ = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (GRP)  
B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

Los Angeles, CA 90027

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FA6C.6E1 : 9 : 38625)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:59 PM  
**From:** Vinita Anand <[felizgirl@yahoo.com](mailto:felizgirl@yahoo.com)>

**Created By:** [felizgirl@yahoo.com](mailto:felizgirl@yahoo.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3055	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 6:59 PM
Mime.822	4264	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNFC

**From:** Thomas Pacheco <tompacheco@sbcglobal.net>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:00 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(194)

2007 SEP -6 PM 3:41

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Thomas Pacheco  
1425 Priscilla Ave.  
Suite 808

E-R105 = ADMIN-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADMIN-013

Indianapolis, IN 46219



**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FA6A.6D0 : 17 : 38608)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:59 PM  
**From:** Thomas Pacheco <[tompacheco@sbcglobal.net](mailto:tompacheco@sbcglobal.net)>

**Created By:** [tompacheco@sbcglobal.net](mailto:tompacheco@sbcglobal.net)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

**Files**

MESSAGE

Mime.822

**Size**

3056

4263

**Date & Time**

Wednesday, August 29, 2007 6:59 PM

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None

**Priority:** Standard

**ReplyRequested:** No

**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No

**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling

This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User

Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator

Junk List is not enabled

Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled

Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USING

**From:** Mike Loutzenhiser <trilce25@hotmail.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:02 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

195

2007 SEP -6 PM 3:42

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Mike Loutzenhiser  
 Arapahoe Ave.  
 Boulder, CO 80303

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (SRP)

B. VonTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FAEF.712 : 8 : 38674)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:01 PM  
**From:** Mike Loutzenhiser <trilce25@hotmail.com>

**Created By:** trilce25@hotmail.com

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3038	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:01 PM
Mime.822	4227	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USFEC

**From:** Julija Merljak <sky\_space@hotmail.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:02 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP -6 PM 3:42

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Julija Merljak  
110 Leonard Ave.  
Neptune, NJ 07753

E-RDS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VonTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

1-345-927-8220

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FAF0.718 : 14 : 38680)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:02 PM  
**From:** Julija Merljak <[sky\\_space@hotmail.com](mailto:sky_space@hotmail.com)>

**Created By:** [sky\\_space@hotmail.com](mailto:sky_space@hotmail.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3054	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:02 PM
Mime.822	4246	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07  
72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USFEC

**From:** Dave Cavanaugh <drc813@earthlink.net>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:02 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP -6 PM 3:42

197

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in-situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Dave Cavanaugh  
7401 Overbrook Dr  
Tampa, FL 33634

E-RIDS: Adm-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. Von Till (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = Adm-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FAF0.717 : 13 : 38679)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:02 PM  
**From:** Dave Cavanaugh <drc813@earthlink.net>

**Created By:** drc813@earthlink.net

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3037	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:02 PM
Mime.822	4223	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled



7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
12-NEC

**From:** Charley Wittman <nitwitdog@gmail.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:02 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

198

2007 SEP -6 PM 3:42

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Charley Wittman  
276 Briarwood Ct.  
Allentown, PA 18104

E-R103 = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VonTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FB0F.71B : 17 : 38683)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:02 PM  
**From:** Charley Wittman <[nitwitdog@gmail.com](mailto:nitwitdog@gmail.com)>

**Created By:** [nitwitdog@gmail.com](mailto:nitwitdog@gmail.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3042	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:02 PM
Mime.822	4224	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07  
72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USRC

**From:** Jeffry Steele <music@jeffrysteele.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:02 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP --6 PM 3:42

199

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Jeffry Steele  
1111 Washington #R  
Gloucester, MA 01930

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VonTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FB10.71F : 21 : 38687)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:02 PM  
**From:** Jeffry Steele <music@jeffrysteele.com>

**Created By:** music@jeffrysteele.com

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3042	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:02 PM
Mime.822	4236	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Georgann Falotico <georganns@hotmail.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:03 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

200

2007 SEP -6 PM 3:42

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Georgann Falotico  
6598 NE Cedar  
Suquamish, WA 98392

E-RIDS: ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)  
B. DonTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FB50.72F : 12 : 38703)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:03 PM  
**From:** Georgann Falotico <[georganns@hotmail.com](mailto:georganns@hotmail.com)>

**Created By:** [georganns@hotmail.com](mailto:georganns@hotmail.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3040	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:03 PM
Mime.822	4233	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**Reply Requested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
UNFC

**From:** John Lee <gameshowguy2000@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:04 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP -6 PM 3:43

201

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

John Lee  
2102 Rolling Oak Lane  
Suite 808

E-R10J = Adm-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VanTill (RUV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = Adm-03

Garland, TX 75044



**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FB6F.734 : 17 : 38708)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:03 PM  
**From:** John Lee <[gameshowguy2000@yahoo.com](mailto:gameshowguy2000@yahoo.com)>

**Created By:** [gameshowguy2000@yahoo.com](mailto:gameshowguy2000@yahoo.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3047	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:03 PM
Mime.822	4255	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
UERC

**From:** Robert Fuchs <rfuchs@unmc.edu>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:04 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP -6 PM 3:43

202

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Robert Fuchs  
1113 Dillon Dr  
Omaha, NE 68132

E-RIDS = APR-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. Vontill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template: APR-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FB6F.735 : 18 : 38709)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:04 PM  
**From:** Robert Fuchs <[rfuchs@unmc.edu](mailto:rfuchs@unmc.edu)>

**Created By:** [rfuchs@unmc.edu](mailto:rfuchs@unmc.edu)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3033	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:04 PM
Mime.822	4193	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Nayeem Aslam <nayeemaslam@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:04 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(203)

2007 SEP --6 PM 3:43

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in-situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Nayeem Aslam  
135 Elk Trail  
# 334

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VonTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

Carol Stream, IL 60188

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FB8E.73B : 24 : 38715)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:04 PM  
**From:** Nayeem Aslam <nayeemaslam@yahoo.com>

**Created By:** nayeemaslam@yahoo.com

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3044	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:04 PM
Mime.822	4237	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07  
72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Kaylyn Wingo <kbozekw@aol.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:04 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

207 SEP --6 PM 3:43

204

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Kaylyn Wingo  
29938 Meridian Place  
Apt. 19202

E-R105 : ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)  
B. VonTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complet

Template = ADM-013

Farmington Hills, MI 48331



**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FB8E.73D : 1 : 38717)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:04 PM  
**From:** Kaylyn Wingo <kbozekw@aol.com>

**Created By:** kbozekw@aol.com

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

**Files**

MESSAGE

Mime.822

**Size**

3060

4220

**Date & Time**

Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:04 PM

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Mike DellaPenna <mdellapenna@comcast.net>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:06 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

205

2007 SEP -6 PM 3:43

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in-situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Mike DellaPenna  
2 Fairway Drive  
Malvern, PA 19355

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (GRP)

B. VonTill (RWV)

SUNS1 Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FBCD.746 : 10 : 38726)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:05 PM  
**From:** Mike DellaPenna <mdellapenna@comcast.net>

**Created By:** mdellapenna@comcast.net

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3038	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:05 PM
Mime.822	4267	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Linda Mazer <lbmazer@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:07 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(206)

2007 SEP -6 PM 3:43

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Linda Mazer  
2022 Columbia Rd., N.W.  
Suite 808

E-R105: ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. Von Till (RUV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

Washington, DC 20009

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FC2C.75D : 8 : 38749)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:07 PM  
**From:** Linda Mazer <[lbmazer@yahoo.com](mailto:lbmazer@yahoo.com)>

**Created By:** [lbmazer@yahoo.com](mailto:lbmazer@yahoo.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3055	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:07 PM
Mime.822	4253	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
US:PC

**From:** Maria Snell <davidcoty@tx.rr.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:08 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

207

2007 SEP --6 PM 3:43

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Maria Snell  
5753 Arminta Ave  
Frisco, TX 75034

E-RID: ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. Von Till (RVO)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FC4C.764 : 15 : 38756)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:07 PM  
**From:** Maria Snell <davidcoty@tx.rr.com>

**Created By:** davidcoty@tx.rr.com

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3034	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:07 PM
Mime.822	4240	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled



7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Leslee Doner <leslee\_doner@hp.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:08 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP -6 PM 3:44

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Leslee Doner  
2500 Millway Dr.  
Boise, ID 83709

E-R10J = Apr-03

Add: J. Park (GRP)

B. VonTill (RWV)

Sunni Review Complete

Template = Apr-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FC4F.773 : 5 : 38771)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:07 PM  
**From:** Leslee Doner <[leslee\\_doner@hp.com](mailto:leslee_doner@hp.com)>

**Created By:** [leslee\\_doner@hp.com](mailto:leslee_doner@hp.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3034	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:07 PM
Mime.822	4212	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Anne Hedberg <annie.hedberg@comcast.net>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:08 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP --6 PM 3:44

209

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in-situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Anne Hedberg  
7 Heather Way  
Golden, CO 80401

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (GRP)

B. VonTill (RDV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FC70.792 : 11 : 38802)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:08 PM  
**From:** Anne Hedberg <[annie.hedberg@comcast.net](mailto:annie.hedberg@comcast.net)>

**Created By:** [annie.hedberg@comcast.net](mailto:annie.hedberg@comcast.net)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWD001  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWD001

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3032	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:08 PM
Mime.822	4241	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07  
72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
C-97C

**From:** Thomas Barrett <tbar1a@comcast.net>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:08 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

210

2007 SEP -6 PM 3:44

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Thomas Barrett  
1190 W Northern Pkwy  
Baltimore, MD 21210

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. Von Till (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-03

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FC70.790 : 9 : 38800)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:08 PM  
**From:** Thomas Barrett <[tbarla@comcast.net](mailto:tbarla@comcast.net)>

**Created By:** [tbarla@comcast.net](mailto:tbarla@comcast.net)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3044	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:08 PM
Mime.822	4219	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
UNRDC

**From:** Leslie Minot <whozzit@earthlink.net>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:09 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP -6 PM 3:44

(211)

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face, particularly to those of us who live in the desert Southwest and know that water is a quirky, geographically-specific resource vital to the very survival of our communities. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Leslie Minot

E-RID = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VonTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

9724 Peacock Hill Circle  
Las Vegas, NV 89117



**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FC90.79E : 23 : 38814)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:08 PM  
**From:** Leslie Minot <[whozzit@earthlink.net](mailto:whozzit@earthlink.net)>

**Created By:** [whozzit@earthlink.net](mailto:whozzit@earthlink.net)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3219	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:08 PM
Mime.822	4436	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USMPC

**From:** Elizabeth Nollner <enollner@gmail.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:09 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(212)

2007 SEP -6 PM 3:44

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Nollner  
15 Elis Lane  
Suite 808

E-RIDJ = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. V. Till (RWV)

SLANSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

Duxbury, MA 02332

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FC90.79D : 22 : 38813)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:08 PM  
**From:** Elizabeth Nollner <enollner@gmail.com>

**Created By:** enollner@gmail.com

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3047	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:08 PM
Mime.822	4255	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Pat cuviello <pcuvie@gmail.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:09 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(213)

2007 SEP -6 PM 3:44

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Pat cuviello  
box 2834  
box 2834

E-RIDS = Adm-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VonTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = Adm-013

RWC, CA 94064

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FC91.79F : 24 : 38815)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:08 PM  
**From:** Pat cuviello <pcuvie@gmail.com>

**Created By:** pcuvie@gmail.com

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3033	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:08 PM
Mime.822	4198	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
LIBRARY

**From:** darynne jessler <darynnej@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:10 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP -6 PM 3:44

(214)

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

darynne jessler  
4408 gentry av  
valley village, CA 91607

E-RIDJ = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013



**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FCEE.7AC : 12 : 38828)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:10 PM  
**From:** darynne jessler <darynnej@yahoo.com>

**Created By:** darynnej@yahoo.com

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWD001  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWD001

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3044	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:10 PM
Mime.822	4250	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
UNRBO

**From:** Mare Stanton <marekstanton@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:10 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(215)

2007 SEP -6 PM 3:45

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Mare Stanton  
POB 2325  
Suite 808

E-R105 = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

Red Oak, TX 75154

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FCEF.7AD : 13 : 38829)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:10 PM  
**From:** Mare Stanton <[marekstanton@yahoo.com](mailto:marekstanton@yahoo.com)>

**Created By:** [marekstanton@yahoo.com](mailto:marekstanton@yahoo.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3038	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:10 PM
Mime.822	4262	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40322

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
UNRC

**From:** Kerry Rebitski <rebitski3@centurytel.net>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:11 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(216)

2007 SEP --6 PM 3:45

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Kerry Rebitski  
211 N. Main St.  
Suite 808

E-RIDS: ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VonTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

Oconto Falls, WI 54154

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FD0D.7B0 : 16 : 38832)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:10 PM  
**From:** Kerry Rebitski <[rebitski3@centurytel.net](mailto:rebitski3@centurytel.net)>

**Created By:** [rebitski3@centurytel.net](mailto:rebitski3@centurytel.net)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3052	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:10 PM
Mime.822	4257	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
UNITED

