

April 18, 2011

MEMORANDUM TO: Lydia Chang, Chief
Special Projects Branch
Decommissioning and Uranium Recovery
Licensing Directorate
Division of Waste Management
and Environmental Protection
Office of Federal and State Materials
and Environmental Management Programs

FROM: Dominick Orlando, Project Manager */RA/*
Special Projects Branch
Decommissioning and Uranium Recovery
Licensing Directorate
Division of Waste Management
and Environmental Protection
Office of Federal and State Materials
and Environmental Management Programs

SUBJECT: MARCH 30, 2011 PUBLIC MEETING SUMMARY

On March 30, 2011, a teleconference (conducted as a Category I public meeting) was held with Umetco Minerals Corporation (Umetco) at U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) Headquarters, to discuss the NRC staff's review of the Above Grade Tailings Impoundment and A-9 Repository Erosion Protection Enhancement Design Report for Umetco's Gas Hills Reclamation Project.

Enclosure: Meeting Summary

License No.: SUA-648
Docket No.: 040-0299

CONTACT: Dominick Orlando, FSME/DWMEP
(301) 415-6749

April 18, 2011

MEMORANDUM TO: Lydia Chang, Chief
Special Projects Branch
Decommissioning and Uranium Recovery
Licensing Directorate
Division of Waste Management
and Environmental Protection
Office of Federal and State Materials
and Environmental Management Programs

FROM: Dominick Orlando, Project Manager **/RA/**
Special Projects Branch
Decommissioning and Uranium Recovery
Licensing Directorate
Division of Waste Management
and Environmental Protection
Office of Federal and State Materials
and Environmental Management Programs

SUBJECT: MARCH 30, 2011 PUBLIC MEETING SUMMARY

On March 30, 2011, a teleconference (conducted as a Category I public meeting) was held with Umetco Minerals Corporation (Umetco) at U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) Headquarters, to discuss the NRC staff's review of the Above Grade Tailings Impoundment and A-9 Repository Erosion Protection Enhancement Design Report for Umetco's Gas Hills Reclamation Project.

Enclosure: Meeting Summary

Docket No.: 040-0299
License No.: SUA-648

CONTACT: Dominick Orlando, FSME/DWMEP
(301) 415-6749

DISTRIBUTION:

Meeting Attendees LChang KMcConnell

ML110950420

OFC	DWMEP	DWMEP	DWMEP
NAME	NOrlando	SAchten	NOrlando
DATE	4/7/11	4/18/11	4/18 /11

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

MEETING SUMMARY

DATE: March 30, 2011
TIME: 10:00 am -11:30 am
PLACE: T3C01, TWFN
US NRC Headquarters
11545 Rockville Pike
Rockville, MD 20555

PURPOSE:

To discuss the NRC staff's review of the Above Grade Tailings Impoundment (ATGI) and A-9 Repository Erosion Protection Enhancement Design Report (Report) for Umetco's Gas Hills Reclamation Project in Fremont and Natrona Counties, Wyoming

ATTENDEES:

See attached Attendees List.

DISCUSSION:

The NRC (staff) discussed its review of the Report and requested clarification on several technical issues associated with the Report. These issues and their resolution are summarized below.

Financial Assurance/Cost Estimates

The staff requested additional information in four specific areas:

1. the costs for a third party to complete the project and a description of the scope of the costs covered by each activity described in the cost estimate,
2. the basis for unit costs relied on for calculating the construction cost estimate,
3. the basis for the overhead and profit rates cited in the report, and
4. a description of the manner in which various figures in the cost estimate were calculated.

Umetco provided responses to the staff's questions and indicated that they would be addressed in a revision to the Report.

Geotechnical Issues

The staff questioned the number of test excavations to evaluate rill formation Umetco will employ at the site cited in Section 2.1.3. Umetco indicated that it will develop at least 2 test excavations to evaluate rill formation, one on the ATGI and one on the A-9 Repository.

Enclosure

The staff questioned how Umetco will determine if settlement observed during the test excavations to evaluate rill formation is “significant” and thus subject to additional evaluation. Umetco stated that any settlement identified will be investigated.

The staff requested clarification on the manner in which excavations will be developed across the rill features. Umetco stated that excavations would be perpendicular to the rill and described the width and depth planned for each test excavation.

