LOST CREEK ISR, LLC Lost Creek Project South-Central Wyoming

Environmental Report

(Docket No. 40-9068)

October, 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS - General

VOLUME L of 3

 \sim

VOLUME 2 of3

VOLUME 3 of 3

 $\mathbf i$

 \bar{z}

TABLE OF **CONTENTS -** Detailed

VOL UMElIof3

 $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$

VOLUME 1 of 3 (continued)

VOLUME 2 of 3

VOLUME 2 of 3 (continued)

Lost Creek Project NRC Environmental Repon October **2007**

 ϵ , $\epsilon_{\rm max}$

VOL UME3 of3

VOL UME 3 of 3 (continued)

VOLUME 3 of 3 (continued)

VOLUME 3 of 3 (continued)

LIST OF **FIGURES**

VOLUME of 3

SECTION 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Figure 1.2-1 Regional Map of the Permit Area

Figure 1.2-2 Solution Flow Patterns

Figure 1.2-3a Lost Creek Ore Trend

Figure 1.2-3b Site Layout

Figure 1.2-4 Injection Well Construction

Figure 1.2-5 Production Well Construction

Figure 1.2-6a Typical ISR Operation

Figure 1.2-6b Ion Exchange Process Flow

Figure 1.2-6c Plant Process Flow

Figure 1.2-7 Pre-Operation Schedule of the Lost Creek Project

Figure 1.2-8 Lost Creek Project Development, Production, and Restoration Schedule

SECTION 2.0 ALTERNATIVES

Figure 2.4-1 Potential Plant Site Locations

SECTION 3.0 DESCRIPTION OF THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

Section 3.1 Land Use

Figure 3.1-1 Land Ownership

Figure 3.1-2 BLM Grazing Allotments

Figure 3.1-3 Nuclear Fuel Cycle Facilities and Mines within 50 Miles

Section 3.2 Transportation

Figure 3.2-1 Regional Transportation Network

Figure 3.2-2 On-site Road Network

Section 3.3 Soils

Figure 3.3-1 Existing Road Disturbance

Figure 3.3-2 Typical Two-Track Road within the Permit Area

Section 3.4 Geology and Soils

Figure 3.4-1 Regional Geologic Map

Figure 3.4-2a Geologic Cross Section Schematic of the Permit Area

Figure 3.4-2b General Stratigraphy of the Upper Battle Spring Formation

Figure 3.4-3 Historical Seismic Activities in Wyoming

Figure 3.4-4 UBC Seismic Zones

Figure 3.4-5 Active Fault Systems in the Vicinity of the Permit Area

Figure 3.4-6 500-Year Probabilistic Acceleration Map of Wyoming

LIST OF **FIGURES** (continued)

VOLUME 2o 3

SECTION 3.0 DESCRIPTION OF THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT (continued)

Section 3.5 Hydrology

Figure 3.5-1 Surface Drainage Map for the Lost Creek Permit Area

Figure 3.5-2 Longitudinal Profile along Battle Spring Draw from the Northern Boundary

Figure 3.5-3 Photo of Crooked Well Reservoir Taken during Spring Snowmelt Runoff Looking West

Figure 3.5-4 Storm Water Sampler Installed to Collect a One-Liter Sample of Snowmelt or Storm Surface Runoff

Figure 3.5-5 Locations of Storm Water and Spring Snowmelt Samplers

Figure 3.5-6 Potentiometric Surface, Wasatch/Battle Spring Aquifers, Great Divide Basin (After Welder & McGreevey, 1966)

Figure 3.5-7 Regional Hydrostratigraphic Units of Interest, Great Divide Basin

Figure 3.5-8 Potentiometric Surface, Tertiary Aquifer System, Great Divide Basin (After Naftz, 1966)

Figure 3.5-9 Location Map, Lost Creek Monitor Wells

Figure 3.5-10 Site Hydrostratigraphic Units, Lost Creek Project

Figure 3.5-11 a Potentiometric Surface, HJ Production Zone, June 2007

Figure 3.5-1 lb Potentiometric Surface, HJ Production Zone, August 1982 and October 2006

Figure 3.5-11 c Potentiometric Surface, Overlying Aquifer (LFG), August 1982 and October 2006

Figure 3.5-1 **ld** Potentiometric Surface, Underlying Aquifer (UKM), August 1982 and October 2006

Figure 3.5-12 Location of Well Groups Used to Evaluate Vertical Hydraulic Gradients

Figure 3.5-13 Location of Pump Tests Conducted in 1982 and 2006

Figure 3.5-14 Location of Pump Test and Monitor Wells, 2006

Figure 3.5-15 Drawdown in the HJ Aquifer at the End of the LC19M Pump Test

Figure 3.5-16 Potentiometric Surface in the HJ Aquifer at the End of the LC19M Pump Test

Figure 3.5-17 Spatial Distribution of Aquifer Transmissivity

Figure 3.5-18 Groundwater Use Permits

Figure 3.5-19 BLM Battle Spring Well No. 4777

Figure 3.5-20 BLM Eagle Nest Draw Well

Figure 3.5-21 Location of Site Monitor Wells, Lost Creek Project

Figure 3.5-22 Location of Site Baseline Monitor Wells

Figure 3.5-23b Distribution of Radium-226, August 1982

LIST OF FIGURES (continued)

VOLUME 2 of 3 (continued)

SECTION 3.0 DESCRIPTION OF THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT (continued)

Section 3.5 Hydrology (continued)

Figure 3.5-23a Distribution of TDS, August 1982

Figure 3.5-23c Distribution of Uranium, August 1982

Figure 3.5-24a Distribution of Average TDS, September 2006 to May 2007

Figure 3.5-24b Distribution of Average Sulfate, September 2006 to May 2007

Figure 3.5-25a Piper Diagram - Average Water Quality at Individual Monitor Wells

Figure 3.5-25b Piper Diagram - Average Water Quality in Aquifers of Interest

Figure 3.5-26a Distribution of Average Uranium, September 2006 to May 2007

Figure 3.5-26b Distribution of Average Radium 226+228, September 2006 to May 2007

Section 3.6 Ecology

Figure 3.6-1 Vegetation Map

Figure 3.6-2 Upland Big Sagebrush Shrubland

Figure 3.6-3 Lowland Big Sagebrush Shrubland

Figure 3.6-4 Pronghom Range

Figure 3.6-5 Mule Deer Range

Figure 3.6-6 Elk Range

Figure 3.6-7 Moose Range

Figure 3.6-8 Sage Grouse Leks

Figure 3.6-9 Raptor Nests

Section 3.7 Meteorology, Climatology, and Air Quality

Figure 3.7-1 Meteorological Stations within 50 Miles of the Permit Area

Figure 3.7-2 Monthly Total Precipitation in the Project Region

Figure 3.7-3a to m Wind Speed and Wind Direction of the Lost Soldier

Meteorological Station

Figure 3.7-4 Tornado Statistics by County

Figure 3.7-5 Air Particulate Sampling Locations

Figure 3.7-6 Passive Radiological Sampling Locations

Section 3.9 Existing Historic and Cultural Resources

(separate volume - *requesting NRC confidentiality)*

Section 3.10 Visual/Scenic Resources

Figure 3.10-1a View from Center of Lost Creek Permit Area Facing North

Figure 3.10-lb View from Center of Lost Creek Permit Area Facing Northeast

Figure 3.10-1 c View from Center of Lost Creek Permit Area Facing East

Figure 3.10-1d View from Center of Lost Creek Permit Area Facing Southeast

Figure 3.10-1e View from Center of Lost Creek Permit Area Facing South

Figure 3.10-1f View from Center of Lost Creek Permit Area Facing Southwest

LIST OF FIGURES (continued)

VOLUME 2 of 3 (continued)

SECTION 3.0 DESCRIPTION OF THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT (continued)

Section 3.10 Visual/Scenic Resources (continued)

Figure 3.10-1g View from Center of Lost Creek Permit Area Facing West

Figure 3.10-lh View from Center of Lost Creek Permit Area Facing Northwest

Section 3.11 Socioeconomic Conditions

Figure 3.11-1 Significant Population Centers within 80 Kilometers

Section 3.12 Background Radiological Characteristics

Figure 3.12-1 Scanning System Equipment and Configuration

Figure 3.12-2 Correlation Grid Sampling Design

Figure 3.12-3 Nal-Based Gamma Survey Results

Figure 3.12-4 Nal Gamma Survey Results and HPIC Measurement Locations

Figure 3.12-5 OHV Re-Scan Results

Figure 3.12-6 Soil Sampling and Gamma Survey Results Overlay

Figure 3.12-7 Ra-226 Soil Concentration and Gamma Exposure Rate Correlation

Figure 3.12-8 Ra-226 and Uranium Soil Concentration Correlation

Figure 3.12-9 Calibration Curves for HPIC versus Nal Detectors

Figure 3.12-10 Three-Foot Nal Detector Height Data

Figure 3.12-11 Three-Foot and 4.5-Foot Nal Detector Height Readings Correlation

Figure 3.12-12 Calculated Three-Foot-HPIC-Equivalent Gamma Exposure Rates

Figure 3.12-13 Kriged Estimates of the Three-Foot-HPIC-Equivalent Gamma Exposure Rates

Figure 3.12-14 Regression Used to Predict Soil Ra-226 Concentrations

Figure 3.12-15 Estimated Soil Ra-226 Concentrations

VOLUME 3of 3

SECTION 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION, AND MONITORING

Figure 4.2-1 Transportation to Sussex, WY

Figure 4.2-2 Transportation to Falfurrias, TX

Figure 4.3-1 Soil Type with Projected Disturbance

Figure 4.6-1 Potential Impacts to Vegetation and Wildlife Habitat

Figure 4.6-2 Ornithological Impacts

Figure 4.8-1 Preferred Alternative Relative to Potential Archaeological Sites

Figure 4.8-2 Other Alternative Relative to Potential Archaeological Sites

Figure 4.12-1 Locations of Modeled Receptor Points for the Lost Creek Project

LIST OF TABLES

VOLUME of 3

SECTION 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Section 1.0 Introduction

Table 1.3-1 List of Regulatory Requirements

SECTION 3.0 DESCRIPTION OF THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

Section 3.1 Land Use

Table 3.1-1 Hunting Statistics for Hunt Areas that Include the Permit Area Section 3.2 Transportation

Table 3.2-1 Local and Regional Roads

Table 3.2-2 Traffic Safety Data

Section 3.4 Geology and Soils Table 3.4-1 Permit Area Stratigraphy

VOLUME 2 of3

SECTION 3.0 DESCRIPTION OF THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT (continued)

Section 3.5 Hydrology

Table 3.5-1 Peak Flow Regression Equations

Table 3.5-2 Calculated Peak Flows for Battle Spring Draw

Table 3.5-3 Historic Water Quality Results for Battle Spring from the Sweetwater Mill Permit Application

Table 3.5-4 Water Quality Results for Seven Storm Water/Spring Snowmelt Samples Collected on 17 April 2007

Table 3.5-5 Monitor Well Data

Table 3.5-6 Water Level Data

Table 3.5-7 Horizontal Hydraulic Gradients

Table 3.5-8 Vertical Hydraulic Gradients

Table 3.5-9 1982 and 2006 Pump Test Results

Table 3.5-10 2007 LC19M Long Term Pump Test Monitor Wells

Table 3.5-11 2007 LC19M Pump Test Results

Table 3.5-12 Groundwater Use Permits

Table 3.5-13 Cancelled and Abandoned Wells

Table 3.5-14 Baseline Water Quality Monitoring Parameters

Table 3.5-15 Analytical Results of Baseline Monitoring

Table 3.5-16 Distribution of Samples Exceeding EPA MCL for Radium-226+228

VOLUME 2 of 3 (continued)

SECTION 3.0 DESCRIPTION OF THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT (continued)

Section 3.6 Ecology

Table 3.6-1 Summary of Vegetation Data

Table 3.6-2 Rare Plant Species

Table 3.6-3 Prohibited and Restricted Noxious Weeds

Table 3.6-4 Wildlife Species Observed or Potentially Occurring in the Permit Area

Table 3.6-5 Relative Abundance of Big Game Observations

Table 3.6-6 Sage Grouse Lek Counts

Table 3.6-7 Raptor Nest Locations

Table 3.6-8 T&E Wildlife Species Potentially Occurring in the Permit Area

Table 3.6-9 Wildlife Species of Special Concern

Section 3.7 Meteorology, Climatology, and Air Quality

Table 3.7-1 Comparison of Temperature Data

Table 3.7-2 Dew Point Temperature Data

Table 3.7-3 Monthly Maximum and Minimum Humidity Measured.at the Lost Soldier Meteorological Station

Table 3.7-4 Monthly Estimated Lake Evaporation at the Pathfinder Dam

Table 3.7-5 Air Stability Data

Table 3.7-6 Primary and Secondary Limits for National Ambient Air Quality Standards and the State of Wyoming

Table 3.7-7 Allowable Increments for Prevention of Significant Deterioration of Air Quality

Table 3.7-8 Reported Sources of Emissions near the Permit Area

Table 3.7-9 Reported Total Emissions near the Permit Area

Table 3.7-10 PM_{10} Concentrations at Lost Creek

Table 3.7-11 Analytical Results for Passive Radon and Gamma Sampling Section 3.9 Existing Historic ad Cultural Resources

(separate volume - *requesting NRC confidentiality)*

Section 3.11 Socioeconomic Conditions

Table 3.11-1 Demographic Information

Table 3.11-2 Population Distribution

Table 3.11-3 Population Forecasts for the Study Area

Table 3.11-4 Labor Force Statistics

Table 3.11-5 Average Rental Rates

Section 3.12 Background Radiological Conditions

Table 3.12-1 Soil Sampling and Correlation Grid Results

Table 3.12-2 Gamma Exposure Rate Differences from Two Nal Detector Heights

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

VOLUME 3 of'3

SECTION 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION, AND MONITORING

Table 4.2-1 Bulk Chemicals Required at the Permit Area

Table 4.3-1 Disturbance Type and Associated Stripped Acreage

Table 4.6-1 Stripped and Disturbed Acreage by Vegetation Type

Table 4.6-2 Permanent Seed Mixture

Table 4.6-3 Exclusion Periods for Migration of Activity from Rawlins

Table 4.7-1 Estimated Emission from Vehicles

Table 4.10-1 Estimated Work Force Requirements for All Alternatives

Table 4.10-2 Estimated Tax Revenues based on Lost Creek Annual Production

Table 4.11-1 US Census Bureau Community Statistics for Environmental-Justice Analysis

SECTION 5.0 COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS

Table 5.1-1 Estimated Project Costs

Table 5.2-1 Estimated Project Benefits

SECTION 6.0 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES Table 6.0-1 Summary of Environmental Consequences

ATTACHMENTS

VOLUME I of 3

SECTION 3.0 DESCRIPTION OF THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT Section 3.4 Geology and Soils

Attachment 3.4-1 Typical Geophysical Logs

Attachment 3.4-2 Locations, Total Depths, and Completion Dates of Historic Exploration Holes

VOLUME 2 of 3

SECTION 3.0 DESCRIPTION OF THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT (continued)

Section 3.5 Hydrology

Attachment 3.5-1 Evaluation of Pump Tests

Section 3.6 Ecology

Attachment 3.6-1 WGFD Wildlife Observations System Data

Attachment 3.6-2 Work Plan for Wildlife 2007

Attachment 3.6-3 BLM and WDEQ Correspondence

Attachment 3.6-4 MBHFI in Wyoming

Section 3.9 Existing and Historic Cultural Resources (separate volume - requesting NRC confidentiality)

Section 3.12 Background and Radiological Characteristics

Attachment 3.12-1 Data Quality Assurance Documentation

Attachment 3.12-2 Data Quality Control Documentation

Attachment 3.12-3 Final Baseline Gamma Survey and Ra-226 Soil Maps

Attachment 3.12-4 HPIC-Adjusted Gamma Datasets (Electronic Dataset Only)

VOLUME 3of 3

SECTION 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION, AND MONITORING Attachment 4.12-1 MILDOS-AREA Modeling Results

PLATES

VOLUME of 3

SECTION 1.0 INTRODUCTION Section 1.2 Proposed Action Platel.2-1 Plant Site Plan

SECTION 3.0 DESCRIPTION OF THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT Section 3.3 Soils

Plate 3.3-1 Distribution of Soil Units and Sampling Locations

Section 3.4 Geology

Plate 3.4-1a Geologic Cross Section A-A'

Plate 3.4-1b Geologic Cross Section B-C

Plate 3.4-1c Geologic Cross Section C-D

Plate 3.4-1d Geologic Cross Section D-E

Plate 3.4-le Geologic Cross Sections F-F, G-G, and H-H

Plate 3.4-2a Lost Creek Shale Isopach Map

Plate 3.4-2b HJ Sand Isopach Map

Plate 3.4-2c Sagebrush Shale Isopach Map

Plate 3.4-2d UKM Sand Isopach Map

VOLUME 2 of 3

SECTION 3.0 DESCRIPTION OF THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT (continued)

Section 3.7 Meteorology, Climatology, and Air Quality

Plate 3.7-1 Meteorological Stations within 50 Miles of the Permit Area

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS (cont.)

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS (cont.)

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS (cont.)

