

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

In the Matter of

POWERTECH (USA), INC.,
(Dewey-Burdock In Situ Uranium
Recovery Facility)

Docket No. 40-0975-MLA
ASLBP No. 10-898-02-MLA-BD01

January 25, 2013

CONSOLIDATED INTERVENORS' NEW CONTENTIONS BASED ON DSEIS

Consolidated Intervenors¹ hereby timely submit the following new contentions based on the Board's Scheduling Orders dated November 2, 2010, October 16, 2012, and December 18, 2012, and the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS) for Powertech (USA) Inc.'s proposed Dewey-Burdock Project in-situ leach (ISL) uranium mine.

I. INTRODUCTION

The DSEIS fails to meet the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA"), 42 U.S.C. §§ 4231, et seq., the National Historic Preservation Act ("NHPA"), 16 U.S.C. § 470, et seq., and implementing regulations, including NRC regulations in 40 C.F.R. Part 51, specifically including 10 CFR §51.45, §51.10, §51.70, and §51.71, because the DSEIS does not provide analyses that are adequate, accurate, and complete in all material respects to demonstrate that cultural and historic resources within the project area are identified and protected pursuant to Section 106 of the NHPA. As a result, the DSEIS fails to comply with Section 51.60 because its analyses are not adequate, accurate and complete in all material respects concerning archaeological sites and materials within the project area. No sub-surface testing was performed in order to demonstrate that

¹ Susan Henderson, Dayton Hyde and Aligning for Responsible Mining ("ARM").

archaeological sites within the project area are properly identified, evaluated and protected and to show that it has submitted a proper analytic discussion under Sections 51.45 and 51.60. Not all interested tribes were consulted. Proper baseline information is lacking in the DSEIS and it fails to demonstrate adequate confinement and protection of groundwater resources.

As required by 10 C.F.R. § 2.309, Consolidated Intervenors set forth below specific contentions with respect to the sufficiency of the DSEIS under the NEPA, NHPA, and applicable regulations, including those of NRC, the federal Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (“ACHP”), and the Council on Environmental Quality (“CEQ”). Each contention set forth below implicates and asserts violations of 10 C.F.R. §§ 51.10, 51.70, and 51.71, which require NRC compliance with all provisions of NEPA as well as the NHPA, and any other applicable federal, state, and local requirements.

II. DSEIS CONTENTIONS

DSEIS Contention A: Failure to Meet Applicable Legal Requirements Regarding Protection of Cultural Resources, and Failure to Involve or Consult All Interested Tribes as Required by Federal Law

The DSEIS fails to meet the requirements of NEPA, the NHPA, and 40 C.F.R. §§ 51.10, 51.70 and 51.71, along with the NRC, ACHP, and CEQ regulations because it lacks an adequate description of either the affected environment or the impacts of the project on archaeological, historical, and traditional cultural resources. The DSEIS also fails to analyze or demonstrate compliance with the relevant portions of NRC guidance included at NUREG-1569 section 2.4. Section 51.71(a) provides that the DSEIS is to

“address the topics in paragraphs (b), (c), (d) and (e) of this section and the matters specified in §§ 51.45, 51.50, 51.51, 51.52, 51.53, 51.54, 51.61 and 51.62.”

10 C.F.R. § 51.71(d) and NEPA require each draft DEIS to include an analysis of all environmental impacts of a proposed action, including cultural impacts. 10 C.F.R. § 51.70(a) places an affirmative duty on NRC Staff to conduct all NEPA analysis in conjunction with other surveys or studies required under federal law. This includes necessary surveys required under NEPA and the NHPA. In this case, the DSEIS demonstrates that a significant number of archaeological, historical, and traditional cultural resources on site have not been evaluated because no sub-surface testing has been done; therefore, the potential impacts to these resources have not been addressed.

Despite this confirmed lack of adequate survey, the DSEIS prematurely determines that the impacts from operations fit within the “small” category. Such pre-ordained and categorical conclusions, without the benefit of necessary information and a competent analysis raise serious legal and procedural questions regarding the integrity of the entire DSEIS analysis, and form the basis for a contention as to whether or not the DSEIS conforms with NRC regulations, the NHPA, and NEPA, and the implementing regulations for these laws.

Among the applicable requirements are those under the NHPA and related Executive Orders. Under these authorities, the NRC is required to fully involve Native American Tribes in all aspects of decision-making affecting Tribal interests such as those directly impacted by the project. NHPA also requires that federal agencies consult with any “Indian tribe ... that attaches religious and cultural significance” to the sites. 16 U.S.C. § 470(a)(d)(6)(B). Consultation must provide the tribe “a reasonable opportunity

to identify its concerns about historic properties, advise on the identification and evaluation of historic properties, including those of traditional religious and cultural importance, articulate its views on the undertaking's effects on such properties, and participate in the resolution of adverse effects.” 36 C.F.R. § 800.2(c)(2)(ii).

To date, the cultural resources evaluation consists of merely an inventory of sites based on previously existing information; as such it lacks analytical content. There has been no evaluative report of the cultural resources in the area which would be required to satisfy Sections 51.45(c) and (d). Therefore, the DSEIS fails to comply with Section 51.71(a).