The staff questioned the reason why a filter layer is contemplated for the downslope side of the launch rock apron. Umetco stated this was a conservative approach to ensure that the area would remain stable in the future.

The staff requested clarification on the manner in which material will be staged during the enhancement operations and how material and removed rock would be managed. Umetco described its contemplated approach (i.e., limited staging on site and removing and replacing the rock in bands) and committed to revising the Report to more fully discuss the manner in which onsite staging and management of material will be accomplished.

Cause of the Formation of the Rill Features

The staff discussed Umetco’s theory regarding the reason for the formation of the rills. The staff proposed an alternative theory for the formation of the rills and will provide this discussion in the Request for Additional Information (RAI). The staff indicated that Umetco’s proposed solution to the formation of the rills appeared acceptable, but that the enhancement should extend into the 3 inch rock apron, to ensure that rill formation was not an issue in the future. Alternatively, Umetco could develop additional analysis showing formation of rills in the 3 inch rock apron is not a concern. Umetco indicated that it would address this as part of its response to the request (RAI).

Miscellaneous Issues

The staff requested clarification about the amount of Type A bedding material already at Rattlesnake Quarry and if enough was available for the repair on both the AGTI and the A-9. Umetco indicated that enough material had been collected but that some milling may need to be done to produce the appropriate rock size. This would be done at the Quarry.

The staff questioned where the rock from the upstream side of the launch rock structure will be placed during repair. Umetco described this and will include it in the revised Report.

The staff questioned statements regarding activities performed outside the site boundary being done with the owner’s permission. Umetco committed to responding to this in the RAI.

The staff questioned the statements regarding the justification for re-using the radon barrier material. Umetco stated that this was only included in the unlikely event that radon cover would be disturbed.

The staff questioned why Umetco didn't contemplate re-use of the frost protection cover material for the test excavations. Umetco described the process for developing the frost protection material and committed to responding to this in the RAI.

The staff questioned the source of water that would be used to condition material at the site. Umetco clarified that there were several wells in the vicinity of the site that could be used.

The staff indicated that it is not clear from the discussion what the release criteria are for the license. Umetco committed to providing this information to the staff.

The staff indicated that it is not clear why Umetco would wash a vehicle before doing the survey. Umetco stated that it would survey first and wash it, if needed. Umetco committed to describing the process in the RAI.

The staff stated that the basis for the statement that '10 percent of the heavy equipment leaving the site will be surveyed,' was not clear. Umetco indicated this was an artifact from the operational procedures and that all vehicles leaving the site would be surveyed. This will be included in the revised Report.

The staff questioned the procedure whereby equipment delivered to the site in a contaminated condition is reported to the equipment owner and not the NRC. Umetco committed to revising this discussion in the Report to indicate that NRC will be contacted.

The staff indicated that a major issue to be addressed would be how Umetco will demonstrate that the erosion protection enhancements are working. The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) indicated that they believed that a robust quality assurance/quality control process during the employment of the erosion enhancements would be an adequate approach. NRC staff indicated that inspections would be necessary to ensure that the enhancements were being employed appropriately as well. NRC committed to keeping DOE informed of inspections during the employment of the enhancements and would coordinate with Umetco to ensure that inspections were conducted such that all phases of the enhancements could be observed.

ACTIONS:

None

ATTACHMENT:

Meeting attendee list

MEETING ATTENDEES & TELECONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

Topic: NRC Staff Review of the Above Grade Tailings Impoundment and A-9 Repository Erosion Protection Enhancement Design Report for Umetco's Gas Hills Reclamation Project.

Date: Wednesday, March 30, 2011; 10:00 am – 11:30 am

NAME	AFFILIATION
Meeting Attendees	
Dominick Orlando	US NRC HQ
Douglas Mandeville	US NRC HQ
Roman Przygodzki	US NRC HQ
D. Blair Spitzberg	US NRC Region IV
Robert Evans	US NRC Region IV
Gerald Schlapper	US NRC Region IV
Scott Surovchak	US DOE
Thomas Gieck	UMETCO
Steven Hall	Stoller
Mike Widdop	Stoller
Greg Smith	Stoller
James Heck	URS
Rodger Quinn	URS
Ralph Garver	URS
Jason Smith	URS
Karen Maestas	URS
Matt Spansky	URS