February 26, 2008

Mr. Ken Milmine
Manager of Environmental
and Regulatory Affairs, Wyoming
Uranium One
907 N. Poplar
Suite 260
Casper, WY 82601

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF FEBRUARY 14, 2008, MEETING CONCERING THE MOORE RANCH IN SITU LEACH URANIUM RECOVERY LICENSE APPLICATION

A summary of the February 14, 2008, meeting between U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff and representatives of Energy Metals Corporation (EMC) and Uranium One is enclosed. No action items were agreed upon at the meeting.

If you have any questions regarding this letter or the enclosed meeting summary, please contact the NRC Project Manager for the Moore Ranch site, Mr. Myron (Mike) Fliegel, at (301) 415-6629 or by email at MHF1@NRC.GOV.

In accordance with 10 CFR 2.390 of the NRC's "Rules of Practice," a copy of this letter will be available electronically for public inspection in the NRC Public Document Room or from the Publicly Available Records component of NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS). ADAMS is accessible from the NRC Web site at http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Myron Fliegel, Senior Project Manager
Uranium Recovery Licensing Branch
Division of Waste Management
and Environmental Protection
Office of Federal and State Materials
and Environmental Management Programs

Docket No.: 40-9073

Enclosure:
Meeting Summary

February 26, 2008

Mr. Ken Milmine
Manager of Environmental
and Regulatory Affairs, Wyoming
Uranium One
907 N. Poplar
Suite 260
Casper, WY 82601

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF FEBRUARY 14, 2008, MEETING CONCERING THE MOORE RANCH IN SITU LEACH URANIUM RECOVERY LICENSE APPLICATION

A summary of the February 14, 2008, meeting between U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff and representatives of Energy Metals Corporation (EMC) and Uranium One is enclosed. No action items were agreed upon at the meeting.

If you have any questions regarding this letter or the enclosed meeting summary, please contact the NRC Project Manager for the Moore Ranch site, Mr. Myron (Mike) Fliegel, at (301) 415-6629 or by email at MHF1@NRC.GOV.

In accordance with 10 CFR 2.390 of the NRC's "Rules of Practice," a copy of this letter will be available electronically for public inspection in the NRC Public Document Room or from the Publicly Available Records component of NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS). ADAMS is accessible from the NRC Web site at http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Myron Fliegel, Senior Project Manager
Uranium Recovery Licensing Branch
Division of Waste Management
and Environmental Protection
Office of Federal and State Materials
and Environmental Management Programs

Docket No.: 40-9073

Enclosure:
Meeting Summary

DISTRIBUTION:
DOrlando Meeting Attendees

ML 080530303

OFC	DWMEP	DWMEP	DWMEP
NAME	MFliegel	BGarrett	WvonTill
DATE	02/25/08	02/26 /08	02/26/08

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

MEETING WITH ENERGY METALS CORPORATION/URANIUM ONE
MEETING REPORT

On February 14, 2008, U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff (NRC), and staff from the Uranium Recovery and Licensing Branch, Decommissioning and Uranium Recovery Licensing Directorate, and the Environmental Review Branch, Environmental Protection and Performance Assessment Directorate met with representatives of Energy Metals Corporation (EMC)/Uranium One and Petrotek Engineering Corporation at the NRC headquarters in Rockville, Maryland (Room T-8C5c). The meeting was held from 9:30 am to 11:45 am. The public meeting was originally announced on the NRC public web site on January 29, 2008. One member of the public chose to attend via teleconference.

PURPOSE:

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss technical issues related to EMC's Moore Ranch In Situ Leach (ISL) uranium recovery facility application. EMC also provided an update on the status of its forthcoming Jab & Antelope ISL uranium recovery facility application.

ATTENDEES: Refer to Attachment

BACKGROUND:

On October 3, 2007, EMC submitted its application for a new ISL facility at Moore Ranch, located in Campbell County. NRC staff completed its acceptance review of the Moore Ranch application and formally accepted the application for full technical review on December 20, 2007. Based on the results of the staff's ongoing technical review, a request for additional information is currently scheduled to be sent to EMC by May 16, 2008.

DISCUSSION:

NRC staff is currently conducting its full technical review of the Moore Ranch application. At this stage of the review, staff has identified some technical areas in the application where more detailed information is needed. The meeting focused primarily on three of these technical areas: site characterization, coal-bed methane (CBM), and injection/production operations.

