

Official Transcript of Proceedings

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Public Meeting on Rulemaking and Guidance
Development for Uranium Recovery Industry

Docket Number: (not applicable)

Location: Rockville, Maryland

Date: Tuesday, April 10, 2001

Work Order No.: NRC-152

Pages 1-99

NEAL R. GROSS AND CO., INC.
Court Reporters and Transcribers
1323 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

(202) 234-4433

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING ON RULEMAKING AND GUIDANCE
DEVELOPMENT FOR URANIUM RECOVERY INDUSTRY

+ + + + +

TUESDAY,
APRIL 10, 2001

+ + + + +

ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

+ + + + +

The Commission met at the Nuclear
Regulatory Commission, in The Secretary's Commission
Meeting Room, White Flint One, 11555 Rockville Pike,
at 10:30 a.m., Richard A. Meserve, Chairman,
presiding.

PRESENT:

- | | |
|------------------------|--------------|
| RICHARD A. MESERVE | Chairman |
| NILS J. DIAZ | Commissioner |
| GRETTA DICUS | Commissioner |
| EDWARD McGAFFIGAN, JR. | Commissioner |

1 PRESENT: (cont'd)

2 JEFFREY S. MERRIFIELD Commissioner

3 ANNETTE L. VIETTI-COOK Secretary

4 KAREN D. CYR, ESQ. General Counsel

5

6 ALSO PRESENT:

7 JACK GERARD, President and CEO, National Mining
8 Association

9 ALLEN HOWE, Division of Industrial and Medical
10 Nuclear Safety, NMSS

11 MICHAEL LAYTON, Fuel Cycle Licensing Branch,
12 NMSS

13 FLETCHER NEWTON, President and CEO, Power
14 Resources, Inc.

15 CARL PAPERIELLO, Deputy EDO

16 KATIE SWEENEY, ESQ., Associate General Counsel,
17 National Mining Association

18 ANTHONY THOMPSON, ESQ., Shaw, Pittman, Potts &
19 Trowbridge

20 MARTIN VIRGILIO, Director, NMSS

21 MICHAEL WEBER, Director, Division of Fuel Cycle
22 Safety and Safeguards, NMSS

23

24

25

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

I N D E X

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

<u>AGENDA ITEM</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Opening Remarks	4
Presentations:	
National Mining Association	5
NRC Staff	63

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

(10:29 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Good morning.

Actually, it's reasonably cool in here today. I was going to make a -- repeat a crack from Commissioner Merrifield yesterday about how we put our witnesses in the hot seat. It turns out the air conditioning has failed in this building, but with the fans, and so forth, we're doing reasonably well. We had a hot session yesterday, and I mean in terms of the room temperature.

(Laughter.)

The Commission, over the past year, has reached a variety of decisions relating to the uranium and thorium recovery industry, and we had contemplated a rulemaking to establish a new Part 41 to cover issues relating to that industry.

We have received communications from our licensees, and, as you know, there is a SECY paper that has been presented to us that provides a variety of different options as to whether or not and how we might proceed with a rulemaking.

Our session today is to deal with that issue, in part. We also have continuing concerns about issues relating to dual regulation and the fact

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that there are -- these types of licensees confront
2 dual regulation both from the Environmental Protection
3 Agency in the NRC and also from the states in certain
4 areas.

5 And we have been concerned about ways in
6 which some of that is maybe legally required. We're
7 concerned about ways in which to minimize the impact
8 of dual regulation. There are issues relating to fees
9 that I know that are important to these licensees and
10 for good reason, and there are a variety of other
11 issues that are outgrowths of the quite active
12 Commission work in the policy areas.

13 So we very much look forward to the
14 sessions this morning to deal with that. Our first
15 panel consists of Mr. Tony Thompson from Shaw Pittman,
16 Ms. Katie Sweeney from NMA, Mr. Jack Gerard, who is
17 President and CEO of NMA, and Mr. Fletcher Newton. We
18 make you welcome. We much appreciate your being with
19 us today. Why don't we proceed.

20 MR. GERARD: Great. Well, thank you, Mr.
21 Chairman and members of the Commission. We appreciate
22 the opportunity to be here today.

23 As mentioned earlier, I'm Jack Gerard, the
24 new President and CEO of the National Mining
25 Association. I've been in this capacity for probably

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a sum total of about three months now. So, of course,
2 I'm a seasoned expert now on the uranium issue. We do
3 appreciate the opportunity to be here today, and we
4 appreciate the time that you've all taken to hear some
5 of our concerns and let us express some of our views.

6 I will be very brief today and try to turn
7 it over to some of the experts. But before beginning,
8 if I may, let me just introduce the group that's with
9 me. Obviously, Katie Sweeney, who is our Associate
10 General Counsel at the National Mining Association,
11 will give part of the presentation; Tony Thompson,
12 whom many of you I think know from other work here
13 with the Commission; and then, obviously, Fletcher
14 Newton, who is the President and CEO of Power
15 Resources, who will be part of that presentation.

16 And if we may, Mr. Chairman, we have some
17 other uranium recovery licensees in the group, about
18 a half a dozen. If we could quickly introduce them,
19 if that is all right, a quick introduction --

20 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Quick introduction. Go
21 ahead.

22 MR. GERARD: -- we'd appreciate it.

23 (Whereupon, the uranium recovery
24 licensees introduced themselves.)

25 MR. GERARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: You have about the
2 whole industry here.

3 MR. GERARD: That's right. We've got them
4 all here. The positive is there are a few of them, in
5 the sense for introductions. The down side is,
6 obviously, there's very few of them left in terms of
7 uranium production in this country.

8 Very briefly, just let me say again thank
9 you very much for hosting us today. As you know, at
10 least from my perspective, we have perhaps a unique
11 opportunity in this country now as we have the country
12 focus on energy issues and policy debates.

13 And as we move forward now to look at the
14 national energy policy from our perspective at the
15 National Mining Association, not only representing
16 major users in the terms of hard rock consumers,
17 copper, silver, gold, and others, but producers in the
18 sense of the coal producers in the country. And a key
19 part of our group, obviously, is the uranium
20 producers. And so we appreciate your willingness to
21 take some time today.

22 With that, why don't I turn it over to
23 Katie for part of our presentation.

24 MS. SWEENEY: Okay. As Chairman Meserve
25 just said, and we all know, the staff developed a SECY

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 paper presenting three alternatives, which include the
2 National Materials Program pilot, continuing with the
3 Part 41 rulemaking, or discontinuing the Part 41
4 rulemaking.

5 National Mining Association's Uranium
6 Committee met to discuss these options, and
7 essentially we have some serious concerns with option
8 one. We didn't dismiss it out of hand, especially
9 because we have in the past asked to be involved early
10 in scoping of regulations and guidance documents. But
11 we think in this case the scoping has already
12 happened.

13 There were scoping meetings on Part 41 in
14 Denver, Casper, Albuquerque, and Austin, I think.
15 States have submitted comments on the draft rulemaking
16 plan, and we've had with the Commission a pretty
17 thorough airing of NMA's white paper issues. So we
18 don't think we need to have another scoping process
19 here.

20 In addition, we have concerns about the
21 cost and the timing of the pilot program. Because it
22 is a new process, I don't think that anybody is sure
23 how much it will cost or how long it will take. And
24 then, what if it fails? Then, we would have to pay

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 for some other procedure to go ahead, be it rulemaking
2 or updating of guidance.

3 We also have concerns about whether the
4 people involved would have the expertise needed to
5 deal with these fairly complex legal and technical
6 issues, issues that I think it would be probably quite
7 difficult to get consensus on. People didn't
8 understand those issues well.

9 For option two, continuing with the Part
10 41 rulemaking, there are certainly some advantages to
11 continuing with the rulemaking, I think one of the
12 most important of which would be codification of the
13 performance-based license concept.

14 Also, rulemaking does provide additional
15 certainty over guidance, and I think that we -- that
16 the industry and NRC have learned a lot over the past
17 20-odd years dealing with the program, and we've
18 learned things that we could incorporate into a Part
19 41 rulemaking.

20 NMA itself, at the scoping meeting in
21 Denver, provided kind of a laundry list of issues that
22 could be addressed in the Part 41 rulemaking, from
23 changes in the definition of byproduct material to
24 small changes for some of the criterion to Appendix A.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Despite the advantages of continuing with
2 the Part 41 rulemaking, we can't support it at this
3 time. We looked at the SECY paper discussion of
4 resources where it's estimated that proceeding with
5 the rulemaking would cost about \$300,000 over a three-
6 year period. That's a lot of money and a lot of time,
7 and the industry just can't afford it at this
8 juncture.

9 Which brings us to option three, which is
10 to discontinue the Part 41 rulemaking. That's NMA's
11 preferred approach. We would like to go forward with
12 updating the guidance documents. This option, we
13 noted, would cost approximately \$100,000, but in the
14 SECY paper there was no discussion of the timeframe
15 involved. And I think we'd like to hear a little more
16 hopefully from the staff on what that might entail.

17 NMA is interested in providing information
18 that we think might be of some help in updating the
19 guidance documents. But before I get into that, I'd
20 like to note that we recently became aware of an NRC
21 document, a regulatory information summary, which was
22 RIS 2000-23. That document indicates that the
23 alternate feed guidance and the non-11(e)(2) guidance
24 have already been updated to some degree.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 We're not certain what the status of that
2 document is or those revisions, because none of us
3 officially received a copy of the document from NRC.
4 So to the extent that NRC intends to move forward with
5 that process, we'd like the opportunity to comment on
6 those papers and meet with staff to discuss our
7 concerns, because we did review that RIS paper and we
8 do not think that the revisions there reflect the
9 Commission's direction on the non-11(e)(2) and
10 alternate feed guidance.

11 With updating the guidance documents, NMA
12 will provide the NRC with information pertinent to
13 updating the non-11(e)(2) guidance, and hopefully
14 point NRC to some existing information that will help
15 address the listed hazardous waste concern relating to
16 the alternate feed guidance.

17 On the non-11(e)(2) guidance, NMA and the
18 Fuel Cycle Facility Forum met last month and decided
19 to develop generic criteria for acceptance of non-
20 11(e)(2) material for disposal and tailings piles.
21 Dave Culberson from the Fuel Cycle Facility Forum is
22 here today in the audience if you have any questions
23 about their participation in that effort.

24 We think it makes sense for these two
25 groups to get together to do this, because we have the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 technical information on the suitable -- the candidate
2 sites and the candidate materials. And we would try
3 to develop criteria that ensure no greater health and
4 safety concerns will be presented by the added
5 materials, and also the criteria will identify
6 potential jurisdictional hurdles that industry will
7 have to address.

8 On the alternate feed guidance, we know
9 that NRC has expressed concerns about listed hazardous
10 waste and feed stock and how to ensure that they are
11 not run through the mill. We know there's concerns
12 about dual jurisdiction with EPA, and we believe the
13 staff should review the protocol that the
14 International Uranium Corporation has developed in
15 conjunction with the State of Utah to address those
16 types of concerns.

17 And Dave Frydenlund of International
18 Uranium is actually here in the audience if you have
19 questions about that protocol.

20 And now I will turn it over to Tony to
21 deal with the dual regulation issues.

22 MR. THOMPSON: Yes. I'm going to talk
23 about -- just briefly about the non-agreement
24 state/NRC interface on the concurrent jurisdiction
25 issue, and then talk a little bit about the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 jurisdictional issues and dual regulation issues
2 related to ISL mining in particular.

3 There are some indications at least one
4 non-agreement state does not believe that the
5 Commission's decision on preemption with respect to
6 non-11(e)(2) byproduct material is effective at this
7 time. There are some indications that they believe
8 that it is intended that that will be addressed in a
9 Part 41 rulemaking proceeding.

10 NMA believes that our reading of the
11 decision by the Commission was that the Commission
12 changed -- issued a legal interpretation of the Atomic
13 Energy Act, as amended by the Mill Tailings Act, and
14 that that is, in effect, in effect now. And so it
15 might be useful to clarify the status with relevant
16 non-agreement states, such as New Mexico, Wyoming.

17 Now, turning to the dual regulation and
18 the overlapping regulation in the in situ leach area,
19 we understand, and we know the Commission understands,
20 that there is some overlapping regulation as a result
21 of the EPA UIC program. Indeed, before any kind of
22 ISL mining can proceed, the proposed -- the applicant
23 has to have both a UIC permit and an aquifer
24 exemption, from EPA or from the appropriate delegated
25 state.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 The aquifer exemption essentially says
2 that a part of an aquifer -- and it's a very clearly
3 defined part of an aquifer -- can be used for mining
4 purposes because it contains recoverable minerals.
5 You can't drink the water in that portion of the
6 aquifer prior to mining because of the radionuclide
7 content. You can have radionuclide radon levels of
8 hundreds of millions -- or millions of picocuries per
9 liter.