**From:** Michael Moore <michael@michaelworks.info>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:11 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(217)

2007 SEP -6 PM 3:45

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Michael Moore  
19069 Glen Haven Place NE  
Poulsbo, WA 98370

E-RIOS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VonTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-03



**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FD0D.7B3 : 19 : 38835)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:10 PM  
**From:** Michael Moore <[michael@michaelworks.info](mailto:michael@michaelworks.info)>

**Created By:** [michael@michaelworks.info](mailto:michael@michaelworks.info)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3045	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:10 PM
Mime.822	4255	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
1980

**From:** James Zaino <froghair342@aol.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:11 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(218)

2007 SEP -6 PM 3:45

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

James Zaino  
6850 Willow Springs Rd  
Suite 808

E-RIS = Adm-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template: Adm-013

Countryside, IL 60525

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FD2C.7B9 : 0 : 38841)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:11 PM  
**From:** James Zaino <[froghair342@aol.com](mailto:froghair342@aol.com)>

**Created By:** [froghair342@aol.com](mailto:froghair342@aol.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3055	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:11 PM
Mime.822	4234	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
ISUFC

**From:** chris Le Blond <cleblon@hotmail.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:11 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(219)

2007 SEP -6 PM 3:45

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

chris Le Blond  
15500 Bubling wells  
Suite 808

E-R10S = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (GRP)

B. V. Till (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

Desert Hot Springs, CA 92240

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FD2C.7BA : 1 : 38842)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:11 PM  
**From:** chris Le Blond <[cleblon@hotmail.com](mailto:cleblon@hotmail.com)>

**Created By:** [cleblon@hotmail.com](mailto:cleblon@hotmail.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3062	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:11 PM
Mime.822	4244	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40322

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
LBNRC

**From:** Michael Letendre <maletendre@comcast.net>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:12 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(220)

2007 SEP -6 PM 3:45

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Michael Letendre  
92 Cass St. #1  
Portsmouth, NH 03801

E-RIDJ: ADM-43

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013



**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FD4B.7C1 : 8 : 38849)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:11 PM  
**From:** Michael Letendre <maletendre@comcast.net>

**Created By:** maletendre@comcast.net

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3041	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:11 PM
Mime.822	4239	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40322

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Alicia Sanguinetti <asanginetti@yahoo.com.ar>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:12 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(221)

2007 SEP -6 PM 3:45

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in-situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Alicia Sanguinetti  
Lorenzini 574  
Suite 808

E-RID = Adm-03

Attn: J. Park (GRP)

B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = Adm-013

Alejandro Korn, Buenos Aires, ot 1864

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FD4B.7C2 : 9 : 38850)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:11 PM  
**From:** Alicia Sanguinetti <[asanginetti@yahoo.com.ar](mailto:asanginetti@yahoo.com.ar)>

**Created By:** [asanginetti@yahoo.com.ar](mailto:asanginetti@yahoo.com.ar)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3069	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:11 PM
Mime.822	4275	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40322

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USMPC

**From:** Peggy Binns <rosiladie@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:12 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(222)

2007 SEP -6 PM 3:46

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in-situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

It's essential that our key decision-makers demonstrate social responsibility and ethical accountability. Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this important matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,  
Peggy Anwar Binns

E-RID = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

Peggy Binns  
15642 Bernardo Center Drive  
Apt 503  
San Diego, CA 92127

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FD4B.7C3 : 10 : 38851)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:11 PM  
**From:** Peggy Binns <rosiladie@yahoo.com>

**Created By:** rosiladie@yahoo.com

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3193	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:11 PM
Mime.822	4377	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNFC

**From:** ami bhavsar <amibhavsar28@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:13 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP -6 PM 3:46

223

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

ami bhavsar  
13005 heinemann drive  
austin, TX 78727

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. Vantill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013



**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FDA8.7D0 : 23 : 38864)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:13 PM  
**From:** ami bhavsar <amibhavsar28@yahoo.com>

**Created By:** amibhavsar28@yahoo.com

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3039	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:13 PM
Mime.822	4261	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
NRC

**From:** Jeff Pritchard <lonewolfjp@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:14 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(224)

2007 SEP -7 AM 11: 48

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in-situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Jeff Pritchard  
912 pearl str apt 313  
Apt 313

E-105 = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. DonTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

Chippewa Falls, WI 54729

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FDC9.7D6 : 4 : 38870)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:13 PM  
**From:** Jeff Pritchard <[lonewolfjp@yahoo.com](mailto:lonewolfjp@yahoo.com)>

**Created By:** [lonewolfjp@yahoo.com](mailto:lonewolfjp@yahoo.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3058	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:13 PM
Mime.822	4246	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
UNSC

**From:** "David S. Nichols" <Davemult@aol.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:14 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

225

2007 SEP -7 AM 11:48

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

David S. Nichols  
5107 NE Couch Street  
Portland, OR 97213

E-RIPS = Adm-03

Add: J. Park (GRP)

B. VonTill (RWU)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = Adm-013

503-234-9764

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FDC9.7D7 : 5 : 38871)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:13 PM  
**From:** "David S. Nichols" <[Davemult@aol.com](mailto:Davemult@aol.com)>

**Created By:** [Davemult@aol.com](mailto:Davemult@aol.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3059	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:13 PM
Mime.822	4231	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
UNFEC

**From:** harriet miller <harriem247@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:14 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP -7 AM 11:48

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

harriet miller  
pob 493953  
redding, CA 96049

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-R105 = ADM-a3  
Add: J. Park (JRP)  
B. VonTill (RWV)



**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FDC9.7D9 : 7 : 38873)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:14 PM  
**From:** harriet miller <[harrietm247@yahoo.com](mailto:harrietm247@yahoo.com)>

**Created By:** [harrietm247@yahoo.com](mailto:harrietm247@yahoo.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWD001  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWD001

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3032	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:14 PM
Mime.822	4252	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** marcelo nasif <marcelo@theriver.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:15 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP -7 AM 11:48

227

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

marcelo nasif  
6601 n. Longfellow Drive  
tucson, AZ 85718

E-R105 = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (GRP)

B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FDEA.7E1 : 15 : 38881)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:14 PM  
**From:** marcelo nasif <[marcelo@theriver.com](mailto:marcelo@theriver.com)>

**Created By:** [marcelo@theriver.com](mailto:marcelo@theriver.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3044	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:14 PM
Mime.822	4257	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNPO

**From:** Mary Markus <mmmarkus@earthlink.net>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:15 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(228)

2007 SEP -7 AM 11:48

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

THERE ARE ALREADY ENOUGH PEOPLE DYING OF CANCER AS A RESULT OF URANIUM MINING

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Mary Markus

E-RIDS = Adm-03

Add: J. Pork (JRP)

B. VonTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = Adm-013

10462 Ramona Way  
Garden Grove, CA 92840

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FDEC.7E3 : 17 : 38883)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:14 PM  
**From:** Mary Markus <[mmmarkus@earthlink.net](mailto:mmmarkus@earthlink.net)>

**Created By:** [mmmarkus@earthlink.net](mailto:mmmarkus@earthlink.net)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3119	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:14 PM
Mime.822	4342	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** denise d'Anne <ddanne1@sbcglobal.net>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:15 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

229

2007 SEP -7 AM 11: 49

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

denise d'Anne  
SEIU-Local 790  
351 Guerrero St

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VonTill (Rov)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

Suite 808  
san Francisco, CA 94103



**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FE0C.7E5 : 19 : 38885)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:15 PM  
**From:** denise d'Anne <[ddanne1@sbcglobal.net](mailto:ddanne1@sbcglobal.net)>

**Created By:** [ddanne1@sbcglobal.net](mailto:ddanne1@sbcglobal.net)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3067	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:15 PM
Mime.822	4259	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USMFC

**From:** Mary Sari <mesari@optonline.net>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:15 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(230)

2007 SEP -7 AM 11: 49

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Mary Sari  
PO Box 109  
Suite 808

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (GRP)

B. VonTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

Sterling Forest, NY 109

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FE0C.7E4 : 18 : 38884)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:15 PM  
**From:** Mary Sari <[mesari@optonline.net](mailto:mesari@optonline.net)>

**Created By:** [mesari@optonline.net](mailto:mesari@optonline.net)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3043	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:15 PM
Mime.822	4253	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USMPC

**From:** Sarah Hafer <charityh@comcast.net>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:16 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP -7 AM 11:49

231

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Sarah Hafer  
4913 Cowell Blvd #A  
Davis, CA 95618

E-RID = ADM-03

ADD: J. Park (GRP)

B. Votilli (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FE4A.7ED : 2 : 38893)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:16 PM  
**From:** Sarah Hafer <[charityh@comcast.net](mailto:charityh@comcast.net)>

**Created By:** [charityh@comcast.net](mailto:charityh@comcast.net)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3036	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:16 PM
Mime.822	4218	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**Reply Requested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Stacey Baker <staceybaker1173@care2.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:16 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP -7 AM 11: 49

(232)

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Stacey Baker  
178 Garrison Crossing  
Dallas, GA 30157

E-RIDW = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FE4A.7EE : 3 : 38894)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:16 PM  
**From:** Stacey Baker <staceybaker1173@care2.com>

**Created By:** staceybaker1173@care2.com

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3041	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:16 PM
Mime.822	4250	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled



7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USMRC

**From:** Verlin Cross <vkcross@Yahoo.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:17 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

233

2007 SEP -7 AM 11:49

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Verlin Cross  
1280 North Mountain  
Ashland, OR 97520

E-RIDJ = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)  
B. VonTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

5414825145

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FE69.7F7 : 12 : 38903)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:16 PM  
**From:** Verlin Cross <[vkcross@Yahoo.com](mailto:vkcross@Yahoo.com)>

**Created By:** [vkcross@Yahoo.com](mailto:vkcross@Yahoo.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3052	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:16 PM
Mime.822	4252	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07  
72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Katherine Connor-McKee <shamrocksassy2u@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:17 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP -7 AM 11:49

234

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Katherine Connor-McKee  
1103 Fallston Road  
Suite 808

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VonTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

Shelby, NC 28150

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FE88.7FD : 18 : 38909)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:17 PM  
**From:** Katherine Connor-McKee <[shamrocksassy2u@yahoo.com](mailto:shamrocksassy2u@yahoo.com)>

**Created By:** [shamrocksassy2u@yahoo.com](mailto:shamrocksassy2u@yahoo.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3058	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:17 PM
Mime.822	4307	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07  
72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Kim Tostenson <terabyte@gctel.net>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:17 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

235

2007 SEP -7 AM 11:49

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Kim Tostenson  
P.O. Box 412  
Evansville, MN 56326

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)  
B. VonTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FE88.7FE : 19 : 38910)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:17 PM  
**From:** Kim Tostenson <terabyte@gctel.net>

**Created By:** terabyte@gctel.net

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3036	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:17 PM
Mime.822	4239	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled



7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Mercy Drake <drakemee@wellsfargo.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:18 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(236)

2007 SEP --7 AM 11: 49

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Mercy Elaine Drake  
320 E. McKellips Rd. #165  
Mesa, AZ 85201

E-RIDS = ADM-03  
Add: J. Park (JRP)  
B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

480-733-5329

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FEA8.802 : 23 : 38914)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:17 PM  
**From:** Mercy Drake <[drakemee@wellsfargo.com](mailto:drakemee@wellsfargo.com)>

**Created By:** [drakemee@wellsfargo.com](mailto:drakemee@wellsfargo.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3062	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:17 PM
Mime.822	4261	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
10000

**From:** Thomas Lynn <TJL7@PSU.EDU>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:18 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP -7 AM 11:49

(237)

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Thomas Lynn  
47 Decatur Rd.  
Havertown

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

PA, PA 19083

610-853-6647

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FEA9.804 : 0 : 38916)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:17 PM  
**From:** Thomas Lynn <[TJL7@PSU.EDU](mailto:TJL7@PSU.EDU)>

**Created By:** [TJL7@PSU.EDU](mailto:TJL7@PSU.EDU)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3052	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:17 PM
Mime.822	4200	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**Reply Requested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USMPC

**From:** Gail Bates <gbatesphd@comcast.net>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:18 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(238)

2007 SEP -7 AM 11: 50

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Gail Bates  
22268 Bellevue Avenue  
Cupertino, CA 95014

E-PLDS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VonTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template - ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FEC7.808 : 4 : 38920)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:18 PM  
**From:** Gail Bates <[gbatesphd@comcast.net](mailto:gbatesphd@comcast.net)>

**Created By:** [gbatesphd@comcast.net](mailto:gbatesphd@comcast.net)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3041	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:18 PM
Mime.822	4227	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled



7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
UFRD

**From:** Michele Sohn <instagold@aol.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:19 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(239)

2007 SEP -7 AM 11: 50

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Michele Sohn  
1741 SW Fortune Road  
Port Saint Lucie, FL 34953

E-RID = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)  
B. Vontill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-03

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FEE7.80F : 11 : 38927)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:18 PM  
**From:** Michele Sohn <[instagold@aol.com](mailto:instagold@aol.com)>