Lost Creek Project NRC Environmental Report October 2007

 $\bar{\Lambda}$

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.2-1 Regional Map of the Permit Area

Figure 1.2-2 Solution Flow Patterns

Figure 1.2-3a Lost Creek Ore Trend

Figure 1.2-3b Site Layout

Figure 1.2-4 Injection Well Construction

Figure 1.2-5 Production Well Construction

Figure 1.2-6a Typical ISR Operation

Figure 1.2-6b Ion Exchange Process Flow

Figure 1.2-6c Plant Process Flow

Figure 1.2-7 Pre-Operation Schedule of the Lost Creek Project

Figure 1.2-8 Lost Creek Project Development, Production, and Restoration Schedule

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.3-1 List of Regulatory Requirements

PLATES

Plate 1.2-1 Plant Site Plan

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Lost Creek ISR, LLC (LC ISR, LLC) is submitting this Environmental Report (ER) to the United States (US) Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) in support of a source and byproduct material license to operate the Lost Creek Project (Project) in accordance with the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, 10 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Parts 20, 40, *51,* and 70, and other applicable laws, regulations and NRC guidelines. Issuance of this license would authorize LC ISR, LLC to conduct in situ recovery (ISR) uranium mining in Sweetwater County, Wyoming.

Per the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) of 1969, federal agencies are obligated to evaluate the effects of major federal actions on the health and safety of the public and -assess impacts to the environment. NRC and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) are the federal agencies with jurisdiction over the Project and the Lost Creek Permit Area (Permit Area), respectively. NRC has jurisdiction under 10 CFR Part 51, Environmental Protection Regulations for Domestic Licensing and Related Regulatory Functions. NRC is required to perform an environmental evaluation of the proposed licensing actions. As the land manager, the BLM has jurisdiction over leases related to the use of the Permit Area. After consultations with both federal agencies, it was agreed that NRC will take the lead on implementing the NEPA process for the Project. Consequently, NRC will prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) related to the Lost Creek Project. LC ISR, LLC has, held regular pre-licensing meetings with NRC and BLM to discuss baseline survey work plans, proposed hydrogeological programs, permitting schedules and application preparation. NRC and BLM staff members were also invited to the Project site during the baseline surveys. NRC issued a Docket Number (40-9068) and a Technical Assignment Control (TAC) Number (LU0142) for the Project in September 8, 2006.

This ER is organized in accordance with the guidance contained in NUREG-1748, Environmental Review Guidance for Licensing Actions Associated with Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards (NMSS) Programs, dated August 2003. Section 1 provides an introduction of the Project, discusses why LC ISR, LLC is requesting a license to operate a uranium ISR facility, and presents a detailed Project description. Section 2 discusses the proposed action versus alternatives, including the no-action alternative and alternatives considered but eliminated. Section 3 describes the existing environmental conditions in the Permit Area; and Section 4 discusses how those conditions could be impacted, if at all, by the proposed action, and the mitigation and monitoring-measures that will be implemented during the Project. Section 5 presents the Cost-Benefit Analysis. Section 6 provides the summary of the environmental

consequences from the Project. Sections 7 and 8 contain a list of references and preparers, respectively.

1.1 Purpose and Need for the Proposed Action

The Lost Creek Project will contribute to the advancement of the energy security goal of maintaining a reliable, economical, and domestic source of uranium. Exploratory drilling and testing have provided the delineation of the uranium ore trend and a reliable estimate on the uranium reserve, ore grade and percent recovery.

The Project will support energy-independent and environment-friendly policies. The uranium production will assist to supply a viable domestic uranium recovery industry by applying new technologies that minimize environmental disturbance and potential adverse effects to public health and safety. This Project will also help to offset the deficit in annual domestic uranium production and help to meet increasing energy demands. Between 1989 and 2003, annual domestic uranium production decreased by 75 percent. The United States produces about two percent of world uranium production, while consuming over 25 percent of that production. As of 2006, the world produced just over 50 percent of the annual consumption of U_3O_8 . The gap between demand and supply has been filled by stockpiles and uranium from non-traditional sources (e.g., dilution of weapon-grade uranium). There are concerns about the long-term availability of uranium from non-traditional sources. The Project, once in full scale production, will add 1,000,000 pounds of U_3O_8 per year to the market. With appropriate regulatory approval, the processing facilities could also process ore from other ISR sites in the region even after the ore recovery is complete in the Permit Area.

Mining and other industrial activities have potential impacts. However, ISR operations will minimize surface and underground disturbance and significantly reduce potential adverse impacts to workers and the general public.

Nuclear energy production is an important strategy for curbing global climate change over the long-run. Unlike coal-fired power plants, nuclear power plants produce virtually no greenhouse gas emissions.

1.2 Proposed Action

LC ISR, LLC is applying for a source and byproduct material license for the Project in order to facilitate the production of U_3O_8 "yellowcake" slurry from the Permit Area.

1.2.1 Overview

The Permit Area is located in the northeast portion of Sweetwater County, south central Wyoming. Figure 1.2-1 shows the regional location of the Permit Area and the general geographic features of the region. The approximate 4,220-acre Permit Area is remotely located on public land administered by the BLM and the State of Wyoming. The Permit Area is within Township 25 North and Ranges **92** and 93 West of the Sixth Principal Meridian and approximately centered at 42 degrees, eight minutes North latitude and 107 degrees, 51 minutes West longitude. Rawlins is 38 miles southeast; Rock Springs is 80 miles southwest; Casper is 90 miles northeast; and Jeffrey City is 25 miles north. The nearest population center, located 15 miles northeast of the Permit Area, is Bairoil, a small town with less than 100 people.

The Permit Area is characterized by low-relief, sagebrush-dominated plains, dissected by small, ephemeral drainages. Due to little variation in topography, severe winter conditions, and less than ten inches of annual precipitation, the ecological diversity in the Permit Area is limited.

The discovery of uranium deposits in the Permit Area and consequential exploratory drilling and studies have occurred over the course of four decades.

In 1968, American Metals Climax Inc. acquired the property and discovered low-grade mineralization. Exploration drilling, carried out by Texasgulf, Inc. (Texasgulf) from 1976 through 1982, identified the main mineral trend.

In 1969, Conoco Inc. (Conoco) acquired the adjacent property to the east and conducted a major exploratory drilling program, including the installation of groundwater monitor wells. In 1978, Texasgulf optioned a 50 percent interest in Conoco's property and continued the exploratory drilling of the main mineral trend at Lost Creek to the east. In 1981, Texasgulf carried out laboratory column leach testing of core samples with carbonate lixiviant which resulted in extraction in excess of 89 percent. In 1982, Texasgulf conducted pump tests on the mineralized sandstones at Lost Creek. The hydrological characteristics of the mineralized sandstones indicated that uranium extraction could be conducted with ISR methods (Poole, 1984). In 1983, Texasgulf and Conoco discontinued their exploration activities and studies due to economic reasons.

In 1986, the Japanese-owned, PNC Exploration, USA acquired the lode claims in the Lost Creek area and carried out additional delineation drilling, geologic and resource studies of the deposit through 1992 (Fruchey and Groth, 2004). New Frontiers Uranium, LLC, purchased the property from PNC Exploration, USA in 2000. New Frontiers

Lost Creek Project *NRC Environmental Report October 2007*

Uranium, LLC subsequently transferred the Lost Creek property along with its other Wyoming properties into **NFU** Wyoming, LLC (NFU).

From June 2005 through June 2007, Ur-Energy USA, Inc. (Ur-E), a Colorado corporation, purchased **100** percent ownership of NFU. During that time, NFU conducted engineering feasibility studies, core drilling for metallurgical studies and delineation drilling to outline and define the uranium resources at Lost Creek. In addition, NFU conducted comprehensive baseline studies, including the installation of additional monitor wells for hydrological testing and water. quality sampling and a meteorological station within the Permit Area.

In July 2007, NFU transferred its Lost Creek property to Lost Creek ISR, LLC a wholly owned subsidiary of Ur-E formed for the specific purpose of owning and developing the Lost Creek property.

1.2.2 Project Description

LC ISR, LLC is proposing the construction, operation, and reclamation of facilities for ISR operations within the Permit Area. ISR involves the use of a recovery solution, otherwise known as a lixiviant, to extract the mineral from the geologic formation in which it occurs without physically removing the ore-bearing strata.

1.2.2.1 Design and Construction of Mine Units and Facilities

LC ISR, LLC will design and construct mine units and a processing facility in order to recover the uranium resources at Lost Creek.

Mine Units

A typical uranium ISR mine unit, usually 30 to 40 acres in area, will consist of:

- **"** a production field with injection and production well patterns,
- a monitor well ring, and
- header houses and pipelines.

Production and injection well patterns will' primarily be conventional five-spot patterns, unless modified to fit the shape of the ore body. A five-spot pattern, otherwise known as a cell, is a square with four injection wells at the comers and a centrally located production well. Figure 1.2-2 shows a typical layout of an ISR mine unit and solution flow patterns. The injection wells will be spaced 75 to 150 feet apart. All the production and injection wells will be completed so they can be used as either production wells or injection wells. This design allows changes in the solution flow patterns to improve uranium recovery and to restore the groundwater in the most efficient manner.

There are four types of monitor wells, those completed in a 'monitor ring' around the production zone, those completed in the overlying and underlying aquifers, if any, and those completed within the pattern areas. The wells in the monitor ring will be spaced about 500 feet apart, depending on the hydrogeology of the production zone,-and will be located approximately 500 feet outside the pattern area. Monitor wells will also be completed in the aquifers directly overlying and underlying the production zone. These wells will uniformly be distributed across the mine unit area, with approximately one overlying, one underlying, and one production zone monitor well in each four acres of the production field.

Injection wells and-production wells will be connected to their respective injection or production manifold in a building commonly called a header house. The manifolds route solutions in pipelines to and from the ion exchange circuit in the Plant. Flow meters, control valves, and pressure gauges will be installed in the individual well lines to monitor and control the individual well flow rates.

Each mine unit will have its own construction, operation, and reclamation schedule, One or more mine units may be in production at any one time with additional mine units in various stages of construction and/or reclamation. A mine unit will be dedicated to only one production zone and will typically have a flow rate of about 6,000 gallons per minute (gpm). The size and location of the mining units will be defined based on the final delineation of the ore deposits, performance of the area and development requirements. Figures 1.2-3a shows the Lost Creek ore trend within the Permit Area. Based on current geological and hydrogeological data, approximately six mine units will be developed in the Permit Area during the life of the Project (Figure 1.2-3b).

Mine unit piping will be high-density polyethylene (HIDPE), polyvinyl chloride (PVC), and/or steel. The individual well lines and the trunk lines to the Plant will be installed below ground to prevent freezing. Ancillary equipment needed will include truck mounted pulling units, trailer mounted hose reels, electrical generators, backhoes, mechanical integrity test (MIT) trucks, motor graders, all terrain forklifts, cementing trailers and light duty 4-wheel drive vehicles.. The wells will be installed by contract well drillers who will use truck mounted rotary drilling rigs and water trucks.

Lost Creek Project NRC Environmental Report October 2007

Well Construction

The injection, production, and monitor wells will be drilled to the base of the target completion interval with a truck-mounted rotary drilling unit using native mud and a small amount of commercial drilling-fluid additive for viscosity and filtrate control. Following geophysical logging (spontaneous potential, single point resistivity, gamma ray, and Prompt Fission Neutron (PFN)), the upper portion of the hole will be reamed to accommodate casing. Casing will be set and cemented to isolate the completion interval from overlying aquifers. The cement will be placed by pumping it down the casing and forcing it out the bottom of the casing and back up the casing drill hole annulus.

The PVC well casing will have a standard dimension ratio (SDR) of 17, available in 20 foot joints. The typical casing will be a nominal 4.5 inch diameter with a minimum wall thickness of 0.291 inches and an internal pressure rating of 160 pound-force per square inch gauge (psig).

One casing centralizer will be located at each 40-foot interval to ensure the casing is centered in the drill hole and to ensure an effective cement seal.

The volume of cement used is the calculated volume required to fill the annulus and return cement to the surface. In most cases, the cement returns to the surface, at least initially. However, in some cases, the drilling may result in a larger annulus volume than anticipated and cement may not return to the surface. In these cases, the upper portion of the annulus will be cemented from the surface. In the majority of cases, where the cement fails to return to surface, the reason will be a washout or a casing failure. In the event of a casing problem, the well will not pass the MIT. In all cases, wells are required to pass an MIT test before operations approval. This will ensure that there is sufficient integrity to allow the use of the well in handling lixiviant.

After the cement has set, the cement plug within the casing will be drilled out and the well will be flushed with water to remove any cement fines from the target zone. An under reaming tool is then used to cut a larger diameter hole across the completion zone. The well is then air lifted for a period of time adequate to remove any remaining drilling mud and/or cuttings. If sand production or hole stability problems are expected, a wirewrapped screen or similar equipment may be installed across the completion interval. The typical injection well and production well completions are illustrated in Figure 1.2-4 and Figure 1.2-5, respectively. Further well development may be achieved by swabbing the well, additional airlifting or pumping.

Well Casing Integrity

Prior to operating a well, the well casing will undergo an MIT. During the MIT, the well casing is plugged, pressurized, and the pressure monitored for a set period of time. The bottom of the casing adjacent to or below the confining layer above the injection zone is sealed with a plug, down-hole packer, or other suitable device. The top of the casing is then sealed in a similar manner or with a threaded cap. A pressure gauge is instalied to monitor the pressure inside of the casing. Once the well casing is plugged and a pressure gauge is installed, the pressure inside of the well casing is increased to a specified test pressure and will maintain 95 percent of that pressure for ten minutes to pass the test.

If a well casing does not pass an MIT, the casing will be repaired and retested. If a repaired well casing meets an MIT, the well will be used for its intended service. Also, if the well defect occurs at depth, the well may be plugged back and re-completed for use in a shallower zone provided it passes a subsequent MIT. If an acceptable MIT cannot be .obtained after repairs, the well will be plugged. A new well casing integrity test will also be conducted after any well repair using a down hole drill bit or under reaming tool.

Monitor wells will be drilled and constructed in the same manner as production and injection wells and all three types of wells must pass MIT. All methods for demonstrating casing integrity must be approved by the Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality (WDEQ) prior to use on the Project.

Process Plant[;]

The Plant will house three distinct process circuits: the ion exchange circuit (also called the resin-loading circuit), the elution circuit, and the precipitation/filtration circuit: The ion exchange circuit will be located adjacent to the other. two circuits. The design of the Plant is presented in Plate 1.2-1.

The facility will be capable of processing 6,000 pounds U_3O_8 per day (2.2 million pounds per year) with normal operations at 90 percent of the design. The uranium concentration of the lixiviant solution is anticipated to range between 30 and 100 milligrams per liter (mg/L) of uranium oxide (U_3O_8), averaging 40 to 50 mg/L. Standard commercially available ion exchange resins function well under these conditions.

The Plant will be constructed by qualified contractors with direct supervision by LC ISR, LLC engineers.

1.2.2.2 ISR Operations

The Project will use ISR technology to extract uranium from permeable, uranium-bearing sandstones located at depths ranging from 300 to 700 feet below the surface. The processes used for uranium ISR are well understood and well-established industrial practices. Figures 1.2-6a, b and **c** are schematics of a typical uranium ISR operation.

Mine Units

The uranium ISR process starts at the mine units by first introducing lixiviant into the ore zone through the injection wells. The lixiviant is composed of native groundwater, carbon dioxide and oxygen or an equivalent oxidizing agent. Carbon dioxide is to be added either at the Plant and/or at the header houses. Oxygen will be added to the barren lixiviant at the mine unit header houses. The combined carbonate/bicarbonate concentration in the injected solution will be maintained at less than five grams per liter (g/L) , and the hydrogen peroxide and/or oxygen concentration will be less than one g/L . These limits help reduce the possibility of "gas lock" in the formation, which reduces mining efficiency.

When the lixiviant is injected into the ore zone, the dissolved oxidant reacts with the uranium mineral and brings the uranium to the U^{+6} oxidation state. The uranium then complexes with some of the carbonates in the lixiviant to form an uranyl dicarbonate ion $[UO_2(CO_3)_2]^2$ and/or an uranyl tricarbonate ion $[UO_2(CO_3)_3]^4$, both of which are soluble and stable in solution. A small portion of the radium content will also be mobilized along with the uranium. Depending on site conditions, other metals such as arsenic, molybdenum, selenium, and/or vanadium, may also be mobilized. The resultant uranium-bearing solution will be recovered from the production wells to the surface. The injection and production rates will be balanced to control the movement of fluids in the aquifer.

In each mine unit, more uranium-bearing solution will be extracted than lixiviant injected which creates a localized hydrological cone of depression or pressure sink. The anticipated overproduction or bleed will be a nominal 0.5 percent to one percent of the production rate. Under this pressure gradient, the groundwater in the surrounding area will move toward the mine unit, minimizing any chance of excursion.

Small groups of injection and production wells will be connected by buried pipelines to a header house. The uranium-bearing solution will be conveyed between the mine unit and the ion exchange facility through buried pipelines with controlled flows.

Lost Creek Project NRC Environmental Report October 2007

Plant

The ion exchange circuit at the Plant receives the uranium-bearing solution from the mine unit(s) through buried pipelines. The following operations will occur at the Plant:

Resin Loading

The ion exchange circuit in the Plant will consist of ten pressurized vessels, each containing 500 cubic feet, of anionic ion exchange resin. These vessels will be configured as five parallel trains for two-stage down-flow loading. Booster pumps will be located upstream and downstream of the trains.

As the pregnant (uranium rich) lixiviant enters the ion exchange circuit from the mine unit, the upstream booster pumps will pressurize the fluid to approximately 100 psig. The dissolved uranium in the pregnant lixiviant will chemically adsorb onto the ion exchange resin as the lixiviant passes through the resin beds. Any sand or silt entrained in the pregnant lixiviant will be trapped by the resin bed like a traditional sand filter. The barren lixiviant exiting the second stage will normally contain less than five mg/L uranium. A slip stream of the barren lixiviant will be treated with reverse osmosis (RO) prior to sending it back to the field for re-injection. The injection fluid will be pressurized by booster pumps prior to returning to the mine unit for re-injection. The bleed portion of the fluid will be treated and disposed of via a UIC Class I well.