10 And you can't drink it after restoration
11 is complete either because you still have high levels
12 of radium, perhaps uranium, and certainly radon, in
13 those restored aquifer areas. So you have to -- there
14 is no way to avoid the UIC permitting and aquifer
15 exemption process. And, certainly, NMA is not
16 suggesting that it should.

17 Recognizing, then, that we do have some
18 EPA controls on these kinds of issues, EPA doesn't
19 require restoration. But if your activities in an
20 exempted aquifer are going to have an adverse impact
21 on some non-exempted portion of the aquifer, then EPA
22 can require you to come in and clean it up.

23 The second sort of overlapping area is, of
24 course, with NRC and the states. Some of the states
25 have very extensive ISL regulatory programs. In fact,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 they are much -- delegated states, for example, have
2 UIC authority from EPA, have regulatory programs that
3 are specifically designed to address ISL operations.
4

5 They go beyond just the delegated UIC
6 authority of EPA, and, indeed, Wyoming and Nebraska
7 are two such states. And those state regulations do
8 require restoration of wellfields.

9 The Commission has suggested that the
10 staff look at either MOUs or reliance on the state ISL
11 program. This was discussed back at Riverton about
12 five or six years ago, and the -- '97, I guess, okay
13 -- and the staff was at that time looking at
14 developing a chapter in NRC inspection manual to see
15 if they could look at a particular state and look at
16 what the state did to assess the regulatory issues for
17 ISL mining. If the state covered all the issues NRC
18 had to cover, then NRC could rely on the state. If
19 there were deficiencies, they would take a look at it.
20 That somehow went by the boards.

21 It's sort of like a standard review plan-
22 like type of review that we're suggesting here. And
23 indeed, and in fact, if you actually look at the draft
24 standard review plan for ISL, NRC's draft, you'll --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 it virtually mirrors the Wyoming regulatory process
2 for ISL operations.

3 So it would seem to us that there is no
4 reason why, as in other areas, for example, historic
5 preservation, issues like that where NRC lets other
6 agencies sort of, in effect, do the work that they are
7 closest to, have the most expertise in, NRC will then
8 make sure its own requirements are satisfied, but will
9 rely on the findings of the other agency, whether it's
10 a federal agency -- and there's no reason why they
11 can't rely on a state agency, in our view here.

12 The jurisdictional issues associated with
13 ISL wellfields -- it is well-known I'm sure to the
14 Commission at this point that in the view of NMA the
15 whole set of complex legal and technical issues began
16 when NRC asserted jurisdiction over the wellfields and
17 ignoring, in effect, certain definitional things, such
18 as licensable source material.

19 It has to be over .05 percent source
20 material, or there shall be no licenses -- a mandatory
21 provision, in our view, and in the view of the NRC
22 General Counsel back in 1964, I guess.

23 Now, by changing the division between
24 calling process wastes from ISL 11(e)(2) and now
25 saying that all waste from ISL are 11(e)(2) has

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 created additional regulatory problems and is going to
2 cause all kinds of difficult legal gyrations.

3 It immediately puts licensees with NPDS
4 permits in violation of those permits and in violation
5 of the NPDS regulations, which do allow the discharge
6 of restoration fluids if you meet the NPDS limits down
7 the stream but which do not allow the discharge of
8 process waste waters even if you meet the NPDS limits
9 down the stream.

10 So by declaring restoration fluids and
11 restoration waste as byproduct material, you have now,
12 in effect, ex post facto if you will, you may have
13 created liability for stuff that's gone down the creek
14 that was under an NPDS permit and now it's 11(e)(2)
15 byproduct material. And, indeed, at least one or two
16 licensees have received letters from the staff
17 suggesting that they have to go and evaluate whether
18 they have to go down the creek and clean all of this
19 up, because it's now, ex post facto, 11(e)(2)
20 byproduct material.

21 The distinction between restoration fluids
22 and process fluids is not an artificial one, as sort
23 of is suggested in some of the SECY papers, because it
24 has existed in the NPDS rule since the middle 1980s.
25 One of the suggestions that the restoration fluids --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 although you are not -- when you are restoring, you
2 are not producing uranium primarily for the source
3 material content. You are pumping water to restore
4 the ore body.

5 Now what you have when you've declared all
6 of this as byproduct material, you're saying it's an
7 integrated hole -- the restoration and the ISL. That
8 was exactly the same circumstance as in 1978 before
9 the definition of byproduct material came into being.

10 A mill tailings pile is part of an
11 integrated hole with a mill, yet back in 1978 NRC
12 said, "We don't have authority to regulate the
13 tailings because it doesn't contain licensable levels
14 of source material." And that's where the definition
15 of byproduct material came from.

16 So by declaring restoration fluids and
17 wastes as byproduct material, it seems to us you're
18 violating the definition of byproduct material, which
19 is producing primarily for the source material
20 content. You are, in effect, creating -- you are, in
21 effect, saying that the under -- the mine working
22 which are in the regulations, defined not to be
23 11(e)(2) byproduct material, are effectively byproduct
24 material until restoration is completed.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So you are restoring something that isn't
2 11(e)(2) byproduct material, and the waste therefrom
3 you're now saying is 11(e)(2). It's just gotten so
4 that we -- I don't think we know which way we're
5 coming and which way we're going. The depleted ore
6 body is one of those problems.

7 So our suggestion for moving forward on
8 this restoration issue is to go back to the
9 distinction between restoration fluids being not
10 11(e)(2) byproduct material, and presuming that NRC is
11 going to continue to operate in the wellfields,
12 treating the waste from processing as byproduct
13 material.

14 MS. SWEENEY: Fletcher, that brings us to
15 you.

16 MR. FLETCHER: Mr. Chairman, I want to
17 thank you and the other members of the Commission for
18 having this meeting today. I know that you, and
19 particularly your staffs, have put a lot of time into
20 this, and we appreciate the effort.

21 I apologize for being a little late this
22 morning. I think I hit every single traffic light and
23 every single traffic jam between here and the center
24 of town.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 As we discussed earlier, I'm the President
2 of Power Resources. I'm also the President of Crowe-
3 Butte Resources. And between these two companies we
4 are the largest producers of uranium in the United
5 States. We produce more uranium together than anyone
6 else. Crowe-Butte operates an in situ leach facility
7 in Nebraska. Power Resources operates an in situ
8 leach facility in Wyoming.

9 And what I wanted to do briefly is just
10 give you a quick summary of where the industry stands
11 right now domestically and how the fee structure as it
12 currently is affects us, what impact that has on us,
13 and then hopefully provide some solutions from a
14 policy standpoint that can give us something to work
15 towards going forward.

16 We use technology solution mining to
17 extract uranium from ore bodies, and this is, I think
18 without question, the most environmentally friendly,
19 the safest, and the most efficient means of extracting
20 uranium. We simply use water that occurs naturally
21 together with the ore, and we pump that water through
22 a system that extracts the uranium.

23 So as Tony pointed out, the water that
24 exists in the sandstone where the ore occurs naturally
25 has elevated levels of radionuclides, which makes the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 water unusable for drinking which is why we were able
2 to get an aquifer exemption from the EPA in the first
3 place. This is the natural state of things.

4 As we process the water, we naturally
5 change the level of certain constituents in the water,
6 and because of that, both in Wyoming and Nebraska,
7 both states have extremely rigorous standards that we
8 need to follow in order to comply with their standards
9 and their definitions of restoration.

10 The current state I think, if you will see
11 the next slide, I want to talk a little bit about the
12 state of the industry, both with regards to the price
13 of U_3O_8 right now as well as the production. The
14 price of uranium, natural uranium, U_3O_8 , is lower
15 today than it has ever been. In real dollars, it's at
16 an absolute historical low. It was a little lower a
17 few months ago. The spot market price has come back.
18 But the current spot market price is \$8.20, \$8.25.
19 The long-term spot market price -- or the long-term
20 price is quoted currently at \$9.75.

21 At the same time, production of uranium in
22 the United States has also dropped to its lowest point
23 ever. Last year's production was about 3.7 million
24 pounds. Of that, we produced about 1.7 million pounds

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 between our two operations -- 800,000 pounds in
2 Nebraska and 900,000 pounds in Wyoming.

3 As I said, the solution mining industry is
4 extremely efficient. And we are trying to be more
5 efficient every day. Unfortunately, the regulatory
6 structure of fees is imposing a burden on us, a cost
7 burden, that we're finding to be simply one that we
8 can't continue to bear.

9 I think if you'll see the next
10 slide you'll note that, as I said, the price is
11 currently around \$8 a pound. Our fear is that, given
12 the current fee structure, this is becoming a burden
13 for us that will simply make the continued operation
14 of our mines not possible.

15 The graph that you see as the next slide
16 is just a quick summary of how prices have declined
17 since 1996. At that time, they jumped up to a little
18 bit over \$16 a pound, and they've consistently
19 declined, as I said, to the level now which is around
20 \$8.20.

21 The next chart is simply a numerical
22 summary of what production has been in the United
23 States since 1966. And as I said, last year's
24 production was 3.7 -- almost 3.8 million pounds. The
25 following chart is simply a breakdown of that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 production by quarter. And, again, you can see how
2 that has decreased.

3 I should emphasize that ISL mining in the
4 United States accounts for the vast majority of
5 uranium production. There is still a small amount of
6 production that comes from operations that are in
7 restoration in Wyoming and New Mexico as well.

8 Now, we certainly understand -- and you
9 can see in the next chart -- we certainly understand
10 that the NRC is mandated to recover its fees. And we
11 understand that the Commission is proposing a revised
12 fee schedule. We've all read that, and we certainly
13 appreciate the efforts that the Commission has made to
14 reduce the annual fees next year.

15 Unfortunately, the hourly fees -- and
16 these are the fees that are charged to us for the
17 project managers as well as for the hourly fees that
18 we incur for specific work directed at specific
19 activities at our sites -- that fee is proposed to go
20 up. And it's that fee that is really perhaps the
21 biggest problem for us, particularly the project
22 manager fees, because this is something over which we
23 have absolutely no control.

24 We can't anticipate that. We have no idea
25 what goes into that. And although the work that's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 been done is certainly I think done in good conscious,
2 it's something that when we have to pay \$140 or \$144
3 an hour, it becomes a prohibitive expense for us.

4 Just so you understand what these fees
5 represent, I wanted to give you a quick analysis of
6 how they affect operations. For example, for an
7 operating ISL facility -- and the figures that are
8 quoted here apply to the Smith Ranch facility, which
9 is operated by Rio Algom Mining in Wyoming. Our costs
10 and the impact of these fees on us would be similar.

11 Rio Algom, as I said, is the largest
12 single operating facility currently in the United
13 States, but you can see that the fees represent a
14 significant portion of the total payroll. They
15 represent a significant portion of the actual
16 administrative costs for the site. They represent, in
17 the case of Rio Algom, 25 cents per pound of their
18 total costs. For us at Crowe-Butte and at Highland,
19 that cost is higher, close to 50 cents per pound.

20 And you can see that it represents -- and
21 this is I think maybe the most important point of all
22 -- 7.8 -- almost eight full-time workers at that site.
23 At a time when we've been forced to lay people off, I
24 had to lay off last year 10 people. We closed our
25 office in Casper. Again, the fees are imposing a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 burden on us, which is becoming simply cost
2 prohibitive.

3 For a tailings site, in reclamation, you
4 can see that, again, the fees represent a significant
5 portion of their operating costs. And with the next
6 slide you can see that for a mill -- we've got them
7 reversed, actually, or I've got mine reversed, but the
8 point here is that the fees represent a significant
9 portion of the operating costs, both for a tailings
10 site as well as for a mill.

11 If we go to the next slide, and I think
12 you've probably all seen this chart, I sent this to
13 you in a letter several months ago. And the following
14 two slides are, again, a summary simply comparing
15 price to the number of employees, the pounds produced,
16 and how these have affected us.

17 The last slide here, which is one more I
18 think after this, this particular slide is a bar
19 chart. I think this gives perhaps the most graphic
20 example of how fees have exploded. These are the fees
21 for our operation in Nebraska at Crowe-Butte, and you
22 can see that the hourly fees and the project manager
23 fees have gotten out of control.

