



RESPONSE TO FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT (FOIA) / PRIVACY ACT (PA) REQUEST

2003-0334

2

RESPONSE TYPE FINAL PARTIAL

REQUESTER

Sarah Fields

DATE

NOV 25 2003

PART I. -- INFORMATION RELEASED

- No additional agency records subject to the request have been located.
- Requested records are available through another public distribution program. See Comments section.
- APPENDICES Agency records subject to the request that are identified in the listed appendices are already available for public inspection and copying at the NRC Public Document Room.
- APPENDICES **C & E** Agency records subject to the request that are identified in the listed appendices are being made available for public inspection and copying at the NRC Public Document Room.
- Enclosed is information on how you may obtain access to and the charges for copying records located at the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW, Washington, DC.
- APPENDICES **C & E** Agency records subject to the request are enclosed.
- Records subject to the request that contain information originated by or of interest to another Federal agency have been referred to that agency (see comments section) for a disclosure determination and direct response to you.
- We are continuing to process your request.
- See Comments.

PART I.A -- FEES

AMOUNT *
\$

- You will be billed by NRC for the amount listed.
- None. Minimum fee threshold not met.
- You will receive a refund for the amount listed.
- Fees waived.

* See comments for details

PART I.B -- INFORMATION NOT LOCATED OR WITHHELD FROM DISCLOSURE

- No agency records subject to the request have been located.
- Certain information in the requested records is being withheld from disclosure pursuant to the exemptions described in and for the reasons stated in Part II.
- This determination may be appealed within 30 days by writing to the FOIA/PA Officer, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001. Clearly state on the envelope and in the letter that it is a "FOIA/PA Appeal."

PART I.C COMMENTS (Use attached Comments continuation page if required)

SIGNATURE - FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT AND PRIVACY ACT OFFICER

Carol Ann Reed

RESPONSE TO FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT (FOIA) / PRIVACY ACT (PA) REQUEST

2003-0334

NOV 25 2003

PART II.A – APPLICABLE EXEMPTIONS

APPENDICES
C & D

Records subject to the request that are described in the enclosed Appendices are being withheld in their entirety or in part under the Exemption No.(s) of the PA and/or the FOIA as indicated below (5 U.S.C. 552a and/or 5 U.S.C. 552(b)).

- Exemption 1: The withheld information is properly classified pursuant to Executive Order 12958.
- Exemption 2: The withheld information relates solely to the internal personnel rules and procedures of NRC.
- Exemption 3: The withheld information is specifically exempted from public disclosure by statute indicated.
 - Sections 141-145 of the Atomic Energy Act, which prohibits the disclosure of Restricted Data or Formerly Restricted Data (42 U.S.C. 2161-2165).
 - Section 147 of the Atomic Energy Act, which prohibits the disclosure of Unclassified Safeguards Information (42 U.S.C. 2167).
 - 41 U.S.C., Section 253(b), subsection (m)(1), prohibits the disclosure of contractor proposals in the possession and control of an executive agency to any person under section 552 of Title 5, U.S.C. (the FOIA), except when incorporated into the contract between the agency and the submitter of the proposal.
- Exemption 4: The withheld information is a trade secret or commercial or financial information that is being withheld for the reason(s) indicated.
 - The information is considered to be confidential business (proprietary) information.
 - The information is considered to be proprietary because it concerns a licensee's or applicant's physical protection or material control and accounting program for special nuclear material pursuant to 10 CFR 2.790(d)(1).
 - The information was submitted by a foreign source and received in confidence pursuant to 10 CFR 2.790(d)(2).
- Exemption 5: The withheld information consists of interagency or intraagency records that are not available through discovery during litigation. Applicable privileges:
 - Deliberative process: Disclosure of predecisional information would tend to inhibit the open and frank exchange of ideas essential to the deliberative process. Where records are withheld in their entirety, the facts are inextricably intertwined with the predecisional information. There also are no reasonably segregable factual portions because the release of the facts would permit an indirect inquiry into the predecisional process of the agency.
 - Attorney work-product privilege. (Documents prepared by an attorney in contemplation of litigation)
 - Attorney-client privilege. (Confidential communications between an attorney and his/her client)
- Exemption 6: The withheld information is exempted from public disclosure because its disclosure would result in a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.
- Exemption 7: The withheld information consists of records compiled for law enforcement purposes and is being withheld for the reason(s) indicated.
 - (A) Disclosure could reasonably be expected to interfere with an enforcement proceeding (e.g., it would reveal the scope, direction, and focus of enforcement efforts, and thus could possibly allow recipients to take action to shield potential wrongdoing or a violation of NRC requirements from investigators).
 - (C) Disclosure would constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.
 - (D) The information consists of names of individuals and other information the disclosure of which could reasonably be expected to reveal identities of confidential sources.
 - (E) Disclosure would reveal techniques and procedures for law enforcement investigations or prosecutions, or guidelines that could reasonably be expected to risk circumvention of the law.
 - (F) Disclosure could reasonably be expected to endanger the life or physical safety of an individual.
- OTHER (Specify)