Resin Elution

When resin in an ion exchange vessel is loaded and removing very little additional uranium from the incoming solution, the vessel will be isolated from the normal process flow. The resin will then be transferred to the Elution Circuit. At the Plant, the resin will be passed over vibrating screens with wash water to remove entrained sand particles and other fine debris. The resin will be gravity fed into pressurized down-flow elution vessels for uranium recovery and resin regeneration.

Once placed in the elution vessel, the resin will be contacted with an eluate composed of approximately 90 **g/L** sodium chloride and 20 **g/L** sodium carbonate (soda ash). The eluted resin will be rinsed with fresh water and returned to the bulk tank trailer or an empty ion exchange vessel. The resin will then be transported back to the ion exchange facility and placed in an ion exchange vessel for additional uranium recovery.

Using a three-staged elution circuit, 45,000 gallons of eluate will contact 500 cubic feet of resin, generating approximately 15,000 gallons of rich eluate containing ten to 20 g/L $U₃O₈$. Likewise, 15,000 gallons of fresh eluate will be required per elution. The fresh

eluate will be prepared by mixing the proper quantities of a saturated sodium chloride (salt) solution, a saturated soda ash solution and water. The saturated salt solution will be generated in commercially available salt saturators (brine generators). The saturated soda ash solution will be prepared by passing warm water (greater than 105 degrees Fahrenheit [°F]) through a bed of soda ash. Both types of saturators are commercially available and represent standard, proven design and construction techniques.

Precipitation

In the elution circuit, the uranyl dicarbonate ions will be removed from the loaded resin and converted to uranyl tricarbonate by a relatively small volume of strong sodium chloride/soda ash solution. The resultant rich eluate will contain sufficient uranium for economic precipitation.

From the elution circuit, the uranium-rich eluate will be sent to an agitator tank for batch precipitation. To initiate the precipitation cycle, hydrochloric or sulfuric acid will be added to the eluate to breakdown the uranyl carbonate present in the solution. Hydrogen peroxide will then be added to the eluate to effect precipitation of the uranium as uranyl peroxide. Caustic soda solution will then be added to elevate the pH, which promotes growth of uranyl peroxide crystals and makes the slurry safer to handle in the subsequent process steps.

Product Filtering

After precipitation, the precipitated uranium will be washed, to remove excess chlorides and other soluble contaminants, and then de-watered and filtered to form the yellowcake slurry. This slurry will then be stored in holding tanks or in transport tanks parked in a secure area in the Plant. The holding and transport tanks will be used solely for yellowcake slurry. On-site inventory of U_3O_8 in the slurry form will typically be less than 100,000 pounds. However, in periods of inclement weather or other interruptions to product shipments, there will be capacity for up to 200,000 pounds of slurry within the Plant. The yellowcake slurry will be shipped by exclusive-use, authorized transport to a facility licensed by NRC for processing the slurry into dry yellowcake.

1.2.2.3 Instrumentation and Control

For control and monitoring purposes, two separate control systems will be provided during ISR operations. Each system will be designed and instrumented to accommodate the steady state or batch flow that is characteristic of particular process flow streams or unit operations. In particular, this distinction is highlighted as follows.

1. Steady State:

a. Mine Unit/Resin Loading Circuit

b. Mine Unit Process Water Disposal

2. Batch:

a. Bleed Treatment

b. Resin Elution

c. Precipitation

d. Product Filtering

e. Process Water Disposal

Since the mine unit resin loading circuit operates at a steady state, modest deviations from the normal operating flow rates and pressure profiles (plus or minus ten percent or greater) will be indicative of major operating upsets. An automatic Emergency Shut Down (ESD) system, consisting of pressure and flow rate switches, will be provided for this circuit.

In the event of an automatic shut down, an alarm will notify the operator of the situation. Once the major upset (broken piping, leaking vessels, etc.) is identified and corrective action taken, only then can the circuit be manually restarted. This type of control system provides the best protection against fluid spills to the environment and product losses. The back-up for the automatic ESD system is provided by local displays of the same flow rates and pressures that the ESD system monitors.

The Elution, Precipitation, and Product Filtering Circuits will operate in a batch nature. These circuits are controlled by Programmable Logic Controllers (PLCs), which sequence the opening and closing of appropriate valves once the processes are manually initiated. In addition, the PLC will provide closed-loop feedback control for the elution and precipitation circuits. All automatic valves will be equipped with manual control override. Local indication of pressures, levels, flow rates, and pH will be provided for the complete manual control of these circuits if required.

Process water treatment and disposal circuits will operate under semi-continuous, steadystate conditions, which require control systems that integrate components of both steadystate and batch operations.

The control systems will employ state-of-the-art hardware with proven as well as demonstrated process logic. Like all elements of the designs, instrumentation and control designs are based on modem practices with proven techniques.

Lost Creek Project NRC Environmental Report October 2007

1.2.2.4 Restoration, Decommissioning, and Reclamation

Technical, economic, and operational criteria can be reviewed to determine if uranium recovery is complete in a given header house and/or mine unit. When the mineral is sufficiently recovered, the lixiviant injection ceases and groundwater restoration commences. If a mined unit is adjacent to another unit being produced, restoration of a portion of the unit may be deferred to minimize interference with the operating unit. However, LC ISR, LLC intends that concurrent restoration and mining will be conducted (e.g., each mine unit will be restored following mining).

The goal of groundwater restoration will be to return the water quality parameters to the pre-operational class of use as defined by WDEQ. After completion of groundwater restoration, which will be approved by WDEQ and NRC, all cased wells will be permanently plugged and capped. The well casing will be cut off below plow depth and the site revegetated.

Byproduct material, as defined and amended in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, will be disposed of at'an off-site NRC-licensed disposal facility or in a UIC Class I well.

Prior to the commencement of surface reclamation, affected areas and buildings will be decontaminated, and facilities and ancillary equipment will be decommissioned and removed. Vegetation will.be reestablished with the approved seed mixtures.

1.2.3 Schedule

Prior to Project start up, the WDEQ Permit to Mine, NRC Source Material License, and .other federal, state and local permits and approvals must be received. Figure **1.2-7** presents the pre-operational development schedule. The critical tasks in this phase will be the approval of the Permit to Mine application and Mine Unit 1 permit by WDEQ, the NRC Source Materials License approval, approval of the Project by BLM, and approval of the Class III (deep injection) and Class I (ISR solution injection) Underground Injection Control (UIC) permits with aquifer exemptions from WDEQ/Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

The projected mining schedule is based on an initial production rate of 45,000 pounds of U_3O_8 for the first year and increased to the maximum production rate sustainable from the ore-bearing sandstones, currently estimated at 1,000,000 pounds per year. The actual development schedule and production rates will be adjusted in response to actual mine unit conditions (e.g., flows, recovery rates, etc.) and the market demand for uranium.

Lost Creek Project NRC Environmental Report October 2007

Figure **1.2-8** provides a current estimated schedule of operational activities at Lost Creek for the first nine years of operation. Additional ore reserve and resources areas are known to exist within the Permit Area, but are not currently drilled adequately to evaluate for ISR planning. These reserve areas have the potential to extend the ultimate Project life beyond this initial period.

1.3 Applicable Regulatory Requirements, Permits, and Required Consultations

Prior to commencing ISR operations, LC ISR, LLC must obtain a License to Mine and a Permit to Mine from WDEQ. Since Wyoming is not an NRC Agreement State, a Source and Byproduct Material License must be obtained from NRC. Other permits that must be obtained prior to the commencement of operations include, but not limited to, two UIC Permits with aquifer exemptions (one forinjection into the aquifer to be produced and the other for injection into a deeper formation for waste water disposal), an Air Quality Permit, a Wyoming Pollution Discharge Elimination System (WYPDES) discharge permit, and a Storm Water Discharge Permit. A list of the necessary' permits and licenses are provided in Table **1.3-1.**

Federal statutes (including authority delegated to states) that pertain to the Project include the:

- Atomic Energy Act,
- Clean Air Act,
- Clean Water Act,
- ***** Resource Conservation and Recovery Act,
- Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Act,
- Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act,
- **a** Safe Drinking Water Act,
- Noise Control Act,
- National Historic Preservation Act, and related statutes
- **0** Endangered Species Act,
- Occupational Safety and Health Act, and
- Hazardous Material Transportation Act.

Under Sections 101 and 102 of NEPA, federal agencies are'required to interpret and administer the policies, regulations, and public laws of the Act in order to foster and promote the general welfare, to create and maintain conditions under which man and nature can exist in productive harmony, and fulfill the social, economic, and other requirements of present and future generations of Americans. As such, federal agencies

Lost Creek Project NRC EnVironmental Report October 2007
must address environmental issues and allow public input in the decision-making processes of major projects under their jurisdiction. NRC's regulations are contained in **10** CFR Part *51.*

BLM administers the federal land on which the Permit Area is located, and NRC is the ISR licensing agency. After consultations with NRC and BLM, it was agreed that NRC will take the lead on implementing the NEPA process for the Project.

In order to perform a NEPA assessment of an ISR project, the applicant must provide the necessary information to the federal agencies. In October of 2006, NRC reorganized the review process to facilitate the application review process of proposed ISR facilities. As a result, a Technical Report must be prepared following the guidelines of NUREG- 1569. In addition, all new ISR project applicants must prepare an Environmental Report in accord with NUREG- 1748.

LC ISR, LLC has maintained consistent contact with federal and state agencies. Since the beginning of the Project, quarterly meetings have been conducted with NRC, BLM, and WDEQ. LC ISR, LLC has held regular pre-licensing meetings with NRC to discuss baseline survey work plans, proposed hydrogeological programs, permitting schedules, and application outlines and preparation. NRC staff members have also been invited to the Permit Area at the beginning and during the baseline surveys. NRC issued a Docket Number (40-9068) and a TAC Number (LUO 142) for the Project on September 8, 2006.

Other state and federal agencies involved in the permitting and licensing process include the EPA and the Wyoming State Engineer's Office (WSEO).

Representatives from LC ISR, LLC met with the Sweetwater County commissioners on October 16, 2007. LC ISR, LLC described the operations and schedule of the Project to the commissioners and answered related questions. Additional public consultation is planned for the near future.

Following WDEQ Rules and Regulations, a separate application packet will be prepared and submitted to WDEQ. During this review process, two different public-comment periods will allow individuals to contribute to the Project.

Applicable state and federal agencies were consulted in accordance with the requirements of the Endangered Species Act and the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act. Personnel were contacted from the Wyoming Game and Fish Department (WGFD) in 2006 and 2007. The US Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), was also contacted. Wildlife surveys were completed according to a work plan developed in consultation with the WGFD, WDEQ, and BLM. The scope of field work was finalized in consultation with BLM

Lost Creek Project NRC Environmental Report October 2007

1-14

during February through March of 2006, and field survey protocols were consistent with recommendations from both BLM and WGFD.

A Class I file search was conducted through the Wyoming State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) Cultural Records Office prior to the Class **III** archaeological survey with follow-up research at the BLM Rawlins Field Office. A fieldwork authorization was obtained from BLM prior to the onset'of field investigations in 2006. Consultation with Native American groups will be conducted by BLM after the archaeological technical report has been received.

Lost Creek Project NRC Environmental Report October 2007

1-15

From Main Process Plant

To Main Process Plant

Lost Creek ISR, LLC
Littleton, Colorado USA

AATA INTERNATIONAL, INC.
For Collins, Colorado, USA

FIGURE 1.2-6b Ion Exchange Process Flow

Lost Creek Permit Area

Issued For: NRC ER 1.0 Drawn By: SMH

Issued / Revised: 10.2.2007 Drawing No. NRCER 1.0 FIG 1.2-6b 10.2.2007 SMH

Figure 1.2-7 Pre-operation Schedule of the Lost Creek Project

FIGURE-1.2-8

Lost Creek Project Development, Production and Restoration Schedule

Table **1.3-1** List of Regulatory Requirements

j.

THIS PAGE IS AN OVERSIZED DRAWING OR FIGURE, THAT CAN BE VIEWED AT THE RECORD TITLED: "PLATE 1.2-1 PLANT SITE PLAN Lost Creek Permit Area" DRAWING NO. NRCER 1.0 PLT 1.2-1 10.2.2007 SMH

WITHIN THIS PACKAGE... OR BY SEARCHING USING THE DOCUMENT/REPORT NO.

D-01

TABLE OF CONTENTS

 \bar{z}

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.4-1 Potential Plant Site Locations

2.0 **ALTERNATIVES**

2.1 No-Action Alternative

Under this alternative, no ISR operations would be conducted within the Permit Area. There would be no uranium produced from the Permit Area and no favorable or unfavorable impacts from this alternative.

2.2 Alternatives Considered but Eliminated

Underground and open pit mining represent the two currently available alternatives to ISR of the uranium resources in the Permit Area. Use of evaporation ponds for process water disposal was considered as an alternative to the UIC Class I wells. Shipping of loaded ion exchange resin, rather than yellowcake slurry, was also considered.

2.2.1 Open Pit Mining

Open pit mining requires the removal of all material covering the orebody (overburden) and then the ore itself. The ore would then be transported to a conventional mill for further processing and extraction through grinding, leaching, purifying, concentrating, and drying.

From an economic point of view, open pit mining of the relatively low grade and moderate depth of the Lost Creek orebodies would require a much larger investment than ISR, especially in the early phase, when a significant investment would be required for acquisition of heavy equipment to perform the earthwork to expose the orebody. The overall size of the operation facilities would be larger because of greater manpower and material handling requirements.

Waste rock piles from excavation of the overburden and the mine pit would make permanent changes to the topography, with a disturbed area approximately three times the area of the orebody mined, in order to maintain slope stability. Potential personnel injury rates and potential radiological exposures at the mining site would also be higher with open pit mining than what would be experienced with ISR.

A mill tailings pond would be required to contain the millions of tons of waste produced from the uranium mill. This tonnage would represent a large volume of radioactive tailings slurry covering a large area of ground surface. Conventional mill operation

2-1

would involve higher risks of spillage and radiological exposure to both personnel and the environment than those associated with the proposed ISR operations.

Open pit mining at the Permit Area would also require substantial dewatering of the pit to depress the potentiometric surface of all aquifers. Large quantities of groundwater would be discharged to the surface. Some of this groundwater contains naturally elevated radium-226 (Ra-226), radon and uranium, which would have to be treated before discharge and the residue disposed of as radioactive solid waste.

2.2.2 Underground Mining

Underground mining of the uranium resources at the Permit Area would involve sinking of shafts to the vicinity of the orebodies, horizontally driving crosscuts and drifts to the orebodies at different levels, physically removing the ore and transporting the mined ore to the conventional mill for further processing. Processes for milling and uranium extraction from underground mined ores would be the same as those for ores mined from the open pit.

When one considers the alternative of underground mining, the economic and environmental disadvantage closely parallel those of an open pit mine. These, as stated above, include large amounts of initial investment, permanent changes to the topography (though in a smaller scale than open pit mining because less amounts of waste rock are being generated), generation of a significant amount of mine tailings, increased risks of injury and potential exposure to radioactive materials. during mining and milling, and surface discharge of groundwater from mine dewatering with elevated radionuclide concentrations.

One major concern for underground uranium mining is the potential exposure of miners to radon gas if the gas is not continuously vented to the atmosphere. Subsequent land surface subsidence could also occur after the completion of underground mining.

Economic costs and environmental impacts associated with open pit and underground mining clearly show that ISR is the more viable uranium extraction technique to use. The initial investment is lower; the tailings problem is completely eliminated; radiation exposure and environmental impacts are minimized; and the groundwater resource is preserved. In addition, because of the reduced costs, lower grade ores can be recovered through ISR than can be recovered from open pit and underground mines.

2.2.3 Evaporation Ponds for Process Water Disposal

Using evaporation pond(s) and/or UIC Class I well(s) for process water disposal are the most common practices for uranium ISR operations. The evaporation pond alternative was considered for the Project but eliminated for the following reasons.

- Productivity and efficiency: Due to the severe winter weather conditions at the Permit Area, evaporation ponds would be frozen and covered with snow for several months, making any evaporation close to impossible.
- Area of land surface disturbance: The size of the evaporation pond(s) would have to be large enough to accommodate the extremely low evaporation rate during the winter and to support the constant year-round production rate of the Project. A preliminary feasibility study indicates that the evaporation ponds would be approximately 21 acres in total area to sustain the proposed production rate.
- * Clean-up and reclamation: The solid wastes that precipitate from the process water are radioactive and extensive efforts are needed during the reclamation phase to clean up and dispose of these solid wastes.

UIC Class I wells will be drilled and used (together with Storage Ponds) for process water disposal at the Permit Area instead, as described in the sections that follow.

2.2.4 Shipping Loaded Resin

Shipping uranium-laden resin is a standard industry practice for satellite processing plants in conjunction with processing facilities. However, the option of shipping resin for processing and drying versus shipping slurry was eliminated for the following reasons.

- Productivity and efficiency: LC ISR, LLC's Project anticipates a production rate of one million pounds U_3O_8 per year. The average load of resin would be 500 cubic feet at a loading rate of eight pounds per cubic foot, or 4,000 pounds U_3O_8 per transfer (load). This would require a shipment of loaded resin to a separate facility approximately every 1.5 days. The Project will process slurry and require the transport of approximately 15,000 pounds U_3O_8 to a drying facility at a time. This will require a shipment every 5.5 days.
- Environmental health and safety: The transport of resin over slurry would increase the time an equipment operator would spend in transit by more than 350 percent.
- Operating cost: Processing the uranium at the Permit Area into slurry will reduce not only the transportation cost, but will reduce the number of trucks, trailers and equipment operators. Standby materials, such as resin and transport equipment, will also not be required. In addition, the cost for toll processing of resin will be

recovered against the Plant investment over the life of the Project, yielding a more valuable asset to be used in processing for other projects or toll processing of resin.

2.3 Proposed Action

The Project will use ISR technology to extract uranium from permeable, uranium-bearing sandstones located at depths ranging from **300** to **700** feet. Once extracted, the uranium will be recovered **by** means of ion exchange, which uses commercially available anionic resin. Periodically, the ion exchange resin will become saturated with uranium. Uranium will be removed from the ion exchange resin **by** conventional elution processing. The ion exchange resin, now stripped of uranium, will be returned to recover additional uranium. The uranium removed during the elution processing step will be precipitated, washed to remove impurities and filtered for shipment as slurry. The detailed operation plan **is** presented in **Section 1.2** of this report.

2.4 Reasonable Alternatives

2.4.1 Alternate Plant/Facility Locations

Two locations were considered for the Plant (Figure 2.4-1). The primary areas of concern were: **1)** proximity to the ore, 2) surface geology, and **3)** environmental issues, including sage grouse and raptor nests. Plant Site One, which is located in the Northwest Quarter of the Southeast Quarter of Section **18,** Township **25** North, Range **92** West, was selected **as** the preferred alternative. Plant Site Two (located in the Northeast Quarter of the Southeast Quarter of Section **19,** Township **25** North, Range **92** West) was considered, but not chosen based on the following.

- Proximity to ore: This location is reasonably close to the known ore trends, and has potential for future operations. This alone precludes it from being the first choice for the Plant site.
- Surface geology: No issues were noted.
- Environmental issues: No primary drainage concerns were noted. While this location does not encroach upon a two-mile lek (sage grouse mating area) buffer area, it is closer than the proposed Plant Site One.

2.4.2 Scale of Monitor Rings

A mine unit consists of ISR amenable production zones within a sandstone bounded by an upper and lower hydrologic barrier. In the simplest scenario, there is a single production zone; and a monitor well ring radially bounds that production zone, as one of the primary means of ensuring control of mining solutions within a mine unit. In more complex systems, there may be more than one production zone stacked vertically within a sandstone, and there may be more than one sandstone, with multiple production zones stacked vertically.

Depending on the location within the Permit Area, there may be only a single production zone underlying the Permit Area, or there may be multiple production zones in more than one sandstone. For this permit application, the term "sand" is applied to a specific production zone, and the term "horizon" is applied to the sandstone that contains one or more production zones. Specifically, LC ISR, LLC is proposing to recover uranium from the HJ Horizon, which has up to three production zones, the Upper, Middle, and Lower HJ Sands (UHJ, MHJ, and LHJ Sands, respectively). There are also shallower and deeper horizons within the Permit Area, in particular, the KM Horizon. LC ISR, LLC is not proposing to recover uranium from those horizons at this time, but may request a license amendment to recover uranium those horizons in the future.

Because of the different ore depths, several scenarios are possible for well completions. The Project proposes relatively small monitor rings, each containing approximately 1.2 million pounds of reserves, within the HJ Horizon. In the simplest scenario, where only one sand is present in a horizon, the production, injection, and monitor wells will be installed in that sand. Where more than one sand is present in the horizon, e.g., the MHJ and LHJ Sands, uranium will be recovered from one sand at a time. The production and injection wells will be installed with the lowest sand in the horizon and ore from that sand recovered. The lowest sand will then be sealed off, and the well completed in the next sand up. This process continues until ore has been recovered from all the targeted sands within the horizon. Restoration occurs in the reverse, with the uppermost sand being restored then sealed off and the next sand below opened up for restoration, in progression until all the sands are restored. The wells in the monitor ring will be designed so the open intervals correspond to the depths of the sands adjacent to each well. This is the Preferred Alternative. Other Alternatives include the following.

Multiple Completions

An alternate scenario to the one above is the completion of wells across multiples sands within the same horizon, using the same wells and the same monitor ring. However, this is not considered an appropriate alternative because of the difficulties of ensuring the injection and production fluids are

being efficiently distributed to the various sands **in** the horizon and of .monitoring the performance of the mine unit.

Larger Rings Encompassing More Reserves

Another option is the installation of a ring that contains production of several million pounds of reserves from one sand within a horizon. This option requires the installation of pattern areas within a monitor ring covering a much larger area. The wells are completed in the same manner as the preferred option. Because of the increase in scale, the construction time, evaluation of pump tests, and all other activities associated with installing and producing the mine unit would increase dramatically: Final restoration/reclamation of the mine unit would be delayed until all operations for the area were complete. Therefore, this option is not considered the most efficient approach.

Table of Contents

FIGURES

Figure 3.1-1 Land Ownership

Figure 3.1-2 BLM Grazing Allotments

Figure 3.1-3 Nuclear Fuel Cycle Facilities and Mines within 50 Miles

TABLES

Table 3.1-1 Hunting Statistics for Hunt Areas that Include the Permit Area

3.0 DESCRIPTION OF THE **AFFECTED** ENVIRONMENT

The Permit Area is located in the northeastern corner of Sweetwater County, Wyoming near Carbon County, Wyoming. The Permit Area is about 15 miles southwest of the Bairoil, Wyoming, about 38 miles northwest of Rawlins, and about 90 miles southwest of Casper. The Permit Area consists of 199 unpatented federal lode claims and one state lease totaling 4,220 acres. The general location of the Permit Area is shown in Figure 1.3-1.

The regional landscape consists of rolling plains with some draws, rock outcroppings, ridges, bluffs and some isolated mountainous areas. Vegetation is primarily sagebrush and rabbit brush. The area is sparsely populated, and the closest residence is approximately 15 miles from the Permit Area boundary. The weather is dry and windy, with short, hot summers and cold winters. There is no perennial surface water, although there are a few'! ephemeral drainages that can convey surface water during spring snowmelt and following intense rainstorms.

3.1 Land Use

The land within the Permit Area is entirely publicly- owned. Eighty-five percent is federal land, managed by BLM through the Rawlins and Lander Field Offices. Fifteen percent is owned by the State of Wyoming. The primary study area for land use includes a two-mile radius from the Permit Area boundary. Within the study area, 96 percent of the land is federally owned, three percent is state owned, and one percent is privately owned (Figure 3.1-1). The primary land use in the study area is rangeland for cattle, but the area is also used for dispersed recreation such as hunting, off-highway vehicle (01HV) use, and antler collecting. There are no maintained roads within the study area, but a power line is present. Regional land uses include grazing, industry, wildlife habitat, hunting, dispersed recreation, OHV use, oil and gas extraction, gas and carbon dioxide $(CO₂)$ pipelines, and transmission lines.

3.1.1 Existing Land Uses

3.1.1.1 Rangeland and Agriculture

There is no crop production within the Permit Area or within two miles of the Permit Area; the only agricultural production is related to grazing. The study area includes portions of three BLM grazing allotments: Stewart Creek, Cyclone Rim, and Green

Mountain (Figure 3.1-2). These allotments provide forage for cattle that are generally sold as food sources, as well as a small number of horses and sheep. Grazing rights are assigned by section, so all sections that are at least partly within two miles of the Permit Area are included in the grazing allotment study area. Water sources that support this grazing are discussed in Section **3.5.**

The Stewart Creek and Cyclone Rim allotments are managed by the BLM Rawlins Field Office, and cover 22,101 acres within the study area. Together, these two allotments provide 3,027 animal unit months (AUMs) of summer and winter grazing (Calton, M. Range Specialist. BLM Rawlins Field Office. Personal communication. July, 2007.) The Green Mountain allotment is managed by the BLM Lander Field Office, and includes 9,339 acres within the study area. This acreage provides 635 AUMs of summer grazing. An AUM is an animal unit month, the common unit of measure defined as "the amount of forage to sustain one mature cow or the equivalent, based on an. average daily forage consumption of 26 pounds of dry matter per/day" (BLM, 2004a). The total AUMs for the study area is 3,662, which would provide year-round forage for the equivalent of 305 cattle. For a 1,000-pound cow, the average meat yield is 550 pounds (National Sustainable Agriculture Information Service, 2007). Therefore, the annual potential total meat production associated with the Permit Area is roughly 168,000 pounds if all the cattle are slaughtered. However, some animals are generally kept for breeding, so the actual meat production is probably somewhat smaller.

In 2000, one AUM for cattle was worth \$33.27. At these values, the BLM calculated that cattle production would produce \$65.07 per AUM of total economic impact, which includes both direct and secondary returns (BLM, 2004a). Using these figures, livestock production on rangeland within the grazing allotments of the Permit Area has a potential value of about \$238,000 per year based on the current AUMs of the study area.

3.1.1.2 Wildlife Hunting and Viewing

WGFD hunting areas for antelope, deer, elk, and mountain lion include the Permit Area. Hunting seasons run from September through December, but hunting occurs primarily in October and November. Hunter days for the hunt areas that include the Project are shown in Table **3.1-1.** There are no designated wildlife viewing locations in the study area.

3.1.1.3 Recreation and Special Use Areas

Considerable dispersed recreational activity takes place in the Green Mountains and Ferris Mountains, eight miles to the north and 25 miles northeast of the Permit Area, respectively. The Green Mountain Area has one developed campground with 17

campsites, water, and toilets (Rau, P. Recreation Specialist, BLM Rawlins Field Office. Personal communication. 2007.). This campground is under-used and is closed during elk calving season. There are also additional primitive camping areas available for campers with recreational vehicles (RVs) and tents. The general area is designated as an Extensive Resource Management Area (ERMA), which does not have restrictive use compared to a Special Recreation Management Area (SMRA) or Wilderness Study Area (WSA).

According to BLM's Natural Resource Recreation Settings, which are the criteria used for classification and prescriptions for BLM lands, the area is managed for Middle Country Designation. This designation does not restrict natural resource development and allows motorized and mechanized uses in most areas with some restrictions (BLM, 1987 and 2004c). A Middle Country designation falls between a Primitive classification and an Urban classification. The physical characteristics of the land area appear natural, except for primitive roads and within 0.5 miles of all improved roads, although improved roads may be visible.

3.1.1.4 Minerals and Energy

Bairoil is the residential area closest to the Permit Area, and is economically dependent on energy development in the area. Bairoil has an airport landing strip and residential and industrial units, a school, and town offices, including a police department.

Wyoming is a state with active mineral development. The types of minerals developed include oil and gas, coal and other minerals. About half the oil produced in the Resource Management Plan Planning Area (RMPPA) during 2000 and 2001 was from the Lost Soldier-Wertz Fields near Bairoil. This field complex is in a tertiary phase of oil recovery via $CO₂$ injection; it is expected that no future oil production enhancement can be accomplished.

There are no nuclear fuel cycle facilities within 50 miles of the Lost Creek Permit Area (NRC, 2007). However, there are several conventional uranium mills and mines and ISR projects within 50 miles of the Permit Area; the locations are shown on Figure **3.1-3.** Other than Kennecott Uranium Company's Sweetwater Mill (NRC License No. SUA-1350; WDEQ Permit No. 481), which is currently on stand-by, and the PRI Gas Hills Project (NRC License No. SUA- 1511 -Amendment; WDEQ Permit No. 603), which is a new ISR project not yet in operation, all of the operations shown in Figure **3.1-3** are in decommissioning or reclamation or have been reclaimed by the operator or the WDEQ Abandoned Mine Lands Division. The closest facility to the Project is the Sweetwater Mill, which is located about five miles south-southwest of the center of the Project, with about two miles separating the permit boundaries.

3.1.1.5 Infrastructure

Regional transportation corridors are discussed in Section 3.2 of this report. A power line runs in a north-south direction along the western boundary of the Permit Area. The right-of-way easement for this power line is 25 feet wide.

3.1.2 Planned Land Uses and Developments

Both Carbon and Sweetwater Counties are experiencing considerable natural resource development, much of which is related to oil and gas exploration and production. Based on publicly available information, no projects are currently planned within the study area (Simons, D. Planning and Environmental Coordinator, BLM Rawlins Field Office. Personal communication. 2007; Murray, C. Planning and Environmental Coordinator, BLM Lander Field Office. Personal communication. 2007). Although specific locations and plans have generally not been publicly disclosed, uranium exploration in the general vicinity has recently increased in response to the current uranium market.

Game	Hunter Days	Active Licenses	Total Harvest	Hunter Success (percent)	Outfitters	Hunting Area
Antelope	683	233	229	98.30	19	Chain Lakes
Deer	544	126	12	9.50		Chain Lakes
Elk	496	82	42	51.20	3	Shamrock Hills
Mountain Lion	NA ¹	NA		NA	5	Red Desert ²

Table **3.1-1** Hunting Statistics for Hunt Areas that Include the Permit Area

 $\overline{N_A} = \overline{N_O}$ Data

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FIGURES

Figure 3.2-1 Regional Transportation Network Figure 3.2-2 Onsite Road Network

TABLES

Table 3.2-1 Local and Regional Roads Table 3.2-2 Traffic Safety Data

3.2 Transportation

This section provides a description of the regional and on-site transportation network that is relevant to the Project. Most transportation will use the public road network; but goods may be transported by rail to and from Wamsutter. The road network will be used for: 1) shipments of construction materials, process chemicals, office supplies, and related materials from suppliers to the Plant; 2) shipment of yellowcake slurry to an off-site drying facility; 3) shipments of waste material to be disposed of off-site; and 4) movement of personnel to and from the site and within the Permit Area.

3.2.1 Regional Transportation Corridors

The transportation system serving the Project relies almost exclusively on public roads and highways. Automobiles and, trucks are the primary mode of transportation. The regional transportation network relevant to the Project consists of primary, secondary, and local roads (Figures 1.2-1 and 3.2-1). The Permit Area is served by an Interstate Highway (1-80); a US Highway (US 287); Wyoming State routes (SR 220 and 73 to Bairoil); local Carbon, Sweetwater, and Fremont County roads; and BLM roads. Transportation to the Permit Area will be predominantly from 1-80 at Rawlins, Wyoming, north about 15 miles on US 287, west approximately 32 miles on Mineral Exploration Road (Sweetwater County Road 63) then six miles north on Sooner Road (BLM Road 3215) to the Permit Area access road. These roads are paved with the exception of Sooner Road and the site access road. Some of the heavier transports of materials and equipment may use the unpaved Wamsutter-Crooks Gap Road (CR 23N) to the west of the Permit Area, that connects Wamsutter and Jeffrey City. In addition to the designated routes, there are a number of four-wheel-drive routes that traverse the area for recreation and grazing access, as well as various other uses, including oil, gas, and mineral exploration.

The primary interstate and US highways are well maintained. The other county and BLM roads providing access to the Permit Area are generally maintained biannually and in fair condition, depending on the season and how recently maintenance occurred. These roads are infrequently plowed in the winter. Ranchers, agency personnel and some hunters, fishermen, and other recreationists use these roads (Rau, P. Recreation Specialist, BLM Rawlins Field Office. Personal communication. 2007).

Table 3.2-1 describes these roads, with daily and peak traffic counts for the roads that are regularly monitored. Traffic counts are not available for the county roads. These roads receive little traffic for most of the year, but use peaks in the summer and fall, when hunting and dispersed recreation is greatest.

Traffic safety data are summarized in Table 3.2-2. An Operator's or Owner's Traffic Accident Report is required by the Wyoming Department of Transportation. (WYDOT) if any party is injured or if there is property damage of \$1,000 or more (Carpenter, T. Senior Data Analyst, WYDOT. Personal communication. March, 1997). The accident rate was calculated by dividing the mean number of truck accidents per year (2002 to 2006) by the product of the road segment length, the average number of trucks per day, and the number of days per year (365). From 2002 to 2006, no accidents involving large trucks occurred on the segment of interest of WY-73, so the accident rate was calculated using all traffic. During this period, there were an average of 230 cars per day, and a total of three accidents. Traffic counts were not available for the county and BLM roads listed in Table 3.2-2, so the accident rate for these segments could not be calculated directly. Where no data were available, the truck accident rate was estimated as 2.2 x 10^{-6} accidents per mile (Harwood and Russell, 1990), a widely cited value for two-lane rural roads. Most traffic accidents do not cause injuries or fatalities. From 2002 to 2005, an average of 15,867 accidents occurred in Wyoming, annually. Of these accidents, 0.9 percent was fatal, 25 percent caused injuries, and 74 percent caused property damage only (WYDOT, 2007a).

3.2.2 On-site Transportation Corridors

Currently, the only on-site transportation corridors are two-track roads that are accessible year-round by four-wheel-drive vehicles (Figure 3.2-2). Most are indistinct, difficult to delineate, or do not have obvious end points. These tracks are not maintained, have no drainage, and are sometimes impassable during the winter months. County Road 23 North (Wamsutter-Crooks Gap Road) is about five miles west of the Permit Area; and the BLM 3215 (Sooner Road) is about five miles east.

Table **3.2-1** Local and Regional Roads *

* (Sandidge. M. Transportation Technician 3, WYDOT Planning Traffic Surveys. Personal communication. March, 2007) 'NA **=** No Data.

Table **3.2-2** Traffic Safety Data *****

No Truck Accidents; Accident rate calculated from all vehicles

 $\frac{2}{5}$ Generic Accident Rate (Harvoord and Russell, 1990)

3 NA **=** No Data

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FIGURES

PLATES

3.3 Soils

NUREG- 1748 suggests a single section in the Environmental Report to include information on both soils and geology. However, for LSR operations, the data requirements and environmental concerns for soils and geology differ significantly. In particular, specific soil data are needed to support the proposed topsoil protection practices, surface reclamation, and vegetation reestablishment, while geology data is needed to understand the distribution of the ore reserve. Therefore, the topics of soil and geology are separated in this Environmental Report.