Site characterization discussion/comments included the following:

1. Provide stratigraphic cross sections to surface using MSL datum (per NUREG 1569).

2. Increase number of wells used to define stratigraphic cross sections to better establish presence or absence of confining layers (Conoco site characterization data on fifty foot centers).

3. Include the 60 sand on stratigraphic cross sections to demonstrate where it coalesces with the 68 sand.

Enclosure

4. Where possible, include CBM zones on stratigraphic cross sections (logs of CBM wells in permit area are available from the Wyoming State Oil and Gas Conservation Commission (WYOGCC)).

5. Show water levels in the 72 sand across the permit area on cross sections.

6. Show 70 sand water levels across permit area on stratigraphic cross sections to demonstrate saturation.

7. Explain the saturation of the 70 sand based on pump test results. Do pump test responses clearly indicate unconfined or confined conditions in the 70 sand? For example, page 2-7-19 provides storativity for Wellfields 1 and 2 and specific yield for Wellfield 3.

8. Provide original Conoco pump test reports and data.

9. Investigate Wellfield 1 68 and 70 sand communication in pump tests (Conoco). Pump test in Wellfield 1 on 8/17/77 indicated connection between 70 and 68 sands even though shale looks intact (page 2-7-17).

10. Investigate source of 25 ft drawndown in UMW 3, starting in February 2007, until mid August 2007.

11. Investigate Wellfield 2 68 and 70 sand communication in pump tests (Conoco and 2007). Pump test in Wellfield 2 6/25/78 indicated drawdown in 68 sand after 170 minutes. 2007 tests showed communication in Wellfield 2 in UMW-2 and 1807.

CBM discussion/comments included the following:

1. Provide current and projected CBM activity (present and future permitted well locations, production screen locations, annual water production, pumping rates) in permit area (WYOGCC).

2. Provide Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitted discharge points for CBM produced water within the permit area and a three mile radius.

3. Provide CBM produced water volumes released and permitted to be released at these NPDES discharge points.

4. Evaluate possible impact to 72 sand water quality from CBM produced water discharge at surface in the permit area (72 sand within 50 feet of surface in some places). Provide discussion on how this impact can be separated from possible excursion impacts?

5. The Bureau of Land Management has monitored the impact of CBM water production on overlying and underlying aquifers in the Powder River Basin. Is any of this monitoring data available in the Moore Ranch permit area or within a three mile radius?

Production /Injection operation discussion/comments included the following:

1. Demonstrate how production and injection well operations on a five spot pattern will impact saturation of the unconfined 70 sand injection/production zone. For example, will the 70 sand be substantially dewatered at the production wells by drawdown and/or will significant mounding occur at injection wells?

2. Explain how desaturation and saturation of the unconfined 70 sand will impact horizontal and vertical excursion control (i.e., less drawdown required in gravity drainage, so inward gradient reduced).

3. Explain how vertical excursions from the 70 sand to the 68 sand will be hydraulically controlled when the 70, 68, and possibly 60 sands are in communication.

4. Address the additional monitoring required in the 68 and 60 sands to capture possible vertical excursions where these sands coalesce with the 70 sand.

5. Explain how desaturation and saturation of the 70 sand will impact restoration of this ore zone during sweep, transfer, and circulation.

6. Explain how saturation/desaturation of the 70 sand injection/production zone will influence horizontal and vertical excursion control during restoration.

There was additional discussion related to the need for radiological dose monitoring and estimation for non-operational personnel in the permit area (e.g., delivery truck drivers, CBM workers, etc.).

Finally, EMC/Uranium One provided an update on the status of its Jab & Antelope ISL project, located within the Great Divide Basin in Wyoming. The project will include a Central Processing Plant (complete ISL circuit, ion exchange through yellowcake packaging) at the Antelope site, with the Jab site containing remote wellfields supported by a satellite facility. EMC/Uranium One indicated that, weather permitting, it was on schedule to submit an ISL application for the Jab & Antelope project to the NRC by the end of April 2008.

ACTIONS: No action items were identified.

ATTACHMENT:
A. Meeting attendees

No handouts or presentation materials were used or distributed at the meeting.