**Created By:** [instagold@aol.com](mailto:instagold@aol.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3049	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:18 PM
Mime.822	4217	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Patricia Larch <yona\_@hotmail.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:19 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP -7 AM 11: 50

240

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Patricia Larch  
999 Park View Dr.  
Suite 808

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (GRP)  
B. VonTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template - ADM-03

South Hill, VA 23970

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FEE7.812 : 14 : 38930)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:18 PM  
**From:** Patricia Larch <[yona\\_@hotmail.com](mailto:yona_@hotmail.com)>

**Created By:** [yona\\_@hotmail.com](mailto:yona_@hotmail.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3052	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:18 PM
Mime.822	4224	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Ximena Ortiz <xortiz@att.net.mx>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:20 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(241)

2007 SEP -7 AM 11: 50

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Ximena Ortiz  
Luis Kuhne 11  
Mexico City, ot 01710

E-RIDJ = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)  
B. von Till (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-03

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FF26.81E : 1 : 38942)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:19 PM  
**From:** Ximena Ortiz <[xortiz@att.net.mx](mailto:xortiz@att.net.mx)>

**Created By:** [xortiz@att.net.mx](mailto:xortiz@att.net.mx)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3037	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:19 PM
Mime.822	4206	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
LEAD

**From:** scott nicol <annikadel@hotmail.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:20 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(242)

2007 SEP -7 AM 11: 50

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

scott nicol  
1604 s orange  
weslaco, TX 78596

E-RIDJ = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VonTill (RWV)

SUND Review Complete

Template = ADM-03



**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FF26.81C : 24 : 38940)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:19 PM  
**From:** scott nicol <[annikadel@hotmail.com](mailto:annikadel@hotmail.com)>

**Created By:** [annikadel@hotmail.com](mailto:annikadel@hotmail.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3032	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:19 PM
Mime.822	4220	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Lynette Holtz <MHoltz@Austin.rr.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:20 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

243

2007 SEP -7 AM 11: 50

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Lynette Holtz  
2803 Lawrence Dr  
Suite 808

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03

ADM = J. Park (GRP)

B. VanTill (RWV)

Austin, TX 78734

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FF27.827 : 10 : 38951)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:20 PM  
**From:** Lynette Holtz <MHoltz@Austin.rr.com>

**Created By:** MHoltz@Austin.rr.com

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3046	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:20 PM
Mime.822	4232	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USFRC

**From:** Robert Singler <bsingler@bensonsd.k12.az.us>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:20 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP -7 AM 11: 50

344

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Don't forget ur choldren's children. What kind of legacy are we leaving behind for them??????????  
Sincerely,

Robert Singler  
17650 Copperecut Place  
Suite 808

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03

AM: J. Park (GRP)

B. VonTill (RWV)

Vail, AZ 85641

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FF46.82B : 14 : 38955)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:20 PM  
**From:** Robert Singler <[bsingler@bensonsd.k12.az.us](mailto:bsingler@bensonsd.k12.az.us)>

**Created By:** [bsingler@bensonsd.k12.az.us](mailto:bsingler@bensonsd.k12.az.us)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3152	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:20 PM
Mime.822	4373	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNFO

**From:** Cheryl Vallone <clvallone@aol.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:20 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP -7 AM 11: 50

245

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to vehemently oppose this GEIS. The reasons are many:

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd. These issues can only be evaluated on a site-specific basis with a site-specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site-specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is irresponsible. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site-specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for your consideration and for accepting these comments. I look forward to hearing from you regarding any developments on this GEIS.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Vallone  
10 Ivy Lane  
Ashland, MA 01721

E-RIPS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013



508-881-3515

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FF46.82A : 13 : 38954)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:20 PM  
**From:** Cheryl Vallone <[clvallone@aol.com](mailto:clvallone@aol.com)>

**Created By:** [clvallone@aol.com](mailto:clvallone@aol.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3048	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:20 PM
Mime.822	4248	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
1-NRC

**From:** Carrie Schudda <cschudda@verizon.net>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:20 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP -7 AM 11: 50

(246)

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Carrie Schudda  
510 Ash St.  
Oregon, WI 53575

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03

ASH: J. Park (JRP)

B. VanTill (RWV)

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FF46.829 : 12 : 38953)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:20 PM  
**From:** Carrie Schudda <[cschudda@verizon.net](mailto:cschudda@verizon.net)>

**Created By:** [cschudda@verizon.net](mailto:cschudda@verizon.net)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3032	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:20 PM
Mime.822	4218	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07  
72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Chris Clovis <Christopher.clovis@TCDSB.org>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:21 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

247

2007 SEP -7 AM 11: 50

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Chris Clovis  
24 Fallingbrook Road  
Scarborough, ON M1N2T4

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDJ = ADM-03  
Add: J. Park (GRP)  
B. VonTill (RWV)

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FF85.831 : 20 : 38961)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:21 PM  
**From:** Chris Clovis <Christopher.clovis@TCDSB.org>

**Created By:** Christopher.clovis@TCDSB.org

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3045	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:21 PM
Mime.822	4269	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 46344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** George Stradtman <gstradtman@juno.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:21 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP -7 AM 11: 51

248

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

George Stradtman  
700 Elkins Avenue  
Unit B-3

E-105-ADM-63

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template - ADM-013

Elkins Park, PA 19027



**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FF85.830 : 19 : 38960)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:21 PM  
**From:** George Stradtman <[gstradtman@juno.com](mailto:gstradtman@juno.com)>

**Created By:** [gstradtman@juno.com](mailto:gstradtman@juno.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3054	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:21 PM
Mime.822	4241	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** MICHAEL HERNANDEZ <MHERNA15@SBCGLOBAL.NET>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:22 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(249)

2007 SEP -7 AM 11: 51

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL HERNANDEZ  
2906 REARDON DR  
JOLIET, IL 60435

E-RIDS: Adm-03

Ack: J. Park (GRP)

B. VonTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Templak = Adm-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FFA6.842 : 12 : 38978)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:22 PM  
**From:** MICHAEL HERNANDEZ <[MHERNA15@SBCGLOBAL.NET](mailto:MHERNA15@SBCGLOBAL.NET)>

**Created By:** [MHERNA15@SBCGLOBAL.NET](mailto:MHERNA15@SBCGLOBAL.NET)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3039	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:22 PM
Mime.822	4267	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Kevin Hopper <shdwhawk@email.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:23 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(250)

2007 SEP -7 AM 11: 51

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Kevin Hopper  
1151 Saratoga  
Lincoln, NE 68502

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (GRP)

B. VanTil (RWW)

SUMSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5FFE6.84A : 20 : 38986)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:23 PM  
**From:** Kevin Hopper <[shdwhawk@email.com](mailto:shdwhawk@email.com)>

**Created By:** [shdwhawk@email.com](mailto:shdwhawk@email.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3034	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:23 PM
Mime.822	4236	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
JES:PC

**From:** Julie Van Sant <julievs@hotmail.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:24 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(251)

2007 SEP -7 AM 11: 51

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Julie Van Sant  
20 Mountain View  
Suite 808

E-RIDJ = Adm-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VonTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = Adm-013

Clancy, MT 59634

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D60005.84C : 22 : 38988)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:23 PM  
**From:** Julie Van Sant <[julievs@hotmail.com](mailto:julievs@hotmail.com)>

**Created By:** [julievs@hotmail.com](mailto:julievs@hotmail.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**  
nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3047	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:23 PM
Mime.822	4229	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled



7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USIPC

**From:** sherrill futrell <safutrell@ucdavis.edu>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:25 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP -7 AM 11: 51

252

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

sherrill futrell  
151 inner circle  
davis, CA 95618

E-RIDS = ADN-03

Adm: J. Park (GRP)

B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADN-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D60061.85B : 12 : 39003)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:25 PM  
**From:** sherrill futrell <[safutrelll@ucdavis.edu](mailto:safutrelll@ucdavis.edu)>

**Created By:** [safutrelll@ucdavis.edu](mailto:safutrelll@ucdavis.edu)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3037	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:25 PM
Mime.822	4263	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

72 FR 40344

7/24/07

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Anthony Pfohl <runespeaker@aol.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:25 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(253)

2007 SEP -7 AM 11: 51

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Anthony Pfohl  
4500 Erin Dr  
Haymarket, VA 20169

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (GRP)

B. VonTill (RDV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D60061.85A : 11 : 39002)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:25 PM  
**From:** Anthony Pfohl <runespeaker@aol.com>

**Created By:** runespeaker@aol.com

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3035	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:25 PM
Mime.822	4215	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Mary Perdue <mperdue1@tampabay.rr.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:25 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(254)

2007 SEP -7 AM 11: 51

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in-situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Mary Perdue  
7806 wicklow street  
New Port Richey, FL 34653

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VanTill (RWU)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D60062.85C : 13 : 39004)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:25 PM  
**From:** Mary Perdue <[mperdue1@tampabay.rr.com](mailto:mperdue1@tampabay.rr.com)>

**Created By:** [mperdue1@tampabay.rr.com](mailto:mperdue1@tampabay.rr.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3047	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:25 PM
Mime.822	4250	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USRC

**From:** Eugene Dumas <eugenedumas@email.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:26 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP -7 AM 11: 51

255

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Eugene R Dumas  
244 Ba Wood Lane  
Janesville, WI 53545

E-RIDS = Adm-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VanTill (RBV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template: Adm-013

(608)359-3533



**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D60081.861 : 18 : 39009)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:25 PM  
**From:** Eugene Dumas <[eugenedumas@email.com](mailto:eugenedumas@email.com)>

**Created By:** [eugenedumas@email.com](mailto:eugenedumas@email.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**  
nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3056	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:25 PM
Mime.822	4247	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USMTC

**From:** Eva Barta <info@acceltradeny.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:26 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(256)

2007 SEP -7 AM 11: 52

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Eva Barta  
37-27 32nd Street  
Suite 808

E-R105 - Adm-23

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template - Adm-013

Long Island City, NY 11101

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D60081.860 : 17 : 39008)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:25 PM  
**From:** Eva Barta <[info@acceltradeny.com](mailto:info@acceltradeny.com)>

**Created By:** [info@acceltradeny.com](mailto:info@acceltradeny.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3053	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:25 PM
Mime.822	4268	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USMPC

**From:** Anthony Capobianco <acapobia@comcast.net>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:26 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(257)

2007 SEP -7 AM 11: 52

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Anthony Capobianco  
1400 Knights Drive  
Apt. 311

E-RID = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (GRP)

B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNJ Review Complete

Template = ADM-03

South Park, PA 15129

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D600A0.86A : 2 : 39018)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:26 PM  
**From:** Anthony Capobianco <[acapobia@comcast.net](mailto:acapobia@comcast.net)>

**Created By:** [acapobia@comcast.net](mailto:acapobia@comcast.net)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3056	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:26 PM
Mime.822	4246	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
ISL/FC

**From:** Bridget O'Neill <boneiill6@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:26 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP -7 AM 11: 52

258

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Bridget O'Neill  
609 W. Church #32  
Champaign, IL 61820

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013



**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D600A0.864 : 21 : 39012)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:25 PM  
**From:** Bridget O'Neill <[boneiill6@yahoo.com](mailto:boneiill6@yahoo.com)>

**Created By:** [boneiill6@yahoo.com](mailto:boneiill6@yahoo.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3042	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:25 PM
Mime.822	4226	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Lucy Mojica <sageexplorer@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:26 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(259)

2007 SEP -7 AM 11: 52

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Lucy Mojica  
9236 True Avenue  
Downey, CA 90240

E-R105 = ADM-013  
Add: J. Park (GRP)  
B. VonTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D600A0.869 : 1 : 39017)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:26 PM  
**From:** Lucy Mojica <[sageexplorer@yahoo.com](mailto:sageexplorer@yahoo.com)>

**Created By:** [sageexplorer@yahoo.com](mailto:sageexplorer@yahoo.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3034	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:26 PM
Mime.822	4255	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07  
72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Jeffery McGonagill <igmod@comcast.net>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:27 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP -7 PM 4: 32

262

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Jeffery McGonagill  
280 SW Tunison Ave  
Corvallis, OR 97333

E-R103 = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VonTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D600C0.872 : 10 : 39026)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:26 PM  
**From:** Jeffery McGonagill <[igmod@comcast.net](mailto:igmod@comcast.net)>

**Created By:** [igmod@comcast.net](mailto:igmod@comcast.net)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3046	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:26 PM
Mime.822	4221	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
NRC

**From:** "BK Gardner,LMT" <bkaygardner1@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:27 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP -7 PM 4:33

263

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

BK Gardner,LMT  
4021 SW 124th Ct  
Miami, FL 33175

E-R105 = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VonTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D600C0.871 : 9 : 39025)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:26 PM  
**From:** "BK Gardner,LMT" <[bkaygardner1@yahoo.com](mailto:bkaygardner1@yahoo.com)>

**Created By:** [bkaygardner1@yahoo.com](mailto:bkaygardner1@yahoo.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3036	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:26 PM
Mime.822	4236	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Michael McFarland <mdmcfarland@email.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:28 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP -7 PM 4:33

264

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Michael McFarland  
6377 Vista Drive  
Apt 176

