List of Topics for Categorizing Public Comments on the EPA Proposed Actions at the Dewey-Burdock Uranium In-Situ Recovery Site

1. Stating general opposition to uranium mining, drilling and uranium waste disposal, especially in the Black Hills (without more specific information)
2. General concerns for impacts to Native Americans/the sacred Black Hills
3. Concerns about tribal trust responsibilities and tribal treaty rights
4. Concerns about respect to Native Americans (e.g. having a Lakota translator present at the hearings, even proposing the draft permits is an affront)
5. Concerns about EPA's tribal consultation process
6. Native American narratives (historic, present day, etc.)
7. Concerns about general environmental impacts
8. Concerns for contamination of surface water and the Cheyenne River
9. Concerns about impacts to aquifers & contamination of drinking water (including future need for water due to effects of climate change)
10. Other climate-change-related comments
11. Concerns about seismic activity related to injection activity
12. Concerns about hydrofracking
13. Concerns about historical exploration boreholes (including impacts of improper closure)
14. Concerns about the proposed aquifer exemption
15. Concerns specifically about uranium ISR
16. Against uranium mining in general
17. Against uranium mining because of problems with nuclear power generation and nuclear weapons
18. Concerns about the price of uranium, future demand for uranium and future viability of nuclear energy
19. Concerns about effects of past uranium mining
20. Concerns about Azarga (e.g. integrity of investors, integrity of company itself, solvency, experience in the ISR industry, etc.)
21. Issuance of these draft permits seems contrary to EPA's mission
22. Concerns about ability of EPA to monitor the activity or require clean-up because of uncertain future of EPA
23. Concerns about adequate monitoring (mistrust of Azarga/Powertech fulfilling monitoring requirements, the permit needs to contain additional monitoring requirements, etc.)
24. Comments about plans for injection of fluids received from outside the Dewey-Burdock Area
25. Comments on draft Environmental Justice Analysis document
26. Comments on draft Cumulative Effects Analysis document
27. Comments on draft NHPA document
28. Comments in support of the project
29. Comments on EPA hampering the project (e.g. EPA taking too long to issue draft permits or permit requirements are too stringent)
30. General questions about the EPA permitting and public review processes
31. List of questions asked: (divided into rhetorical questions & questions for EPA to answer in the response to comments)

32. Specific technical comments related to errors or suggested changes in the draft permits and fact sheets, separated into Class V and Class III.
33. EPA needs to conduct further investigation
34. General info about Edgemont
35. Concerns the project will not benefit Edgemont, the Counties, the States or USA
36. Comment topic unrelated to the UIC draft permits & aquifer exemption.
37. Any additional topics not included in the above list.