3.3.1 Soil Characteristics

The soils within the Permit Area are typical of the semiarid areas of the western US. Most of the soil has developed from the sedimentary bedrock of the Permit Area. The precipitation of the region is not enough to leach the majority of calcium and divalent cations from the soil profile. As a result, the soil pH tends to be slightly alkaline. Vegetation is also limited by the amount of precipitation in this region. The soils in the Permit Area tend to have low organic matter.

3.3.1.1 Soil Mapping Unit (SMU) Interpretation

The vertical relief of the Permit Area is approximately 260 feet with an average gradient of 1.5 percent. Due to the relative lack of relief and uniform surficial geology, there are only three exposed soil types within'the Permit Area. The three units are very similar in color, depth of horizons, and geomorphic surface. The primary difference between the three soils is the texture; and, therefore, the soil texture is the only difference in the three SMU names.

All soil units within the Permit Area support similar vegetation types. The Lowland Big Sagebrush Shrubland is present in and immediately surrounding the ephemeral channels; and the Highland Big Sagebrush Shrubland is present over the remainder of the Permit Area. The uniformity in vegetation across the Permit Area indicates that the three soil units are roughly equally productive, and that plant growth is limited by precipitation and not by soil fertility.

Plate 3.3-1 shows the distribution of the three soil units identified in the Permit Area and their characteristics are described below.

Thirty-four percent of the Permit Area (1,435 acres) is Typic Torriorthent, loamy, mixed, mesic. The soil is brown to yellowish-brown, and is typically five to 15 inches thick. It

generally occurs on the lower foot-slopes, where slopes are less than ten percent but can be as steep as 30 percent. The dominant vegetation is low-growing sagebrush with intermittent patches of grasses. The geomorphic surface ranges from bare loamy soil to pebbles and gravel-sized particles. A typical profile of this soil is brown to yellowishbrown sandy loam; and the subsoil is a brown to pale brown sandy loam that extends to depths greater than 30 inches.

Forty-six percent of the Permit Area (1,941 acres) is Typic Torriorthent, fine loamy, mixed, mesic. This soil is abundant in the down-slope areas of the Permit Area, where slopes are very gradual. The dominant vegetation is sagebrush, with scattered grasses and cactuses. The geomorphic surface consists of bare, fine sandy loam. The upper profile contains a dark grayish-brown silt loam to loam that is about nine inches thick. The subsoil is dark yellowish-brown to light yellowish-brown, and extends to a depth of at least 27 inches.

Twenty percent of the Permit Area (844 acres) is Typic Torriorthent, fine loamy over sandy, mixed, mesic. Slopes are less than five percent; and the dominant vegetation is low-growth sagebrush and scattered grasses. The geomorphic surface is bare loamy soil with approximately 25 percent gravel. The surface layer consists of a brown loam that is ten to 15 inches thick. The subsoil is a brown to a light yellowish-brown sandy loam that extends to a depth greater than 20 inches.

3.3.1.2 Topsoil Suitability

Based on WDEQ-LQD Guideline No. **1,** Topsoil Suitability, Table 1-2 (1994), all of the Lost Creek samples were within the range for suitable plant growth media for pH, conductivity, sodium adsorption ratio (SAR), texture, selenium, and boron.

Of the 28 Permit Areai samples, 11 were classified as marginally suitable for topsoil because of low saturation percentages. The measured saturation percentages of these marginally suitable soils ranged from 16 to 24 percent. These 11 samples were from seven different profiles, and represented all SMUs present in the Permit Area.

One sample from the Permit Area was considered unsuitable for topsoil; because the percentage of coarse fragment was 39 percent compared to a 35-percent threshold for unsuitable soil. This sample represented the B horizon of a soil profile in SMU #3. Therefore, only the top 11 inches of this SMU should be used as reclamation topsoil. One sample is considered marginally suitable due to an over 8.5 pH value. During reclamation, the use of marginal soils as topsoil will be avoided where possible, except in. areas where the undisturbed topsoil is marginally suitable.

3.3.2 Geotechnical Investigations

A preliminary geotechnical evaluation of the Permit Area was completed in September 2007. The evaluation found that the subsurface conditions consist of unconsolidated sand with clay lenses from ground surface to depths of up to 20 feet below ground surface **(ft** bgs), transitioning to weathered to competent sandstone bedrock of the Battle Spring Formation through at least 600 ft bgs. It is unlikely that expansive, soft, or otherwise unsuitable soils will be encountered within the depth of anticipated shallow foundation excavations.

A full geotechnical engineering report will be performed prior to construction. This report will include engineering analyses on the representative site soils to determine the bearing capacity and potential settlement. The report will, be used to determine the foundation type, depth, and allowable bearing capacity as well as provide guidance on preparation, earthwork, and cement type.

3.3.3 Historical Surface Disturbances

There was surface disturbance prior to LC ISR, LLC operations within the Permit Area. Most of this disturbance was due to historical exploration activities for oil and gas, as well as for uranium, and to support livestock and wildlife grazing. The primary activities included vehicle traffic, drilling activities, and stock tank usage. Approximately 26 miles of existing roads were delineated from the 2002 aerial photo of the Permit Area (Figure 3.3-1). Field measurements in 2007 indicate that the roads range from 6.9 to 9.4 feet wide. A few of these roads may still be used by grazing lessees, hunters, and for ongoing exploration activities. Evidence of abandoned drill sites and stock tanks is more difficult to delineate; but numerous small areas are evident on the aerial photograph.

The roads caused compaction to the soil, which limits infiltration rates and decreases the vegetation regrowth (Figure 3.3-2). Active road surfaces have little to no organic matter, and most of the topsoil has been eroded from the road surface.

FIGURE 3.3-2 Typical Two-Track Road within the Permit Area

July 2007

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2}d\mu_{\rm{max}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right).$

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$

THIS PAGE IS AN OVERSIZED DRAWING OR FIGURE, THAT CAN BE VIEWED AT THE RECORD TITLED: "PLATE 3.3-1 SOIL SURVEY MAPPING UNITS Lost Creek Permit Area" DRAWING NO. NRC-ER-3.3-1- 10. 16.07-EJS

WITHIN THIS PACKAGE... OR BY SEARCHING USING THE DOCUMENT/REPORT NO.

D-02

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 3.4-1 Regional Geologic Map

Figure 3.4-2a Geologic Cross Section Schematic of the Permit Area

Figure 3.4-2b General Stratigraphy of the Upper Battle Spring Formation

Figure 3.4-3 Historical Seismic Activities in Wyoming

Figure 3.4-4 UBC Seismic Zones

Figure 3.4-5 Active Fault Systems in the Vicinity of the Permit Area Figure 3.4-6 500-Year Probabilistic Acceleration Map of Wyoming

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.4-1 Permit Area Stratigraphy

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 3.4-1 Typical Geophysical Logs

Attachment 3.4-2 Locations, Total Depths, and Completion Dates of Historic Exploration **Holes**

PLATES

Plate 3.4-la Geologic Cross Section A-A' Plate 3.4-1b Geologic Cross Section B-C Plate 3.4-1c Geologic Cross Section C-D Plate 3.4-1d Geologic Cross Section D-E Plate 3.4-le Geologic Cross Sections F-F, G-G, and H-H Plate 3.4-2a Lost Creek Shale Isopach Map 'Plate 3.4-2b HJ Sand Isopach Map Plate 3.4-2c Sagebrush Shale Isopach Map Plate 3.4-2d UKM Sand Isopach Map *Lost Creek Project*

NRC Environmental Report October 2007

3.4 Geology

3.4.1 Regional Geology

The Great Divide Basin (Basin) is an oval-shaped structural depression, encompassing some 3,500 square miles in south-central Wyoming.. The Basin is bounded on the north by the Wind River Range and Granite Mountains, on the east by the Rawlins Uplift, on the south by the Wamsutter Arch and on the west by the Rock Springs Uplift. The regional geologic map is shown in Figure 3.4-1. Geologic development of the Basin began in the Late Cretaceous and continued through much of the Early Eocene.

3.4.1.1 Stratigraphy

The earliest sedimentation in the Basin was the Paleocene (Early Tertiary) Fort Union Formation, which was unconformably deposited on the Lance Formation of Late Cretaceous age. The Fort Union Formation consists mostly of lacustrine shales, siltstones, and thin sandstones, which locally contain lignite beds. The thickness of the Fort Union Formation varies from place to place in the Basin, and it is approximately 4,650 feet thick in the Permit Area.

The Fort Union Formation is unconformably overlain by sediments of Eocene age, making up about 6,200 feet of basin fill. The western and southern portions of the Basin are covered by the Wasatch Group, which consists of sandstone, siltstone, limestone, conglomerate and lignite beds. The rocks in the Wasatch Group are believed to be of fluvial-lacustrine origin. Towards the north and northeast, the Wasatch Group rapidly grades into and inter-tongues with the equally, thick, fine- to coarse-grained arkosic sandstones and conglomerates of the Battle Spring Formation, a typical alluvial fan complex. The source of the Battle Spring sediments is believed to be the ancestral Granite Mountains to the north. Pliocene pediment deposits and recent alluvium cover large areas of the surface in the Basin. Table 3.4-1 and Figure 3.4-2a show the general stratigraphy of the Basin.

The upper portion of the Battle Spring Formation is the host to the uranium mineralization in the Permit Area. In the Permit Area, the top 700 feet of the Battle Spring Formation is divided into at least five horizons marked from top to bottom as BC, DE, FG, HJ, and KM. These horizons are separated from one another by various thicknesses of shale, mudstone and siltstone (Figure 3.4-2b).

3.4.1.2 Structure

The present physiographic feature of the Basin was generated by the Laramide Orogeny. During the Late Cretaceous and Early Tertiary, the structures surrounding the Basin were either rejuvenated or were formed, transforming the area into a bowl-shaped geological structure, the Basin. During this upheaval, the ,Wind River Mountains and Granite Mountains were uplifted on the north side of the Basin. The Rawlins Uplift formed to the east; the Wamsutter Arch formed to the south; and the Rock Spring Uplift formed to the west. All of these highs formed a ring around the Basin, turning the Basin into a bowllike structure with drainage being inward. The Continental Divide, extending from the south, splits into two and forms half circles on the east and west sides of the Basin, joining again as one topographic high on the north side of the Basin.

The Basin is asymmetrical with its major axis trending west-northwest. Several anticlines and synclines have been mapped within the Basin, and some of these features are oil-bearing (at much deeper levels than the uranium-bearing formations). Noteworthy among these structures is the Lost Soldier anticline in the northeastern part of the Basin, approximately 15 miles northeast of the Permit Area. The Battle Spring and Fort Union Formations, as well as older rocks crop out in the anticline; and the formations on the southwestern flank of the anticline dip 20 to 25 degrees to the southwest. The dip gradually becomes gentler, and, at the Permit Area, it is merely three degrees to the west.

Contemporaneous with the uplift of the mountains surrounding the Basin, there were episodes of normal and thrust faulting within and around the Basin. Most of the major faults are located in the northern part of the Basin, with displacement ranging from a few feet to over 3,000 feet. But, toward the center of the Basin near the Permit Area, faulting seems to be only on a minor scale. For example the displacement at the Lost Creek Fault (Fault) which traverses the mineralized area from west-southwest to east-northeast is zero to about 80 feet. More details about the Fault are given in Section 3.4.2.2.

3.4.2 Site Geology

The Permit Area is located near the north-central part of the Basin, where the Basin fills are predominantly the Eocene Battle Spring Formation and the Paleocene Fort Union Formation. Geological cross sections throughout the Permit Area are presented in Plates 3.4-1a, **b,** c, **d.** and e. Attachment 3.4-1 contains copies of typical geophysical logs from the Permit Area.

3.4.2.1 Stratigraphy

The entire Permit Area is covered by the upper part of the Battle Spring Formation, which is the host to uranium mineralization. Generally, in the Basin, Battle Spring and Wasatch Formations, which are time equivalent, interfmger with one another. In the Permit Area, the upper half of the lithologic units consists of Battle Spring Formation and the lower half is made up of Wasatch Formation. The total thickness of the Battle Spring and Wasatch Formations under the Permit Area is about 6,200 feet. The Fort Union Formation, is 4,650 feet thick beneath the Permit Area and unconformably underlies the. Battle Spring/Wasatch Formations. Deeper in the Basin and lying unconformably are various Cretaceous, Jurassic, Triassic, Paleozoic and Precambrian basement lithologic units (Table 3.4-1). A schematic geologic cross section across the Permit Area is shown in Figure 3.4-2a, depicting all lithologic units present under the Permit Area.

The Battle Spring Formation in the Permit Area is part of a major alluvial system, consisting of thick beds of very fine- to coarse-grained arkosic sandstones separated by various layers of mudstones and siltstones. Conglomerate beds may exist locally. The uranium mineralization is associated with finer-grained sandstones and siltstones, which may contain minor organic matter in a few areas. At least five horizons with various amounts of mineralization have been identified. From the surface down, they have been named: BC, DE, FG, HJ, and KM. The two horizons with the most mineralization are HJ and KM, which have been further divided into upper, middle and lower sub-units of sandstones (UHJ Sand, MHJ Sand, and LHJ Sand; and UKM Sand, MKM Sand, and LKM Sand). Geological cross sections through the mineralized zones in the Permit Area are presented in **Plates 3.4-1a, b, c, d,** and **e**. Thickness (isopach) maps of the HJ Horizon and **UKM** Sand, as well as the shales above HJ (Lost Creek Shale) and below HJ (Sage Brush Shale), are presented in Plates 3.4-2a, **b.** c, and d.

The HJ Horizon is 110 to 130 feet thick, averaging about 120 feet. The thinner part of HJ is generally south of the Fault. A thicker part of the HJ Horizon runs parallel to the Fault, trending in a west-southwest to east-northeasterly direction. The mineralization is mostly concentrated in the middle part of the HJ Horizon and occurs as both roll front and tabular deposits. The subdivided sand units within the HJ Horizon are separated, by discontinuous shale, siltstone and mudstones.

The UKM Sand lies under the Sage Brush Shale and is 20 to more than 60 feet thick, averaging about 40 feet. In the eastern part of the Permit Area, the unit is 20 to 50 feet thick; whereas the sand unit in the western portion of the permit area is 40 to more than 60 feet thick, indicating the development of a major paleo-channel. The mineralization occurs as both roll front and tabular deposits.

3.4.2.2 Structure

The geologic structure in the Permit Area is rather simple, as shown in Plates 3.4-1a, **b** c, **d.** and e. The Battle. Spring Formation dips gently to the west at three degrees and only one fault (i.e., the Fault) was recognized in the mineralized area. The Fault is a "scissor fault" that extends the length of the Permit Area from the west-southwest to the eastnortheast. The maximum displacement at the west end of the Permit Area is around 45 feet, dropping down to the north; whereas the displacement on the east side of the Permit Area is about 80 feet with the down-dropped side to the south, creating the scissor fault. Near the middle of the Permit Area, the displacement is practically zero.

3.4.2.3 Ore Mineralogy and Geochemistry

.The age of mineralization in the Battle Spring Formation is considered to be between 35 and 26 million years before present. Uranium mineralization in the Basin generally occurs either as tabular or C-shaped roll-front deposits. Oxygen-rich surface water, carrying dissolved uranium, entered various sandstones in the Basin. The water percolated down dip, oxidizing the sandstones on its way down dip. Upon reaching sites rich in organic matter, the water lost its oxidizing potential and deposited the uranium, forming the two types of mineralization mentioned above.

Tabular deposits may form at the interface between oxidizing and reducing conditions (the redox front), where oxidation, for all practical purposes, stops. Localized tabular deposits may also form up-dip from the redox front in an entirely oxidized zone, where carbonaceous materials have gathered and formed locally reducing conditions.

The C-shaped roll-front deposits normally form just at the redox front, where the water loses its oxidizing potential. The uranium precipitates and accumulates in a "C"-shaped deposit, with the concave side facing up-dip toward the oxidized sand. Uranium usually accumulates in finer-grained sandstones that carry various amounts of organic matter, which provides a reducing condition.

The alteration process not only changes the color, but also alters the mineralogy of the host sandstones. The color of unaltered, reduced sandstone is light to dark grey, with carbon trash, dark accessories, and traces of.pyrite. Altered, oxidized, sandstone contains iron oxide staining (where former carbonaceous matter and pyrite were present), kaolinized feldspar, and has a pink to tan-buff, greenish-grey to bleached appearance. The presence of pyrite and carbonaceous material appear to be the major controlling factors for the precipitation of uranium mineralization. Thinning of sandstones and diminishing grain size probably slowed the advance of the uranium-bearing solutions and further enhanced the chances of precipitation.

The main uranium minerals are uraninite, a uranium oxide, and coffinite, a uranium silicate. Russell Honea.(1979) and John V. Heyse (1979) studied several core samples by scanning electron microprobe (SEM), polished section and thin section. Their conclusions were that the host sands are fine- to coarse-grained, poorly sorted arkose. The uranium mineralization is of sub-microscopic size and can be seen only in SEM magnification. They are associated and at times intergrown with round pyrite particles. The uranium minerals identified are mostly uraninite and, possibly, coffinite. The uranium, besides occurring with pyrite, also occurs as a coating around sand grains and as filling of voids between grains. It also occurs as minute particles within larger clay particles.

The most recent study of the lithology and mineralogy was conducted by Hazen Research under the guidance of Dr. Nick Ferris, Ur-E geologist (Ferris, 2007, company report). He concluded that the rocks, represented by a core sample from a depth of 506 to 507 feet of Hole Number LC-64C, are medium- to coarse-grained with interstitial clay and silt. Uranium occurrences are very fine-grained and micron-sized, and are mainly dispersed throughout some of the interstitial clays, and occur similarly in some of the interstitial pyrite as well. Because of the size of uranium mineral particles, it was not certain whether the uranium mineral was coffinite or uraninite. The sample tested, comes from the Upper KM Sand unit and may or may not be representative of the majority of the mineralization in the overlying HJ Horizon within the Permit Area.