No sub-surface testing was performed in these areas. Accordingly, the archaeological submission upon which DSEIS relies, is not adequate, accurate and complete in all material respects and does not demonstrate that the cultural and historic resources identified at the sites within the project area are not eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. Further it does not provide sufficient information as an inventory alone, lacking analytic content and without results of sub-surface testing, in order to be compliant with Sections 40.9, 51.45 and 51.71(a).

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

Previously filed in this matter is the expert opinion of Louis A. Redmond, PhD, Red Feather Archeology, dated April 21, 2010, and the expert opinion of Dr. Redmond dated January 14, 2010. Attached hereto is the expert opinion of Dr. Redmond dated November 29, 2012. Dr. Redmond is a qualified expert in his field, having worked for

almost 20 years as a Principal Archaeological Investigator in South Dakota.² Dr.

Redmond states:

It is my considered opinion that without an in-depth investigation of any of these areas, involving both surface and subsurface areas on at least a strong sampling effort, that there is the strong possibility of massive disturbance of cultural materials.

It has been my experience that in the majority of areas that are defined by either current or extinct water resources, there is a high degree of probability of encountering both historic and prehistoric cultural remains, to include human burials (see the above reports and overview). As both a professional archeologist and a responsible citizen of this region, I would find any degree of ground disturbance without some form of in-depth surface and subsurface investigation to be not only remiss, but disrespectful of our collective heritage.

Dr. Redmond has rendered a professional opinion, based on his knowledge, experience and review of the materials, that there is a strong possibility of massive disturbance of cultural materials and that the Augustana Report on which the Application and the DSEIS are based:

is essentially an inventory of cultural resources in the area and primarily avoids the required analyses directed by the State of South Dakota. A number of the sites were found by ALAC personnel to be ineligible for inclusion to the National Register of Historic Places. Apparently by the information currently available to me, this was accomplished by simply stating that the surface area was disturbed; no sub-surface testing was performed in these areas. In the approximately 20 years that I have worked as a Principal Investigator in South Dakota, it has always been required that prior to the finding of ineligibility of any cultural materials, sub-surface testing must be accomplished; this is so even if the item involved is an isolated artifact. This sub-surface testing must be a specific size, minimum of 50 by 50 centimeters, and taken down through a minimum of 2 sterile 10-centimeter levels. None of the sites that I reviewed where a finding of ineligibility was recorded was this accomplished.

² A copy of Dr. Redmond's abbreviated CV is on file in this proceeding.

Also there were a number of sites that were found to be unevaluated and needing further work. These sites cannot be counted as either ineligible or eligible for inclusion to the National Register of Historic Places. There is, however, an implication by omission that these sites or at least a majority of them, are ineligible; this finding is erroneous at best.

At this point, no true professional evaluation of the impact of the current proposed project(s) in this area can be done with the information available, as required in a Section 106 investigation/evaluation.

Dr. Redmond's final conclusion is that there has been no true professional evaluation of the current proposed project, as required by Section 106 of NHPA.

In Dr. Redmond's November 29, 2012 opinion letter, attached, he states that:

One of the most sought-after resources, other than wild game, in this specific area around the current projects is that of the remarkable lithic sources in the immediate area between Edgemont and Hot Springs South Dakota. **Within that zone are at least 3 major sources of very fine tool-making materials.** Not far to the south and west is another area around Spanish Diggings in Wyoming that has also been utilized by many tribes for exquisite lithic materials through vast prehistoric times. In that area I personally found indications of Lakota, Cheyenne, Crow and Omaha teepee rings just east of Spanish Diggings on private property in 1995. (Emphasis added.)

Part of the current problem of defining which tribes were specifically utilizing the project areas is that the treaties enacted with the above noted tribes do not specify the range of the treaty tribe(s). I have added a map (incl. 1) of the military forts in the general Dakota/Nebraska/Wyoming territories. It can be seen that there were a number of forts scattered over this area by the time the Fort Laramie Treaty of 1868 was signed. (NOTE: all but Fort Robinson were built by 1867). At the time of the Fort Laramie Treaty of 1851, there were only 2 Forts built in this area, Fort Laramie and Fort Kearney II, and Fort Randall was built a few years after, in 1856.

Accordingly, it can reasonably be inferred that the Oglala, Brule, Minnecoujou, Sicangu, Hunkpapa, Izipaco, Siha Sapa, Ooinunpa, Yanctonai, Arapaho (both North and South), Cheyenne (both North and South), Pawnee (at least the Skidi), Omaha, and Crow at a minimum utilized these project areas in the past in some cultural manner

Section 11.2 of the DSEIS lists all the tribes who were consulted in connection with this project but the Omaha, Skidi and Southern Cheyenne are not on the list. Dr. Redmond opines that such tribes likely have an interest in the cultural resources in that area.

16 U.S.C. § 470(a)(d)(6)(B) requires all interested tribes to be contacted. This has not been done for the Omaha, Skidi or Southern Cheyenne resulting in a violation of that Section.

