
From: Cash, John [mailto:John.Cash@ur-energyusa.com]
Sent: Friday, July 23, 2010 10:29 AM
To: Bjornsen, Alan
Subject: RE: More Questions

Alan,

1. A copy of the Wildlife Monitoring Plan is attached for your use along with the cover letter it was submitted under.
2. Yes, NRC has the most up to date financial assurance. It was submitted to Tanya Oxenberg.
3. Until we have a license in hand and other permitting is complete or nearly complete we are hesitant to sign a disposal agreement. Therefore, we do not have a disposal agreement in place yet.
4. Non-hazardous, non-radiological solid waste will most likely go to the Rawlins Landfill that is located just north of Rawlins.
5. I don't see the reference to 324 acres in the Draft SEIS but I may be missing it. The WDEQ has made us make some minor revisions to how we calculate disturbance. The most significant difference is that they required us to place the entire east and west access roads into the permit area. This increased the area of disturbance by about 19.3 acres. The remaining differences are simply minor adjustments required by WDEQ-LQD. I have attached the latest table submitted to LQD.
6. We would love to find a way to make portable pits or mud separators work. In fact, we have spent considerable effort assessing various methods and have even taken two field trips to look at separation units. However, there are three significant problems that we have not been able to overcome. First, using a portable pit for the depth of holes we are drilling is impractical due to the volume of cuttings. Second, mud separation units are very expensive. Third, and most significantly, what do we do with the cuttings? Each exploration hole will generate around four yards of cuttings and each well, due to its larger diameter, will generate around 10 yards of cuttings. If you can solve the cuttings problem for us economically we will find a way to work out the technical problems. But for now, a mud pit at each hole is the best we can do.

Hope this answers your questions but if not just send me an email. I plan to be in the office all day today and most of next week.

Regards,
John

From: Bjornsen, Alan [mailto:Alan.Bjornsen@nrc.gov]
Sent: Friday, July 23, 2010 6:24 AM
To: Cash, John
Subject: More Questions

John,

I'm embarrassed to keep asking you questions, but the closer we get to finalizing the SEIS the more 'little holes' we find.

1. I know I asked you this before, but could you send me a copy of the Sage Grouse Impact Study your consultant prepared? An electronic would be preferable.

2. Can I assume that the NRC has the most up-to-date financial assurance info?
3. Where does the Lost Creek ISR facility plan to dispose its solid byproduct material?
4. Can I assume that the non-hazardous, non-radiological solid waste would go to the SWCSWD#1 landfill in Rock Springs?
5. On Table 4-1 of the draft SEIS, the numbers don't align with the text – Total Land Disturbed from the table is 285.4 ac vs. 324 ac in the text -Which one is it?
6. What is UR-Energy's position/thoughts on the use of portable tanks in place of mud pits?

Thank you.

Alan B. Bjornsen

Environmental Project Manager
FSME/DWMEP/EPPAD/ERB
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
11545 Rockville Pike
Rockville, MD 20852
(301) 415-1195
alan.bjornsen@nrc.gov

E-mail Properties

Mail Envelope Properties (C070F82E831E1C44879BFA258CF960C91C22B5D50D)

Subject: FW: More Questions
Sent Date: 7/28/2010 3:51:35 PM
Received Date: 7/28/2010 3:51:37 PM
From: Bjornsen, Alan

Created By: Alan.Bjornsen@nrc.gov

Recipients:
Debra.Miller@nrc.gov (Miller, Debra)
Tracking Status: None

Post Office:
HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	6597571	7/28/2010
Submittal of Wildlife Monitoring and Protection Plan_Oct2009.pdf	65327	
Attach_OP_6_Wildlife_Oct2009.pdf	6469465	
TabOP_2_VegTopsoilDisturb_Feb10.xls	36258	

Options
Expiration Date:
Priority: o!ImportanceNormal

ReplyRequested: False
Return Notification: False

Sensitivity: olNormal
Recipients received: