

Meeting Notes

Organization: Uranerz Energy Corporation (Uranerz)

Location: Casper, WY

Date: January 13, 2009

Attendees:

Irene Yu, NRC
Nancy Barker, VHB
Scott R., environmental consultant, TRC
Scott C., environmental consultant, TRC
George Hoffman, hydrologist, Uranerz
Craig, environmental consultant
Mike Thomas, Environmental Safety and Health Manager, Uranerz
Glenn Catchpole, President and CEO, Uranerz
Chris Dray, Environmental & Safety Coordinator, Uranerz
George Hartman, Executive Vice-President and Chief Operating Officer, Uranerz

Purpose:

To ask questions to help finalize the number of RAls for Nichols Ranch

Discussion:

- Alternatives – what did they consider for this site?
 - No action
 - Conventional mining – open pit and underground (too costly)
 - ISL with different types of lixiviant – carbonate, acid
 - Underground injection wells (UIC) vs evaporation ponds vs land application
 - Ponds were considered but can leak and have volume limitations
 - Land application can have cumulative effect of buildup of contaminants in soil
 - Industry has moved toward UIC, risk in UIC is that we don't know what the results are actually going to be and have had difficulty finding right aquifer to inject into
- Land use
 - Nichols Ranch drawdown extends out 5 miles with a 5 ft drawdown
 - Area around Nichols Ranch mostly private
 - Information in application list all wells out to 3 miles
 - Uranerz has established surface use agreements
 - Hank Unit drawdown far less – should be less than a mile
 - No grazing leases except on Hank site
- Surface water and wetlands
 - Most everything on site is ephemeral
 - Wetlands shouldn't be impacted so function value assessment not needed
 - CBM – one retention pond currently being constructed onsite, one being proposed for construction on northeast part of Nichols Ranch (would flow to Cottonwood Creek)

I/21

- Surface water data is available from June 2008, Uranerz wasn't able to collect water samples prior to that because of dry conditions, results will be included in safety RAI responses
- No buried piping proposed, should all be aboveground
- Header houses have electric heaters
- Groundwater
 - Unconfined aquifer issue
 - Reno Creek pilot plant – located 15 miles east of site, were able to operate in unconfined aquifer and restore, should have a DEQ mine plan and reclamation plan
 - Storage value 1000 times larger than in a confined aquifer
 - Water supply comes from closer
 - Gradients are deeper but drawdown not as far out
 - ISL should be easier to control
 - Potential impact is that water can move faster
 - Uranerz proposing the same ring of monitoring wells for confined and unconfined aquifers – seems adequate for both conditions
- Noise
 - No field noise measurements were taken
 - Statements in the TR/ER based on typical experience
 - Need quick analysis on noise from trucks for construction and operation
- Cultural resources
 - ER includes an assessment of effect of project
 - Uranerz to send NRC remaining cultural resources survey write-up soon
- Socioeconomics
 - Housing shortage – people driving as far as Wright, Buffalo, Casey, Casper, and Gillette
 - 2006 population data used in the ER
- Uranerz plans to revise the TR
- Uranerz would like NRC to work with DEQ and BLM to standardize their source material license applications so they don't have to submit three separate applications for the same proposed project

Questions:

- Did they ever consider just mining Nichols Ranch Unit and not Hank Unit?
- Does Uranerz need to update the ER or does the TR update suffice since there is a lot of repetition in the ER and TR? (Ron Linton)

Action Items:

- Get docket number of Reno Creek files (Ron Linton), pass onto contractor