DSEIS Contention B: The DSEIS Fails to Include Necessary Information for Adequate Determination of Baseline Ground Water Quality

The DSEIS violates 10 C.F.R. §§ 51.10, 51.70 and 51.71, and NEPA, and implementing regulations – each requiring a description of the affected environment and impacts to the environment – in that it fails to provide an adequate baseline groundwater characterization or demonstrate that ground water samples were collected in a scientifically defensible manner, using proper sample methodologies. NRC Regulations Section 51.70(b) requires that the DSEIS “will be concise, clear and analytic, will be written in plain language with appropriate graphics, will state how alternatives considered in it and decisions based on it will or will not achieve the requirements of sections 101 and 102(1) of NEPA and of any other relevant and applicable environmental laws and policies, will identify any methodologies used and sources relied upon, and will be supported by evidence that the necessary environmental analyses have been made.”

This contention is one of omission, and as such does not require expert support. However, the Supplemental Declaration of Dr. Robert E. Moran (attached as Exhibit 2), particularly ¶7 provides additional support for this contention, as follows:

7. The DSEIS fails to provide basic information necessary to reliably evaluate future, LONGTERM impacts. If the D-B-area resources had been evaluated in a truly detailed, interdisciplinary, scientific manner, the DSEIS would have collected and summarized the most fundamental technical information relating to water resources, such as:
 - a detailed inventory of all present water users within a radius of at least 2 miles of the proposed D-B boundaries. Such an inventory would include statistically-valid, preoperational data on well yields, water levels, detailed water quality
 - a detailed, statistically-valid summary of BASELINE data for water quality and quantity from the relevant water-bearing units, based on pre-operational data. These would already include evaluation of hydrogeologic characteristics for all of the relevant water-bearing units based on actual, long-term aquifer / pump testing data. Such baseline data would also incorporate all relevant data collected prior to Powertech's involvement, including data collected during the 1950s to the present (including, for example, TVA data).
 - detailed data on the presence and condition of all subsurface borings (exploration holes, oil and gas holes, etc.)
 - a detailed spring and seep survey, which would have included statistically-reliable (and seasonally-meaningful) measurement of field parameters and yields, detailed water quality---all based on preoperational data.
 - all such actual data / information could easily be summarized the form of maps, tables, and graphs, without resorting to thousands of pages of disorganized volumes of text, which has been the approach taken by Powertech and the NRC.

10 C.F.R. §§ 51.10, 51.70 and 51.71, and NEPA and implementing regulations, require a description of the affected environment containing sufficient data to aid the Commission in its conduct of an independent analysis. Further, 10 C.F.R. Part 40, Appendix A, criterion 7 requires the applicant to provide “complete baseline data on a milling site and its environs.” NUREG-1569 section 2.7.1(4) requires that ISL applications must provide an “assessment of available ground-water resources and

ground-water quality within the proposed permit boundaries and adjacent properties, including a quantitative description of the chemical and radiological characteristics of the ground water and potential changes in water quality caused by operations.” NUREG-1569 section 2.7.3(4) sets forth acceptance criteria for the Application requiring a “reasonably comprehensive chemical and radiochemical analysis of water samples, obtained within and at locations away from the mineralized zone(s)...to determine pre-operational baseline conditions.” NUREG-1569, section 2.7.3(4). This acceptance criteria also requires an applicant to “show that water samples were collected by acceptable sample procedures...” Id. See also NUREG-1569 Section 2.7.4. Lastly, NUREG-1569 requires that “[t]he applicant should identify the list of constituents to be sampled for baseline concentrations. The list of constituents in Table 2.7.3-1 is accepted by the NRC for in situ leach facilities.” NUREG-1569, section 2.7.3.

Under NEPA, an agency is required to “describe the environment of the areas to be affected or created by the alternatives under consideration.” 40 C.F.R. § 1502.15. The establishment of the baseline conditions of the affected environment is a fundamental requirement of the NEPA process:

NEPA clearly requires that consideration of environmental impacts of proposed projects take place before [a final decision] is made.” LaFlamme v. FERC, 842 F.2d 1063, 1071 (9th Cir.1988) (emphasis in original). Once a project begins, the “pre-project environment” becomes a thing of the past, thereby making evaluation of the project's effect on pre-project resources impossible. Id. Without establishing the baseline conditions which exist in the vicinity ... before [the project] begins, there is simply no way to determine what effect the proposed [project] will have on the environment and, consequently, no way to comply with NEPA. Half Moon Bay Fisherman’s Mark’t Ass’n v. Carlucci, 857 F.2d 505, 510 (9th Cir. 1988) (emphasis added). “In analyzing the affected environment, NEPA requires the agency to set forth the baseline conditions.” Western Watersheds Project v. BLM, 552 F.Supp.2d 1113, 1126 (D. Nev. 2008) (emphasis added). “The concept of a baseline against which to compare

predictions of the effects of the proposed action and reasonable alternatives is critical to the NEPA process.” Council of Environmental Quality, Considering Cumulative Effects under the National Environmental Policy Act (May 11, 1999).

40 C.F.R. § 1502.22 imposes detailed requirements and justifications necessary for any agency to decline to provide necessary and relevant information.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

The attached Supplemental Declaration of Dr. Robert E. Moran details the lack of scientifically-defensible analysis in the DSEIS regarding potential impacts to ground water associated with the proposed Project. See Supplemental Declaration of Dr. Robert E. Moran, attached, in which he states:

Baseline Water Quality

56. The D-B project area has been historically mined and thousands of exploration holes have been drilled within the properties. Hence, it is imperative that high-quality baseline data be supplied to evaluate the actual extent of past impacts to water resources, and the success of future containment or aquifer restoration.

57. The DSEIS, like the Powertech Application, fails to define pre-operational baseline water quality and quantity—both in the ore zones and peripheral zones, both vertically and horizontally. Without adequate baseline water quality data (both ground water and surface water), there is no reasonable method for either the public or the NRC to evaluate the success or failure of either fluid containment or aquifer restoration. The DSEIS and Powertech Application documents repeatedly attempt to convey the impression that the D-B ground water quality is already degraded, rather than compile statistically-defensible data from both the ore zones and non-mineralized zones.

58. This approach contradicts NRC guidance, which requires that pre-mining baseline conditions be defined before licensing (NRC, 2003, pg. 2-24). Failing to define specific baseline conditions prior to license approval also contradicts NEPA regulations (Parsons, 2013, p.2).

59. Failing to define and quantify preoperational baseline is also scientifically unsupportable as it allows Powertech and the DSEIS to avoid discussing which specific water sources are contaminated by past uranium mining activities and which represent naturally-contaminated waters.

60. The DSEIS, Table 3.5-4 misleadingly presents what is entitled: Baseline Groundwater Samples with Values Exceeding the MCLs(p. 3-38). Firstly, this table and related discussion fail to make clear that many of these sites are contaminated by past, un-remediated uranium mining and processing. Secondly, the table leaves out most of the important baseline constituents a competent evaluation would have included. Thirdly, the table leaves out any values below the MCLs. Thus, this table does not represent baseline ground water quality. Most importantly, the DSEIS does not contain tables of any of the detailed water quality data, baseline or otherwise. Further, there is no data or analysis of the hydrogeological mechanisms by which the previous contamination occurred, spread, or was contained.

61. Clearly the DSEIS / Powertech ground water baseline data should include, as a minimum, the chemical constituents listed in Table 2.7.3.1 of the NRC's Standard Review Plan (NRC, 2003, pg. 2-25), and Table 7.3-1 of the DSEIS. In addition, baseline water quality monitoring (both ground and surface water) should be expanded to include nitrate, ammonia, aluminum, antimony, strontium, lithium, thallium, turbidity, scans for organic compounds, and / or total organic carbon, and be integrated with in-situ field measurements (temperature, pH, S.C. turbidity), water levels and well yields and / or flows.

62. It is only logical that the actual list of baseline constituents should be based on analyses of pregnant solutions resulting from leach testing of the D-B ores and lixiviants—not on theoretical assumptions about what might be the chemical compositions. Such pregnant solution analyses should be made public in the DSEIS prior to Application approval.

63. Frequently, uranium roll-front ores will also mobilize significant concentrations of additional constituents, such as antimony, lithium, and strontium (Moran, 1976). In addition, it is common to detect elevated concentrations of aluminum, sometimes as the result of well-drilling and completion techniques. Thus, it is recommended that these constituents

be included in routine determinations of baseline water quality. In fact, standard lab analytical scans, such as ICP (inductively-coupled plasma spectroscopy) routinely report all (or most) of these metals and metalloids at the same cost. It should be noted that almost all of these constituents were included in the data in Appendix 3.4-C of the Powertech ER.

64. I suggest that nitrate and ammonia determinations be included to allow future analysis and determinations regarding impacts from agricultural or industrial sources (ammonia may enter the aquifer via numerous agricultural or industrial activities).

65. Section 2.7 of NRC (2003) is unclear whether applicants shall provide water quality data from unfiltered (Total concentrations) or 0.45-micrometer-filtered samples (“dissolved”). Table 7.3-1 of the DSEIS states that only dissolved constituents will be reported. Much of the D-B data in the Powertech Application Appendices include both dissolved and Total. It is recommended that unfiltered samples be collected and analyzed, as a minimum, for baseline ground water evaluation. These provide more conservative characterization of the ground waters, and waters used in rural areas (human and livestock consumption from wells; other agricultural uses; irrigation; fisheries) are not filtered. Furthermore, contaminants carried in particulate form are ingested by humans and other organisms when consuming unfiltered waters. These particles / colloids are dissolved by the extreme biochemical conditions found in the guts of such organisms, mobilizing the contaminants into the blood and other tissues. In addition, many trace constituents are mobile in ground waters as colloidal particles (McCarthy, 1989; Ramsey, 2000), which would be removed by filtration, generating unreasonably-low concentrations.

66. Determination of “suspended” fractions is of little utility as there are no regulatory criteria or standards for suspended forms, and such data are subject to much greater error (from the combination of sampling and analytical errors) than are either simple filtered (Dissolved) or unfiltered (Total) determinations.

67. To ensure data quality, the D-B baseline data should include:

- statistical comparisons of the field and lab determinations of pH, and S.C. for the same samples;
- comparisons of Dissolved versus Total determinations from the same samples;
- ion balances, to assist in evaluating the reliability of the analytical data, with comparisons of TDS and S.C. (Hem, 1985).