24 You will recall last August I was here,
25 and I met with Commissioner Diaz, Commissioner

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Meserve, Commission McGaffigan. We talked about an
2 issue we had facing us with regards to restoration of
3 our mine unit number one at that time.

4 We are, unfortunately, still trying to get
5 resolution of this issue. This is after several
6 months and over \$100,000 in project manager fees that
7 we've been charged for this.

8 Now, I want to emphasize that this is not
9 the fault of the project managers. It's not the fault
10 of the staff. It's not the fault of individuals at
11 the NRC. In fact, the project managers we have at
12 Crowe-Butte and Highland, these are extremely
13 dedicated, hardworking, capable people who do, I
14 think, an excellent job of working with us.

15 The problem lies with the regulatory
16 environment in which the fees are being assessed, and
17 that's I think what we have to address.

18 We certainly appreciate the effort that
19 the Commission, as I said, has put into preparing for
20 this meeting. We simply want to indicate that the
21 uranium recovery industry in the United States is, I
22 think without question, an extremely important
23 industry. Obviously, it's under market pressure.
24 These things happen in free markets. We're not
25 concerned with that as much as we're concerned with

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the current fee structure that we face, which, as I
2 said, puts us in a position of bearing a cost which we
3 are now finding to be simply not bearable.

4 Thank you again for your time and for the
5 chance to talk to you today.

6 MS. SWEENEY: Oscar, if you'd go to the
7 last slide, I'll just cover that real quickly. It's
8 just on -- moving forward on fees.

9 We think it's in the nation's best
10 interest to have a strong domestic uranium recovery
11 industry, but to achieve this we think something has
12 got to give. That's why we're going to pursue any
13 solutions that we think might be feasible. So we will
14 be going to the Hill and coming to the Commission.
15 We'll be going to the Hill to look for legislative
16 solutions. We'll be coming to the Commission with a
17 petition for rulemaking, for an exemption from fees,
18 something akin to what the non-profits have.

19 We'd be more than willing to sit down and
20 discuss the best ways to go about that or what should
21 be included in those packages with any appropriate
22 staff -- Karen Cyr perhaps or the CFO at NRC. We'd be
23 more than willing to sit down with them and discuss
24 how to move ahead on these.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 We are not asking for a permanent
2 exclusion from fees. This would be a temporary
3 measure until the price of uranium went up to a level
4 where the industry can function again.

5 Of course, the outcome of the legislative
6 or the rulemaking would be uncertain. So there are a
7 couple of things that we think that NRC should be
8 looking at now to help. And I think, as Fletcher
9 indicated, one would be the project manager time and
10 how their time is coded.

11 We know there have been some discussions
12 about changing project manager designation to point of
13 contact in some instances, and that might keep some of
14 those costs down. Also, any place that we could
15 eliminate unnecessary duplicative oversight to the
16 minimum necessary would also reduce fees.

17 And, again, we thank you for your time
18 today.

19 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: I'd like to thank you
20 for a very interesting and helpful presentation.
21 We'll go through our full cycle, but I think it's
22 Commissioner Diaz's turn to go first.

23 COMMISSIONER DIAZ: Oh, it is? Well,
24 thank you, Mr. Chairman. It must be something to do
25 with the temperature of the room.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 (Laughter.)

2 I'm really pleased that the Commission is
3 holding this meeting today. I believe it is an
4 important meeting and brings out facts that are
5 important to our nation. I think we have been making
6 a lot of decisions, many of them very complex, and
7 half of them I don't understand myself, which is good
8 because normally it's three-quarters of the time.

9 (Laughter.)

10 But we really needed to pause at one time
11 and take another look at what has been going on and
12 what have people learned, and what have we learned on
13 this process. And I really thank you for the
14 opportunity to listen to your views, and I assure you
15 that I personally think this is an important issue to
16 our country, that deserves our best attention, and I
17 personally -- I'm sure my colleagues, too -- intend to
18 do that.

19 Having said that, and turning to the
20 issues that have been presented in the SECY, I tried
21 to understand and I will ask a question. It seems
22 like the changes to Part 40 are not bad. The issue is
23 an issue of, can you afford it or not? Do you want to
24 elaborate on that? Will Part 40 -- let's assume that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 somebody has a magic wand. Maybe the Chairman has a
2 magic wand.

3 (Laughter.)

4 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: I've been hiding it.

5 (Laughter.)

6 COMMISSIONER DIAZ: Yes. You know, I'm
7 good at shifting responsibility to somebody else.

8 (Laughter.)

9 And fees could be, you know, ignored.
10 Will Part 40 do what needs to be done, the revision to
11 Part 40?

12 MS. SWEENEY: I think the industry would
13 support going forward if fees were magically taken
14 away and it wasn't going to cost the industry --

15 COMMISSIONER DIAZ: For a short period of
16 time.

17 MS. SWEENEY: For a short period of time,
18 yes.

19 COMMISSIONER DIAZ: Right. Okay. I think
20 that's the only question that I have. Fundamentally,
21 it's what I needed to know. Thank you so very much.

22 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

23 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Thank you.

24 Commissioner McGaffigan?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 COMMISSIONER MCGAFFIGAN: Thank you, Mr.
2 Chairman.

3 I want to commend folks for the
4 presentation they made. I agree with Commissioner
5 Diaz that this is an area where something needs to be
6 done, and, you know, clearly the end of the Cold War,
7 the vast amounts of highly-enriched uranium that have
8 become available, both in the United States and
9 Russia, are a large part of why the industry -- why
10 the price of U₃O₈ -- the spot price is \$8 a pound.

11 And I've noticed that the Congress has
12 passed a lot of report language urging that we -- that
13 the executive branch think about this issue. I think
14 that a legislative solution could well make some
15 sense. I mean, I support a legislative solution,
16 basically, that would get your fees off the fee base
17 for a period of time until the price of uranium was at
18 a lower level.

19 What is the level, Katie? I mean, if they
20 are writing legislation here, in mark-up what is the
21 price I put in where -- and what is the period of
22 time? If the price of uranium -- is it spot, or is it
23 the long-term price, and is it above what number?

24 MS. SWEENEY: I think that we would
25 probably need to get together and discuss that. But

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I think we were preliminarily discussing spot, and it
2 would have to be at a certain price for at least a
3 year.

4 COMMISSIONER MCGAFFIGAN: Okay. Well, I
5 think you need -- we -- in some sense, we will be
6 asked by Congress whether we agree with your
7 legislative solution. But I think that's -- you all
8 have to write it first.

9 MS. SWEENEY: Which is why we want to
10 discuss it --

11 COMMISSIONER MCGAFFIGAN: Okay.

12 MS. SWEENEY: -- with the appropriate
13 people here also.

14 COMMISSIONER MCGAFFIGAN: Well, you need
15 to discuss it on the Hill, because they're the ones
16 that are --

17 MS. SWEENEY: Yes.

18 COMMISSIONER MCGAFFIGAN: The amount of
19 money is relatively modest. The total amount that
20 would then go to the general fund is a relatively
21 modest amount of money, as I understand it. And we
22 can ask the staff later what that amount would be.

23 But the second option you mention is a
24 rulemaking akin to the non-profits as a -- in case the
25 legislation fails. In the case of the non-profits,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 there's a similar theory that the non-profit
2 educational institutions provide the framework, the
3 human capital for the industry as a whole, and,
4 therefore, they deserve to be off the fee base. You
5 provide the material capital for the industry as a
6 whole, and I'm sure that's the theory you're going to
7 be forwarding.

8 The trouble for you, given the
9 presentation by Mr. Newton, is that the non-profits
10 have an exemption from annual fees under that rubric,
11 but I don't believe they have an exemption from hourly
12 fees. And so I don't know what the legal -- whether
13 -- I'm not a lawyer. I defer to Katie and Karen and
14 Joe and other lawyers in the room as to whether you
15 could come up with a theory for the hourly payments.

16 But I -- I think that might be more
17 difficult. So I think the legislative solution may be
18 the more attractive solution because it can be a more
19 comprehensive one. And I'd suggest working with our
20 staff and the Hill staff to try to deal with that.

21 The PM fees -- in all honesty, when we did
22 that a couple of years ago, I will admit, as
23 Commissioner Diaz has admitted, to not total
24 knowledge. I will admit that the model I had in my
25 head was the PM for, say, Dominion Power who covers

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 North Anna and Surry, you know, four plants that
2 probably make multi-hundreds of millions each per
3 year, and not the notion -- we have a single PM, I
4 believe, that covers them now. And not the notion of
5 having a PM who might be costing \$100,000 a year for
6 a concern where it's a very small entity.

7 I think we may need to consider that. I
8 mean, we have a current rule out. You all presumably
9 are going to comment on the current rule, consistent
10 with some of what you've said previously. But I
11 personally think that we need to consider whether the
12 decision we made on PM fees, whereas the model I --
13 I'll admit I had in my head were big licensee, big
14 fuel cycle facilities, big reactor facilities. I did
15 not see the unintended consequence on you all, so I --
16 that's something that I will think about as we go
17 forward.

18 And with regard to the issues, I think
19 you've made your point. I personally am willing to
20 reconsider the decision that we made on water, on
21 waste water. I think that it's something that we do
22 need to find a way to reconsider as we go forward.

23 I don't really -- I understand the points
24 you're making. I'll have some questions for the staff
25 later as to why those points aren't sound. But I --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 again, there's unintended consequences to a decision,
2 and I just telegraph that I'm -- I'm heavily
3 influenced by what you've said thus far.

4 That's all, Mr. Chairman.

5 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Commissioner
6 Merrifield?

7 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: Thank you, Mr.
8 Chairman.

9 I would agree with my two fellow
10 Commissioners. I think this is a good opportunity for
11 us to sit down and have a dialogue about the issues
12 that we have between us. I have to admit, I think in
13 the two and a half years I've been here on the
14 Commission some of the issues associated with the
15 mining industry have not gotten the sort of airing and
16 opportunity for this kind of presentation before.

17 In a discussion I had with Mr. Gerard, we
18 both agreed something like this would be helpful, and
19 I'm glad the Commission has agreed to have this
20 meeting.

21 I guess there's a variety of different
22 issues we've discussed today. Commissioner McGaffigan
23 just talked about the issue of restoration associated
24 with in situ leach operations and how we go about
25 regulating that. Again, coming -- I think I came to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 it originally when I cast my vote from a couple of
2 perspectives. One is an eastern perspective on the
3 issues of water, and the second one is as a result of
4 the dialogue that I had had with EPA on RCRA and
5 Superfund issues that I dealt with when I worked up on
6 Capitol Hill.

7 It was unique for me to hear, and only
8 after I cast my vote did I hear of the notion that EPA
9 was willing to give exemptions for these aquifers.
10 That is typically not an issue that we find when we
11 interact with EPA at many other sites. And so I think
12 that issue in and of itself highly colors where we may
13 need to rethink where we went on that particular
14 issue.

15 COMMISSIONER MCGAFFIGAN: It doesn't
16 happen in Arlington or Rockville.

17 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: It does not
18 happen in Arlington or Rockville. That is exactly
19 right.

20 (Laughter.)

21 So that -- I think that is an important
22 one.

23 On the issue of PM costs, I wasn't here
24 when that original decision was made. I have spoken

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 with other members of the Commission. I think that's
2 something that is of great concern.

3 We have to be mindful of a variety of
4 burdens that we have. And to the extent that we are
5 passing off such a large cost on a small licensee, I
6 think it's something we need to be mindful of. So,
7 again, I think that's something which is worth
8 reassessment and reevaluation over.

9 I'm disturbed -- you know, I think we are
10 caught here in a regulatory Catch 22. And
11 Commissioner Diaz has alluded to it. We have a
12 situation in which there is general agreement I think
13 among our staff, in some of the comments we have heard
14 today, about the benefits that we could receive from
15 going forward with the Part 41 rulemaking, not only in
16 terms of being more risk-informed about the
17 regulations we do, but the possibility of reducing
18 unnecessary regulatory burden, which is obviously one
19 of the things that we, as a Commission, have been very
20 interested in following.

21 Yet, at the same time, to the extent we
22 try to achieve some of those benefits, both from
23 greater health and safety and environmental benefits,
24 yet reducing the burden, we can't do that because the
25 costs are too large for the licensees who are

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 associated with it. So you can't get the benefit
2 because you can't pay for it, and I think that's not
3 a good outcome in a regulatory atmosphere.

4 And like Commissioner McGaffigan, I would
5 support legislative options up in Congress that would
6 provide us some relief to provide you some relief in
7 that respect.

8 I guess there is one area I do have a
9 question about. We talked a little bit -- Mr.
10 Thompson talked about the issue of concurrent
11 jurisdiction relative to the states, dual regulations,
12 as it results in our interactions with EPA. I
13 understand better now how some of that overlap can
14 occur.

15 At the same time, I'm also mindful of the
16 fact that Congress clearly does not want us to simply
17 turn tail and walk away from our regulatory
18 requirements. I mean, we have an expectation up in
19 Congress that we do the right thing.

20 What that may require, as you've
21 suggested, is perhaps an MOU, with either EPA or other
22 state agencies, to make sure that to the extent -- if
23 we were to decide to step back somewhat, that the
24 field would be covered. And I don't think we can

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 merely do that without making sure that we're
2 fulfilling our legislative responsibilities under law.

3 With that, too, however, also comes a
4 cost. The cost of MOU is not small. We've been
5 undergoing efforts to try to draft an MOU with EPA on
6 other cleanup issues. That has taken extraordinary
7 amounts of time and resources of our agency, and we
8 have as of yet -- as of yet have not been able to
9 fulfill that desire to meet that.

10 I hope you're cognizant that there's a
11 cost associated with that and understand some of the
12 burdens that we have. I don't know if you want to
13 comment on either of those issues.

14 MR. THOMPSON: I would say that we do
15 understand that. I think that the -- frankly, my
16 personal opinion -- and others may disagree -- that
17 the approach that makes the most sense is what the
18 staff was looking at back at -- in 1997 at Riverton,
19 which is -- is to look at you've got a draft standard
20 review plan that pretty much mirrors the Wyoming
21 approach.

22 Now, if you look at what Wyoming does, or
23 Nebraska -- just pick one -- and if you are
24 comfortable with the way they go about it, you can
25 rely on what they find to an extent and fulfill your

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 responsibilities by relying on what they provide you,
2 the information they provide you, and that the
3 licensee has provided to them. And where you find it
4 deficient, then you can step in and go forward with
5 the licensee to work out additional information.

6 That seems to me to make the most sense.
7 That was what the staff was sort of working towards,
8 and you almost have it in being with this draft
9 standard review plan. You ought to be able to take
10 that, size it up with Wyoming or Nebraska, and see
11 where you think the rough edges are, and then work out
12 some sort of an agreement with them. I don't think it
13 would have to be anything too formalized that NRC --
14 to the extent it -- it will review what the state
15 provides, say, when restoration is completed and the
16 wells are tapped and all this sort of thing.

17 And unless you have serious questions
18 about it, you're prepared to accept what your fellow
19 state regulators, you know, provide to you. That
20 makes sense to me as an approach that might be
21 workable without -- and the EPA thing, I don't really
22 think we have as much of a -- I mean, we recognize
23 that you have to have an aquifer exemption and a UIC
24 permit.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 For example, if you apply for an NRC
2 license to be an ISL mining operating, if you get your
3 NRC license before you get those permits you can't
4 start operating until you get them. I mean, they're
5 a prerequisite to ISL mining. And we don't quarrel
6 with that. We understand that. In fact, the aquifer
7 exemption is what allows us to do that.

8 So we don't have a problem with that. So
9 I don't think there's as much overlapping
10 jurisdiction, frankly, between EPA and NRC on the UIC
11 side of things. It's maybe more of a theoretical
12 overlap. You have to have those things in place.

13 So I don't think that's our big problem.
14 I think it's more with the states.

15 Fletcher, you maybe disagree with that I
16 guess.

17 MR. FLETCHER: No. No, I would agree with
18 that. As Tony pointed out, the EPA -- for purposes of
19 our operations, the EPA is involved from the very
20 beginning. And they grant us an aquifer exemption on
21 the basis that, first of all, the water in that
22 aquifer cannot be used as drinking water, and has
23 never been used for drinking water ever. Number one.

24 Number two, that the aquifer contains a
25 mineral that we can extract and essentially make money

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 extracting it. And based on those two criteria, they
2 then give us an exemption in perpetuity.

3 Now, in both Wyoming and Nebraska, the
4 local state authorities were concerned, nonetheless,
5 that they wanted to make sure once we completed our
6 mining operations we did not create a problem down the
7 road. And so both of those states have developed, as
8 I said, a well-defined, rigorous set of laws that
9 control the issue of restoration.

10 And the reason we're so frustrated in
11 Nebraska, where we've submitted to the NRC our
12 proposal for your consent that we've completed
13 restoration in our first mine unit there, is that the
14 State of Nebraska, which developed these rigorous
15 standards many years ago, they have already signed off
16 on that. They've agreed two years ago that we have
17 completed restoration.

18 And we're answering the same questions and
19 dealing with many of the same issues, as well as many
20 new issues, at the NRC level. Now, again, I want to
21 emphasize it's not -- you know, I'm not finding fault
22 here with the project managers. I mean, the people
23 doing this work I think are well-intended. They are
24 trying to make sure that the NRC fulfills its mandate.
25 These are conscientious, hardworking people.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 The problem is that, given the regulatory
2 environment in which we work now, we are paying a
3 tremendous amount of money and spending a tremendous
4 amount of time and precious resources that we can't
5 afford to spend. We're spending it answering issues
6 and dealing with questions that have been dealt with
7 years and years ago.

8 MR. THOMPSON: And one of the issues that
9 was raised is, what happens if the restoration
10 doesn't, in effect, hold over time? And as I pointed
11 out before, the EPA UIC rules don't require
12 restoration. But if you're going to impact a non-
13 exempted aquifer, then you have to fix it. So if it
14 didn't hold, you'd have to come back and fix it, I
15 presume. I'm pretty sure the state, as a delegated
16 authority, would require you to do that.

17 MR. FLETCHER: This is exactly something
18 that the states are concerned with. And this is one
19 of the reasons why the states have imposed extremely
20 rigorous standards on us. They want to know what's
21 going to happen in 50 years, 100 years, how fast is
22 water in the aquifer moving, where is it going, and
23 what's going to happen over time as that water moves.

24 And we've demonstrated to both the State
25 of Nebraska as well as now in Wyoming -- in Wyoming

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we've used, actually, a computer model that tells us
2 very clearly and very specifically what happens to
3 that water as it moves through the ground over the
4 next 100, 1,000, 10,000 years.

5 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: Well, you've
6 raised some interesting issues for us to think about
7 some more, and I appreciate it.

8 For my part, I did have -- during my time
9 on the Hill, I did have a variety of interactions with
10 NMA and did have an opportunity to visit a number of
11 the facilities of your members. I have not yet done
12 so as a Commissioner at any of these facilities, but
13 I intend to do so this summer. I will be visiting
14 some of the mines out west and look forward to it.

15 MR. THOMPSON: We would be delighted to
16 host you as well as all of the other Commissioners.
17 Any time.

18 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: Thank you, Mr.
19 Chairman.

20 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Thank you.

21 COMMISSIONER MCGAFFIGAN: Mr. Chairman,
22 could I just get a brief -- Mr. Thompson, do I
23 interpret your answer to say that we don't need MOUs?
24 So the cost of negotiating them wouldn't be there?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. THOMPSON: I'm not sure that you need
2 an MOU. I think that -- yes, I mean --

3 COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: I just wanted to
4 clarify that.

5 MR. THOMPSON: I think the states have
6 indicated that -- for example, Wyoming said, "Look,
7 you know, we're willing to work in a cooperative
8 manner. We're going to do this anyway, so we'll
9 submit it to you. And if it satisfies you, then you
10 can sign off."

11 COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: Okay. I just
12 wanted to clarify that.

13 MR. THOMPSON: Yes.

14 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Thank you.

15 Let me say, like my fellow Commissioners,
16 I am fully cognizant and agree with the importance of
17 this industry, and recognize the difficult economic
18 situation in which the industry finds itself and the
19 problems that our fee rule -- fee obligations do
20 present.

21 It does seem to me that the -- from our
22 perspective, the easiest solution is one that's a
23 legislative one, that finding a way through the
24 thicket of our -- what we're required to do
25 statutorily, to try to find a way -- that relief may

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 be difficult, although I'm open to exploring whether
2 there are some ways we can handle this.

3 I think that there are complexities there
4 that may make that extraordinarily difficult to do,
5 but we're -- we have definitely -- I think all of us
6 have received the message that you've sent us about
7 the problems on the fee rule and the fees, and we're
8 all -- I'm sure all committed to try to find a way to
9 try to deal with that problem.

10 I have just a few minor questions on more
11 ancillary points. In one of your slides you had
12 indicated that NMA and the Fuel Cycle Forum are
13 working on generic guidance for disposal of non-
14 11(e)(2) material and tailings piles. And I am
15 curious as to whether the DOE -- there's been
16 interactions with DOE on that issue.

17 I know that one of the concerns has been
18 that DOE, of course, has to be the ultimate custodian
19 of the site or state if they were to choose to do so.
20 Probably it's going to be DOE for the tailing sites,
21 and so they have got to be comfortable with the
22 situation at the end of restoration.

23 I'm curious as to whether there has been
24 any engagement by you with DOE on that issue.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. SWEENEY: We have talked to some DOE
2 personnel about this issue in the past. We haven't
3 talked to them again since we have decided we wanted
4 to move forward with this, with the Fuel Cycle
5 Facility Forum, but we definitely intend to be talking
6 to them about the jurisdictional issues and the hoops
7 that industry might have to jump through to pursue
8 going forward with putting non-11(e)(2) materials in
9 tailings piles. We know that's a big issue.

10 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: So this process -- you
11 don't have indication where DOE is on that issue?

12 MS. SWEENEY: I think we have gotten some
13 conflicting messages from DOE.

14 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Okay.

15 MS. SWEENEY: Depending on where they're
16 located.

17 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Mr. Thompson, I want to
18 raise one question that you raised in your slides.
19 You had made the point that our decisions with regard
20 to the liquids resulting from ISL activities created
21 a problem with violations of NPDS permits. I would
22 have understood that if the liquids were defined as
23 byproduct material they would be exempted under the
24 Clean Water Act.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I think the Dawn Mining case from the
2 Ninth Circuit would -- holds that. So I think that
3 you may have some unnecessary NPDS permits as to those
4 liquids, to the extent that they are deemed to be
5 byproduct material. But you wouldn't have a violation
6 problem.

7 You might have a violation problem with us
8 in terms of past releases that, because of the
9 retroactive issue, presumably we can deal with that.
10 But I don't understand the point about the violation
11 with the -- of the NPDS permits.

12 MR. THOMPSON: Well, I think that I -- I
13 understand your point about the Dawn Mining decision,
14 and that the requirements are not applicable to
15 byproduct material. But these NPDS permits and
16 regulations were in place well before that decision
17 happened. And while it may not be -- and, of course,
18 the Commission's decision on the concurrent
19 jurisdiction essentially reinforces that, as far as
20 I'm concerned.

21 But it does raise the problem of
22 technically being in violation of the rules and the
23 permits, but the more important question is the
24 liability. A much more important question is the
25 liability for cleanup for something that's gone down

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the stream that was in -- in accordance with the
2 regulatory limits.

3 And in some of these areas out there, as
4 you well know, in the grants area where -- where some
5 of these streams -- streams were coming from a variety
6 of different mining sources, and there's no way to
7 tell who put what in there and how much of it is yours
8 and what's byproduct material and what's not. And so
9 the liability issues are staggering, and it's already
10 being pressed on these licensees by the staff as a
11 result of that decision.

12 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Let me make sure I
13 understand. Is it -- I think that your answer is is
14 that the problems as the liability are being created
15 by the NRC --

16 MR. THOMPSON: Right.

17 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: -- in that materials
18 that were released pursuant to an NPDS permit you
19 thought you were authorized to do. Now the staff is
20 coming back at you and saying, "Now, wait a minute.
21 That's byproduct material, and you have to do
22 restoration activities."

23 MR. THOMPSON: Right.

24 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: So it's an NRC --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. THOMPSON: It's an NRC issue, and you
2 have the situation, for example, in the grants area
3 where people were pumping mine water, where you're
4 running it through the IX and you're discharging it on
5 an NPDS permit which is not the same thing as -- it is
6 the same thing physically, chemically, and otherwise,
7 as restoration fluids that are being pumped down the
8 stream. So you have multiple of these things pumped
9 down the stream.

10 Now, all of a sudden, some part of that is
11 byproduct material. How do we tell whose is what, how
12 much of it is yours, how much of it is somebody
13 else's, and it's -- it is an NRC-created problem.
14 That's right.

15 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Don't you have that
16 problem anyway with -- to the extent you have
17 contributions to those streams that are not through
18 the NPDS permit, non-point discharges, or groundwater
19 contribution to the stream, which maybe you don't have
20 in that area, or materials that have been windblown
21 and have then been entrained in the stream?