E-RIDS = Apr-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VonTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = Apr-013



West Des Moines, IA 50266

(559) 322-0423

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D6011D.87B : 19 : 39035)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:28 PM  
**From:** Michael McFarland <mdmcfarland@email.com>

**Created By:** mdmcfarland@email.com

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3073	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:28 PM
Mime.822	4270	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Janet Larson <janetl@pacific.net>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:29 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

265

2007 SEP -7 PM 4:33

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Janet Larson  
PO Box 75  
Calpella, CA 95418

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)  
B. VonTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D6013D.881 : 0 : 39041)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:28 PM  
**From:** Janet Larson <[janetl@pacific.net](mailto:janetl@pacific.net)>

**Created By:** [janetl@pacific.net](mailto:janetl@pacific.net)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3030	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:28 PM
Mime.822	4232	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USMPC

**From:** Sarah Borron <sarahborron@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:29 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP -7 PM 4: 33

266

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Sarah Borron  
8250 N. Grand Canyon Dr.  
Unit 2009

E-RIDJ = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (GRP)

B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

Las Vegas, NV 89166

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D6015B.887 : 6 : 39047)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:29 PM  
**From:** Sarah Borron <[sarahborron@yahoo.com](mailto:sarahborron@yahoo.com)>

**Created By:** [sarahborron@yahoo.com](mailto:sarahborron@yahoo.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3056	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:29 PM
Mime.822	4249	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07  
72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Jutta Rosenthal <juttarosenthal@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:29 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP -7 PM 4:33

267

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Jutta Rosenthal  
12 Penn Oak Lane  
Kennett Square, PA 19348

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-03



**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D6015B.886 : 5 : 39046)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:29 PM  
**From:** Jutta Rosenthal <[juttarosenenthal@yahoo.com](mailto:juttarosenenthal@yahoo.com)>

**Created By:** [juttarosenenthal@yahoo.com](mailto:juttarosenenthal@yahoo.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3046	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:29 PM
Mime.822	4256	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USMFC

**From:** mary lewis <yinyam@earthlink.net>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:30 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(268)

2007 SEP -7 PM 4:33

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

mary lewis  
2340 semoran  
pensacola, FL 32503

E-R105 = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VonTill (RDV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D6017B.889 : 8 : 39049)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:29 PM  
**From:** mary lewis <[yinyam@earthlink.net](mailto:yinyam@earthlink.net)>

**Created By:** [yinyam@earthlink.net](mailto:yinyam@earthlink.net)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3032	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:29 PM
Mime.822	4241	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
LSNFC

**From:** Janet Hudgins <jhudgina@sfu.ca>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:30 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

269

2007 SEP -7 PM 4:33

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Janet Hudgins  
Vancouver  
Suite 808

E-RIDJ = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VonTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

Vancouver, BC V6J

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D6019A.892 : 17 : 39058)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:30 PM  
**From:** Janet Hudgins <[jhudgina@sfu.ca](mailto:jhudgina@sfu.ca)>

**Created By:** [jhudgina@sfu.ca](mailto:jhudgina@sfu.ca)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3041	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:30 PM
Mime.822	4230	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USDO

**From:** Emily Macaux <emilyjane1230@msn.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:30 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(270)

2007 SEP -7 PM 4: 33

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Emily Macaux  
169 Spencer Avenue  
Suite 808

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VonTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

East Greenwich, RI 02818



**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D6019B.894 : 19 : 39060)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:30 PM  
**From:** Emily Macaux <[emilyjane1230@msn.com](mailto:emilyjane1230@msn.com)>

**Created By:** [emilyjane1230@msn.com](mailto:emilyjane1230@msn.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3055	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:30 PM
Mime.822	4245	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Deborah Goodsite <picturesleuth@mindspring.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:31 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP -7 PM 4: 34

271

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Deborah Goodsite  
312 County Road 513  
Suite 808

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

Califon, NJ 07830

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D601B9.896 : 21 : 39062)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:30 PM  
**From:** Deborah Goodsite <[picturesleuth@mindspring.com](mailto:picturesleuth@mindspring.com)>

**Created By:** [picturesleuth@mindspring.com](mailto:picturesleuth@mindspring.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3053	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:30 PM
Mime.822	4282	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
DANISH  
USPO

**From:** Lynn Eubank <lynneubank@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:31 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(272)

2007 SEP -7 PM 4:34

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Lynn Eubank  
PO Box 520  
Angel Fire, NM 87710

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VonTill (Rwv)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D601D8.89B : 1 : 39067)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:31 PM  
**From:** Lynn Eubank <[lynneubank@yahoo.com](mailto:lynneubank@yahoo.com)>

**Created By:** [lynneubank@yahoo.com](mailto:lynneubank@yahoo.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3032	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:31 PM
Mime.822	4217	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Joanna Soto-Aviles <JSAviles@prtc.net>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:31 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP -7 PM 4: 34

(273)

To Whom It May Concern:

We are responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

We write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico.

Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored.

Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit our comments on this matter, and please keep us apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Joanna Soto-Aviles

E-RID = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B-VonTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template: ADM-013

HC2 Box 4913  
Coamo, PR 00769



**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D601D9.89E : 4 : 39070)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:31 PM  
**From:** Joanna Soto-Aviles <[JSAviles@prtc.net](mailto:JSAviles@prtc.net)>

**Created By:** [JSAviles@prtc.net](mailto:JSAviles@prtc.net)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3040	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:31 PM
Mime.822	4218	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Willow Coyote <coyotehome@comcast.net>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:32 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(274)

2007 SEP -7 PM 4: 34

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Willow Coyote  
6336 NE Roselawn  
Portland, OR 97218

E-RIPS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)  
B. VonTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D60217.8A5 : 11 : 39077)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:32 PM  
**From:** Willow Coyote <[coyotehome@comcast.net](mailto:coyotehome@comcast.net)>

**Created By:** [coyotehome@comcast.net](mailto:coyotehome@comcast.net)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3038	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:32 PM
Mime.822	4232	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

72 FR 40344

7/24/07

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Becky Tinsley <cavallygirl@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:32 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

275

2007 SEP -7 PM 4:34

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Becky Tinsley  
224 Winchester Dr  
Suite 808

E-R105 = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. Vo-Till (BVT)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

Goleta, CA 93117

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D60217.8A6 : 12 : 39078)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:32 PM  
**From:** Becky Tinsley <cavallygirl@yahoo.com>

**Created By:** [cavallygirl@yahoo.com](mailto:cavallygirl@yahoo.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3047	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:32 PM
Mime.822	4267	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Todd Monson <tcmonson@hotmail.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:34 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

276

2007 SEP -7 PM 4: 34

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Todd Monson  
1127 Narcisco St. NE  
Albuquerque, NM 87112

E-RIDW = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VonTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D60255.8AB : 17 : 39083)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:33 PM  
**From:** Todd Monson <[tcmonson@hotmail.com](mailto:tcmonson@hotmail.com)>

**Created By:** [tcmonson@hotmail.com](mailto:tcmonson@hotmail.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3043	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:33 PM
Mime.822	4226	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**Reply Requested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled



7/24/07  
22 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
LSMRC

**From:** Jason Levy <jsnlvy@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:35 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

277

2007 SEP -7 PM 4: 34

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Jason Levy  
1375 Burns Drive  
Elgin, IL 60120

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. Vontill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D602B1.8B5 : 2 : 39093)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:34 PM  
**From:** Jason Levy <[jsnlvy@yahoo.com](mailto:jsnlvy@yahoo.com)>

**Created By:** [jsnlvy@yahoo.com](mailto:jsnlvy@yahoo.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3032	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:34 PM
Mime.822	4222	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Brian & Rita Cohen <afgetsalocal1@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:35 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(278)

2007 SEP -7 PM 4:34

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Brian & Rita Cohen  
3852 E Alamos Ave Apt 125  
Fresno, CA 93726

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. Von Till (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D602B1.8B6 : 3 : 39094)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:34 PM  
**From:** Brian & Rita Cohen <[afgetsalocal1@yahoo.com](mailto:afgetsalocal1@yahoo.com)>

**Created By:** [afgetsalocal1@yahoo.com](mailto:afgetsalocal1@yahoo.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3050	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:34 PM
Mime.822	4258	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
UNPC

**From:** Tammy Robinson <jnyanydots@hotmail.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:36 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP -7 PM 4: 35

279

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Tammy Robinson  
1588 Lake Country Dr Ext  
Asheboro, NC 27205

E-RIPS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. Vontill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

3365583856

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D602D1.8BC : 9 : 39100)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:35 PM  
**From:** Tammy Robinson <jnyanydots@hotmail.com>

**Created By:** jnyanydots@hotmail.com

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3059	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:35 PM
Mime.822	4256	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNFC

**From:** Athena Coroneos <acoroneos@juno.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:36 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(280)

2007 SEP -7 PM 4:35

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Athena Coroneos  
14 Theodore Lane  
Suite 808

E-R105 = Adm-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. Von Till (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = Adm-013



Norwalk, CT 06851

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D602D1.8BB : 8 : 39099)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:35 PM  
**From:** Athena Coroneos <[acoroneos@juno.com](mailto:acoroneos@juno.com)>

**Created By:** [acoroneos@juno.com](mailto:acoroneos@juno.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3049	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:35 PM
Mime.822	4255	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Bob Stanley <rsnowretired@hotmail.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:36 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP -7 PM 4:35

(281)

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Bob Stanley  
1307 Hickey St.  
Hobart, IN 46342

E-RID = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VanTill (RUV)

SUNS Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D602D1.8C0 : 13 : 39104)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:35 PM  
**From:** Bob Stanley <rsnowretired@hotmail.com>

**Created By:** rsnowretired@hotmail.com

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3033	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:35 PM
Mime.822	4236	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
101 PC

**From:** Phoebe Love <epheppenstall@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:36 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP -7 PM 4:35

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Phoebe Love  
19711 112th Ave NE  
apt c101

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. Vo, Till (RDV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

Bothell, WA 98011

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D602D1.8BF : 12 : 39103)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:35 PM  
**From:** Phoebe Love <epheppenstall@yahoo.com>

**Created By:** epheppenstall@yahoo.com

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3046	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:35 PM
Mime.822	4248	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
03:00

**From:** Lisa Pitkin <lpitkin7@gmail.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:37 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(283)

2007 SEP -7 PM 4:35

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Lisa Pitkin  
6421 Lakeway Drive  
Raleigh, NC 27612

E-FILES - Adm-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VonTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = Adm-013



**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D6032E.8D0 : 4 : 39120)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:37 PM  
**From:** Lisa Pitkin <[lpitkin7@gmail.com](mailto:lpitkin7@gmail.com)>

**Created By:** [lpitkin7@gmail.com](mailto:lpitkin7@gmail.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3037	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:37 PM
Mime.822	4238	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
UNFEC

**From:** Annie Fox <Annie@AnnieFox.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:37 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

284

2007 SEP -7 PM 4: 35

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Annie Fox  
11 Indian Rock Rd.

E-RIDS: ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template: ADM-013

Suite 808  
San Anselmo, CA 94960

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D6032E.8D2 : 6 : 39122)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:37 PM  
**From:** Annie Fox <[Annie@AnnieFox.com](mailto:Annie@AnnieFox.com)>

**Created By:** [Annie@AnnieFox.com](mailto:Annie@AnnieFox.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3050	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:37 PM
Mime.822	4251	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Kathleen View <rushnroll@hotmail.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:38 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(285)

2007 SEP -7 PM 4:35

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Kathleen View  
PO Box 48  
Chemung, NY 14825

E-RIOS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. Von Till (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D6034C.8D4 : 8 : 39124)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:37 PM  
**From:** Kathleen View <[rushnroll@hotmail.com](mailto:rushnroll@hotmail.com)>

**Created By:** [rushnroll@hotmail.com](mailto:rushnroll@hotmail.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3030	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:37 PM
Mime.822	4247	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USMPC

**From:** Suzanne Lipkin <suzanne.lipkin@gmail.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:38 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

286

2007 SEP -7 PM 4:36

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Lipkin  
200 W. 109th St. #A4  
New York, NY 10025

E-RID = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (GRP)

B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D6036B.8D7 : 11 : 39127)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:38 PM  
**From:** Suzanne Lipkin <[suzanne.lipkin@gmail.com](mailto:suzanne.lipkin@gmail.com)>

**Created By:** [suzanne.lipkin@gmail.com](mailto:suzanne.lipkin@gmail.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3043	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:38 PM
Mime.822	4277	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled



7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
UNFEC

**From:** Robert Landry <rmlandry@comcast.net>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:39 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(287)

2007 SEP -7 PM 4:36

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Robert Landry  
41 Tall Trees Court  
Sarasota, FL 34232

E-R103 = Adm-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VonTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = Adm-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D6038A.8E0 : 20 : 39136)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:38 PM  
**From:** Robert Landry <[rmlandry@comcast.net](mailto:rmlandry@comcast.net)>

**Created By:** [rmlandry@comcast.net](mailto:rmlandry@comcast.net)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	3041	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:38 PM
Mime.822	4254	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
US/E/C

**From:** Sara Boissonnault <sara62285@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:40 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(288)

2007 SEP -7 PM 4:36

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Sara Boissonnault  
103 Blueberry Ln. #31  
Suite 808

E-R105 = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VonTill (RWV)

SUN1 Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

Laconia, NH 03246

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D603E6.8EB : 6 : 39147)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:40 PM  
**From:** Sara Boissonnault <sara62285@yahoo.com>

**Created By:** sara62285@yahoo.com

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3056	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:40 PM
Mime.822	4272	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
US-FC

**From:** Michelle Murphy <craftfair@hotmai.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:41 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(289)

2007 SEP -7 PM 4: 36

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Michelle Murphy  
189 Matterhorn Dr.  
Effort, PA 18330

E-RIDJ = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (GRP)

B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D60404.8EE : 9 : 39150)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:40 PM  
**From:** Michelle Murphy <[craftfairy@hotmail.com](mailto:craftfairy@hotmail.com)>

**Created By:** [craftfairy@hotmail.com](mailto:craftfairy@hotmail.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3040	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:40 PM
Mime.822	4264	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Charles Shelton <crsheltn@verizon.net>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:42 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

290

2007 SEP -7 PM 4: 36

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Charles Shelton  
po box 453  
grottoes, VA 24441

E-R105 = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (GRP)

B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013



**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D60444.8FD : 24 : 39165)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:41 PM  
**From:** Charles Shelton <[crsheltn@verizon.net](mailto:crsheltn@verizon.net)>

**Created By:** [crsheltn@verizon.net](mailto:crsheltn@verizon.net)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3034	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:41 PM
Mime.822	4221	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**Reply Requested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** stephen hudson <stephenloyhudson@hotmail.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:42 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(291)

2007 SEP -7 PM 4:36

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

stephen hudson  
6 Kings Ct.  
Suite 808

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. Vontill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

Little Rock, AR 72211

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D60444.8FC : 23 : 39164)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:41 PM  
**From:** stephen hudson <[stephenloyhudson@hotmail.com](mailto:stephenloyhudson@hotmail.com)>

**Created By:** [stephenloyhudson@hotmail.com](mailto:stephenloyhudson@hotmail.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3047	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:41 PM
Mime.822	4274	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
1 SEP

**From:** Margaret Novitski <pegnovitski@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:42 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

292

2007 SEP -7 PM 4:37

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Margaret T Novitski  
1208 E. Preston  
Mt. Pleasant, MI 48858

E-RID: ADM-03

Ack: J. Park (GRP)  
B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-03

989 772-4273

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D60462.902 : 4 : 39170)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:42 PM  
**From:** Margaret Novitski <[pegnovitski@yahoo.com](mailto:pegnovitski@yahoo.com)>

**Created By:** [pegnovitski@yahoo.com](mailto:pegnovitski@yahoo.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3061	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:42 PM
Mime.822	4286	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Erik Schnabel <erikschnabel@hotmail.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:43 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(293)

2007 SEP -7 PM 4:37

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Erik Schnabel  
290 Bowdoin St.  
San Francisco, CA 94134

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (GRP)

B. VanTill (RWV)

SUMSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013



**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D60481.905 : 7 : 39173)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:42 PM  
**From:** Erik Schnabel <erikschnabel@hotmail.com>

**Created By:** erikschnabel@hotmail.com

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3042	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:42 PM
Mime.822	4246	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
LENRC

**From:** LauraMarie Taylor <veralinnysweet@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:43 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP -7 PM 4: 37

(294)

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

LauraMarie Taylor  
1728 Richmond St #9  
9

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VonTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-03

Sacramento, CA 95825

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D60481.906 : 8 : 39174)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:42 PM  
**From:** LauraMarie Taylor <[veralinnyumsweet@yahoo.com](mailto:veralinnyumsweet@yahoo.com)>

**Created By:** [veralinnyumsweet@yahoo.com](mailto:veralinnyumsweet@yahoo.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3049	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:42 PM
Mime.822	4271	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Marcus Walther <marcwalt@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:43 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

295

2007 SEP -7 PM 4:37

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Marcus Walther  
PO Box 10003  
Virginia Beach, VA 23450

E-RIDS = Adm-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = Adm-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D604A1.90B : 13 : 39179)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:43 PM  
**From:** Marcus Walther <[marcwalt@yahoo.com](mailto:marcwalt@yahoo.com)>

**Created By:** [marcwalt@yahoo.com](mailto:marcwalt@yahoo.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3041	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:43 PM
Mime.822	4220	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Cindy Torrey <cindytorrey@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:44 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(296)

2007 SEP -7 PM 4:37

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Cindy Torrey  
12404 Oak Bluff Trail  
Suite 808

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNDI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

Chester, VA 23831



**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D604C0.90F : 17 : 39183)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:43 PM  
**From:** Cindy Torrey <[cindytorrey@yahoo.com](mailto:cindytorrey@yahoo.com)>

**Created By:** [cindytorrey@yahoo.com](mailto:cindytorrey@yahoo.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3051	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:43 PM
Mime.822	4270	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
US/RC

**From:** Scott Batson <oldbear72@verizon.net>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:44 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(297)

2007 SEP -7 PM 4:37

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Scott Batson  
35 Pine Hill Circle  
Wakefield, MA 01880

E-RID = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (GRP)

B. V. Till (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D604C0.910 : 18 : 39184)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:43 PM  
**From:** Scott Batson <[oldbear72@verizon.net](mailto:oldbear72@verizon.net)>

**Created By:** [oldbear72@verizon.net](mailto:oldbear72@verizon.net)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3041	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:43 PM
Mime.822	4258	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
UNREC

**From:** Roy Moss <beromos@charter.net>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:44 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(298)

2007 SEP -7 PM 4: 37

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Roy Moss  
7000a Monument Drive  
Grants Pass, OR 97526

E-RIDS = Adm-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VonTill (RDV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = Adm-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D604E0.916 : 24 : 39190)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:44 PM  
**From:** Roy Moss <[beromos@charter.net](mailto:beromos@charter.net)>

**Created By:** [beromos@charter.net](mailto:beromos@charter.net)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3040	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:44 PM
Mime.822	4215	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USMFC

**From:** elizabeth path <path35@juno.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:44 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

299

2007 SEP -7 PM 4:38

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

elizabeth path  
25 elm ave  
Suite 808

E-RIDS = ADM-03

ADD: J. Park (JRP)

B. Vontill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

Homer, NY 13077

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D604E0.915 : 23 : 39189)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:44 PM  
**From:** elizabeth path <path35@juno.com>

**Created By:** [path35@juno.com](mailto:path35@juno.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3040	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:44 PM
Mime.822	4231	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled



7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
ENRC

**From:** Jean Gore <jeangore@comcast.net>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:45 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:27

(300)

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Jean Gore  
350 Ponca Pl. #175  
Boulder, CO 80303

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (GRP)

B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D604FE.919 : 2 : 39193)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:44 PM  
**From:** Jean Gore <[jeangore@comcast.net](mailto:jeangore@comcast.net)>

**Created By:** [jeangore@comcast.net](mailto:jeangore@comcast.net)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3035	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:44 PM
Mime.822	4244	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Robert Justis <ryjustis@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:45 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

301

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:27

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Robert Justis  
P O BOX 53  
Suite 808

E-RIW = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

Telluride, CO 81435-0053

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D6051E.91C : 5 : 39196)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:45 PM  
**From:** Robert Justis <[ryjustis@yahoo.com](mailto:ryjustis@yahoo.com)>

**Created By:** [ryjustis@yahoo.com](mailto:ryjustis@yahoo.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

**Files**

MESSAGE

Mime.822

**Size**

3047

4252

**Date & Time**

Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:45 PM

**Options**

**Expiration Date:**

None

**Priority:**

Standard

**ReplyRequested:**

No

**Return Notification:**

None

**Concealed Subject:**

No

**Security:**

Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling

This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User

Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator

Junk List is not enabled

Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled

Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Hanna Hayden <hanna.hayden@gmail.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:45 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(362)

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:27

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Hanna Hayden  
650 W. Hawthorn St.  
Louisville, CO 80027

E-RIDJ = ADM-03

Add: J. Pork (GRP)

B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-03

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D6051E.91D : 6 : 39197)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:45 PM  
**From:** Hanna Hayden <[hanna.hayden@gmail.com](mailto:hanna.hayden@gmail.com)>

**Created By:** [hanna.hayden@gmail.com](mailto:hanna.hayden@gmail.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3042	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:45 PM
Mime.822	4263	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard,

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07  
72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Patricia Youngson <patyoungson@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:46 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

303

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:27

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Patricia Youngson  
2227 Canyon #352  
Boulder, CO 80302

E-RIDS: ADM-03

Add: J. Pork (JRP)

B. VonTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013



303-415-9872

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D6053D.920 : 9 : 39200)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:45 PM  
**From:** Patricia Youngson <[patyoungson@yahoo.com](mailto:patyoungson@yahoo.com)>

**Created By:** [patyoungson@yahoo.com](mailto:patyoungson@yahoo.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3054	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:45 PM
Mime.822	4277	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
UNRRC

**From:** David Goolin <dave\_g59@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:46 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(364)

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:27

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

David Goolin  
34 Challenger Court  
Walkersville, MD 21793

E-R105 = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNS, Review Complete

Template = ADM-03

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D6055D.925 : 14 : 39205)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:46 PM  
**From:** David Goolin <dave\_g59@yahoo.com>

**Created By:** dave\_g59@yahoo.com

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3044	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:46 PM
Mime.822	4249	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
ISURC

**From:** Cyndi Nusbaum <cydnico@webtv.net>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:47 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:27

(306)

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Cyndi Nusbaum  
5000 Butte St. #152  
Boulder, CO, CO 80301

E-RID = Adm-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template - Adm-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D6057D.92B : 20 : 39211)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:46 PM  
**From:** Cyndi Nusbaum <[cydnico@webtv.net](mailto:cydnico@webtv.net)>

**Created By:** [cydnico@webtv.net](mailto:cydnico@webtv.net)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3044	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:46 PM
Mime.822	4214	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Stanley Becker <stanleyxbecker@msn.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:48 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:27

306

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Stanley Becker  
370 West Broadway, Apt. 3C  
Long Beach, NY 11561

E-RIPJ = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (GRP)

B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D605BD.944 : 20 : 39236)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:47 PM  
**From:** Stanley Becker <[stanleyxbecker@msn.com](mailto:stanleyxbecker@msn.com)>

**Created By:** [stanleyxbecker@msn.com](mailto:stanleyxbecker@msn.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3051	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:47 PM
Mime.822	4247	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled



7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNPC

**From:** Colin K N A U F <knauf@syncogent.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:48 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

307

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:27

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Colin Knauf

Colin K N A U F

E-RIOS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. Vontill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

1928 Wildflower Drive  
Pickering, ON L1V7A7

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D605DE.953 : 10 : 39251)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:48 PM  
**From:** Colin K N A U F <[knauf@syncogent.com](mailto:knauf@syncogent.com)>

**Created By:** [knauf@syncogent.com](mailto:knauf@syncogent.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3059	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:48 PM
Mime.822	4270	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USEC

**From:** Jayne Kurschner <jaynek88@aol.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:49 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:28

308

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS and insist that public hearings are held. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Jayne Kurschner  
2339 N, Sawyer Ave.  
Chicago, IL 60647

E-RIDJ = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D605FD.957 : 14 : 39255)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:49 PM  
**From:** Jayne Kurschner <[jaynek88@aol.com](mailto:jaynek88@aol.com)>

**Created By:** [jaynek88@aol.com](mailto:jaynek88@aol.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3084	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:49 PM
Mime.822	4279	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Mary Halligan <mary4mac@earthlink.net>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:50 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:28

(309)

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I am writing to oppose a GEIS for the following reasons.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Mary Halligan  
16610 White Star Drive  
Houston, TX 77062

E-R10S = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VonTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D6061D.95C : 19 : 39260)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:49 PM  
**From:** Mary Halligan <[mary4mac@earthlink.net](mailto:mary4mac@earthlink.net)>

**Created By:** [mary4mac@earthlink.net](mailto:mary4mac@earthlink.net)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**  
nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3051	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:49 PM
Mime.822	4245	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Anne-Marie Ammann <tahiti94510@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:50 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(310)

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:28

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Anne-Marie Ammann  
2137 Clear View Circle  
Suite 808

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)  
B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-03



Benicia, CA 94510

707-748-7436

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D6061E.95E : 21 : 39262)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:49 PM  
**From:** Anne-Marie Ammann <[tahiti94510@yahoo.com](mailto:tahiti94510@yahoo.com)>

**Created By:** [tahiti94510@yahoo.com](mailto:tahiti94510@yahoo.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3071	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:49 PM
Mime.822	4272	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Richard Smith <rasmithwa@igc.org>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:50 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(311)

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:28

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Richard Smith  
4800 Fremont Ave. N. #202  
Seattle, WA 98103

E-RIDS: ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template: ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D6063F.966 : 4 : 39270)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:50 PM  
**From:** Richard Smith <[rasmithwa@igc.org](mailto:rasmithwa@igc.org)>