68. No coordinated, statistically-sound data set for all Baseline Water Quality data (both surface and ground water) is presented in these documents—as is required in NUREG-- 1569. The DSEIS makes clear that baseline water quality will actually be established after operations begin (e.g. DSEIS p.7-13, 14: Projectwide GW monitoring). The DSEIS fails to include reliable baseline water quality data for any of the categories of ground water or surface water.

69. The 2009 Powertech Application, carried forward in the DSEIS, include what it incorrectly calls baseline. For example, on pg. 2-14 and 2-15 of the Technical Report (TR), Sect. 2.2.3.2.2, Powertech states: “At the project site, baseline groundwater sampling was conducted in general (sic) accordance with NRC Regulatory Guide 4.14 (NRC, 1980). ... A summary of the results and methods for the groundwater quality monitoring program, as well as the historical TVA data, is presented in Section 2.7.” However, when the reader goes to TR Section 2.7, there are no tables that actually statistically summarize complete baseline field and lab water quality data for the complete data sets—both historic and recent. Instead, for ground waters, Powertech presents statistics for field data from individual wells or selected aquifers, but fails to statistically-summarize the laboratory data and leaves out the historic TVA data. Powertech then states (TR, pg. 2-203): “Complete groundwater quality data results are available in Appendix 2.7-G.” However, on TR, pg. 2-205 (Sect. 2.7.3.2.2.2, Results for Laboratory Parameters) Powertech then states: “Summary statistics for baseline monitoring program laboratory samples are contained in Appendices 2.7-H and 2.7-I. Appendix 2.7-H gives statistics for all groundwater constituents detected at or above PQL by constituent.” Thus, it appears that Powertech has not included “qualified values,” that is data reported as “less than” some concentration. By deleting the “less than” values, Powertech has severely biased the data set, rendering it useless as a reliable source for evaluating baseline conditions.

70. Furthermore, Powertech states (TR, pg. 2-217-218) that they have arbitrarily selected some analyses from the voluminous historic TVA data, but the reviewer is never allowed to see a statistical summary of the total original data set. This error is carried forward in the DSEIS. Portions of the relevant data are scattered throughout the Appendices of the various documents, and disingenuously organized to leave out all baseline data that had concentrations reported below the detection limits

(i.e. “less than” values). Obviously, this approach biases the data. The NRC must require Powertech to statistically summarize all historic water quality data and all recently collected data in separate tables, including all “less than values.” Both historic and recent baseline data should be segregated by water-bearing unit. Even should averaging of water quality data over a portion of the aquifer be acceptable, the methodology employed in the Application and DSEIS of discounting relevant data points is untenable.

71. To further confuse the baseline issues, Powertech’s Supplement to the Application (August 2009) states on pg. 3-3: “A minimum of eight baseline water quality wells will be installed in the ore zone in the planned well field area.” Thus it appears that the Applicant intends that the massive amounts of water quality data (historic and recent) presented in both the TR and ER (Environmental Report) will not actually be used to determine baseline. More importantly, it is unclear whether Powertech has true baseline (pre- operational) ground water quality data that describe the non-ore zone regions of the relevant aquifers. It is imperative that baseline data for the non-ore zone ground waters be collected and summarized separate from those of the ore zones – a review the DSEIS fails to conduct.

72. Any revision of the DSEIS should incorporate the comments made in Abitz (2009) regarding baseline characterization and data interpretation.

73. Lastly, the DSEIS should already contain a statistically-reliable database of baseline ground water quality data from all known wells within at least 2 miles of the DB boundary

Confusion of Baseline and Background

74. Table 7.3-1 of the DSEIS (p. 7-8 to 7-11), and the accompanying text confusingly and incorrectly use the terms “Background” and “Baseline” as having the same meaning. For many decades, “background” in geochemical / water quality literature has been defined as: “The normal abundance of an element in unmineralized earth materials is commonly referred to as background.” (Rose, Hawkes & Webb, 1979, p. 30). Baseline in environmental studies has routinely been used to define a starting criterion, or yardstick, against which subsequent data are to be compared. Baseline has been used in this sense for many

decades. In mining-related studies, the most common “baseline” is either pre-mining or preoperational conditions.

The DSEIS fails to clearly and adequately describe the detailed methods employed for collecting water quality and water quantity data, for both surface and ground waters.

75. Because the specific sampling and handling procedures can drastically change the results obtained when collecting water quality samples (both surface and ground water), it is imperative that the DSEIS include detailed descriptions of the various sampling, sample handling, preservation and shipment methods employed. Likewise, the DSEIS contains inadequate detail concerning the specific methods employed in collecting field water quality measurements and measurements of well yield, stream flow, etc.

76. For example, such details should provide information similar to those contained in the U.S.G.S. methods documents cited below:

[USGS] United States Geological Survey, variously dated, National field manual for the collection of water-quality data: U.S. Geological Survey Techniques of Water-Resources Investigations, book 9, chaps. A1-A9, available online at: <http://pubs.water.usgs.gov/twri9A>.