22 MR. THOMPSON: I'm not sure I understand,
23 Mr. Chairman.

24 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: I guess the question I
25 have is you've indicated that part of the issue was

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the NPDS permit, that you had exempted releases and
2 that this -- and that, therefore, there's a
3 retroactive problem of going back and recapturing.

4 I'm just raising a question as to whether
5 there isn't going to be some issue -- factual issue --
6 as to the origins of the materials in the stream in
7 any event, because some of the material that might be
8 in the stream could well be argued got there through
9 a mechanism other than an NPDS release.

10 MR. THOMPSON: I'm sure that's -- that's
11 possible. That's possible, because these are not --
12 you know, we're not talking about a room where
13 everything is inside and we know what gets out. It's
14 -- we're talking about out in the environment. That's
15 possible.

16 But, certainly, if anybody thought that --
17 that by releasing hundreds of thousands of gallons of
18 water for 15 years down the stream was going to cause
19 them to all of a sudden be subject to clean it up
20 because it's now byproduct material, whether they
21 would have done it is a serious question.

22 And I can't imagine that windblown
23 tailings would be -- I mean, it might in a site-
24 specific situation be blowing into a water course,
25 but, you know, each mill is going to know more or less

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 where their tailings are from the wind direction and
2 all that sort of thing.

3 These are complicated. There's no
4 question. The physical circumstances are complicated.
5 That's a fair statement.

6 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Thank you.

7 Commissioner Dicus?

8 COMMISSIONER DICUS: Thank you.

9 Let me apologize for being late. It
10 wasn't so much the traffic lights from downtown. It
11 wasn't even the traffic lights from out in the
12 boondocks where I live. But it's -- I'm going to be
13 out of town for a few days. It was getting the kids
14 to the kennel, and they're starting to build my deck,
15 and dealing with that, so I had a lot of things going
16 this morning. I do apologize for being a few minutes
17 late.

18 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: By "kids," she means
19 dogs.

20 (Laughter.)

21 You said kennel. I --

22 COMMISSIONER DICUS: Yes. The kids are --
23 my dogs are my kids. Okay?

24 (Laughter.)

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 COMMISSIONER MCGAFFIGAN: Sometimes those
2 of us with real kids are tempted.

3 (Laughter.)

4 COMMISSIONER DICUS: Anyway, the kids are
5 at the kennel, the deck is doing well, and my neighbor
6 has got everything under control. So I'm here.

7 My being late does not in any sense
8 indicate my lack of interest in this, because, indeed,
9 I think you know from the interactions that we've had
10 over time I do have some -- I do have some issues and
11 concerns. And I -- like my fellow Commissioners, we
12 are all concerned about any kind of regulatory burden
13 that impacts an industry.

14 But at the same time, obviously, we have
15 a certain radiation safety and radiation protection
16 mandate that we cannot back away from. So I think
17 what we're trying to deal with here is, how do we
18 marry these two, not conflicting issues but certainly
19 less than easy issues to resolve?

20 Now, I want to talk about your legislative
21 solution. I think you probably are aware that for
22 some years now the Commission had worked very hard to
23 get -- get some of our activities off the fee base,
24 and it took years to do it, and only very recently
25 have we been successful in that.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And then that is going to take time to
2 phase in. I think you're aware it's over a period of
3 about six years. At a certain percentage per year, we
4 will get something off the fee base.

5 How optimistic are you on a legislative
6 solution, given obvious history that we have?

7 MR. GERARD: Is this the easy one, Katie?
8 Is that --

9 MS. SWEENEY: This is your bailiwick.

10 MR. GERARD: My bailiwick. Oh.

11 In answer to that, Commissioner, I'm not
12 sure right now. I think we've got to go up and do
13 some preliminary pulsing, if you will, and some seated
14 here on the Commission may have a better guesstimate
15 than I would. But I think it's something, obviously,
16 we feel strongly enough about, as I mentioned earlier
17 in some of my opening remarks.

18 I think the climate has shifted a little
19 bit to where there's going to be more sensitivity to
20 these types of issues in light of what's going on
21 around the country, just from an energy policy
22 perspective. So I think our hope is that in that
23 environment perhaps we'll have a few more listening
24 ears and a chance to articulate our views or to make
25 our case.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Will that happen this year? I'm not sure.
2 Will it happen this Congress? Not sure. I think
3 after we begin to pulse a little bit, one of the
4 reasons, obviously, we wanted to come as part of this
5 presentation and let you know our thinking in that
6 regard is we believe it's important that we do
7 coordinate with you.

8 Having been in town for a little bit, we
9 understand a lot of those first calls are going to
10 come right here as to, what do you think about this?
11 What's your reaction to what they're proposing? So
12 our hope is let's work together. But to guess right
13 now, our likelihood of success, not -- not sure.

14 COMMISSIONER DICUS: Okay. That's a fair
15 answer. I appreciate that.

16 Then, let's take it to the next step, and
17 assuming perhaps that there is not in the immediate
18 foreseeable future a legislative solution, then you're
19 going to pursue regulatory exemption from our fees,
20 and along much in the same way as in the non-profits,
21 which means that -- now, the base fees have to be
22 shifted to someone else, just as they are for those
23 who don't pay fees.

24 Now, I think we do have some -- and, you
25 know, as I mentioned, I share with my fellow

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Commissioners some concerns about the fee situation
2 here. And we probably have some efficiencies that we
3 can get at, but we're looking -- I think all of us are
4 looking closely at the PMs and whether or not there
5 are some excesses there that we can control a little
6 bit better.

7 But assuming whatever efficiencies we're
8 able to do, assuming that we pursue the regulatory
9 exemption -- and I don't mean to put you on the spot
10 -- but somebody has to pay. There is a fundamental --
11 who do you assume is going to pick up the difference
12 in the fuel cycle? Or is it the end user?

13 MS. SWEENEY: No. I think it would have
14 to be kind of spread out on -- amongst the rest of
15 NRC's licensees. Is that fair? No. But if there is
16 -- I mean, if the domestic uranium recovery industry
17 goes away, it would be awful hard to start it back up.
18 We'll lose it. We'll lose the expertise.

19 I just think that -- and that's why we're
20 looking for a temporary exemption. No, it's not fair.
21 Is OBRA fair? I don't think so. So we're going to
22 try to work whatever solutions we can.

23 But, yes, we had the same concern as you
24 did. We talked about this. We had a meeting

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 yesterday, and we said, you know, "That question is
2 going to come up. How do we feel about it?"

3 COMMISSIONER DICUS: Well, I'm glad I
4 asked it. I wouldn't want you to be disappointed.

5 (Laughter.)

6 MS. SWEENEY: Well, that's true. Somebody
7 else is going to have to pay for what we're not
8 paying.

9 MR. FLETCHER: Commissioner Dicus, if I
10 could just add -- one difference between us and, let's
11 say, operators of a nuclear utility is that we're not
12 able to pass our costs along directly to ratepayers.
13 Now, I understand that not every nuclear utility today
14 can do that. But I also think that utilities
15 themselves are becoming more and more concerned with
16 what they see as the tendency towards consolidation in
17 the nuclear fuel cycle.

18 There are fewer producers, fewer
19 enrichers, fewer converters, and fewer fuel
20 fabricators today than ever before. And particularly
21 when utilities are realizing that their nuclear assets
22 are of tremendous value, the fuel for those assets is
23 of concern to them.

24 Now, obviously, U₃O₈ prices represent the
25 smallest percentage of a utility's fuel operating

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 costs. The amount of money that we're talking about
2 here is not great relative to the other fees that are
3 being paid and the total amount of money that would
4 have to be shifted to other licensees.

5 Given that, our belief and our hope
6 certainly is that the other licensees who would pay
7 this, particularly the utilities, would recognize that
8 ultimately it's in their best interest that the United
9 States maintain its capacity to produce uranium
10 domestically.

11 Because Katie is absolutely right -- when
12 I lose people in Nebraska, when I lose people in
13 Wyoming, when my electrician, as he did yesterday, at
14 Highland quits to take a job in Rawlins, Wyoming,
15 because we can't pay him enough, he's gone. And I
16 lose that expertise, and I can't get it back.

17 The people who are in this room today
18 represent a tremendous amount of experience, much as
19 the staff people at the NRC do as well. When you lose
20 those people, you've lost a tremendously valuable
21 resource and you can't get it back.

22 COMMISSIONER DICUS: Okay. One final
23 thing. And, Mr. Newton, this is to you. You
24 mentioned the fact in your closure activities in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Nebraska that the state had bought off on everything
2 and approved --

3 MR. FLETCHER: Yes.

4 COMMISSIONER DICUS: -- but the NRC hasn't
5 yet, or has been lagging. Of course, this becomes a
6 cost and a fee issue. Did you submit the same
7 material at the same time? And give me your view on
8 why we're not as efficient as the State of Nebraska.

9 MR. FLETCHER: We actually submitted the
10 -- submitted the plan, first of all, to the State of
11 Nebraska. And there's a rather complicated chain of
12 events here that I won't go into. But the project
13 manager at that time, after we had received approval
14 from the State of Nebraska, when we submitted it to
15 the NRC --

16 COMMISSIONER DICUS: So you submitted it
17 after you submitted --

18 MR. FLETCHER: Yes.

19 COMMISSIONER DICUS: -- to --

20 MR. FLETCHER: Yes, yes.

21 COMMISSIONER DICUS: And after you got
22 approval from --

23 MR. FLETCHER: After we got approval.
24 That's correct.

25 COMMISSIONER DICUS: Okay.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. FLETCHER: The project manager at that
2 time was concerned that maybe the standards of the
3 State of Nebraska weren't adequate to ensure public
4 health and safety. I think he was genuinely concerned
5 that, as a representative of the NRC, he wanted to
6 make sure the Commission fulfilled its mandate to
7 protect public health and safety and make sure that
8 five or 10 or 15 years down the road we didn't have
9 problems come up that were unanticipated.

10 Now, of course, the people in Nebraska
11 didn't quite cotton to that because they said, "Look,
12 it's our water. It's our land. We know this as well
13 as anybody. You don't need to tell us how to run our
14 business." But I think the project manager at the
15 time was well intended.

16 Now, he was transferred. We have a new
17 project manager, Mike Layton, who is an exceptionally
18 bright guy, talented guy, hardworking. I've met him
19 on two or three occasions. Obviously, there's a
20 learning curve there. So he has to spend a certain
21 amount of time to bring himself up to speed on what's
22 going on. That's natural.

23 And, obviously, because he's a dedicated
24 guy who takes this stuff seriously, he's going to
25 spend a certain amount of time with it.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So as I say, I'm not -- and I want to be
2 very clear on this. We're not blaming individual
3 project managers. We're not putting the fault there
4 at all, not in the least. It's simply the regulatory
5 environment in which they work.

6 Before Mr. Layton I think is able to make
7 an informed decision or an informed recommendation, he
8 naturally wants to make sure he has covered all the
9 bases. The problem is we're paying a tremendous
10 amount of money for that.

11 COMMISSIONER DICUS: Are the values of the
12 standards of the State of Nebraska not protective --

13 MR. FLETCHER: We think they are --

14 COMMISSIONER DICUS: -- with the water?

15 MR. FLETCHER: We think they are extremely
16 protective. We've explained to the State of Nebraska
17 how this works, what happens to this water. Much of
18 what we're really talking about here is simply an
19 education process, where an aquifer now has been used
20 --

21 COMMISSIONER DICUS: Which aquifer is it?

22 MR. FLETCHER: Geologically?

23 COMMISSIONER DICUS: Yes.

24 MR. FLETCHER: I couldn't tell you off the
25 top of my head.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 COMMISSIONER DICUS: Is it a feedwater?
2 I've forgotten the name of it.

3 MR. FLETCHER: There are so many of them.

4 COMMISSIONER DICUS: Okay.

5 MR. FLETCHER: It's really --

6 COMMISSIONER DICUS: It's a major one,
7 though, that comes -- starts in the --

8 MR. FLETCHER: Oh, no. No, this is not
9 major at all.

10 COMMISSIONER DICUS: Oh, it's a small one.

11 MR. FLETCHER: Yes. You know, the term
12 "aquifer" is a little misleading.

13 MS. SWEENEY: Shadrin.

14 MR. FLETCHER: Shadrin aquifer. Okay.
15 What we're really talking about here is sandstone
16 that's got water in it.

17 COMMISSIONER DICUS: Okay. That's okay.
18 It's not the big one.

19 MR. FLETCHER: Yes. No, it's not the big
20 one at all. And the point here is that we've now
21 demonstrated to the State of Nebraska, and I think
22 we'll be able to demonstrate to the NRC that nothing
23 is going to happen years from now, decades from now,
24 centuries from now, that could in any way harm the
25 public health and safety.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 COMMISSIONER DIAZ: Are you talking about
2 radionuclides, or are you talking about sulphates and
3 --

4 MR. FLETCHER: Everything.

5 COMMISSIONER DICUS: Okay.

6 MR. FLETCHER: And, intuitively, you can
7 understand that. I mean, these aquifers have been
8 there for millions of years. The uranium has been
9 there for millions of years. They haven't polluted
10 other aquifers, and they won't.

