

**From:** <Bob\_Specht@blm.gov>  
**To:** <jrp@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** 04/24/2006 1:58:54 PM  
**Subject:** Fw: Reynolds Ranch EA

James,

I have the comments back from our Hydrologist back already. I'm still working on my comments as well as the others. I've attached mikes comment for the EA below. Mike requested a list of well in the area that could be affected by the draw down. I've attached a copy of the Wyoming State Engineer site which would contain that listing for.

(See attached file: Brogan's Comments on PRI's RR.doc)

Bob Specht  
Mineral Geologist  
Casper Field Office  
Bureau of Land Management

(307) 261-7534  
bob\_specht@blm.gov

----- Forwarded by Bob Specht/CFO/WY/BLM/DOI on 04/24/2006 11:53 AM -----

Mike  
Brogan/CFO/WY/BLM  
/DOI  
04/24/2006 09:48  
AM  
To  
Bob Specht/CFO/WY/BLM/DOI@BLM  
cc  
Subject  
Reynolds Ranch EA

Bob,

Here's my comments.

(See attached file: Brogan's Comments on PRI's RR.doc)

Mike Brogan  
Hydrologist  
USBLM, Casper Field Office  
2987 Prospector Drive  
Casper, WY 82604  
(307)-261-7640

**Mail Envelope Properties (444D11CF.8C8 : 0 : 59592)**

**Subject:** Fw: Reynolds Ranch EA  
**Creation Date** 04/24/2006 1:57:55 PM  
**From:** <Bob\_Specht@blm.gov>

**Created By:** Bob\_Specht@blm.gov

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
 TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
 JRP (James Park)

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	1925	04/24/2006 1:57:55 PM
Brogan's Comments on PRI's RR.doc		226816
Brogan's Comments on PRI's RR.doc		226816
Mime.822	624400	

**Options**

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

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

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

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

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

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

NRC Draft EA  
 Comment Response Form  
 Power Resources, Inc. Reynolds Ranch-Highland Uranium Project *In Situ*

Comment Number	Page Number	Line Number	Commentor Name	Comment
1	14		Brogan	No Figure A-2 in my review document
2	14		Brogan	There should be a list of water wells in this section so that those that might be potentially wells that could potentially be impacted, can be identified. I would suggest all wells in I would suggest looking at all wells in T36,37 R73,74. I did a quick search and came up with 7 domestic, 83 Stock, some CBM, and some industrial wells (not including those for uranium)
3	22		Brogan	Rather than to list a few protection measures, BMP's for road construction, surface disturbance, etc should be referenced.
4	23		Brogan	2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph starts off "In areas where wells may be constructed in drainage areas . . ." does this mean in drainages? On floodplains? If this is the case then there will need to be 404 permits and a fairly detailed analysis of the impacts to the surface hydrology of these areas.
5	24		Brogan	The restoration goal of some of the listed groundwater chemical constituents seem a bit liberal. In example, As, Fe, Se, U, & Cl restoration goals are all an order of magnitude above the ambient levels.
6	23-26		Brogan	In the section on Groundwater Impacts, there is no discussion of the potential impacts as a result of the water use in the project (drawdown). Certainly, when the project is operating at peak flow (4500 gpm) there will be some impacts.
7	30		Brogan	All the groundwater monitoring is geared to water quality. What about the potential drawdown impacts?
8	31		Brogan	Section 7.2 Our (BLM) jurisdiction does not only pertain to fed surface but also fed minerals.
9	32		Brogan	Section 7.4 – I believe that a SWPP plan will also be required by the state.
10	general		Brogan	There is no discussion of cumulative impacts.

NRC Draft EA  
Comment Response Form  
Power Resources, Inc. Reynolds Ranch-Highland Uranium Project *In Situ*

Comment Number	Page Number	Line Number	Commentor Name	Comment
11	general		Brogan	Since there were no line numbers on my review copy, I could not reference line numbers in my review.
12	general		Brogan	No mention of riparian resources.
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				
29				
30				
31				
32				
33				
34				
35				
36				
37				
38				
39				