PART II.B – DENYING OFFICIALS

Pursuant to 10 CFR 9.25(g), 9.25(h), and/or 9.65(b) of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission regulations, it has been determined that the information withheld is exempt from production or disclosure, and that its production or disclosure is contrary to the public interest. The person responsible for the denial are those officials identified below as denying officials and the FOIA/PA Officer for any denials that may be appealed to the Executive Director for Operations (EDO).

DENYING OFFICIAL	TITLE/OFFICE	RECORDS DENIED	APPELLATE OFFICIAL		
			EDO	SECY	IG
Martin J. Virgillio	Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards	App. C, and App. D/1 - D/13	✓		
Bruce S. Mallett	Regional Administrator, Region IV	Appendix D/14	✓		

Appeal must be made in writing within 30 days of receipt of this response. Appeals should be mailed to the FOIA/Privacy Act Officer, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, for action by the appropriate appellate official(s). You should clearly state on the envelope and letter that it is a "FOIA/PA Appeal."

**APPENDIX C
RECORDS BEING WITHHELD IN PART**

<u>NO.</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION (PAGE COUNT) EXEMPTION</u>
1.	10/05/82	Letter to D. Gillen from J. TenBrook, re: Audited Statements of Receipts and Expenditures of the Hanksville-Blanding Limited Partnership, 2 pages released in part, 15 pages withheld, Exemption 4
2.	05/09/83	NRC copy of letter to M.D. Vincelette from D. Smith, re: ALARA Audit Report, 78 pages, Exemption 6
3.	11/14/83	Letter to P. Hildenbrand from G. Glasier, re: Organization of Energy Fuels and Financial Data, 2 pages released, 3 pages withheld, Exemption 4
4.	06/27/94	Memo to Commissioner de Planque from J. Taylor, Subject: Response to Questions on CR-94-079, Letter to Utah Governor Levitt Providing a Follow-Up Response to His Request that NRC Modify the License of Umetco Minerals for its White Mesa Uranium Mill Facility, 1 page released, 2 pages withheld, Exemption 5
5.	10/13/99	Letter to B. Spitzberg from R. Berg, International Uranium (USA) Corporation, Re: notification of a transportation accident, 24 pages, Exemption 6