11 COMMISSIONER DICUS: Okay. I could go on
12 a little bit on this, but I think in light of the time
13 I'll pass at this point.

14 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

15 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Thank you.

16 I'd like to express, on behalf of the
17 Commission, our appreciation to all of you for a very
18 helpful presentation. We now have an opportunity for
19 a second panel from the NRC staff to address us.
20 Thank you very much.

21 COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: Mr. Chairman,
22 while they're coming to the table, I just want to --
23 Karen Cyr clarified for me that the university
24 exemption that we have in place at the moment covers
25 both annual fees and hourly fees. So those with

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 university research reactors pay zero fees, and I was
2 wrong at that. So I just wanted to make that
3 clarification.

4 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Thank you.

5 We have a staff panel now to discuss the
6 same issues. Dr. Paperiello, would you like to
7 proceed?

8 DR. PAPERIELLO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

9 We appreciate the opportunity to brief the
10 Commission today on the rulemaking and guidance
11 development for the uranium recovery industry.
12 Briefly, by way of background, in the staff
13 requirements memorandum for SECY-99-011, the
14 Commission approved the staff's recommendation of a
15 new Part 41 dedicated to the regulation of uranium and
16 thorium recovery facilities.

17 The Commission also directed the staff to
18 be aware of the potential cost of such action and may
19 -- and the fees that may be paid by the affected
20 licensees.

21 After the Commission's directions on SECY-
22 99-011, the staff received strong feedback that the
23 potential cost of a full rulemaking would be
24 exceedingly burdensome to an economically distressed
25 uranium industry. The staff wanted the Commission to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 be aware of the industry's concerns, and also to
2 examine appropriate alternatives to rulemaking that
3 could clarify long-standing issues in the uranium
4 recovery program.

5 Because of these concerns, the staff wrote
6 SECY-01-026, Alternatives for Rulemaking, Domestic
7 Licensing of Uranium and Thorium Recovery Facilities.
8 The purpose of that paper was to solicit the
9 Commission's direction on the best approach to take
10 considering the broad range of desires and needs from
11 the diverse group of stakeholders -- industry, states,
12 DOE, EPA, etcetera -- involved in the uranium recovery
13 industry.

14 Today, the National Mining Association,
15 and now the NRC staff, will discuss several technical
16 and diverse regulatory issues that have become the
17 focus as a result of the work that has been ongoing
18 since the issuance of the SRM for SECY-99-011.

19 In addition to all the papers that have
20 been raised thus far, I think I'd like to emphasize
21 one other point. No matter what alternative the staff
22 is directed to implement, and whether we're talking
23 about overlapping authority, surface water discharges,
24 or some other issues that our stakeholders have

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 discussed with us, these issues are still going to
2 need to be worked through.

3 And whether rule or guidance, we're going
4 to have to write down our policy, so it's understood
5 by all and consistently implemented. And I expect, in
6 accordance with the Commission's existing policy,
7 stakeholders will be involved, and the final product
8 will be reviewed and endorsed by the Commission to
9 ensure Commission policy is met.

10 And this is all going to involve
11 resources. And, in fact, if we do absolutely nothing,
12 the individual licensing actions and uncertainty
13 accompanying them, and potential litigation, will cost
14 resources. So there is a resource implication no
15 matter what we choose. It's just unavoidable.

16 And with me at the table today are Mr.
17 Virgilio, Mr. Weber, Mr. Allen Howe of NMSS's
18 Rulemaking Branch, and Mr. Mike Layton of the Fuel
19 Cycle Branch. And a presentation will be made by Mr.
20 Howe and Mr. Layton. At this point, I'll turn the
21 meeting over to Mr. Howe.

22 MR. HOWE: Thank you, Dr. Paperiello, and
23 Commissioners.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 A lot of the points that have been
2 discussed today I will also cover as well, but I will
3 try to be brief with my remarks.

4 With the first slide, just as an overview,
5 I'll briefly discuss the draft rulemaking plan and the
6 rulemaking options paper that was recently forwarded
7 to the Commission. I'll then turn the discussion over
8 to Mike Layton, who will present the status on other
9 uranium recovery actions, resources, and stakeholder
10 feedback.

11 On the next slide, we implemented the
12 Commission direction in SRM to SECY-99-011 and
13 incorporated guidance from three related SRMs. We
14 developed a revised rulemaking plan and provided it to
15 all of the states for comments last September. We did
16 receive comments on the rulemaking plan from five
17 states, from the Conference of Radiation Control
18 Program Directors, or the CRCPD, and also from
19 industry.

20 Colorado, New Mexico, Washington, Utah,
21 and the CRCPD generally supported the need for a new
22 Part 41 and the specific regulations for the in situ
23 leach facilities. The comments also reflected four
24 previous issues raised in the 1998 National Mining

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Association white paper as issues were discussed
2 earlier.

3 The State of Wyoming, the National Mining
4 Association, and the Rio Algom Company, were not in
5 favor of the Part 41 rulemaking. In support of their
6 position, these commenters cited the current economic
7 status of the industry and that was covered earlier as
8 well.

9 As a result of the potential economic
10 burden on the industry, as a result of the planned
11 rulemaking, and coupled with a proposal by the
12 National Materials Working Group to consider a pilot
13 process for interaction with NRC, we were led to
14 revisit the rulemaking plan.

15 Next slide, please. We're a little bit
16 ahead here. It should be SECY-01-026.

17 The staff recently provided the Commission
18 with an options paper for proceeding. The three
19 options in that paper -- I'll just briefly go through
20 them. Option one was the National Materials Working
21 Group option where a concept was proposed that we
22 would work in conjunction with the agreements states
23 in a leading role to consider revising the existing
24 requirements.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 That three-step process would provide for
2 developing a rulemaking outline similar to an NRC
3 rulemaking plan, but it would also contain the
4 mechanics for interactions, responsibilities, and
5 decisionmaking. As with the rulemaking plan, this
6 outline would have a new rulemaking alternative.

7 Assuming that -- as step two, assuming
8 that rulemaking is the approved product, the working
9 group would implement that Commission direction. And
10 the final step on this would be NRC conversion of that
11 product to a rule under the Administrative Procedure
12 Act.

13 The staff believes that this option gives
14 us an opportunity to clarify and consolidate the
15 existing regulations using less NRC resources than
16 would be in a standard rulemaking and also a chance to
17 evaluate a new concept. As observed earlier by the
18 NMA, the staff also recognizes that this option may
19 include possible difficulties with reaching consensus
20 amongst the stakeholders, and there may also be a
21 longer time for completing such a process than you
22 would have from some of the other options.

23 In option number two, the staff would
24 proceed with the rulemaking to develop Part 41 as
25 directed by the Commission. For brevity, I will not

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 repeat the pro/con discussion that NMA presented
2 earlier.

3 In option three, the NRC would stop
4 current rulemaking and focus its resources on updating
5 guidance documents. A pro for this option is that it
6 would use fewer resources than in option two. This
7 option would also implement Commission direction by
8 updating the existing guidance documents.

9 However, this option would continue the
10 current NRC licensing practices based on guidance and
11 staff practice. As Dr. Paperiello observed, this
12 could subject the NRC to hearing requests on future
13 licensing activities.

14 To varying degrees, any of these options,
15 if successful, would achieve the NRC's strategic goals
16 of increasing public confidence, reducing unnecessary
17 regulatory burden, and increasing effectiveness,
18 efficiency, and realism, while maintaining safety.
19 Because the stakeholder involvement is greater in
20 options one and two, they are expected to achieve a
21 greater level of public confidence than option three.

22 In addition, options one and two may
23 achieve a greater level of effectiveness and
24 efficiency than option three. Because of the lower
25 amount of NRC resources involved, option three would

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 result in an expected lower regulatory burden than
2 options one and two.

3 As indicated in the options paper, the
4 staff is seeking further Commission guidance before
5 proceeding.

6 I'll now turn it over to Mike Layton, who
7 will describe staff actions, uranium recovery actions,
8 resources, and stakeholder feedback.

9 MR. LAYTON: Thank you, Allen.

10 In the interest of time, and, of course,
11 with your permission, I'd just like to touch on the
12 high points of the staff's actions in implementing the
13 directions that the Commission gave us in the staff
14 requirements memorandum for the four Commission
15 papers, and then focus on discussions on some of the
16 resource items and what we learned from other
17 stakeholders.

18 The first action that staff took was to
19 have two meetings with EPA on the issue of groundwater
20 protection at in situ leach facilities. And the
21 participants in these meetings were two offices from
22 EPA headquarters and also representatives from Regions
23 VI, VII, VIII, and IX by telephone.

24 And the focus of these meetings were to
25 really explore the extent to which NRC staff can rely

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 on the reviews performed by EPA or the EPA authorized
2 states, in lieu of staff doing those reviews
3 themselves and supporting the licensing actions.

4 And the feedback we received from EPA as
5 a result of these meetings were that, at least at the
6 federal level, EPA views that NRC's licensing program
7 and the federal underground injection control program
8 are really complementary of each other and not
9 duplicative.

10 EPA also pointed out that some of the
11 authorized states implement programs that are more
12 stringent than the federal program. Consequently,
13 really at the technical review level, the duplication
14 between NRC and the underground injection control
15 program really lies with the states and not with the
16 EPA at the federal level.

17 EPA also encouraged us to meet directly
18 with the affected states, and they offered to stay
19 involved in the process not only from the standpoint
20 of staying informed but also to assist us in
21 understanding how the UIC program is implemented at
22 the authorized state level. And I'd like to let the
23 Commission know that our interactions with EPA on this
24 issue have been very collegial and very mutually
25 cooperative.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 For the remainder of the Commission's
2 directions, we issued a generic communication which
3 the representatives from NMA have mentioned, the
4 regulatory issues summary. And that was issued on
5 November 30th of 2000. It was addressed to the
6 uranium recovery licensees, and it was sent to the
7 agreement states and non-agreement states. And it's
8 also available on NRC's web page.

9 It encompassed, really, the four -- four
10 items that were in SECY -- the Commission papers 99-
11 013, 99-012, and also 99-277.

12 The first item that was covered in the
13 regulatory issues summary was, what constituted
14 11(e)(2) byproduct material at in situ leach
15 facilities? It also encompassed the revised criteria
16 for the direct disposal of materials other than
17 11(e)(2) byproduct material in uranium mill tailings
18 facilities.

19 It addressed the revised criteria for the
20 acceptability of using alternate feed materials for
21 the processing at uranium mills. And, lastly, it
22 covered the concurrent jurisdiction with non-agreement
23 states under the Atomic Energy Act.

24 In addition, there are two items items
25 that we are continuing to proceed with and work on.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 As I mentioned previously in discussions with our
2 meetings with the EPA, the overlapping authority of
3 the Atomic Energy Act and the Safe Drinking Water Act
4 is one issue that we are currently pursuing, primarily
5 in the area of groundwater protection at the in situ
6 leach facilities. Also, the surface water discharges
7 from some in situ leach facilities and uranium mills.

8 As NMA described, previously this dealt
9 with the non-processed wastewaters, discharges that
10 came from the facilities where the states had issued
11 their discharge permits for both radiological and non-
12 radiological constituents.

13 Now the facilities have been informed that
14 some work needs to be done to assure that those
15 discharges can conform and comply with the Part 20
16 regulatory requirements.

17 On the item of resources, I would like to
18 first go over some of the efficiencies and
19 streamlining measures that staff has taken, really
20 within the limited scope of influence that we have on
21 these areas.

22 I think the representatives from NMA will
23 affirm that we have been working with them quite
24 diligently over the last few years in trying to find

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 ways in which we can gain efficiencies in our
2 regulatory process.

3 Some examples of this are that early on,
4 we completed staff guidance in draft and final form
5 for the standard review plans which we use in our
6 license reviews that helps focus our review efforts.
7 We have also implemented the performance-based license
8 condition which is modeled after the 5059 provisions
9 for the reactor licenses.

