

## Stanton, Irene

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** Monday, February 08, 2010 12:39 PM  
**To:** Stanton, Irene  
**Subject:** Uranium mining H.B. 1161

Hi,

After reading everything in the paper for the last year, watching the news programs visiting Powertech sites in TX, and trying to stay informed, my opinion on allowing uranium mining is solidly on the no side. When a restored site is so clean, attractive and safe that people are clamoring to live there, I might change my stand. When has a large commercial/industrial project left the earth better than before they started operations? I cannot identify one instance where this is true. What could be a better cautionary heads up?

I understand the chemistry argument that asserts no damage will be, or even can be done by the process based on the molecular science. But people use a similar argument to tout use of vitamins over the consumption of fruits and vegetables for proper nutrition. Chemically they say there is no difference in absorption and make up of the supplements vs. the natural food product. Somehow I don't believe it. My basic instincts that natural is usually better kick in when learning about the leaching process too. How can an undisturbed aquifer be compared to an aquifer that has been utilized for mining and then "cleaned"? How will the water taste? What trace substances will be altered? What if the process fails? There are too many what ifs. We cannot return to the past after we have caused damage. Where is Powertech's prototype proving success and expertise in returning the earth to a pristine state?

Too many of us live in close proximity and depend on this environment to support our lives, to experiment when any possibility of failure exists.

Thanks for listening. Please make the laws and regulations as strict as possible, maybe even impossibly strict. There won't be any going back later.

Thanks,

Laurie Pessetto