Surface Water Quality Baseline Data: The DSEIS fails to adequately characterize these resources, or to include statistically-reliable summaries of detailed surface water data.

77. Tables 3.5-1 and 3.5-2 (p.3-25-26) present totally incomplete and inadequate summaries of surface water quality. Most hydrogeologically-important chemical constituents are missing from these tables and they contain no indication of whether samples were field-filtered, or if the data are Total concentrations. (unfiltered samples).

78. The DSEIS contains no substantive discussion of the interactions between ground and surface waters, especially when the hydrogeologic system would be under pumping stress---as would be expected during the operating life of the D-B project. The DSEIS contains no detailed analysis or discussion of potential impacts to site surface waters due to ground water pumping, or potential spills and permitted discharges to surface waters. All such operations generate short-term discharges to surface waters, as a minimum.

79. The DSEIS no longer contains the questionable statements included in the 2009 application at ER pg. 4-16, which state: “Most ISL operations extract slightly more groundwater than they re-inject into the uranium bearing formation. The groundwater extracted from the formation could result in a depletion of flow in nearby streams and springs if the ore-bearing aquifer is hydraulically connected to such features. However, because most, if not all ISL operations are expected to occur where the ore- bearing aquifers are confined, local depletion of streams and springs is unlikely, and potential impacts would be anticipated to be SMALL (NUREG-1910, 2008).” However, the DSEIS provides no detailed technical analysis to support the contention that surface waters will not be impacted because water-bearing units having confined aquifer conditions underlie much of the D-B site.

80. More importantly, the DSEIS and Application fail to provide a summarized, statistically-reliable surface water quality baseline database. As such, there will be no defensible method for verifying whether impacts to surface water quality have or have not occurred.

A Baseline Spring and Seep Survey is not presented in the DSEIS.

81. Disingenuously the DSEIS states that: “There are no known natural springs within the proposed Dewey-Burdock ISR Project area (Powertech, 2011). There is one area in the southwest corner of the Burdock area, known as the “alkali flats” or the “alkali area,” where groundwater is discharging to the ground surface from the Fall River aquifer and Chilson aquifer (Chilson Member of the Lakota Formation) through improperly plugged exploratory boreholes (Powertech, 2011). Two springs are present along the Dewey Fault near the town of Dewey approximately 2 km [1.2 mi] northwest of the proposed project boundary (DSEIS p. 3-23).”

82. The DSEIS presents no information to indicate that either the NRC or Powertech have conducted an actual spring and seep survey. Such a survey would have included and characterized the springs along the Dewey Fault, and any others located within the D-B area and a reasonable perimeter, which should be at least 2-miles from the project boundary—given the results of the short-term pump test data in the 2009 Application.

83. The region surrounding the D-B project contains numerous springs in both the Madison and Minnelusa formations (DEIS p.3-32; Driscoll, et al., 2002). Baseline surveys of springs and seeps are crucial in studies where large volumes of ground water are to be extracted. The flows of such seeps and springs often decline or stop after large-scale, long-term ground water extraction begins, especially in arid or semi-arid regions, such as the D-B area. If such impacts begin to occur, disputes will arise as to the possible roles of the project water extraction and overall climate change, for example. Hence, it is imperative that such a survey be performed prior to issuance of any licenses, and such a survey should include, as a minimum:

-locate and survey all springs and seeps within some reasonable radius of the project boundary;

-measure and record flow / discharge quarterly for at least one year prior to issuance of any licenses;

-during all field episodes, make field measurements of in-situ pH, water temperature,

and S.C.(specific conductance) and collect samples for laboratory analysis.

Samples should be analyzed for the same list of constituents noted in the Baseline water Quality comments above. Spring and seep water quality data should be interpreted as representative of local ground water quality (Freeze and Cherry, 1979; Hem, 1985).

The presence of high quality ground waters within the D-B Project boundary have not been adequately defined.

84. Much of the DSEIS discussion concerning ground water quality seems focused on showing that the site waters are already contaminated. This would not be surprising given the presence of the uranium mineralization and the past mining and exploration activities---all of which would have caused increased concentrations of numerous chemical constituents above true pre-mining baseline. However, based on statements and data presented in the DSEIS, Powertech has not adequately defined whether zones peripheral to the D-B ore-bearing geologic formations and bounding formations (above and below) also contain zones of high-quality, possibly potable ground water. Such zones should already have been defined as part of the DSEIS and Application documents.

Potential impacts to ground waters have been unrealistically minimized and inadequately characterized.

85. The DSEIS fails to provide adequate baseline data to demonstrate that portions of the ore-bearing zones do not contain high quality ground water. In fact, it is clear that the NRC has relied on Powertech data that clearly are biased against revealing the extent of high quality ground waters. For example, Table 3.5-4 includes only water quality concentrations that exceed the MCLs (maximum contaminant levels), and discards all data having lower concentrations (p. 3-38). The discussion on p. 3-37 also is clearly intended to convey the message that most of the D-B area waters are already contaminated. A similar bias is presented in the DSEIS discussions of D-B area surface water quality (p.3-23, 25, 26, 27).