10 We have also worked with Region IV, who
11 carries the inspection program for the uranium
12 recovery area in streamlining the inspections, where
13 based on past performance of licensees, some
14 inspections may be reduced or spread out over time as
15 opposed to the past very regimented inspection
16 schedules. Also, in a couple of instances, the
17 inspection frequencies have increased because of the
18 past performance of these facilities.

19 Currently, as a continuing process, we are
20 looking at ways where we can really change our daily
21 practices, like drafting early review -- or not review
22 plans, but technical evaluation reviews. It helps
23 focus us in doing the detailed reviews for the
24 licensing actions. We are trying to achieve a goal of
25 really looking at trying to do one round of requests

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 for additional information as we go through our review
2 process. If the information we receive from our
3 licensees will support that goal.

4 In addition, we have reduced staff
5 resources in the uranium recovery program for Fiscal
6 Year 2001. This is reflected in the proposed fee rule
7 that's now up for comment.

8 Lastly, what we have learned from other
9 stakeholders. In addition to the feedback we receive
10 from EPA in our meetings with the in situ leach
11 facilities, there were two other items that EPA has
12 recently brought to our attention. One deals with the
13 disposal of material that are not similar to uranium
14 mill tailings in the uranium mill tailings facilities.
15 EPA has identified this as a potential issue of
16 concern with EPA and the states. That is primarily
17 the materials that are covered by the Toxic Substances
18 Control Act, CERCLA and some of the recra materials,
19 which contain primarily organic constituents that have
20 different mobilities than the constituents in uranium
21 mill tailings.

22 EPA has also informed us that we really
23 need to face particular attention to the need for full
24 consultation and coordination with the states in
25 dealing with the approvals for alternate fee requests.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Primarily not only where the materials originate, the
2 states in which they originate, but also where they
3 are processed and potentially transported through to
4 the final processing.

5 The item or the issue that is of concern
6 with this is that these materials may be subject to
7 recra use and re-use regulations regardless of their
8 source material content.

9 From the non-agreement states, we have
10 heard primarily two main concerns from them. The one
11 is the preemption of the non-radiological constituents
12 for groundwater protection at mills. This is the
13 concurrent jurisdiction decision.

14 At least one state has significant
15 concerns with this. The feedback we have received
16 from the states is that in their view the NRC program
17 lacks protection. Also, NRC's program does not
18 address the groundwater degradation concerns with non-
19 hazardous constituents that affect the aesthetic
20 quality and potential use of the groundwater resource.

21 The second item that we have heard from
22 the non-agreement states deals with the overlapping
23 groundwater regulations at in situ leach facilities.
24 They have identified that this does create a
25 regulatory burden for the industry. The states views

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 are that they have programs in place, and that really
2 NRC's oversight is really not needed.

3 From the agreement states, we have heard
4 four items. The first item has to deal with an issue
5 that was really not addressed in the previous
6 presentations, either by us or NMA. It has to deal
7 with the confusion over how to regulate the pre-1978
8 uranium mill tailings based on the director's decision
9 that was issued earlier this year.

10 A second issue that came up, and this one
11 actually was quite surprising to me when I heard it,
12 that we at NRC need to be very clear about our
13 regulation of groundwater protection at ISLs.

14 This comes from the State of Texas, which
15 identified that curiously they have a similar problem
16 that the NRC has with the non-agreement states in
17 overlapping authorities with the Safe Drinking Water
18 Act and the Atomic Energy Act. However, their problem
19 deals with differences in state agencies. It's a
20 similar overlapping authority problem that we are
21 facing with the non-agreement states.

22 Also we heard from the State of
23 Washington, who recommended an alternate approach to
24 Part 41. They asked the Commission to consider using
25 the existing framework in the CRCPD as a mechanism for

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 perhaps developing a Part 41 regulation. Currently
2 they are working on suggested state regulations as a
3 Part U that could serve as a vehicle for Part 41.

4 Also, another issue that came up from the
5 agreement states that we have not heard of or that
6 hasn't been presented in the previous discussions
7 deals with the license termination of agreement state
8 licenses, and that NRC really needs to have clear
9 expectations about what process and procedures we go
10 through in terminating those agreement state licenses.

11 As an aside for the Commission's
12 information, we are working with the agreement states
13 on revising and clarifying our existing guidance. We
14 have developed a workshop that will occur with the NMA
15 and the NRC meeting in June, where we will continue to
16 work through that issue.

17 Finally, with industry, there are some
18 members who are not -- or some licensees who are not
19 members of NMA. DOE and other stakeholders like the
20 public and Congress, we do receive feedback from those
21 stakeholders on a regular basis, and do incorporate
22 that feedback in our decision process.

23 With that, this concludes our presentation
24 of the findings that we've come up with through the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 preparation for this Commission meeting. We thank you
2 for your time.

3 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Does that complete the
4 staff? Good. Thank you very much. Very helpful
5 presentation.

6 Commissioner McGriffgan?

7 COMMISSIONER MCGRIFFGAN: Let me ask a
8 question about the reg issue summary that you
9 mentioned. I thought I heard the first panel say that
10 they felt that there were parts the reg issue summary
11 that were not consistent with their reading of what we
12 said in our SRMNR. Our SRMs can be Talmudic
13 documents. It can bring a subject to multiple
14 interpretations. But how deep are the differences,
15 and what's your process for trying to resolve those
16 differences?

17 MR. LAYTON: Well, to be quite honest, we
18 have not really explored what the differences are with
19 NMA at this point. We do have the workshop planned,
20 and we do have preparations in which we are going
21 through with that. We do work with NMA.

22 COMMISSIONER MCGRIFFGAN: The issue in the
23 Nebraska aquifer, and as I understand aquifer in this
24 case is not like we normally think of aquifer. It's
25 a bunch of sandstone that happens to have some water

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in it that is very non -- it doesn't move, over
2 centuries.

3 But in that case, my recollection of the
4 factual situation, and Mr. Layton you are the PM in
5 addition to handling the rulemaking I guess, the
6 factual situation there was that there may have been
7 some license condition referring to some NRC document
8 that implied that they would clean up to a higher
9 standard. They are arguing now, I think perhaps
10 appropriately, that they have met the Nebraska
11 standard, that this is an exempt aquifer, and that
12 radium alone is going to prevent this water from being
13 used for human consumption essentially forever. So
14 some of those previous things are unnecessary
15 regulatory burdens in our current parlance.

16 Why does it take so long to sort of -- I
17 know you -- they have already apologized for you are
18 on a learning curve. You are trying to get on top of
19 it. But in some sense, is it risk-informed to be
20 spending as much time on this decision, given the
21 factual circumstance?

22 I understand there is a legal issue. But
23 then on the technical side, it didn't look that, based
24 on my limited knowledge, it didn't look very
25 ambiguous. Why does that take so long?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. LAYTON: Really the best answer I can
2 put forward to that is that given that the original
3 review looked at it in the NEPA context, really as
4 accumulative impacts for both the restoration to the
5 pre-mining water use and also restoration to a
6 standard that was much less stringent, that was really
7 evaluated more like I said as the cumulative impacts.

8 When the license was originally issued in
9 the late 1980s, the condition was placed in the
10 license for restoration to the background standard, to
11 the pre-mining water use. So I don't think that we
12 were able to carte blanche do it as a license
13 evaluation.

14 In addition, as the Commission is aware,
15 we have been embroiled in a hearing with another in
16 situ facility for quite some time, where many of these
17 same issues have been brought to bear through the
18 course of the hearing.

19 Part of the concern at the time in doing
20 this evaluation is that the recognition that this may
21 have some broad-reaching policy implications.

22 COMMISSIONER MCGRIFFGAN: It strikes me
23 that the decision, that it's the 1988, if that's the
24 year decision that may be the problematic decision.
25 We have got to figure out a way to get out of that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 because we were making in some sense inconsistent
2 decisions then compared to the state regulator. It's
3 not surprising that 13 years later, we are still
4 making inconsistent decisions.

5 The total amount of funds in this area, if
6 the funds like for the universities were off the fee
7 base -- not off the fee base. If the funds for the
8 universities -- there's two options. One, they are
9 off the fee base and they are in the general fund.
10 That's the legislative option.

11 Second is they are given an exemption like
12 the universities and the grounds like the universities
13 that they are part of the infrastructure, and they
14 react to licensees as Commissioner Dicus points out,
15 will pay the bill, should be willing to pay because
16 just as they want to have the human capital available,
17 they want to have a diverse industry available.

18 What is the total amount of money we're
19 talking about here? Do we know? Is it \$3 million, \$4
20 million?

21 DR. PAPERIELLO: I think the CFO has a
22 representative here.

23 MR. TURDIC: It's between \$4 and \$5
24 million

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 COMMISSIONER MCGRIFFGAN: Between \$4 and
2 \$5 million dollars, okay. For the microphones, I'll
3 repeat that. Four and five million dollars if doing
4 a quick calculation, dividing by 100, that would be
5 about is it \$40,000 per reactor licensee if we were to
6 take the exemption approach until the price of U-308
7 is above a number that Katie Sweeney is going to
8 reveal later. But we'll choose \$13 or something like
9 that, just looking at her chart, U-308 spot price
10 above that for a year.

11 Do you have any staff reaction to the
12 exemption approach, the university approach? Not the
13 CFO. I'm asking the staff first. The CFO is always
14 opposed to all exemptions, so I understand that.

15 DR. PAPERIELLO: I am going to give my
16 personal reactions, part of the issue of fees and all,
17 how we proceed here.

18 Anything with the amount -- and Karen can
19 probably correct me, but my perception is that for the
20 size of the area, we're involved in a lot of
21 litigation. If rulemaking would reduce the litigation
22 and the specific cost and also that would help us meet
23 timeliness goals and the like, does that promote the
24 common good? If it promotes the common good, I think
25 there is an intellectual justification for.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 COMMISSIONER MCGRIFFGAN: You are raising
2 a different approach. You are saying that if we could
3 solve the fee issue, then we can do what is
4 everybody's preferred option, which is to proceed with
5 rulemaking. What's preventing the rulemaking is the
6 cost. If the cost is solved, then we can do the
7 rulemaking. Then that has even more benefits because
8 it will drive down costs for both us and licensees in
9 terms of litigation because we'll have had a
10 rulemaking.

11 DR. PAPERIELLO: And settle issues.

12 COMMISSIONER MCGRIFFGAN: And we'll settle
13 issues. So you are saying that there's a long-term
14 economic benefit to both licensees and NRC if we could
15 put this package together where for a period of time,
16 while the price of U-308 is below a number, they are
17 off the fee base. Therefore, we could do a
18 rulemaking. We have to factor that in. Instead of \$4
19 million, it's maybe \$5 million.

20 But there is a nice package there, where
21 everybody wins, except for the reactor guys. They
22 have to decide whether it's worth \$40,000 a year or
23 whether they can stomach that, or you know, the
24 preferred option of everybody is legislative solution.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 That would put it into the general fund and we can
2 take it that way.

3 But I think that's what we're talking
4 about. I think it's an interesting challenge for us
5 as we go forward.

6 I defer with that, Mr. Chairman.

7 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Commissioner
8 Merrifield?

9 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: Thank you very
10 much, Mr. Chairman.

11 I want to start off by saying everything
12 that I have heard today and everything I heard
13 beforehand leads me to believe that in fact the staff
14 is doing a good job. So I wouldn't want anyone to
15 take anything away that we don't believe that. I
16 believe they are. I believe they are fulfilling the
17 desires of the Commission in that respect.

18 What seems clear to me today is obviously
19 there are other people that we can talk to. We have
20 heard today from NMA. We need to have a continuing
21 dialogue with the states, both agreement and non-
22 agreement states. We need to talk to other members of
23 our Federal family and other stakeholders who are
24 concerned about whatever direction the Commission may

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 take. I, for one, certainly am willing to continue
2 that dialogue.

3 Many of the issues that we talked about
4 today certainly revolve around the issues of cost.
5 Commissioner McGriffgan has spoken quite extensively
6 about legislative or non-legislative options and what
7 may or may not be available for the Commission to do
8 in this respect. But clearly, as Carl pointed out to
9 us at the very beginning, none of this comes without
10 costs somewhere. No matter what option we take there
11 are resource implications to that. We need to be
12 mindful and I'm glad that Carl repeated that obvious
13 fact.

14 I guess one question I do want to ask. We
15 had some discussion earlier, and Mr. Layton had talked
16 a little bit about some states that may have
17 regulations that exceed the level of protection we
18 have. What is the ease or difficulty of getting into
19 it, whether it's a formal MOU, a simple MOU or some
20 other type of agreement with those entities?