Known mineralized intervals are found at depths ranging from near surface down to 1,150 feet below the surface in the Permit Area. It is possible that deeper mineralization may exist as well. The main mineralization horizons trend in an east-northeast direction for at least three miles; and are up to 2,000 feet wide. The thickness of individual mineralized beds at the Permit Area ranges from five to 28 feet and averages about 16 feet. The mineralization grade ranges from 0.03 percent to more than 0.20 percent equivalent uranium oxide (eU₃O₈). Four main mineralized horizons, from depths of 300 to 700 feet, have been identified. The richest mineralized zone occurs in the middle part of the HJ Horizon (MHJ Sand) and it is about 30 feet thick, 400 to 450 feet deep, and is believed to contain more than 50 percent of the total resource under the Permit Area.

3.4.2.4 Historic Uranium Exploration Activities

Historic exploration activities in the Permit Area can be summarized as follows:

- **0** Pre-1976: Numerous companies held the property; uranium mineralization was discovered by Climax Uranium and Conoco.
- 1976: Texasgulf optioned property from Valley Development Inc.

Lost Creek Project NRC Environmental Report October 2007

3.4-5

- * 1977 through 1979: Texasgulf optioned property from Valley Development Inc., delineated the main trend of the mineralization, obtained a 50-percent interest in the Conoco claims on the trend to the east, and exercised its option with Valley Development Inc.
- 1986: Power Nuclear Corporation acquired the properties.
- 2000: Power Nuclear Corporation sold its Lost Creek properties to New Frontiers Uranium, LLC.
- ***** 2005: New Frontiers Uranium, LLC transferred its Wyoming properties and data including its Lost Creek property to **NFU** Wyoming, LLC. (NFU).
- 2005: Ur-Energy USA, Inc. purchased NFU from New Frontiers Uranium, LLC on terms.
- * 2007: Ur-Energy USA, Inc. completes the acquisition of NFU from NFU, LLC, and maintains NFU as a wholly owned subsidiary.
- 2007: Ur-Energy USA, Inc. forms LC ISR, LLC to develop the Lost Creek property into an ISR facility and transfers the Lost Creek property from NFU to LC ISR, LLC.

At least '560 uranium exploration holes had been drilled in Permit Area prior to 2000. The plates and table in Attachment 3.4-2 present the locations and total depths of all the known historic exploration holes drilled in the Permit Area.

Historic and current uranium explorations exist in other areas of the Basin. Historic and current oil and gas exploration drilling are also in the region. There are no current oil and gas activities within the Basin that are completed in the same horizons as those discussed for ISR production in this application. The nearest significant gas fields are approximately ten miles to the southwest; therefore, no interference is anticipated between oil and gas production activities and ISR activities. There is no exploration of coal bed methane or other mineral resources within the Permit Area and the nearby region.

3.4.3 Seismology

The discussion of the seismology of the Permit Area and surrounding areas includes: an analysis of historic seismicity; an analysis of the Uniform Building Code (UBC); a deterministic analysis of nearby faults; an analysis of the maximum credible "floating earthquake;" and a discussion of the existing short- and long-term probabilistic seismic hazard analysis. The materials presented here are mainly based on the seismologic characterization of Sweetwater, Carbon, Fremont, and Natrona Counties by James C. Case and others from the Wyoming State Geological Survey (Case, et. al., 2002a, 2002b, 2002c and 2003).

3.4.3.1 Historic Seismicity

The Permit Area is located in the north-eastern portion of the Basin, in south-central Wyoming. Historically, south-central Wyoming has had a low to moderate level of seismicity compared to the rest of the State of Wyoming. As shown in Figure 3.4-3, most of the historical earthquakes occurred in the west-northwest portion of Wyoming. Significant historical earthquakes adjacent to the Permit Area are described below, and are organized by areas in which they occurred.

Town of Bairoil Area

Bairoil is located about 15 miles northeast of the Permit Area. Historically, there have been only a few earthquakes that have occurred within 20 miles of Bairoil. On August **11,** 1916, a non-damaging. intensity III earthquake occurred approximately 1.7 miles northwest of Bairoil. On June 1, 1993, a non-damaging magnitude 3.8, intensity III earthquake occurred four miles north of Bairoil, and was felt by some residents. On December 10, 1996, a non-damaging magnitude 2.6 earthquake occurred approximately ten miles northwest of Bairoil. A few residents also felt that event.

Two recent earthquakes were recorded near Bairoil in 2000. On May 26, 2000, a magnitude 4.0 earthquake occurred, followed by another (magnitude 2.8) four days later, on May 30, 2000. Both earthquakes. were located about 3.5 miles southwest of Bairoil. Most residents in Bairoil felt the first earthquake. No significant damage was associated with either seismic event (Cook, 2000).

City of Rawlins Area

Rawlins is approximately 38 miles southeast of the Permit Area. The first recorded earthquake that was felt and reported immediately southwest of Rawlins occurred on March 28, 1896. The intensity IV earthquake shook for about two seconds. On March 10, 1917, an earthquake (intensity IV) was recorded approximately one mile northeast of Rawlins. The earthquake was felt as a distinct shock that caused wooden buildings to noticeably vibrate. Stone buildings were not affected by the event (Rawlins Republican, 1917).

On September 10, 1964, a magnitude 4.1 earthquake occurred approximately thirty miles west of Rawlins. One Rawlins resident reported that the earthquake caused a crack in the basement of his home in Happy Hollow. No other damage was reported (Daily Times, 1964).

Small earthquakes were detected, on April 13, 1973, May 30, 1973; and June 1, 1973, approximately six miles west of Hanna. No one reported feeling this event. On July 11,

1975, Rawlins residents felt an earthquake (intensity II) event. On January 27, 1976, an earthquake (magnitude 2.3, intensity V) occurred approximately 12 miles north of Rawlins. Several people reported that they were thrown out of bed (Daily Times, 1976). On March 3, 1977, an earthquake (intensity V) was reported approximately 18.5 miles west-northwest of Encampment. Doors and dishes were rattled in southern Carbon County homes; but no significant damage was reported (Laramie Daily Boomerang, 1977).

On April 13, 1991 and April 19, 1991, magnitude 3.2 and magnitude 2.9 earthquakes, respectively, occurred near the center of the Seminoe Reservoir. A magnitude 3.1 earthquake occurred, on December 18, 1991, southwest of the Seminoe Reservoir, approximately 15 miles northeast of Sinclair. No one reported feeling these Seminoe-Reservoir-area earthquakes. On August 6, 1998, a magnitude 3.6 earthquake occurred approximately 13 miles north of Rawlins. Residents in Rawlins reported hearing a sound and then feeling a jolt. On April, 1999, a magnitude 4.3 earthquake occurred approximately 29 miles north-northwest of Baggs. It was felt in Rawlins; and residents reported that pictures fell off the walls.

City of Rock Springs Area

Rock Springs is located approximately 80 miles southwest of the Permit Area. The first recorded earthquake that was felt in Sweetwater County occurred on April 28, 1888. This intensity IV earthquake, which originated near Rock Springs, did not cause any appreciable damage. On July 25, 1910, an intensity V earthquake occurred at the same time that the Union Pacific Number One Mine in Rock Springs partially collapsed. On July 28, 1930, an intensity IV earthquake, with an epicenter near Rock Springs, was felt in Rock Springs and Reliance (Casper Daily Tribune, 1930). The earthquake awakened many residents; and some merchandise fell off of store shelves.

On March 21, 1942, a non-damaging, intensity III earthquake was felt in 'Rock Springs area. This event was followed, on September 14, 1946, by an intensity IV earthquake. On October 25, 1947, a small earthquake with no assigned intensity or magnitude occurred southeast of Rock Springs. Two intensity IV earthquakes occurred in the Rock Springs area on September 24, 1948. The events rattled dishes in parts of Rock Springs.

A magnitude 3.9 event was recorded on January 5, 1964, approximately 23 miles south of Rock Springs. The University of Utah Seismograph Stations detected a non-damaging, magnitude 2.4 earthquake on March 19, 1968. This event was centered approximately 17 miles southeast of Rock Springs. A magnitude 3.2 event occurred on May 29, 1975, approximately 13 miles northeast of Superior. A week later, on June 6, 1975, a magnitude 3.7 earthquake was recorded in the same area. No damage was associated with any of the 1975 events.

 \overline{a}

The University of Utah Seismograph Stations recorded a non-damaging magnitude 2.7 earthquake on June 5, 1986. This event was located approximately 14 miles southwest of Green River, Wyoming.

On February 1, 1992, the University of Utah Seismograph Stations recorded a nondamaging magnitude 2.3 earthquake, approximately seven miles north of Rock Springs.

City of Lander Area

Lander is about 70 miles northwest of the Permit Area. A number of earthquakes have occurred in the Lander area. The first reported earthquake occurred on January 22, 1889, and had an intensity of III to IV. This was followed by an intensity IV event on November 21, 1895, during which houses were jarred and dishes rattled. On November •23, 1934, an intensity V earthquake was centered approximately 20. miles northwest of Lander. For a radius of ten miles around Lander, residents reported that dishes were thrown from cupboards, and that pictures fell down from the walls. Cracks were found in buildings along two business blocks; and the brick chimney of the Fremont County Courthouse was separated by two inches from the building. The earthquake was felt at Rock Springs and Green River, Wyoming (Casper Tribune-Herald, 1934).

There were a series of earthquakes in the Lander area in the 1950s that caused little damage. On August 17, 1950, there was an intensity IV earthquake that caused loose objects to rattle and buildings to creak. On January 12, 1954, there was an intensity II event; and on December 13, 1955, there was an intensity IV event near Lander, with no damage reported.

On June 14, 1973, a small earthquake was reported about eight miles east-northeast of Lander. The earthquake has been recently interpreted as a probable explosion. On January 31, 1992, a non-damaging magnitude 2.8 earthquake occurred approximately 20 miles northwest of Lander. This event was followed, on October 10, 1992, by a magnitude 4.0; intensity III earthquake centered approximately 22 miles east Lander.

City of Casper Area

Casper is located about 90 miles northeast of the Permit Area. Two of the earliest recorded earthquakes in Wyoming occurred near Casper. The first was on June 25, 1894, and had an estimated intensity of V. In residences on Casper Mountain, dishes rattled and fell on the floor and people were thrown from their beds. Water in the Platte River changed from fairly clear to reddish, and became thick with mud, due to the river banks slumping into the river during the earthquake. On November 14, 1897, an even larger event was felt. An intensity VI to VII earthquake, one of the largest recorded in central

and eastern Wyoming, caused considerable damage to a few buildings. As a result of the earthquake, a portion of the Grand Central Hotel was cracked from the first to the third story. Some of the ceilings in the Grand Central Hotel were also severely damaged.

On October 25, 1922, an intensity IV earthquake was reported in the Casper area. The event was felt in Casper; at Salt Creek, 50 miles north of Casper; and at Bucknum, 22 miles west of Casper. Dishes were rattled and hanging pictures were tilted near Salt Creek. No significant damage was reported in Casper (Casper Daily Tribune, 1922). On December 11, 1942, an intensity IV earthquake was recorded north of Casper. Although no damage was reported, the event was felt in Casper, Salt Creek, and Glenrock (Casper Tribune-Herald, 1941). On August 2, 1948, another intensity IV earthquake was reported in the Casper area. No damage was reported (Casper Tribune-Herald, 1948). In the 1950s, two earthquakes caused some concern among Casper residents. On January 24, 1954, an intensity IV earthquake near Alcova did not result in any reported damage (Casper Tribune-Herald, 1954). On August 19, 1959, an intensity IV earthquake was felt in Casper. Most recently, on October 19, 1996, a magnitude 4.2 earthquake was recorded approximately 15 miles north-northeast of Casper. No damage was reported.

3.4.3.2 Uniform Building Code

With safety in mind, the UBC provides Seismic Zone Maps to help identify which building design factors are critical to specific areas of the country. Five UBC seismic zones are recognized, ranging from Zone 0 to Zone 4. These seismic zones are, in part, defined by the probability of having a certain level of ground shaking (horizontal acceleration) in 50 years. The criteria used for defining boundaries on the Seismic Zone Map were established by the Seismology Committee of the Structural Engineers Association of California (SEAOC, 1986). The criteria they developed are as follows:

- Zone 4: \geq 30 percent gravity (g) effective peak acceleration;
- **•** Zone 3: 20 to \leq 30 percent g effective peak acceleration;
- Zone 2: 10 to \leq 20 percent g effective peak acceleration;
- Zone 1: $5 \text{ to } \leq 10$ percent g effective peak acceleration; and
- Zone $0: \leq 5$ percent g effective peak acceleration.

The Seismology Committee of the Structural Engineers Association of California assumed that there was a 90 percent probability that the above values would not be exceeded in 50 years, or a 100 percent probability that the values would be exceeded in 475 years.

Figure 3.4-4 shows the delineation of UBC seismic zones in Wyoming. The Permit Area is located in Seismic Zone 1. Since effective peak accelerations (90 percent chance of and eastern Wyoming, caused considerable damage to a few buildings. As a result of the earthquake, a portion of the Grand Central Hotel was cracked from the first to the third story. Some of the ceilings in the Grand Central Hotel were also severely damaged.

On October 25, 1922, an intensity IV earthquake was reported in the Casper area. The event was felt in Casper; at Salt Creek, 50 miles north of Casper; and at Bucknum, 22 miles west of Casper. Dishes were rattled and hanging pictures were tilted near Salt Creek. No significant damage was reported in Casper (Casper Daily Tribune, 1922). On December 11, 1942, an intensity IV earthquake was recorded north of Casper. Although no damage was reported, the event was felt in Casper, Salt Creek, and Glenrock (Casper Tribune-Herald, 1941). On August 2, 1948, another intensity IV earthquake was reported in the Casper area. No damage was reported (Casper Tribune-Herald, 1948). In the 1'950s, two earthquakes caused some concern among Casper residents. On January 24, 1954, an intensity IV earthquake near Alcova did not result in any reported damage (Casper Tribune-Herald, 1954). On August 19, 1959, an intensity IV earthquake was felt in Casper. Most recently, on October 19, 1996, a magnitude 4.2 earthquake was recorded approximately 15 miles north-northeast of Casper. No damage was reported.

3.4.3.2 *UBC*

With safety in mind, the UBC provides Seismic Zone Maps to help identify which building design factors are critical to specific areas of the country. Five UBC seismic zones are recognized, ranging from Zone 0 to Zone 4. These seismic zones are, in part, defined by the probability of having a certain level of ground shaking (horizontal acceleration) in 50 years. The criteria used for defining boundaries on the Seismic Zone Map were established by the Seismology Committee of the Structural Engineers Association of California (SEAOC, 1986). The criteria they developed are as follows:

- Zone 4: \geq 30 percent gravity (g) effective peak acceleration;
- Zone 3: 20 to \leq 30 percent g effective peak acceleration;
- Zone 2: 10 to \leq 20 percent g effective peak acceleration;
- Zone 1: 5 to ≤ 10 percent g effective peak acceleration; and
- Zone $0: \leq 5$ percent g effective peak acceleration.

The Seismology Committee of the Structural Engineers Association of California assumed that there was a 90 percent probability that the above values would not be exceeded in 50 years, or a 100 percent probability that the values would be exceeded in 475 years.

Figure 3.4-4 shows the delineation of UBC seismic zones in Wyoming. The Permit Area is located in Seismic Zone 1. Since effective peak accelerations (90 percent chance of

non-exceedance in 50 years) can range from five to ten percent g in Zone **1,** it may be reasonable to assume that an average peak acceleration of 7.5 percent g could be applied to the design of a non-critical facility located near the center of Zone 1.

3.4.3.3 Deterministic Analysis of Active Fault Systems

There are two active fault systems in the vicinity of the Permit Area, the Chicken Springs Fault System and the South Granite Mountain Fault System (Figure 3.4-5).

The Chicken Springs Fault System, located six miles east of the Permit Area, is composed of a series of east-west trending segments. In 1996, the Wyoming State Geological Survey investigated this fault system, and determined that the most recent activity on the system appears to be Holocene in age. Reconnaissance-level studies indicated that the fault system is capable of generating a magnitude 6.5 earthquake (Case, et al., 2002a). A magnitude 6.5 earthquake on the Chicken Springs Fault System would generate peak horizontal accelerations of approximately 4.8 percent g at Rawlins (Case, et al., 2002a). These accelerations would be roughly equivalent to an intensity V earthquake, which may cause some light damage. Bairoil, however, would be subjected to a peak horizontal acceleration of approximately 23 percent g, or an intensity VII earthquake (Case, et al., 2002a). Intensity VII events have the potential to cause moderate damage.

The South Granite Mountain Fault System is located about 14 miles northeast of the Permit Area. This fault system is composed of several northwest-southeast trending normal and thrust faults in southeastern Fremont County and northwestern Carbon County. The active segments of the system have been assigned a maximum magnitude of 6.75, which could generate peak horizontal accelerations of approximately 20 percent g at Bairoil and 6.1 percent g at the Rawlins (Case, et al., 2002a).. These accelerations would be roughly equivalent to an intensity VII earthquake at the Bairoil and an intensity V earthquake at Rawlins. Bairoil could sustain moderate damage; whereas minor or no damage could occur at Rawlins.

3.4.3.4 Maximum Tectonic Province Earthquake "Floating Earthquake" Seismogenic Source

Tectonic provinces are regions with a uniform potential for the occurrence of earthquakes that are tied to buried faults with no surface expression. Within a tectonic province, earthquakes associated with buried faults are assumed to occur randomly, and, as a result, can theoretically occur anywhere within that area of uniform earthquake potential. In reality, that random distribution may not be the case, as most earthquakes are associated

with specific faults. If all buried faults have not been identified, however, the distribution has to be considered random. "Floating earthquakes" are earthquakes that are considered to occur randomly in a tectonic province.