86. The DSEIS continues the unbalanced discussion of contaminated “baseline” that was presented in the 2009 Application. The ER (pg. 4-18) states that all D-B ore zone ground water quality is degraded by natural mineralization processes, but there are no data provided to support this allegation and in many similar situations it is simply not true. Furthermore, many ground water- bearing zones in mineralized areas do not contain elevated concentrations of metals, non- metals, etc. until they have been exposed to air and bacteria---often as the result of previous mining or exploration drilling—as has occurred here. Even following exploration and mining activities, some portions of ore-bearing formations continue to contain high-quality ground water.

94. The DSEIS states (p. 7-8) that selected wells completed within the mineralized zones will be used to evaluate “baseline” water quality and they will then be converted into injection or production wells. Clearly the water quality in many of these zones is no longer true baseline due to all of the historical drilling / mining in many of these areas. These activities would have altered the original geochemical and bacteriological conditions, leading to significant changes in the water quality. In addition, if the “baseline” wells are converted to injection or production uses, these wells must be maintained, post-closure, to allow for long-term monitoring to evaluate the success or failure of aquifer restoration.

DSEIS Contention C: The DSEIS Fails to Include An Adequate Hydrogeological Analysis To Assess Adequate Confinement and Potential Impacts to Groundwater

The DSEIS fails to provide sufficient information regarding the hydrologic and geological setting of the area to meet the requirements of 10 C.F.R. §§ 51.10, 51.70 and 51.71, and NEPA, and implementing regulations. As a result, the DSEIS similarly fails to provide sufficient information to establish potential effects of the project on the adjacent surface and ground-water resources, as required by 10 C.F.R. §§ 51.10, 51.70 and 51.71, and NEPA, and implementing regulations.

This contention is one of omission and thus requires no expert support. However, the Supplemental Declaration of Dr. Robert E. Moran (attached as Exhibit 2) provides additional support for this contention.

10 C.F.R. §§ 51.10, 51.70 and 51.71, and NEPA and implementing regulations, require each Draft EIS to include a description of the affected environment and the impact of the proposed project on the environment, with sufficient data to enable the agency and the public to assess and review the potential impacts associated with the proposed mine. 10 C.F.R. Part 40, Appendix A, Criterion 4(e) requires that uranium

processing facilities, including ISL uranium mining facilities, be located away from faults that may cause impoundment failure. Criterion 5G(2) requires an adequate description of the characteristics of the underlying soils and geologic formations.

The descriptions of the affected environment under the above authorities must be sufficient to establish the potential effects of the proposed ISL operation on the adjacent surface water and ground water resources. As discussed in NUREG-1569 at 2.7.1(3), the application must include a description of the “effective porosity, hydraulic conductivity, and hydraulic gradient” of site hydrogeology, including any “other information relative to the control and prevention of excursions.” At minimum, the applicant must develop an acceptable conceptual model of site hydrology adequately supported by the data presented in the site characterization. NUREG-1569 section 2.7.2. This data and model must demonstrate with scientific confidence that the area hydrogeology, including horizontal and vertical hydraulic conductivity, will result in the confinement of extraction fluids and expected operational and restoration performance.

In this case, the DSEIS fails to present sufficient information in a scientifically-defensible manner to adequately characterize the site and off-site hydrogeology to enable a meaningful review of the potential impacts of the proposed mine, particularly on groundwater resources. These deficiencies include unsubstantiated assumptions as to the isolation of the aquifers in the ore-bearing zones and failure to account for natural and man-made hydraulic conductivity through natural breccias pipe formations and the historic drilling of literally thousands of drill holes in the aquifers and ore-bearing zones in question, which were not properly abandoned.

As discussed above, NEPA CEQ regulations and applicable federal case law require this precise information to be included in an EIS in order to comply with NEPA. Here, the DSEIS admits that hydrogeologic information necessary to determine the impacts to groundwater from the project is lacking, and will only be obtained at a future time outside of the NEPA process. For example, the DSEIS admits that substantial and necessary hydrogeologic data collection and aquifer pump tests will only be conducted after license issuance. E.g., DSEIS at 2-16, 7-8, 7-14, 7-17.

The DSEIS further admits that un-abandoned bore holes exist and could cause serious environmental impacts by providing a pathway for spread of contamination in the groundwater. DSEIS at 3-20. The DSEIS also admits that pump test data is necessary “to demonstrate that solutions can be controlled with typical wellfield bleed rates and to detect and identify leakage due to anomalies such as improperly plugged wells and exploration boreholes.” DSEIS 2-18. However, instead of requiring that Powertech collect the necessary data for analysis in the DSEIS, NRC attempts to entirely evade this issue with statements that “[w]hile the applicant cannot confirm that all historic borings were properly plugged and abandoned, the applicant has made commitments to ensure that unplugged drill holes will not impact human health or the environment during operations.” DSEIS at 3-20.

The DSEIS states that in the southwest corner of the Burdock area there is “groundwater [] discharging to the ground surface from the Fall River aquifer and Chilson aquifer (Chilson Member of the Lakota Formation) through improperly plugged exploratory boreholes.” DSEIS at 3-23. This information necessitates a more detailed review of the issue of historic wells or bore holes – and requires that any feasible pump

tests or other analysis be performed as part of the NEPA process, with necessary opportunities for public and agency review and comment, in order to assess the potential impacts of the project.