21 If we decide to go down that road and we
22 wanted to defer, either to other Federal agencies or
23 to other states, in various elements, how difficult
24 would that be for the staff to engage in?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. LAYTON: As far as difficulty, in my
2 view it is not really going to be that difficult of a
3 process. It may be time consuming because there are
4 so many different parties that we have to coordinate
5 with. They are spread out over quite a large area.

6 We have been in communication with the
7 states in broaching these ideas already. We do plan
8 to continue trying to find the means and the mechanism
9 where we can actually meet face to face and talk from
10 the same level of knowledge, and see where we can go
11 from there.

12 MR. WEBER: Commissioner, if I may, the
13 Commission may recall that the staff at the
14 Commission's direction embarked on negotiating an MOU
15 with other Federal agencies and states and some
16 private concerns to provide the basis for EPA
17 rescinding its Clean Air Act requirements. I believe
18 Tony was part of that negotiation process.

19 As I recall, we spent nine months or so
20 negotiating that MOU. Again, it seemed relatively
21 straight-forward at the beginning of that process.
22 Everybody was more or less in agreement that there was
23 a solution out there. Although because of the number
24 of parties involved and their interests, it took some

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 time to come to closure on what the framework should
2 be to resolve that issue.

3 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: Well, I can say
4 this. Any time you get more than two of us in a room,
5 it's going to be more difficult rather than less. But
6 okay, that's fair.

7 I guess my takeaway from the presentation
8 today is there are a lot of things to think about and
9 some more reassessment we can certainly make.

10 Mr. Chairman, as a final comment,
11 unfortunately I have to leave. So I apologize to the
12 other Commissioners for not being able to listen to
13 your final questions. But I certainly will ask my
14 staff to get me the transcript so I can review those
15 later on. Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Thank you very much.

17 I would like to follow up on something.
18 Carl made an important point at the beginning. The
19 theme of this was that regardless of whether we were
20 to deal with these issues by way of a rulemaking or by
21 way of a guidance, it is going to take a lot of staff
22 time. Issues have to be thought through, that there
23 has to be interaction with stakeholders. The message
24 I'm hearing from that, I think, would be that gee,
25 there's not a big difference.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I look at the SECY paper, however, and I
2 see that alternative two, which is the rulemaking
3 approach, here at \$300,000 and three FTE. Whereas
4 alternative three, which is the guidance approach, is
5 in at \$100,000 for contractual support and half an
6 FTE. It's these costs considerations which drove the
7 NMA to say look, don't do rulemaking.

8 But you made a point that either way is
9 going to be expensive in terms of staff resources.
10 Are you walking away from the SECY paper or
11 reconsidering it? Or where are we?

12 MR. WEBER: Not in any way. We're not
13 walking away from the SECY paper.

14 I think in part Carl's remarks apply to
15 the whole area, because it's not just the Part 41
16 rulemaking that's on the table. It is all these other
17 issues that were out there and we're working to
18 resolve.

19 The point is that regardless of which way
20 we go, whether it's all going to be encompassed in one
21 solitary effort or are we going to deal with it in a
22 more fragmented manner, it's still going to take
23 resources to work.

24 The uranium recovery licensees are one of
25 the more active stakeholders as we've known from the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 past experience that we've had. That's very much to
2 their credit because it's helpful for the staff to
3 know what are the concerns that the uranium recovery
4 industry has, and what are the alternatives available
5 out there.

6 I am pleased to hear that they are working
7 on their own solutions for the fuel cycle facility
8 forum for how they might best address a non-11E2
9 byproduct material disposal. So that's an evidence of
10 their willingness to take creative and innovative
11 approaches to solve some of the problems.

12 But it still takes, as Carl mentioned,
13 staff effort at some point, and consultation with the
14 Commission, to bring some of these things to closure.

15 COMMISSIONER DIAZ: The differential
16 between the rulemaking and the other alternatives,
17 it's \$150,000, \$200,000, it's not \$4 or \$5 million.

18 MR. WEBER: Plus the FTE.

19 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Plus two-and-a-half
20 FTE. That's where the money is. It sounds to me the
21 way you've described it, is you see that it's going to
22 take a lot of staff resources going either way. I
23 mean you left the impression that you were saying this
24 is a wash.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 DR. PAPERIELLO: Then let me correct
2 myself. I don't consider all -- in other words, it
3 won't be equal. Guidance is clearly easier to do than
4 all of the formality of a rulemaking, at least at the
5 first cut.

6 Whether or not because it's not a rule and
7 it's guidance, which means there's always alternative
8 proposals, it is going to result in more litigation
9 and more actual implementation costs down the line, is
10 something that concerns me. Not doing anything and
11 leaving it in somewhat of an uncertainty right now
12 concerns me because of the amount of litigation in
13 this area.

14 The other thing is if, from what I hear
15 today, there is a decision on the waters, changes,
16 that means we are going to have to work that one. I
17 don't oppose that. I am just saying that could -- you
18 could put additional requirements on us. I am not
19 objecting. I am just saying anything you do,
20 including this meeting, costs -- you know, has a
21 resource cost which the way we do fees, gets passed
22 onto the people we regulate. So that's the only point
23 I was trying to make. Nothing is really free.

24 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: There was a point that
25 was --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. HOWE: Excuse me. I just want to add
2 one thing. One of the assumptions that went into the
3 calculation or the estimates that were done here was
4 just basically what it would cost to get to an end-
5 point product based on what we laid out in the option.
6 We did not look at potential uncertainties such as a
7 litigation or implementation efforts and things like
8 that. It was just to get a product out, a completed
9 product out.

10 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: I was intrigued by one
11 of the comments you had gotten from the agreement
12 states, which was the CRCPD, it sounded like was
13 developing its counterpart of Part 41, if I understood
14 you correctly.

15 MR. WEBER: Right.

16 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: That's not one of the
17 options that you have mentioned. It seems to me that
18 you have underway someone who is trying to develop the
19 rule, if I understood you correctly. Is there some
20 opportunity for us there, to piggyback on the CRCPD
21 work?

22 MR. WEBER: As I recall, that is being
23 offered as another alternative to the three
24 alternatives that are laid out in the paper. I'm not
25 aware --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: It's not that it's
2 underway?

3 MR. WEBER: I don't believe, and Mike,
4 correct me if I'm wrong, is CRCPD right now writing a
5 suggested regulation that would implement the
6 objectives that the NRC identified for Part 41?

7 MR. LAYTON: Yes. The information I
8 received is that yes, they are currently working on
9 it. But really, I don't know how far along it is in
10 the process or how far along it has to go.

11 COMMISSIONER MCGRIFFGAN: Mr. Chairman,
12 the norm regulation that CRCPD worked on I think was
13 two decades or approximately. So it is a somewhat
14 slow process if they are at the very beginning stages,
15 which it sounds like they may be.

16 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Well, that may well be.
17 It may not be a real option, but it sounds to me like
18 there is a counterpart for the NRC.

19 MR. HOWSTEIN: Paul Howstein, Travel
20 Programs.

21 Chairman, I believe that the Committee is
22 addressing amendment to the suggested state
23 regulations to address some of the earlier changes
24 that NRC had made to its uranium recovery regulations.
25 They have explored the issue or the concept of maybe

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 working in parallel with NRC if we were to go forward
2 with the Part 41 rule. But I believe that they've
3 really not started any kind of extensive effort.

4 But what we can do is check and verify,
5 and see where they are in this process. But I know
6 one of the things we've tried to explore with them is
7 this concept of maybe working in parallel so we'd have
8 a suggested state regulation, at the same time, we'd
9 have our regulation, to try to facilitate the process.

10 But it is certainly an option. It is
11 certainly another option that's similar to the first
12 option, which is the alliance option, using the states
13 as a mechanism to help develop the regulatory base.

14 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Thank you, Paul.

15 On slide 5, you have a discussion of your
16 actions and interactions with EPA and I think some
17 states. If I understood the main theme of this is
18 that not only is it legally required that there be an
19 EPA counterpart program, but they are not duplicative
20 of one another, at least in EPA's view. Our program
21 is not duplicative of theirs.

22 There is I think the argument that NMA has
23 made to us today, that there is duplication with the
24 states, and that we therefore can rely on the states.
25 I mean the argument would be that then we could reduce

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 our effort by relying on the states because in some
2 sense it may even be more comprehensive than us.

3 Does the staff have any view on that
4 issue?

5 MR. LAYTON: That is certainly our goal,
6 is to see whether we can indeed rely on those reviews
7 from the states.

8 The one thing that we have learned in
9 talking with the states is that although each
10 individual state says that their programs are
11 comprehensive and protective, we do notice that there
12 are subtle differences among the states. The
13 difficulty then comes to us of which of these subtle
14 differences do we adopt and which ones do we not adopt
15 in a broader scope.

16 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: I don't think it's a
17 problem if the states are more stringent than we are,
18 then obviously they comply. The issue would be where
19 there are areas where they fall short.

20 MR. LAYTON: That's correct, yes.

21 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: And how significant
22 those are.

23 MR. LAYTON: We identified one or two
24 items where the states are less stringent than we are.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: But isn't the answer to
2 that, I think NMA would advocate, is rely on them
3 where they are at least equal or more stringent. If
4 there's some items that you need to scrutinize because
5 we are different from the states, that we just focus
6 on those areas.

7 MR. LAYTON: Agreed.

8 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: How are we going to
9 explore this? I mean how is this going to move
10 forward?

11 MR. LAYTON: What I had planned in working
12 with these states was initially making the contacts
13 with the cognizant individuals in the states, and
14 letting them know that we were embarking on this
15 process. At least in the interim, conveying a lot of
16 information through the Internet and email and through
17 phone conversations, and try to get all of this really
18 up to the same level of knowledge.

19 Then hopefully, in the June workshop,
20 where a lot of these state representatives will likely
21 be in attendance, that we could finally meet face-to-
22 face and discuss some of these issues, then see where
23 we can proceed from there.

24 MR. WEBER: It's important to point out,
25 the staff has ongoing contact with their state

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 equivalence, because as Mike has alluded to before in
2 the Crow-Butte review, we worked with the state to
3 understand what requirement they are imposing and how
4 do they interpret their own programs and so forth. So
5 there is already a rapport with the state
6 counterparts.

7 Now what we need to do is explore that,
8 and try to develop it into the way to see to what
9 extent can we rely on state regulation in lieu of NRC
10 review.

11 One of the complications that has come out
12 though, and I think Mike discovered this in his
13 discussions with some of the contacts, is that if NRC
14 were to do that and then something were to go to
15 hearing, one of the logistical constraints would be we
16 may then have to call on the state to participate in
17 that hearing. That's something that we need to
18 explore because it's not always apparent to us that
19 they operate in the same sort of regulatory domain
20 that NRC is accustomed to under our rules and
21 procedures.

22 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: On your slide 7, which
23 has to do with the status of actions, you have
24 indicated that you are pursuing issues as to surface

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 water discharges for in situ leach facilities. What
2 exactly are you doing?

3 MR. LAYTON: At this point, it's been an
4 issue that's raised as -- well, you are aware of the
5 letters that have come into you. We have yet to
6 really develop a firm action plan of how we plan to
7 interface with the state of New Mexico and the
8 licensees. But we do know that that is an area where
9 we do have to work on some coordination and pursue
10 this.

11 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: This is basically a
12 coordination issue, is what you are focusing on?

13 MR. LAYTON: Right now, yes.

14 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Good. Thank you very
15 much.

16 Commissioner Dicus had indicated to me
17 that she apologized for the fact that she had to
18 leave. I had not realized that beforehand or I would
19 have called on her first. So for the record, I
20 apologize to her. She did express her regrets that
21 she would not have an opportunity to ask questions.
22 There may be some follow-up that she may want to have
23 with you upon reviewing the matter.

24 Commissioner Diaz?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 COMMISSIONER DIAZ: Yes, thank you, Mr.
2 Chairman. Actually I have a series of very specific
3 questions to the staff. But in deference to the
4 excellent job of my fellow Commissioners have done in
5 exploring all the issues, I will task my staff to get
6 with you and resolve those. Therefore, I have no
7 further questions.

8 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Good. I would like to
9 thank both panels for what has been a very helpful
10 exchange today. You have brought a variety of issues
11 to our attention. They are important to us, and they
12 are ones that we'll be addressing.

13 So thank you very much. With that, we're
14 adjourned.

15 (Whereupon, at 12:34 p.m., the proceedings
16 were concluded.)

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10