The USGS identified tectonic provinces in a report titled "Probabilistic Estimates of Maximum Acceleration and Velocity in Rock in the Contiguous United States" (Algermissen et al., 1982). In that report, Sweetwater County was classified as being in a tectonic province with a "floating earthquake" maximum magnitude of 6.1. Geomatrix (1988) suggested using a more extensive regional tectonic province, called the "Wyoming Foreland Structural Province," which is approximately defined by the Idaho-Wyoming Thrust Belt on the west, 104 degrees West longitude on the east, 40 degrees North latitude on the south, and 45 degrees North latitude on the north. Geomatrix (1988) estimated that the largest "floating earthquake" in the "Wyoming Foreland Structural Province" would have a magnitude in the 6.0 to 6.5 range, with an average value of magnitude 6.25.

3.4.3.5 Short-Term Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Analysis

The USGS publishes probabilistic acceleration maps for 500-; 1,000-; and 2,500-year time frames. The maps show what accelerations may be met or exceeded in those time frames by expressing the probability that the accelerations will be met or exceeded in a shorter time frame. For example, a ten percent probability that acceleration may be met or exceeded in 50 years is roughly equivalent to a 100 percent probability of exceedance in 500 years.

The 500-year map provides accelerations that are comparable to those derived from the UBC and from the deterministic analysis on the Green Mountain Segment of the South Granite Mountain Fault System. It was often used for planning purposes for average structures. Based on the 500-year map (ten percent probability of exceedance in 50 years), the estimated peak horizontal acceleration in the Permit Area is approximately 6.5 percent g, which is comparable to the acceleration expected in Seismic Zone **I** of the UBC (Figure 3.4-6). The estimated acceleration in the Permit Area is 20 percent g on the 2,500 year map.

Lost Creek Project NRC Environmental Report October 2007

I

DE - Alternating very fine-course grain sandstone, mudstone and siltstone. Minor host for uranium mineralization.

FG - Lenticular arkosic sandstones with intervals of mudstone and siltstone. Categorized as suspended load facies. Cut and fill channels not as prominent as in HJ Horizon. Minor host for uranium mineralization.

LCS - Lost Creek Shale separating **FG** Horizon from HJ Horizon; a virtually continuous aquiclude in the Lost Creek Permit Area.

Mineralization

HJ - Coarse-grained arkoses with minor matrix. Very thin lenticular intervals of fine sands. Cut and fill channels are prominent. Mixed load facies. Major host to uranium mineralization, especially in middle parts.

SBS - Sagebrush Shale/Mudstone separating HJ Horizon from KM Horizon. Continuous through-out Permit Area.

KM - Generally massive, coarsegrained sandstone with lenticular fine sand intervals. Mixed load facies. Host to significant uranium mineralization.

NNS - No Name Shale separating KM Horizon

FIGURE 3.4-2b Stratigraphic Column, Upper Battle Spring Formation

Lost Creek Permit Area Issued For. NRC ER1.0 Drawn By: HA Issued/Revised: 10.10.07

Drawing No.. NRCER1.0 FIG3.4-2b 10.10.07

Figure 3.4-3 Historical seismic activities in Wyoming*

* Red dots are locations of epicenters for those magnitude **=** 2.5 or intensity = III earthquakes recorded from 1871 to present. (Bergantion et al., 2007)

Figure 3.4-4 UBC Seismic Zones in Wyoming (Case et. al., 2002)

Figure 3.4-6. 500-YEAR PROBABLISTIC ACCELERATION MAP OF WYOMING (Case et. al., 2002)

Table 3.4-1 Permit Area Stratigraphy (Page 1 of 3) *

Table 3.4-1 Permit Area Stratigraphy (Page 2 of 3)

Table 3.4-1 Permit Area Stratigraphy (Page 3 of 3)

* (Love and Christiansen, 1985; Wellborn and Wold, 1993)

¹ Thicknesses shown are approximate and apply only to the Permit Area and vicinity. ² Aquifer designation only applicable to the vicinity of the Permit Area.

³ Only major unconformities are shown.

THIS PAGE IS AN OVERSIZED DRAWING OR FIGURE, THAT CAN BE VIEWED AT THE RECORD TITLED: "ATTACHMENT 3.4-1 Typical Geophysical logs Lost Creek Permit Area" DRAWING NO. NRCTR 1.0 ATTACHMENT 3.4-1 10.10.07.

WITHIN THIS PACKAGE... OR BY SEARCHING USING THE DOCUMENT/REPORT NO.

D-03

Attachment 3.4-2 Locations, Total Depths, and Completion Dates of Historic Exploration Holes

Attachment 3.4-2 Locations, Total Depths, and Completion Dates of Historic Exploration Holes

HOLE ID	s	T	R	$\mathbf N$	E	ELEV	TD	Year Drilled	HOLE ID S
LC137	20	25	92	534900	743800	6991	850	2007	LC137
LC139	20	25	92	534900	743900	6991	850	2007	LC139
LC143	20	25	92	534700	744100	6987	850	2007	LC143
LC144	20	25	92	534600	744100	6985	850	2007	LC144
LC145	20	25	92	534700	743700	6988	850	2007	LC145
LC146	20	25	92	534600	743700	6986	850	2007	LC146
LC147	20	25	92	534900	744300	6989	850	2007	LC147
LC148	20	25	92	534700	744300	6987	850	2007	LC148
LC149	20	25	92	534600	744300	6985	850	2007	LC149
LC150	20	25	92	534500	744300	6984	850	2007	LC150
LC151	19	25	92	534710	743479	6986	850	2007	LC151
LC152	20	25	92	534900	744400	6988	850	2007	LC152
LC153	20	25	92	534500	744400	6982	850	2007	LC153
LC155	20	25	92	535000	744500	6990	850	2007	LC155
LC156	20	25	92	534900	744500	6988	850	2007	LC156
LC157	20	25	92	534800	744500	6987	850	2007	LC157
LC158	20	25	92	534699	744486	6984	850	2007	LC158
LC159	20	25	92	534601	744498	6983	850	2007	LC159
LC160	20	25	92	534495	744501	6982	850	2007	LC160
LC161	20	25	92	534506	744601	6983	850	2007	LC161
LC162	20	25	92	535000	744700	6990	850	2007	LC162
LC163	20	25	92	534900	744700	6989	850	2007	LC163
LC164	20	25	92	534800	744700	6988	850	2007	LC164
LC165	20	25	92	534700	744700	6986	850	2007	LC165
LC167	20	25	92	534500	744700	6987	850	2007	LC167
LC168	20	25	92	535000	744900	6992	850	2007	LC168
LC169	17	25	92	535200	745000	6997	850	2007	LC169
LC170	20	25	92	535100	745000	6994	850	2007	LC170
LC171	17	25	92	535200	745200	6995	850	2007	LC171
LC172	20	25	92	535100	745200	6994	850	2007	LC172
LC173	17	25	92	535200	745400	6997	850	2007	LC173
LC174	20	25	92	535100	745400	6997	850	2007	LC174
LC175	20	25	92	.535000	745600	6998	850	2007	LC175
LC176	20	25	92	535000	745700	6999	850	2007	LC176
LC177	20	25	92	535100	745800	7001	850	2007	LC177
LC178	20	25	92	534700	745800	6994	850	2007	LC178
LC179	20	25	92	534500	745800	6992	850	2007	LC179
LC180	20	25	92	534400	745800	6994	850	2007	LC180
LC-HJMO101	19	25	92	534988	743281	6952	326	2007	LC-HJMO-101
LC-HJMO102	19	25	92	534762	742550	6987	330	2007	LC-HJMO-102
LC-HJMO103	18	25	92	535101	742646	6939	330	2007	LC-HJMO-103
LC-HJMO104	19	25	92	534899	742898	6946	328	2007	LC-HJMO-104
LC-HJMO105	19	25	92	535074	742953	6944	328	2007	LC-HJMO-105
LC-HJMO106	18	25	92	535258	743169	6995		2007	LC-HJMO-106
							328		
LC-HJMO107	20	25	92	534790	743697	6990	370	2007	LC-HJMO-107
LC-HJMO108	18	25	92	535298	743461	6954	333	2007	LC-HJMO-108
LC-HJMO109	20	25	92	534825	743904	6991	379	2007	LC-HJMO-109
LC-HJMO110	17	25	92	535194	743674	6950	330	2007	LC-HJMO-110
LC-HJMO111	17	25	92	535371	743825	6953	330	2007	LC-HJMO-111
LC-HJMO112	20	25	92	534674	744375	6931	350	2007	LC-HJMO-112
LC-HJMO113	20	25	92	534805	744265	6934	362	2007	LC-HJMO-113
LC-HJMO114	20	$25 -$	92	534676	744979	6938	360	2007	LC-HJMO-114
LC-HJMP101	19	25	92	534998	743287	6951	490	2007	LC-HJMP-101
LC-HJMP102	19	25	92	534755	742559	6939	440	2007	$LC-HIMP-102$
LC-HJMP103	18	25	92	535109	742652	6939	432	2007	LC-HJMP-103
LC-HJMP104	19	25	92	534897	742885	6943	430	2007	LC-HJMP-104
LC-HJMP106	18	25	92	535258	743168	6945	480	2007	LC-HJMP-106
LC-HJMP107	20	25	92	534802	743684	6941	464	2007	LC-HJMP-107
LC-HJMP108	18	25	92	535311	743466	6955	436	2007	$LC-HIMP-108$
LC-HJMP109	20	25	92	534830	743895	6991	512	2007	LC-HJMP-109

Attachment 3.4-2 Locations, Total Depths, and Completion Dates of Historic Exploration Holes

Attachment 3.4-2 Locations, Total Depths, and Completion Dates of Historic Exploration Holes

HOLE ID	s	Т	$\mathbf R$	N	E	ELEV	TD	Year Drilled	HOLE ID S
TE94	24	25	93	532999	733800	6931	700	1977	TE094-242593
TE96	24	25	93	532800	735000	6928	700	1977	TE096-242593
TE97	24	25	93	532800	734800	6925	700	1977	TE097-242593
TE101	24	25	93	532600	734600	6919	720	1977	TE101-242593
$\overline{TGI-17}$	17	25	92	535200	743600	6944	500	1978	TG01-172592
TG1-18'	18	25	92	535000	742400	6929	600	1992	TG01-182592
TG1-19	19	25	92	532400	742400	6908	600	1992	TG01-192592
TG1-20	20	25	92	534800	743600	6936	500	1978	TG01-202592
TG1-21	21	25	92	535000	749000	6947	600	1978	TG01-212592
TG1A-19(60deg)	19	25	92	534724	743405	6940	200	1978	TG01A-192592(60deg)
TG1A-19(75deg)	19	25	92	534720	743405	6940	380	1978	TG01A-192592(75deg)
TG1A-20(60deg)	20	25	92	534902	744200	6933	200	1978	
									TG01A-202592(60deg)
TG1A-20(75deg)	20	25	92	534900	744200	6933	380	1978	TG01A-202592(75deg)
TG2-18	18	25	92	535200	742400	6933	600	1978	TG02-182592
TG2-19	19	25	92	532800	742400	6912	600	1978	TG02-192592
TG2-20	20	25	92	535000	743600	6940	500	1978	TG02-202592
TG2-21	$21 -$	25	92	.534800	749000	6942	540	1978	TG02-212592
TG3-17	17	25	92	535400	745400	6945	600	1978	TG03-172592
$TG3-18$	18	25	92	535400	742400	6939	600	1978	×. TG03-182592
TG3-19	19	25	92	533200	742400	6912	600	1978	TG03-192592
TG3-20	20	25	92	535000	744000	6937	500	1978	TG03-202592
TG3-21	21	25	92	534600	749000	6940	540	1978	TG03-212592
TG4-18	18	25	92	535600	742400	6940	600	1978	TG04-182592
TG4-19	19	25	92	533600	742400	6923	600	1978	TG04-192592
TG4-20	20	25	92	534800	744000	6934	600	1978	TG04-202592
TG4-21	21	25	92	535000	750600	6931	500	1978	TG04-212592
TG5-17	17	25	92	535200	744000	6939	500	1978	TG05-172592
TG5-18	18	25	92	535800	742400	6944	660	1978	TG05-182592
TG5-19	19	25	92	534000	742400	6934	600	1978	TG05-192592
TG5-20	20	25	92	535000	744400	6934	600	1978	
TG5-21	21	25	92	535000			600	1978	TG05-202592
					749400	6946			TG05-212592
TG6-17	17	25	92	535400	743600	6950	600	1978	TG06-172592
TG6-18	18	25	92	536000	742400	6947	600	1978 $\ddot{}$	TG06-182592
TG6-19	19	25	92	534400	742400	6927	600	1978	TG06-192592
TG6-20	20	25	92	534800	744400	6931	600	1978	TG06-202592
TG6-21	21	25	92	535000	749800	6939	540	1978	TG06-212592
TG7-17	17	25	92	535400	744000	6945	540	1978	TG07-172592
TG7-18	18	25	92	536200	742400	6949	660	1978	TG07-182592
TG7-19	19	25	92	534600	742400	6929	600	1978	TG07-192592
TG7-20	20	25	92	534400	744800	6932	520	1978	TG07-202592
TG8-17	17	25	92	535600	744000	6953	560	1978	TG08-172592
TG8-18	18	25	92	535212	743201	6944	600	1978	TG08-182592
TG8-19	19	25	92		534800 742400	6926	600	1978	TG08-192592
TG8-20	20	25	92	534800	744800	6934	600	1978	TG08-202592 ⁻
TG9-17	17	25	92	535123	744387	6936	560	1978	TG09-172592
TG9-18	18	25	92	535200	742800	6935	600	1978	TG09-182592
TG9-19	19	25	92	534800	742800	6935	600	1978	TG09-192592
TG9-20	20	25	92	534600	744800	6932	600	1978	TG09-202592
TG10-17	17	25	92	535400	744400	6941	600	1977	TG10-172592
TG10-18	18	25	92	535600	742800	6946	600	1977	TG10-182592
TG10-19	19	25	92	534600	742800	6932	500	1977	TG10-192592
TG10-20	20	25	92	534600	744400	6930	600	1977	TG10-202592
TG11-17	17	25	92	535600	744400	6949	600	1978	TG11-172592
TG11-18	18	25	92	536006	742800	6951	660	1978	TG11-182592
TG11-19	19 [°]	25	92	535000	742800	6932	500	1978	TG11-192592
TG11-20	20	25	92	534600	744000	6931	600	1978	TG11-202592
TG12-17	17	25	92	535121	744788	6939	560	1978	TG12-172592
TG12-18	18	25	92	536400	742800	6959	660	1978	TG12-182592
TG12-19	19	25	92	535000	743200	6942	500	1978	TG12-192592
TG12-20	20	25	92	535000	745000	6938	600	1978	TG12-202592

Attachment 3.4-2 Locations, Total Depths, and Completion Dates of Historic Exploration Holes

HOLE ID	s	т	\bf{R}	N	E	ELEV	TD.	Year Drilled	HOLE ID S
TG12-21	21	25	92	535000	751000	6948	500	1978	TG12-212592
TG13-17	17	25	92	535400	744800	6949	600	1978	TG13-172592
TG13-18	18	25	92	535200	742900	6936	500	1978	TG13-182592
TG13-19	19	25	92	534600	743200	6932	540	1978	TG13-192592
TG13-20	20	25	92	535000	745400	6942	600	1978	TG13-202592
TG13-21	21	25	92	535000	750200	6935	540	1978	TG13-212592
TG14-18	18	25	92	536400	743200	6949	600	1978	TG14-182592
TG14-19	19	25	92	534800	743200	6941	500	1978	TG14-192592
TG14-20	20	25	92	534800	745400	6941	540	1978	TG14-202592
TG15-17	17	25	92	535800	745400	6961	600	1978	TG15-172592
TG15-18	18	25	92	535414	743205	6943	500	1978	TG15-182592
TG15-19	19	25	92	534600					TG15-192592
					742600	6930	580	1980	
TG15-20	20	25	92	534600	745400	6938	540	1978	TG15-202592
TG16-17	17	25	92	535800	745800	6961	600	1978	TG16-172592
TG16-19	19	25	92	534800	742600	6930	580	1980	TG16-192592
TG16-20	20	25	92	534600	745800	6938	600	1978	TG16-202592
TG17-17	17	25	92	535400	746200	6949	600	1978	TG17-172592
TG17-19	19	25	92	535000	742600	6929	580	1980	TG17-192592
TG17-20	20	25	92	534800	745800	6940	540	1978	TG17-202592
TG18-17	17	25	92	535800	746200	6961	600	1978	TG18-172592
TG18-19	19	25	92	534600	743000	6931	580	1980	TG18-192592
TG18-20	20	25	92	535000	745800	6943	600	1978	TG18-202592
TG19-17	17	25	92	535400	746600	6948	600	1978	TG19-172592
TG19-19	19	25	92	534800	743000	6940	580	1980 \cdot	TG19-192592
TG19-20	20	25	92	535013	746209	6948	600	1978	TG19-202592
TG20-17	17	25	92	535800	746600	6956	600	1978	TG20-172592
TG20-18	18	25	92	535200	742600	6935	580	1980	TG20-182592
TG20-19	19	25	92	535000	743000	6935	580	1980	TG20-192592
TG20-20	20	25	92	534800	746200	6941	540	1978	TG20-202592
TG21-17	17	25	92	535600	745800	6954	600	1978 \mathbf{v}	TG21-172592
TG21-18	18	25	92	535200	743000	6933	580	1980	TG21-182592
TG21-19	19	25	92	534800	743400	6936	580	1980	TG21-192592
TG21-20	20	25	92	534600	746200	6949	516	1978	TG21-202592
TG22-17	17	25	92	536000	745800	6966	600		
			92					1978	TG22-172592
TG22-18	18	25		535400	743000	6938	580	1980	TG22-182592
TG22-19	19	25	92	535000	743400	6942	580	1980	TG22-192592
TG22-20	20	25	92	534600	746600	6947	540	1978	TG22-202592
TG23-17	17	25	92	535200	747000	6948	600	1978	TG23-172592
TG23-18	18	25	92	535200	743400	6942	580	1980	$\ddot{}$ TG23-182592
TG23-19	19	25	92	535000	742200	6936	580	1980	TG23-192592
TG23-20	20	25	92	534800	746600	6944	540	1978	TG23-202592
TG24-17	20	25	92	535400	747000	6944	600	1978	TG24-172592
TG24-18	$\overline{18}$	25 ₁		92 535417 743401		6948	580	1980	TG24-182592
TG24-19	19	25	92 ₁	534800	742200	6931	580	1980	TG24-192592
TG24-20	17	25	92	535000	746600	6951	600	1978	TG24-202592
TG25-17	17	25	92	535200	747400	6954	600	1978	TG25-172592
TG25-18	18	25	92	535600	743400	6942	580	1980 \bullet	TG25-182592
TG25-19	19	25	92	534600	742200	6931	580	1980	TG25-192592
TG25-20	20	25	92	535000	747000	6949	600	1978	TG25-202592
TG26-17	17	25	92	535400	747400	6953	600	1978	TG26-172592
TG26-20	20	25	92	534800	747000	6950	540	1978	TG26-202592
TG27-17	17	25	92	535800	747400	6960	600	1978	TG27-172592
TG27-18	18	25	92	535302	743392	6951	580	1980	TG27-182592
TG27-20	20	25	'92	534600	747000	6951	540	1978	TG27-202592
TG28-17	17	25	92	535800	747000	6956	600	1978	TG28-172592
TG28-20	20	25		534600	747400	6956		1978	TG28-202592
			92				600		
$TG29-17$	17	25	92	535600	745400	6946	600	1978	TG29-172592
TG29-20	20	25	92	534800	747400	6953	540	1978 ÷.	TG29-202592
TG30-17	17	25	92	536000	746200	6964	600	1978	TG30-172592
TG30-20	20	25	92	535000	747400	6952	600	1978	TG30-202592