**Created By:** [rasmithwa@igc.org](mailto:rasmithwa@igc.org)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3046	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:50 PM
Mime.822	4215	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USRC

**From:** joan mccoey <homeforpax@aol.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:51 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(312)

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:28

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

joan mccoey  
1571 Wenonah  
Suite 808

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VanTill (Riv)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-03

Saginaw, MI 48638

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D6065E.969 : 7 : 39273)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:50 PM  
**From:** joan mccoy <[homeforpax@aol.com](mailto:homeforpax@aol.com)>

**Created By:** [homeforpax@aol.com](mailto:homeforpax@aol.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**  
nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3039	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:50 PM
Mime.822	4239	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
LONPO

**From:** Patricia Wilson <bookwilson@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:51 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:28

313

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing about the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

Water will be the next scarce resource. The history of mining of all sorts in the United States is that they do not clean up after them selves. It is easier to pay the fines. The process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

If the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

SUNN Review Complete

Template = ADM-03

E-RIDJ = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (GRP)

B. Von Till (RWW)



Patricia Wilson  
289 Stella Lane  
Vesta, VA 24177

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D6067F.972 : 16 : 39282)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:51 PM  
**From:** Patricia Wilson <[bookwilson@yahoo.com](mailto:bookwilson@yahoo.com)>

**Created By:** [bookwilson@yahoo.com](mailto:bookwilson@yahoo.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3142	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:51 PM
Mime.822	4356	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USARPC

**From:** James Denison <lannd4animals@charter.net>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:52 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

314

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:28

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

James Denison  
6931 E 11 TH ST  
Long Beach, CA 90815

E-RIDW = ADM-03  
Add: J. Pork (GRP)  
B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D606BC.978 : 22 : 39288)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:52 PM  
**From:** James Denison <[lannd4animals@charter.net](mailto:lannd4animals@charter.net)>

**Created By:** [lannd4animals@charter.net](mailto:lannd4animals@charter.net)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3040	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:52 PM
Mime.822	4278	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Ed Morin <edmorin@cox.net>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:52 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(315)

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:28

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Ed Morin  
2952 Glen Albyn  
Santa Barbara, CA 93105-2220

E-RIDS = Adm - 03

Add: J. Park (GRP)

B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNS Review Complete

Template = Adm-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D606BD.979 : 23 : 39289)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:52 PM  
**From:** Ed Morin <[edmorin@cox.net](mailto:edmorin@cox.net)>

**Created By:** [edmorin@cox.net](mailto:edmorin@cox.net)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3042	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:52 PM
Mime.822	4197	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Sarah Roberts <kops-and-robs@patmedia.net>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:53 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(316)

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:29

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

As a civil engineer with experience in hydrogeology, I am surprised that you consider all sites for ISL mining to have equivalent environmental impact. Input from all stakeholders is something that should never be eliminated, especially generically, and far in advance.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

E-RIDJ = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (GRP)

B. U. Till (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

Sarah Roberts  
48 Harlingen Road  
Belle Mead, NJ 08502



**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D606FB.983 : 8 : 39299)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:53 PM  
**From:** Sarah Roberts <kops-and-robs@patmedia.net>

**Created By:** kops-and-robs@patmedia.net

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3313	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:53 PM
Mime.822	4529	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
CONF

**From:** David Lien <dlien2@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:53 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(317)

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:29

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

David Lien  
430 E. Cheyenne Mt. Blvd., #21  
Colorado Springs, CO 80906

E-RIDJ = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (GRP)  
B. DonTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

719-579-6659

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D606FB.985 : 10 : 39301)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:53 PM  
**From:** David Lien <[dlien2@yahoo.com](mailto:dlien2@yahoo.com)>

**Created By:** [dlien2@yahoo.com](mailto:dlien2@yahoo.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3071	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:53 PM
Mime.822	4238	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Sarah de Sousa <salerbo@gvtc.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:53 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(318)

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:29

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Sarah de Sousa  
351 Whispering Oaks  
Spring Branch, TX 78070

E-RID: ADM-03

Add: J. Park (GRP)

B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template: = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D606DC.97E : 3 : 39294)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:52 PM  
**From:** Sarah de Sousa <[salerbo@gvtc.com](mailto:salerbo@gvtc.com)>

**Created By:** [salerbo@gvtc.com](mailto:salerbo@gvtc.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3047	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:52 PM
Mime.822	4240	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Dave Whipple <dwhipple@statconcorp.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:54 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:29

(319)

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Dave Whipple  
2903 Ransford Ave  
Suite 808

E-RIDJ = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (GRP)

B. Von Till (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-03

Pacific Grove, CA 93950



**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D60739.98C : 17 : 39308)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:54 PM  
**From:** Dave Whipple <dwhipple@statconcorp.com>

**Created By:** [dwhipple@statconcorp.com](mailto:dwhipple@statconcorp.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3053	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:54 PM
Mime.822	4286	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Joshua Angelus <joshuaangelus@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:55 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(320)

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:29

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Joshua Angelus  
67 Hillside Avenue  
Waterbury, CT 06710

E-R103 = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (GRP)

B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D60779.99B : 7 : 39323)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:55 PM  
**From:** Joshua Angelus <joshuaangelus@yahoo.com>

**Created By:** joshuaangelus@yahoo.com

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3042	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:55 PM
Mime.822	4246	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
LONFO

**From:** "Steven G. Kellman" <kellman1@gmail.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:55 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

321

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:29

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Steven G. Kellman  
302 Fawn Drive  
San Antonio, TX 78231

E-RIOS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VanTill (RUV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D6077A.99D : 9 : 39325)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:55 PM  
**From:** "Steven G. Kellman" <[kellman1@gmail.com](mailto:kellman1@gmail.com)>

**Created By:** [kellman1@gmail.com](mailto:kellman1@gmail.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3043	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:55 PM
Mime.822	4222	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
UNRPO

**From:** Kristen Osman <k.osman@verizon.net>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:56 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

322

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:29

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Kristen Osman  
222 Miramar St.  
Upland, CA 91784

E-RID = ADM-03

ASD: J. Park (GRP)

B. VanTill (RDV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D60799.9A0 : 12 : 39328)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:55 PM  
**From:** Kristen Osman <k.osman@verizon.net>

**Created By:** k.osman@verizon.net

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3035	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:55 PM
Mime.822	4243	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Robert Pancner <rpancn@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:56 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(323)

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:29

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Robert Pancner  
7936 Redondo Ct.  
Darien, IL 60561

E-RMS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. Von Till (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013



**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D607B8.9A2 : 14 : 39330)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:56 PM  
**From:** Robert Pancner <[rpancn@yahoo.com](mailto:rpancn@yahoo.com)>

**Created By:** [rpancn@yahoo.com](mailto:rpancn@yahoo.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3037	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:56 PM
Mime.822	4231	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** fran sullivan-fahs <sullyfahs@comcast.net>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:56 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(324)

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:30

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

fran sullivan-fahs  
na  
7600 mill pond loop

E-R105 = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)  
B. Von Till (RWV)

SUNN Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

tallahassee, FL 32317

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D607B8.9A5 : 17 : 39333)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:56 PM  
**From:** fran sullivan-fahs <[sullyfahs@comcast.net](mailto:sullyfahs@comcast.net)>

**Created By:** [sullyfahs@comcast.net](mailto:sullyfahs@comcast.net)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3052	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:56 PM
Mime.822	4247	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DEFECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USCFC

**From:** Marilyn & James Keegan <JKeegan1@cfl.rr.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:56 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

325

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:30

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Marilyn & James Keegan  
8895 SW 91st Place  
Unit-d

E-RIDS = ADM-03

ADD: J. Park (GRP)

B. UmTill (RWV)

SUMI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

Ocala, FL 34481

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D607B8.9A4 : 16 : 39332)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:56 PM  
**From:** Marilyn & James Keegan <[JKeegan1@cfl.rr.com](mailto:JKeegan1@cfl.rr.com)>

**Created By:** [JKeegan1@cfl.rr.com](mailto:JKeegan1@cfl.rr.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3053	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:56 PM
Mime.822	4242	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
US/RC

**From:** Steven Tracy <stevepath1@aol.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:56 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(326)

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:30

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Steven Tracy  
1118 Heatherloch Dr.  
Gastonia, NC 28054

E-ROW = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013



704-834-2851

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D607B8.9A7 : 19 : 39335)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:56 PM  
**From:** Steven Tracy <[stevepath1@aol.com](mailto:stevepath1@aol.com)>

**Created By:** [stevepath1@aol.com](mailto:stevepath1@aol.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3055	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:56 PM
Mime.822	4231	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USMPC

**From:** James Murphy <j.murphy.7@mac.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:57 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:30

(327)

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

James Murphy  
1122 East Pike St.  
#1125

E-RIDJ = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)  
B. Von Till (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template - ADM-013

Seattle, WA 98122

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D607D7.9A9 : 21 : 39337)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:56 PM  
**From:** James Murphy <j.murphy.7@mac.com>

**Created By:** j.murphy.7@mac.com

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3044	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:56 PM
Mime.822	4219	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Donna Brook <bunnita@aol.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:57 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(328)

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:30

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Donna Brook  
231 Wyckoff Street  
Suite 808

E-R103 = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. Von Till (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

Brooklyn, NY 11217

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D607F7.9AD : 0 : 39341)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:57 PM  
**From:** Donna Brook <[bunnita@aol.com](mailto:bunnita@aol.com)>

**Created By:** [bunnita@aol.com](mailto:bunnita@aol.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3048	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:57 PM
Mime.822	4235	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled



7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** joanne groshardt <battybadt@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:57 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(329)

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:30

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

joanne groshardt  
302 trailridge dr  
richardson, TX 75081

E-RADS = Adm-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. DonTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template: Adm-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D607F7.9AF : 2 : 39343)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:57 PM  
**From:** joanne groshardt <battybadt@yahoo.com>

**Created By:** [battybadt@yahoo.com](mailto:battybadt@yahoo.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3044	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:57 PM
Mime.822	4230	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
GENC

**From:** Barbara Papalios <papalios.2@osu.edu>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:58 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

330

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:30

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Barbara Papalios  
46 w. 10th ave. apt. B  
Columbus, OH 43201

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (GRP)

B. VonTill (RDV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

(614)-459-0399

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D60817.9B6 : 9 : 39350)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:58 PM  
**From:** Barbara Papalios <[papalios.2@osu.edu](mailto:papalios.2@osu.edu)>

**Created By:** [papalios.2@osu.edu](mailto:papalios.2@osu.edu)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3063	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:58 PM
Mime.822	4271	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**Reply Requested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Bryan Todd <xander61@hotmail.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:59 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(331)

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:30

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Bryan Todd  
 3016 Estates Ave  
 Pinole, CA 94564

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D60855.9BD : 16 : 39357)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 7:59 PM  
**From:** Bryan Todd <xander61@hotmail.com>

**Created By:** xander61@hotmail.com

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWD001  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWD001

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3033	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 7:59 PM
Mime.822	4242	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USFRC

**From:** Sydney Allrud <syddha@msn.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 8:01 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

332

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:31

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Sydney Allrud  
8815 Burke av n  
Seattle, WA 98103

E-RIPS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013



**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D608B2.9C7 : 1 : 39367)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 8:00 PM  
**From:** Sydney Allrud <syddha@msn.com>

**Created By:** syddha@msn.com

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3036	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 8:00 PM
Mime.822	4191	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** "Denise R. Be Cotte" <yogascout@hotmail.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 8:02 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(333)

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:31

To Whom It May Concern:

As a concerned environmentalist, I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Denise R. Be Cotte  
Post Office Box 90024  
Long Beach, CA 90809-0024

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)  
B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D608F3.9E3 : 4 : 39395)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 8:01 PM  
**From:** "Denise R. Be Cotte" <yogascout@hotmail.com>

**Created By:** yogascout@hotmail.com

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3088	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 8:01 PM
Mime.822	4285	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Bud McAllister <budmcallister@hotmail.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 8:02 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(334)

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:31

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Bud McAllister  
155 Blood St  
Lyme, CT 06371

E-RID = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (GRP)

B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template: ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D608F4.9E4 : 5 : 39396)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 8:01 PM  
**From:** Bud McAllister <[budmcallister@hotmail.com](mailto:budmcallister@hotmail.com)>

**Created By:** [budmcallister@hotmail.com](mailto:budmcallister@hotmail.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3031	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 8:01 PM
Mime.822	4242	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
LSNRC

**From:** rachelle ward <rachelleward@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 8:02 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

335

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:31

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

rachelle ward  
9630 south big thunder  
vail, AZ 85641

E-RIDS = Adm - 03

Add: J. Park (GRP)

B. VanTill (RWU)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = Adm-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D60913.9EF : 16 : 39407)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 8:02 PM  
**From:** rachelle ward <[rachelleward@yahoo.com](mailto:rachelleward@yahoo.com)>

**Created By:** [rachelleward@yahoo.com](mailto:rachelleward@yahoo.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3041	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 8:02 PM
Mime.822	4265	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** William Gibbs <BGibbsLMT@cox.net>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 8:03 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(336)

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:31

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

William Gibbs  
57 Hitching Post Dr  
Suite 808

E-RIDS = Adm-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VonTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = Adm-013



Southington, CT 06489

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D60950.9F8 : 0 : 39416)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 8:03 PM  
**From:** William Gibbs <BGibbsLMT@cox.net>

**Created By:** BGibbsLMT@cox.net

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3054	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 8:03 PM
Mime.822	4252	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
UNRAC

**From:** Denise Machowski <rose81512@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 8:04 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(337)

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:31

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

This is an important matter that concerns us all not only now but future generations.