**APPENDIX D
RECORDS BEING WITHHELD IN THEIR ENTIRETY**

<u>NO.</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION (PAGE COUNT) EXEMPTION</u>
1	11/30/79	Memo to R. Scarano from K. Hammill, Subject: Unacceptability of the Surety Arrangements Submitted by Atlas Minerals, Energy Fuels Nuclear, and Plateau Resources, 3 ^{0119 2 Pages} pages, Exemption 5
2	04/26/82	Memo to R. Scarano from D. Gillen, Subject: Source Material License SUA-1358, Energy Fuels Nuclear - White Mesa Uranium Project, Amendment No. 12, 3 pages, Exemption 5
3.	04/02/84	Memo to R. Smith from R. Browning, Subject: Evaluation of Union Carbide's Application for Guaranteeing Surety of the White Mesa Mill, 8 pages, Exemptions 4 & 5
4.	08/03/94	Memo to J. Holonich from J. Austin, Subject: Review of Annual Surety Update Submitted by UMETCO Mineral Coproration for White Mesa Mill, Source Material License SUA-1358, 1 page, Exemptions 4 & 5
5.	05/10/96	Memo to J. Holonich from R. Nelson, Subject: Review of Annual Surety Update Submitted by Energy Fuels Nuclear, Inc., for White Mesa Mill, Source Material License SUA-1358, 1 page, Exemptions 4 & 5
6.	05/02/97	Memo to J. Holonich from J. Hickey, Subject: Review of Annual Surety Update Submitted by Energy Fuels Nuclear, Inc., for White Mesa Mill, Source Material License #SUA-1358, 1 page, Exemptions 4 & 5
7.	05/07/97	Memo to J. Holonich from J. Hickey, Subject: Review of International Uranium (USA) Corporation Financial Assurance Submittals for the White Mesa Mill, License SUA-1358, 2 pages, Exemption 5
8.	04/01/98	Memo to J. Holonich from J. Hickey, Subject: Review of Annual Surety Update Submitted by Energy Fuels Nuclear, Inc., for White Mesa Mill, Source Material License SUA-1358, 1 page, Exemptions 4 & 5
9.	09/28/98	Memo to J. Holonich from C. Erneigh, Subject: Technical Assistance Request - Review of Licensee Request to Process Materials from Fuel Fabrication Facilities, 1 page, Exemption 5
10.	12/03/98	Memo to C. Trottier from J. Hickey, Subject: Review of Draft NUREG-1307, 1 page, Exemption 5
11.	04/02/01	Memo to D. Gillen from T. Essig, re: Review of draft Environmental Assessment for IUC Molycorp Alternate Feed

**Material License Amendment Request for the White Mesa Mill
Located in Blanding, Utah, 3 pages, Exemption 5**

12. 08/27/01 Memo to T. Essig, from M. Leach re: Draft Environmental Assessment for IUC White Mesa Mill, 11 pages, **Exemption 5**
13. 07/25/02 Draft Environmental Assessment for the Maywood Alternate Feed Request IUC's Uranium Mill Site White Mesa, San Juan County, 11 pages, **Exemption 5**
14. 04/15/94 Memorandum from William Brown, Regional Counsel, Region IV, to Ray Hall, URFO, subject: Proposed Revised Surety Arrangement for White Mesa Mill. 3 pages **EX 5 Attorney-Client Privilege**

**APPENDIX E
RECORDS BEING RELEASED IN ENTIRETY**

<u>NO.</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION/PAGE COUNT</u>
1.	Undated	Memo from Carl Paperiello to James Blaha regarding Information Submittal. 1 page
2.	10/06/82	Letter from George Glasier, Energy Fuels Nuclear, Inc., to Dan Gillen regarding surety arrangement. 2 page
3.	04/26/85	Memo from Paul Hildenbrand , subject: Review of Semi-Annual ALARA Audit Report for UMETCO Minerals Corporation's White Mesa Mill. 6 pages
4.	06/29/95	Letter from Ronald Sroggins to Harold Roberts regarding license fees. 38 pages
5.	06/26/02	Letter from S. Fields to P. Lohaus regarding transfer of source material. 7 pages
6.	09/18/02	Letter from P. Lohaus to S. Fields. 3 pages
7.	No date	Excerpt from Materials License Supplementary Sheet - SUA-1341. 2 pages
8.	No date	Quality Plan for Construction Activities - White Mesa Project - Blanding , Utah. 27 pages