 \bar{I}

Attachment 3.4-2 Locations, Total Depths, and Completion Dates of Historic Exploration Holes

HOLE ID	s	т	R	N	Е	ELEV	TD	Year Drilled	HOLE ID S
TG31-20	20	25	92	535000	747800	6957	600	1978	TG31-202592
$\overline{TG32-17}$	17	25	92	535200	747800	6956	600	1978	TG32-172592 ⁻
TG32-20	20	25	92	534800	747800	6953	540	1978	TG32-202592
TG33-17	17	25	92	535400	747800	6957	600	1978	TG33-172592
TG33-20	20	25	92	534600	747800	6949	540	1978	TG33-202592
TG34-17	17	25	92	535200	748200	6958	600	1978	TG34-172592
TG34-20	20	25	92	535000	748200	6955	600	1978	TG34-202592
TG35-17	17	25	92	535200	748600	6954	600	1978	TG35-172592
TG35-20	20	25	92	534800	748200	6949	540	1978	$\hat{}$ TG35-202592
TG36-17	17	25	92	535200	743800	6940	580	1980	TG36-172592
TG36-20	20	25	92	534600	748200	6943	540	1978	TG36-202592
TG37-17	17	25	92	535400	743800	6947	580	1980	TG37-172592
TG38-17	17	25	92	535200	744200	6937	580	1980	TG38-172592
TG39-17	17	25	92	535400	744200	6941	580	1978	TG39-172592
	20	25	92						
TG39-20 TG40-17	17	25	92	535000	748600	6950	600	1978 1980	TG39-202592
				535600	744200	6949	580		TG40-172592
TG41-17	17	25	92	535200	744600	6938	580	1980	TG41-172592
TG41-20	20	25	92	534800	748600	6946	540	1978	TG41-202592
TG42-17	17	25	92	535440	744600	6942	580	1980	TG42-172592
TG42-20	20	25	92	534600	748600	6941	540	1978	TG42-202592
TG43-17	17	25	92	535600	744800	6950	580	1980	TG43-172592
TG43-20	20	25	92	534400	748600	6939	540	1978	TG43-202592
TG44-17	17	25	92	535800	745200	6958	580	1980	TG44-172592
TG44-20	20	25	92	531400	743800	6879	460	1979	TG44-202592
TG45-17	17	25	92	535800	745600	6958	580	1980	TG45-172592
TG46-17	17	25	92	536000	745600	6962	580	1980	TG46-172592
TG47-17	17	25	92	535800	746000	6958	580	1980	TG47-172592
TG48-17	17	25	92	535600	743800	6951	580	1980	TG48-172592
TG49-17	17	25	92	535300	744200	6938	580	1980	TG49-172592
TG50-17	17	25	92	535500	744200	6945	580	1980	TG50-172592
TG51-17	17	25	92	536400	746400	6972	600	1981.	TG51-172592
TG52-17	17	25	92	538400	747200	-7001	600	1981	TG52-172592
TG52-20	20	25	92	534600	743800	6929	580	1980	TG52-202592
TG53-20	20	25	92	534800	743800	6933	580	1980	TG53-202592
TG54-20	20	25	92	535000	743800	6936	580	1980	TG54-202592
TG55-20	20	25	92	534400	744200	6926	580	1980	TG55-202592
TG56-20	20	25	92	534600	744200	6928	580	1980	TG56-202592
TG57-20	20	25	92	534800	744200	6932	580	1980	TG57-202592
TG58-20	20	25	92	535000	744200	6936	580	1980 ϵ	TG58-202592
TG59-20	20	25	92	534600	744600	6928	580	1980	TG59-202592
TG60-20	20	25	92	534800	744600	6930	580	1980	TG60-202592
TG61-20	20	25	92	535014	744604	6939	580	1980.	TG61-202592
$TG62-20$	$\overline{20}$	$\overline{25}$	92	534800	745000	6933	580	1980	TG62-202592
TG63-20	20	25	92	534600	745200	6938	580	1980	TG63-202592
TG64-20	20	25	92	534800	745200	6938	580	1980	TG64-202592
TG65-20	20	25	92	535000	745200	6936	580	1980	TG65-202592
	20	25	92		745600			1980	
TG66-20				534600		6935	580		TG66-202592
TG67-20	20	25	92	534800	745600	6939	580	1980	TG67-202592
TG68-20	20	25	92	535000	745600	6941	580	1980	TG68-202592
TG69-20	20	25	92	534600	746000	6937	580	1980	TG69-202592
TG70-20	20	25	92	534800	746000	6941	580	1980	TG70-202592
TG71-20	20	25	92	535000	744800	6935	580	1980	TG71-202592
TG72-20	20	25	92	534700	744200	6930	580	1980	TG72-202592
TG73-20	20	25	92	535100	744200	6935	580	1980	TG73-202592
TGC1-19	19	25	92	534700	742600	6932	500	1980	TGC01-192592
TGC1A(45deg)	19	25	92	534502	742600	6927	300	1980	TGC01A-192592(45deg)
TGC1A(60deg)	19	25	92	534500	742600	6927	300	1980	TGC01A-192592(60deg)
TGC2-19	19	25	92	534860	742600	6935	480	1980	TGC02-192592
		25	92	535200	742850	6936	475	1979	TGC16-182592
TGC16	18								

Page 11 of 14

 \mathcal{L}

Attachment 3.4-2 Locations, Total Depths, and Completion Dates of Historic Exploration Holes

HOLE ID	s	T	R	N	E	ELEV	TD.	Year Drilled	HOLE ID_S
TT60	24	25	93	533701	736666	6933	900	1977	TT060-242593
TT61	24	25	93	532780	736311	6921	700	1977	TT061-242593
TT62	24	25	93	534541	736958	6948	820	1977	TT062-242593
TT63	19	25	92	534730	741361	6933	600	1977	TT063-192592
TT64	19	25	92	534205	740788	6923	600	1977	TT064-192592
TT65	19	25	92	533720	740218	6928	600	1977	TT065-192592
TT66	19	25	92	534320	740648	6927	600	1978	TT066-192592 λ
TT67	19	25	92	533390	739541	6922	700	1978	TT067-192592
TT68	19	25	92	533163	738795	6915	700	1978.	TT068-192592
TT69	24	25	93	532971	736555	6924	700	1978	TT069-242593
TT70	24	25	93	534439	736943	6947	760	1978	TT070-242593
TT71	24	25	93	534563	736857	6951	760	1978	TT071-242593
TT72	24	25	93	534652	736971	6951	760	1978	TT072-242593
	24	$\overline{25}$							×.
TT73			93	534513	737060	6947	760	1978	TT073-242593
TT74	19	25	92	534519	741445	6928	600	1978	TT074-192592
TT75	19	25	92	534637	741746	6927	600	1978	TT075-192592
TT76	19	25	.92	532907	741106	6921	600	1978	TT076-192592
TT77	19	25	92	532638	740672	6909	600	1978	TT077-192592
TT78	19	25	92	534367	740835	6925	600	1978	TT078-192592
TT79	19	25	92	534052	740388	6931	600	1978	TT079-192592
TT80	19	25	92	533823	740077	6933	600	1978	TT080-192592
TT81	19	25	92	533587	739699	6926	700	1978	TT081-192592
TT82	19	25	92	533435	739490	6923	700	1978	TT082-192592
TT83	19	25	92	532922	738626	6911	700	1978	TT083-192592
TT84	24	25	93	532787	738163	6908	700	1978	TT084-242593
TT85	19	25	92	534292	741243	6921	600	1978	TT085-192592
TT86	19	25	92	534431	741740	6921	600	1978	TT086-192592
TT87	19	25	92	534699	741544	6932	600	1978	TT087-192592
TT88	19	25	92	534732	741952	6926	600	1978	TT088-192592
TT89	19	25	92	533893	741807	6909	600	1978	TT089-192592
TT90	19	25	92	535196	741864	6937	600	1978	TT090-182592
TT94	18	25	92	535900	742100	6948	660	1978	TT094-182592
TT95	18	25	92	535500	742100	6938	660	1978	TT095-182592
TT96	18	25	92	535100	742100	6934	660	1978	TT096-182592
TT97	19	25	93	534723	742106	6927	600	1978	TT097-192592
TT98	19	25	92	534400	740400	6912	700	1978	TT098-192592
TT99	19	25	92	534100	740100	6916	700	1978	TT099-192592
TT100	19	25	92	533900					
					739500	6918	700	1977	TT100-192592
TT101	19	25	92	533700	739100	6912	700	1977	TT101-192592
TT102	19	25	92	533000	738800	6914	660	1977	TT102-192592
TT103	19	25	92	533000	739200	6918	700	1977	TT103-192592
TT104	19	$\overline{25}$	92	533000	739600	6919	600	1977	TT104-192592
TT105	$\overline{24}$	$\overline{25}$		93 533600	738200	6926	660	1977	TT105-192592
TT106	24	25	93.	533385	738216	6924	700	1977	TT106-242593
TT107	24	25°	93	532919	737215	6920	700	1977	TT107-242593
TT108	24	25	93	533613	737270	6924	700	1977	TT108-242593
TT109	19	25	92	533400	738400	6923	700	1977	TT109-192592
TT110	19	25	92	534063	740395	6932	560	1977	TT110-192592
TT111	19	25	92	534741	741947	6928	500	1977	TT111-192592
TT112	24	25	93	533200	738200	6919	660	1977	TT112-242593
TT113	24	25	93	533400	738000	6921	660	1977	TT113-242593
TT114	24	25	93	533000	737200	6920	660	1977 $\epsilon = -\pi$	TT114-242593
TT120	19	25	92	533200	739800	6920	600	1977	TT120-192592
TT121	19	25	92	533200	739600	6919	600	1977	TT121-192592
TT122	19	25	92	533200	739400	6919	600	1977	TT122-192592
TT123	19	25	92	533200	739200	6919	600	1977	TT123-192592
TT124	19	25	92	533600	739200	6927	620	1977	TT124-192592
TT125	19	25	92	533000	739400	6917	600	1977	TT125-192592
TT126	19	25	92	533600	739400	6927	600	1977	TT126-192592
TT127	19	25	92	533600	739600	6926	600	1977	TT127-192592

Attachment 3.4-2 Locations, Total Depths, and Completion Dates of Historic Exploration Holes

THIS PAGE IS AN OVERSIZED DRAWING OR FIGURE,

THAT CAN BE VIEWED AT THE RECORD TITLED: "ATTACHMENT 3.4-2 PLATE A3.4-2a "Location Map of Historical Wells- West Lost Creek Permit Area" DRAWING NO. NRCTR 1.0 PLATE A3.4-2a 10.11.07

WITHIN THIS PACKAGE... OR BY SEARCHING USING THE DOCUMENT/REPORT NO.

D-04

THIS PAGE IS AN OVERSIZED DRAWING OR FIGURE, THAT CAN BE VIEWED AT THE RECORD TITLED: "ATTACHMENT 3.4-2 PLATE A3.4-2b Location Map of Historical Wells-Central Lost Creek Permit Area" DRAWING NO. NRCTR 1.0 PLATE A3.4-2b 10.11.07

WITHIN THIS PACKAGE... OR BY SEARCHING USING THE DOCUMENT/REPORT NO.

THIS PAGE IS AN OVERSIZED DRAWING OR FIGURE, THAT CAN BE VIEWED AT THE RECORD TITLED: "ATTACHMENT 3.4-2 PLATE A3.4-2c Location Map of Historical Wells-East Lost Creek Permit Area" DRAWING NO. NRCTR 1.0 PLATE A3.4-2c 10.11.07

WITHIN THIS PACKAGE... OR BY SEARCHING USING THE DOCUMENT/REPORT NO.

THIS PAGE IS AN OVERSIZED DRAWING OR FIGURE, THAT CAN BE VIEWED AT THE RECORD TITLED: "PLATE 3.4-la Cross Section A-A' Lost Creek Permit Area" DRAWING NO. NRCTR 1.0 PLATE 3.4-la 10.11.07

WITHIN THIS PACKAGE... OR BY SEARCHING USING THE DOCUMENT/REPORT NO.

THIS PAGE IS AN OVERSIZED DRAWING OR FIGURE, THAT CAN BE VIEWED AT THE RECORD TITLED: "PLATE 3.4-1b Cross Section B-C Lost Creek Permit Area" DRAWING NO. NRCTR 1.0 PLATE 3.4-lb 10.11.07

WITHIN THIS PACKAGE... OR BY SEARCHING USING THE DOCUMENT/REPORT NO.

THIS PAGE IS AN OVERSIZED DRAWING OR FIGURE, THAT CAN BE VIEWED AT THE RECORD TITLED: "PLATE 3.4-ic Cross Section C-D Lost Creek Permit Area"

DRAWING NO. NRCTR 1.0 PLATE 3.4-1c 10.11.07

WITHIN THIS PACKAGE... OR BY SEARCHING USING THE DOCUMENT/REPORT NO.

THIS PAGE IS AN OVERSIZED DRAWING OR FIGURE, THAT CAN BE VIEWED AT THE RECORD TITLED: "PLATE 3.4-id Cross Section D-E Lost Creek Permit Area" DRAWING NO. NRCTR 1.0 PLATE 3.4-id 10.11.07

WITHIN THIS PACKAGE... OR BY SEARCHING USING THE DOCUMENT/REPORT NO.

THIS PAGE IS AN OVERSIZED DRAWING OR FIGURE, THAT CAN BE VIEWED AT THE RECORD TITLED: "PLATE 3.4-le Cross Section F-F', G-G', H-H' Lost Creek Permit Area" DRAWING NO. NRCTR 1.0 PLATE 3.4-le 10.11.07

WITHIN THIS PACKAGE... OR BY SEARCHING USING THE DOCUMENT/REPORT NO.

THIS PAGE IS AN OVERSIZED DRAWING OR FIGURE, THAT CAN BE VIEWED AT THE RECORD TITLED: "PLATE 3.4-2a Isopach Map of the Lost Creek Shale Lost Creek Permit Area" DRAWING NO. NRCTR 1.0 PLATE 3.4-2a 10.10.07

WITHIN THIS PACKAGE... OR BY SEARCHING USING THE DOCUMENT/REPORT NO.

THIS PAGE IS AN OVERSIZED DRAWING OR FIGURE,

THAT CAN BE VIEWED AT THE RECORD TITLED: "PLATE 3.4-2b Isopach Map of the HJ Horizon Lost Creek Permit Area" DRAWING NO. NRCTR 1.0 PLATE 3.4-2b 10.10.07

WITHIN THIS PACKAGE... OR BY SEARCHING USING THE DOCUMENT/REPORT NO.

THIS PAGE IS AN OVERSIZED DRAWING OR FIGURE,

THAT CAN BE VIEWED AT THE RECORD TITLED:

"PLATE 3.4-2c Isopach Map of the Sagebrush Shale Lost Creek Permit Area" DRAWING NO. NRCTR 1.0 PLATE 3.4-2c 10.10.07

WITHIN THIS PACKAGE... OR BY SEARCHING USING THE DOCUMENT/REPORT NO.

THIS PAGE IS AN OVERSIZED DRAWING OR FIGURE, THAT CAN BE VIEWED AT THE RECORD TITLED: "PLATE 3.4-2d Isopach Map of the UKM Sand Lost Creek Permit Area" DRAWING NO. NRCTR 1.0 PLATE 3.4-2d 10.10.07

WITHIN THIS PACKAGE... OR BY SEARCHING USING THE DOCUMENT/REPORT NO.