Sincerely,

Denise Machowski  
559 Fuller Road  
Suite 808

E-RIOS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (GRP)

B. Vontell (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

Chicopee, MA 01020

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D6098E.9FC : 4 : 39420)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 8:04 PM  
**From:** Denise Machowski <rose81512@yahoo.com>

**Created By:** rose81512@yahoo.com

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3135	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 8:04 PM
Mime.822	4323	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 46344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Laurajeanne Safford-Kehn <kehrn@speednetllc.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 8:05 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(338)

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:31

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Laurajeanne Safford-Kehn  
Frankenmuth Farmers Market  
11585 King Road

E-RID: ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VonTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

Suite 808  
Frankenmuth, MI 48734

989.652.3006

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D609AD.A02 : 10 : 39426)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 8:04 PM  
**From:** Laurajeanne Safford-Kehn <[kehrn@speednetllc.com](mailto:kehrn@speednetllc.com)>

**Created By:** [kehrn@speednetllc.com](mailto:kehrn@speednetllc.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3102	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 8:04 PM
Mime.822	4302	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled



7/24/07  
72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
UNRRC

**From:** Lisa Langcake <Mllang3@aol.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 8:06 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

339

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:31

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Lisa Langcake  
7268 Coddin Lane  
Fort Mill, SC 29715

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (GRP)

B. VonTill (RDV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D609EA.A08 : 16 : 39432)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 8:05 PM  
**From:** Lisa Langcake <Mllang3@aol.com>

**Created By:** Mllang3@aol.com

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3039	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 8:05 PM
Mime.822	4199	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Sallye Bowyer <sallyebowyer@yahoo.cm>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 8:07 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(340)

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:31

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Sallye Bowyer  
4843 Rivervale Dr  
Soquel, CA 95073

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. VonTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-03

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D60A28.A13 : 2 : 39443)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 8:06 PM  
**From:** Sallye Bowyer <[sallyebowyer@yahoo.cm](mailto:sallyebowyer@yahoo.cm)>

**Created By:** [sallyebowyer@yahoo.cm](mailto:sallyebowyer@yahoo.cm)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3037	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 8:06 PM
Mime.822	4227	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
UNPC

**From:** Keith Ellis <Politics@KeithEllis.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 8:07 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(341)

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:32

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Keith Ellis  
6309 North 15th Road  
Arlington, VA 22205

E-RID: ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. Vontill (RWU)

SUNW Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D60A2A.A18 : 7 : 39448)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 8:07 PM  
**From:** Keith Ellis <[Politics@KeithEllis.com](mailto:Politics@KeithEllis.com)>

**Created By:** [Politics@KeithEllis.com](mailto:Politics@KeithEllis.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3041	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 8:07 PM
Mime.822	4267	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Kevin Zellmer <wonereheb@mailcity.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 8:07 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(342)

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:32

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Kevin Zellmer  
2975 N Prospect Ave.  
Milwaukee, WI 53211

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (GRP)

B. VanTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-03

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D60A49.A21 : 16 : 39457)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 8:07 PM  
**From:** Kevin Zellmer <[wonereheb@mailcity.com](mailto:wonereheb@mailcity.com)>

**Created By:** [wonereheb@mailcity.com](mailto:wonereheb@mailcity.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3043	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 8:07 PM
Mime.822	4266	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled



7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BP/UCH  
USNPC

**From:** Karen Fedorov <klfedorov@aol.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 8:07 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(343)

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:32

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement. This is like saying that we should all wear "one size fits all clothes!!" Rediculous!!

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Karen Fedorov  
8044 Tackett Lane

E-RIDS = Adm-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. Vintill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = Adm-013

Bealeton, VA 22712

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D60A49.A22 : 17 : 39458)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 8:07 PM  
**From:** Karen Fedorov <[klfedorov@aol.com](mailto:klfedorov@aol.com)>

**Created By:** [klfedorov@aol.com](mailto:klfedorov@aol.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3127	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 8:07 PM
Mime.822	4323	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
CNRC

**From:** Joe Feinstein <brendajoe@aol.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 8:08 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(344)

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:32

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Joe Feinstein  
7308 Creek View  
Suite 808

E-R105 = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)  
B. VanTill (RDU)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template: ADM-013

W. Bloomfield, MI 48322

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D60A68.A29 : 24 : 39465)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 8:07 PM  
**From:** Joe Feinstein <[brendajoe@aol.com](mailto:brendajoe@aol.com)>

**Created By:** [brendajoe@aol.com](mailto:brendajoe@aol.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3052	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 8:07 PM
Mime.822	4223	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USFPO

**From:** Sherry Marsh <MTASJ@aol.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 8:08 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(345)

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:32

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Sherry Marsh  
5030 Alicante Way  
Oceanside, CA 92056

E-R105- ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B. Dantill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D60A68.A28 : 23 : 39464)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 8:07 PM  
**From:** Sherry Marsh <[MTASJ@aol.com](mailto:MTASJ@aol.com)>

**Created By:** [MTASJ@aol.com](mailto:MTASJ@aol.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3039	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 8:07 PM
Mime.822	4216	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled



7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** Esther L Kim <estherkim@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 8:08 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(346)

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:32

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Esther L Kim  
4210 21st Avenue, 1st floor  
1st floor

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (GRP)

B. Vontill (RWV)

Astoria, NY 11105

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D60A68.A27 : 22 : 39463)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 8:07 PM  
**From:** Esther L Kim <[estherlkim@yahoo.com](mailto:estherlkim@yahoo.com)>

**Created By:** [estherlkim@yahoo.com](mailto:estherlkim@yahoo.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3057	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 8:07 PM
Mime.822	4271	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
ENR/C

**From:** "Mary S. Lewis" <ism@pitt.edu>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 8:09 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

(347)

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:32

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Mary S. Lewis  
2705 Blackridge Ave.  
Suite 808

E-RIDS: ADM-03

Add: J. Park (GRP)

B. VoJill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template: ADM-013

Pittsburgh, PA 15235

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D60AC9.A35 : 11 : 39477)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 8:09 PM  
**From:** "Mary S. Lewis" <lsm@pitt.edu>

**Created By:** [lsm@pitt.edu](mailto:lsm@pitt.edu)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**  
nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3054	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 8:09 PM
Mime.822	4202	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** joan fabrega <jfrabbie@verizon.net>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 8:09 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

348

2007 SEP 10 PM 3:32

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

joan fabrega  
 257 kenforest  
 pitts., PA 15216

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add: J. Park (JRP)

B.Us-Till (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D60ACA.A3D : 19 : 39485)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 8:09 PM  
**From:** joan fabrega <jfrabbie@verizon.net>

**Created By:** jfrabbie@verizon.net

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3032	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 8:09 PM
Mime.822	4216	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled



7/24/07  
72 FR 40344

**From:** Greg Wingard <gwingard@earthlink.net>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:40 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

351

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Lastly, NEPA requires (and the federal courts have upheld) that federal agencies take a hard look at the environmental impacts of proposals covered by the act. It is absolutely impossible for the NRC to meet these requirement through a GEIS for mining impacts that are so site specific. To do so would be a gross dereliction of duty and obligations. It also appears that use of a GEIS would be a violation of the federal governments Trust obligation to Tribes throughout the United States that are or potentially could be impacted by this technology.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of

SUNSI Review Complete  
 Template = ADM-013

ERIS = ADM-03  
 add = J. Park (JRP)  
 W. Von Till (rwv)

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
 RESEARCH  
 (NRC)

2007 SEP 13 PM 12:48  
 RECEIVED

developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Greg Wingard  
Waste Action Project  
PO Box 4051  
Seattle, WA 98194

(206) 261-2670

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5F5BA.586 : 12 : 38278)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:39 PM  
**From:** Greg Wingard <[gwingard@earthlink.net](mailto:gwingard@earthlink.net)>

**Created By:** [gwingard@earthlink.net](mailto:gwingard@earthlink.net)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	3623	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 6:39 PM
Mime.822	4822	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**Reply Requested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07  
72 FR 40344

**From:** Anca Vlasopolos <vlasopolos@sbcglobal.net>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:40 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

352

RECEIVED

2007 SEP 13 AM 12:49

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
12:49

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Anca Vlasopolos  
820 Notre Dame  
Grosse Pointe, MI 48230

ERIDS-ADM-03  
Add - J. Park (JRP)  
W. VonT:11 (rwv)

SUNSI Review Complete  
Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5F5BA.588 : 14 : 38280)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:39 PM  
**From:** Anca Vlasopolos <[vlasopolos@sbcglobal.net](mailto:vlasopolos@sbcglobal.net)>

**Created By:** [vlasopolos@sbcglobal.net](mailto:vlasopolos@sbcglobal.net)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3043	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 6:39 PM
Mime.822	4250	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

9/24/07  
72 FR 40344

353

**From:** Eileen Harney <eileen.harney@utoronto.ca>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:40 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Eileen Harney  
17 Maplewood Rd.  
Medfield, MA 02052

SunSI Review Complete  
Template = ADM-013

ERIDS = ADM-03  
Add - J. Park (JRP)  
W. Von Till (RWV)

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
10/1/00

RECEIVED

2007 SEP 13 PM 12:44

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5F5BA.589 : 15 : 38281)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:39 PM  
**From:** Eileen Harney <[eileen.harney@utoronto.ca](mailto:eileen.harney@utoronto.ca)>

**Created By:** [eileen.harney@utoronto.ca](mailto:eileen.harney@utoronto.ca)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3038	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 6:39 PM
Mime.822	4276	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

**From:** Virginia Curtis Lee <lee2sky@msn.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:40 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

To Whom It May Concern:  
Not in Utah!

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Virginia Curtis Lee

SUNSI Review Complete  
Template = ADM-013

ERIDS = ADM-03  
Add - J. Park (JRP)  
W. Von Till (rwv)

7/24/07  
72 FR 40344

354

RECEIVED

2007 SEP 13 PM 12:49

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC



1458 Princeton Avenue  
Salt Lake City, UT 84105

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5F5BA.587 : 13 : 38279)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:39 PM  
**From:** Virginia Curtis Lee <[lee2sky@msn.com](mailto:lee2sky@msn.com)>

**Created By:** [lee2sky@msn.com](mailto:lee2sky@msn.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3069	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 6:39 PM
Mime.822	4237	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

**From:** Laura Herndon <laura.herndon@disney.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:40 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Laura Herndon  
125 N. Brighton St. #231  
Suite 808

SUNSI Review Complete  
Template = ADM-013

ERIDS = ADM-03  
Add - J. Park (JRP)  
W. Von Till (rwv)

RECEIVED

2007 SEP 13 AM 12:49

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
15490

355

2124107  
72 FR 40344

Burbank, CA 91506

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5F5D8.58B : 17 : 38283)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:40 PM  
**From:** Laura Herndon <[laura.herndon@disney.com](mailto:laura.herndon@disney.com)>

**Created By:** [laura.herndon@disney.com](mailto:laura.herndon@disney.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3055	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 6:40 PM
Mime.822	4261	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC7/24/07  
72 FR 40344

**From:** Joseph Grinnell <jl\_grinnell@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:41 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP 13 PM 12:49

(356)

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Joseph Grinnell  
1721 Chapel Hill  
Durham, NC 27707

ERIDS = ADM-03  
Add - J. Park (JRP)  
W. Von Till (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete  
Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5F5F7.58D : 19 : 38285)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:40 PM  
**From:** Joseph Grinnell <[jl\\_grinnell@yahoo.com](mailto:jl_grinnell@yahoo.com)>

**Created By:** [jl\\_grinnell@yahoo.com](mailto:jl_grinnell@yahoo.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3038	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 6:40 PM
Mime.822	4258	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC7124107  
72 FR 40344

(357)

**From:** Sandra Breakfield <cbreakfi@tx.rr.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:41 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP 13 PM 12:49

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Sandra Breakfield  
5610 Cliff Haven Dr  
Suite 808

SUNSI Review Complete  
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03  
Add - S. Park (JRP)  
W. Von Till (RWV)



Dallas, TX 75236

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5F5F8.590 : 22 : 38288)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:40 PM  
**From:** Sandra Breakfield <cbreakfi@tx.rr.com>

**Created By:** cbreakfi@tx.rr.com

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3053	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 6:40 PM
Mime.822	4260	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
UOLHC7124107  
72 FR 40344

**From:** Margaret Sterling <aliendancer@comcast.net>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:41 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP 13 PM 12:49

(358)

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Margaret Sterling  
3515 Stuart Ave. #102  
Richmond, VA 23221

E. RIDS = ADM-03  
Godd. J. Parr (JRP)  
W. Vontill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete  
Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5F618.59A : 7 : 38298)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:41 PM  
**From:** Margaret Sterling <[aliendancer@comcast.net](mailto:aliendancer@comcast.net)>

**Created By:** [aliendancer@comcast.net](mailto:aliendancer@comcast.net)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3047	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 6:41 PM
Mime.822	4250	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
US:DC7124107  
72 FR 46344

**From:** Amber Tidwell <etoile90230@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:42 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP 13 PM 12:49

(359)

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Amber Tidwell  
2420 1/2 N. Beachwood Dr  
Los Angeles, CA 90068

E-R105-ADM-03  
Add. J. Parr (JRP)  
W. VonTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete  
Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5F638.59E : 11 : 38302)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:41 PM  
**From:** Amber Tidwell <etoile90230@yahoo.com>

**Created By:** etoile90230@yahoo.com

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3049	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 6:41 PM
Mime.822	4242	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk-Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC7124107  
72 FR 40344

**From:** Sandy Tatum <sandybtatum59@aol.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:42 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP 13 PM 12:49

360

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Sandy Tatum  
131 County Road 27  
Suite 808

E.RIDS-ADM-03  
Add J. Park (JRP)  
W. Von Till (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete  
Template = ADM-013

Prattville, AL 36067

334 365-9734



**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5F657.5A0 : 13 : 38304)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:42 PM  
**From:** Sandy Tatum <[sandybtatum59@aol.com](mailto:sandybtatum59@aol.com)>

**Created By:** [sandybtatum59@aol.com](mailto:sandybtatum59@aol.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3064	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 6:42 PM
Mime.822	4254	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USMC7124107  
72 FR 40344

**From:** Susan Plott <plottlink@insightbb.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:42 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP 13 PM 12:49

(361)

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Susan Plott  
811 W. Deerbrook Dr.  
Peoria, IL 61615-1012

ERIDS-ADM-03  
Add J. Park (JRP)  
W. VonTill (RWV)

SUNSI REVIEW Complete  
Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5F657.5A1 : 14 : 38305)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:42 PM  
**From:** Susan Plott <[plottlink@insightbb.com](mailto:plottlink@insightbb.com)>

**Created By:** [plottlink@insightbb.com](mailto:plottlink@insightbb.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3044	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 6:42 PM
Mime.822	4271	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USDO7/24/07  
72 FR 40344

**From:** Thomas Morrissey <motobojo@spamcop.net>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:43 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP 13 PM 12:49

(362)

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Thomas Morrissey  
East of Huajatolla Citizens Alliance  
21601 Trujillo Creek Road

E-RIDS = ADM-03  
add J. Park (JRP)  
W. Von Till (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete  
Template = ADM-013

Aguilar, CO 81020

719-941-4150

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5F676.5A6 : 19 : 38310)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:42 PM  
**From:** Thomas Morrissey <[motobojo@spamcop.net](mailto:motobojo@spamcop.net)>

**Created By:** [motobojo@spamcop.net](mailto:motobojo@spamcop.net)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3100	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 6:42 PM
Mime.822	4291	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC7124107  
72 FR 40344

363

**From:** Elaine Wilson <elaine1111@earthlink.net>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:43 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP 13 PM 12:49

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Elaine Wilson  
2357 Del Amo  
Torrance, CA 90501

E.RIPS = ADM-03  
add J. Park (JRP)  
W. Von Till (RWV)

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5F676.5AA : 23 : 38314)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:42 PM  
**From:** Elaine Wilson <[elaine1111@earthlink.net](mailto:elaine1111@earthlink.net)>

**Created By:** [elaine1111@earthlink.net](mailto:elaine1111@earthlink.net)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3034	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 6:42 PM
Mime.822	4239	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled



RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
JCHRC

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

364

**From:** Robert Thomas <robertt@spectrallogic.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:43 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP 13 PM 12:49

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Robert Thomas  
1282 E. 108th Avenue  
Northglenn, CO 80233

E-RIDS = ADM-03  
add J. Park (JRP)  
W. Von Till (RWV)

SUNSI REVIEW COMPLETE  
Template = ADM-013

(720) 394-2118

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5F676.5A7 : 20 : 38311)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:42 PM  
**From:** Robert Thomas <[robertt@spectrallogic.com](mailto:robertt@spectrallogic.com)>

**Created By:** [robertt@spectrallogic.com](mailto:robertt@spectrallogic.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3060	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 6:42 PM
Mime.822	4267	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USFRC

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

365

**From:** Jennifer Vaughan <music123j@aol.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:43 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP 13 PM 12:50

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

RECEIVED

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Vaughan  
1554 Union Ave  
North Bend, OR 97459

E-Rids = ADM-03  
Add J. Park (JRP)  
W. Von Till (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete  
Template = ADM-013

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5F697.5B6 : 10 : 38326)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:43 PM  
**From:** Jennifer Vaughan <[music123j@aol.com](mailto:music123j@aol.com)>

**Created By:** [music123j@aol.com](mailto:music123j@aol.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3041	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 6:43 PM
Mime.822	4214	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USMRC7/24/07  
72 FR 40340

**From:** Ryan Dodson <rcdodson@ogmfs.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:43 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

2007 SEP 13 PM 12:50

366

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Ryan Dodson  
175 Hess Blvd  
Lancaster, PA 17601

E.Rids = Adm-03  
Add J. Park (JRP)  
W. Von Till (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete  
Template = Adm-013

717-475-0195

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5F696.5B1 : 5 : 38321)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:43 PM  
**From:** Rya n Dodson <[rcdodson@ogmfs.com](mailto:rcdodson@ogmfs.com)>

**Created By:** [rcdodson@ogmfs.com](mailto:rcdodson@ogmfs.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3049	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 6:43 PM
Mime.822	4225	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled



**From:** Amre Klimchak <amreklimchak@earthlink.net>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:44 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

9/24/07

72FR 40344

367

RECEIVED

2007 SEP 13 PM 12:50

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
LEAD

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Amre Klimchak  
 644 Driggs Ave #6  
 644 Driggs Ave #6

E.Rids=ADM-03

Odd =  
 J. Park (JRP)  
 W. Von Till (RWV)

SONSI Review Complete  
 Template = ADM-013

Brooklyn, NY 11211

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5F6D6.5D1 : 12 : 38353)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:44 PM  
**From:** Amre Klimchak <[amreklimchak@earthlink.net](mailto:amreklimchak@earthlink.net)>

**Created By:** [amreklimchak@earthlink.net](mailto:amreklimchak@earthlink.net)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3057	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 6:44 PM
Mime.822	4273	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7124107  
72 FR 40344

**From:** Patty Diana <pecabo1338@aol.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:43 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

368

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Patty Diana  
4937 W Myrtle  
Glendale, AZ 85301

E. Rids = ADM-03  
Add J. Park (JRP)  
W. VonTill (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete  
Template = ADM-013

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
ENVIRONMENTAL  
COMMISSION  
2007

RECEIVED  
SEP 13 PM 12:5

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5F696.5B0 : 4 : 38320)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:43 PM  
**From:** Patty Diana <[pecabo1338@aol.com](mailto:pecabo1338@aol.com)>

**Created By:** [pecabo1338@aol.com](mailto:pecabo1338@aol.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3033	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 6:43 PM
Mime.822	4234	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07  
72FR 40344  
(369)

**From:** Robert Rineer <bobrineer@roadrunner.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:45 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

RECEIVED

2007 SEP 13 PM 2:50

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
151470

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Robert Rineer  
 1001 Hornet Way  
 Fullerton, CA 92831

SUNSI Review Complete  
 Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03  
 Add = J. Park (JRP)  
 W. VonTill (RWV)

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5F6F5.5D3 : 14 : 38355)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:44 PM  
**From:** Robert Rineer <[bobrineer@roadrunner.com](mailto:bobrineer@roadrunner.com)>

**Created By:** [bobrineer@roadrunner.com](mailto:bobrineer@roadrunner.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3038	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 6:44 PM
Mime.822	4243	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07  
72 FR 40344

**From:** Paul Adams <padams@earthskyarchitecture.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:45 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

370

RECEIVED

2007 SEP 13 PM 12:50

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
10450

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Paul Adams  
 Earth and Sky Architecture  
 1255 Josephine Street

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add = J. Park (JRP)  
W. VonTill (RWV)SUNSI Review Complete  
Template = ADM-013



Denver, CO 80206

303-521-8242

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5F714.5D7 : 18 : 38359)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:45 PM  
**From:** Paul Adams <[padams@earthskyarchitecture.com](mailto:padams@earthskyarchitecture.com)>

**Created By:** [padams@earthskyarchitecture.com](mailto:padams@earthskyarchitecture.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3079	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 6:45 PM
Mime.822	4347	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

7/24/07  
72 FR 40344

**From:** rob danese <robert.danese@ed.gov>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:45 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

371

RECEIVED

2007 SEP 13 12:50

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
ENACT  
12/05

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in-situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

rob danese  
180 Moss Way  
Oakland, CA 94611

SOUSI Review Complete  
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03  
All = J. Park (JRP)  
W. VonTill (RWV)

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5F714.5D8 : 19 : 38360)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:45 PM  
**From:** rob danese <[robert.danese@ed.gov](mailto:robert.danese@ed.gov)>

**Created By:** [robert.danese@ed.gov](mailto:robert.danese@ed.gov)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3029	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 6:45 PM
Mime.822	4239	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

**From:** Michael Suchocki <suchocki@canada.com>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:46 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

372

RECEIVED

700 SEP 13 PM 12:50

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
OF THE  
NATIONAL  
NUCLEAR  
REGULATORY  
COMMISSION

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Michael Suchocki  
 #11-45090 Luckakuk Way  
 Suite 808

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add = J. Park (JRP)

W. Vontell (RWV)

SONSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

Chilliwack, BC V2R3Z5

**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5F732.5DD : 24 : 38365)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:46 PM  
**From:** Michael Suchocki <suchocki@canada.com>

**Created By:** [suchocki@canada.com](mailto:suchocki@canada.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3060	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 6:46 PM
Mime.822	4272	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled

**From:** Charlene Grahn <fishrpeople2@optonline.net>  
**To:** <nrcprep@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:46 PM  
**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS

7/24/07

72 FR 40344

373

RECEIVED

2007 SEP 13 PM 12:50

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
L3750

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Federal Register notice dated July 24, 2007 regarding the scope of the proposed Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS") for in situ leach ("ISL") uranium mining.

I write to oppose a GEIS. The reasons are many.

First, the process by which the NRC arrived at its conclusion to draft a GEIS is fundamentally flawed. There was no public input about whether a GEIS is needed or desirable. Given the site-specific nature of ISL operations, the usefulness of a GEIS is dubious at best.

This process gives the impression that drafting a GEIS that would expedite the ISL licensing process was a foregone conclusion.

Second, the scoping process itself has been deeply flawed. Only two public meetings have been scheduled on this matter - one in Casper, Wyoming and one in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Additionally, a special meeting with the National Mining Association was held in Washington, D.C.

None of these communities is the site of any proposed ISL mining operations. Communities that face proposed ISL mining such as Grants, Gallup, Crownpoint and Church Rock, New Mexico, were ignored. Additionally, the NRC has ignored entire states, such as Utah, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota, where ISL mining is proposed.

The NRC should, at a minimum, extend the comment period and schedule public meetings in communities that will be affected by ISL mining.

Third, if the NRC has concluded, as it appears to have already done, that a GEIS should be drafted, its scope should be very limited. ISL mining is inherently constrained by site specific considerations. To conclude that the hydrology, water quality, geology, socio-economics, and cultural resources in places as diverse as northwest New Mexico and south Texas - where ISL mining is ongoing and proposed - can be evaluated in a generic manner is absurd on its face. These issues can only be evaluated on a site specific basis with a site specific environmental impact statement.

Finally, relegating these important site specific issues to evaluation in an environmental assessment ("EA") is unacceptable. The public participation and environmental analysis requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act are much less stringent for EAs than for EISs.

Because the site specific issues are so central to assessing the environmental impact of proposed ISL operations, meaningful public participation and a rigorous environmental analysis are critical. Such issues should not be left for an EA. In fact, in the August 13, 2007 issue of the Gallup Independent, the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs Branch Chief Gregory Suber stated that "the potential for fewer public meetings is there" with the EA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this matter, and please keep me apprised of developments with regard to the GEIS.

Sincerely,

Charlene Grahn  
 460 Vath Street  
 Jackson, NJ 08527

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Adm = J. Park (JRP)  
 W. VonTeel (RWV)

SUNSI Review Complete  
 Template = ADM-013



**Mail Envelope Properties** (46D5F732.5DC : 23 : 38364)

**Subject:** Uranium Recovery GEIS  
**Creation Date** Wed, Aug 29, 2007 6:46 PM  
**From:** Charlene Grahm <[fishrpeople2@optonline.net](mailto:fishrpeople2@optonline.net)>

**Created By:** [fishrpeople2@optonline.net](mailto:fishrpeople2@optonline.net)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3037	Wednesday, August 29, 2007 6:46 PM
Mime.822	4253	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
Junk List is not enabled  
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
Block List is not enabled