Additionally, the DSEIS identifies areas where the Fall River aquifer proposed to be mined is not hydrologically confined. Instead of requiring the collection of the data necessary to determine the potential impacts of mining in this unconfined aquifer, NRC instead suggests that “[t]he applicant has committed, as part of the license condition, to conduct additional hydrogeological investigations....” DSEIS at 3-37. As with the other fundamental gaps in meaningful data, this lack of baseline data collection as part of the NEPA process severely undermines the public’s (and the agencies’) ability to understand and evaluate the potential impacts of the operation. Indeed, it appears throughout the DSEIS that any time there is a question about the impacts, instead of requiring collection of the data necessary to do a proper analysis, NRC staff simply allows the company to defer collection of any data to a later (post-NEPA) time. This is not allowable under NEPA and applicable regulatory provisions.

As Dr. Moran opines:

The D-B water-bearing units are hydrogeologically interconnected.

39. The DSEIS avoids discussing definitively the likely hydraulic interconnections between the various D-B water-bearing units. The 2009 Powertech Application does discuss these issues, but presents overly-optimistic conclusions about the isolation of the ore-bearing zones, aquifers, and the lack of fluid excursions that will occur, both vertically and horizontally. Powertech’s description and evaluation of possible water-related impacts [2009 Application, ER pg. 8-2 (Table 8.1-1)] are unreasonably optimistic. It is unlikely that the process waters can be contained within the project boundaries given the following pathways that

connect the project area with surrounding aquifers: 1) sedimentary formations; 2) geologic fractures, 3) exploration boreholes, 4) mine workings, 5), other anthropogenic fractures and borings.

40. The D-B uranium deposits occur in subsurface, fluvial channel, sandstone deposits in the Lakota and Fall River formations (Smith, 2005). These sandstones inter-finger with finer-grained silts and shales, often associated with lignites and coals, which form the typical lithologic sequences often seen in classic sedimentary uranium deposits (Abitz, 2005; Gott, 1974; Henry, 1982; Galloway, 1982; Henry, 1980; Harshman, 1972).
41. Hydraulically, such sedimentary packages typically allow ground waters to flow between the inter-fingering facies, both vertically and horizontally, when the coarser-grained sediments are stressed by long-term pumping. The hydraulic inter-connections are verified by conducting long-term aquifer tests integrated with sequential water quality sampling and in-situ measurement of field parameters (Henry, 1982; Galloway, 1982; Moran, R.E.—hydrogeochemical research activities, U.S.G.S., Water Resources Div., 1973—1978). The hydraulic interconnections of such inter-fingering facies has been well known for decades within the petroleum industry allied research groups (e.g. Fisher, et. al., 1969).
42. Thus, ore-bearing sandstones in typical sedimentary packages associated with roll-front uranium deposits do not routinely behave as hydraulically-isolated bodies. Numerous specific lines of evidence from the 2009 D-B Application documents indicate that the project sediments possess various pathways for the migration of water and contaminants from the ore zones into neighboring sediments, both vertically and laterally. For example, thousands of exploration boreholes have been drilled since the 1950's at the D-B site (Smith, 2005; TR, ER), many of which were not correctly plugged and abandoned (TR, Pg. 2-157; Append. 2.7-B, sub-Appendix D, pg. 1484; TR, Append. 2.6- A, pg. 972-1111). In addition, several sources (Smith, 2005, pg. 9; ER, pg. 3-106) report that the area contains historic shallow mine workings, both open pits and short tunnels that would provide additional flow pathways.
43. There are numerous old and existing water wells and old oil test wells in the D-B area, many with rusty and leaky casings, often unplugged or partially-plugged, drilled through several formations which act as potential pathways for flow between water-bearing units (ER, pg.3-40; TR, Append. 2.2-A, pg. 740-779; 2.2-B, especially pg. 864- 902).
44. The 2009 Application, TR, pg. 2-153-154, states that hydraulic connections between local D-B aquifers often result because confining

- units are thin or are absent in many areas (ER, pg.3-56-57). In addition, Gott (1974) and others have mentioned the presence of breccia / evaporite pipes (collapse structures), which create vertical permeability pathways between aquifers. Gott (1974, pg. 27-29) and others discuss the common presence of faults and joints throughout the region, which could easily act as flow pathways.
45. Vertical and lateral hydraulic connectivity between the ore zones and the neighboring facies / formations are also indicated by the aquifer test results conducted in both 1979 and 2008 (ER, pg.3-56-57; TR, pg. 2-170 & 2-180, for example; TR Append. 2.7-B, Knight-Piesold Pumping Test Report, pg. 1290).
 46. The DSEIS fails to assess the forgoing conditions, or likely impacts associated with these conditions in any scientifically meaningful way, nor consider that geologic materials with geologic / hydraulic characteristics similar to the D-B target formations frequently yield both water and oil and gas from geologic fractures. A classic example is the Florence oil field in Colorado, which has been producing continuously from fractures in the Cretaceous Pierre Formation since 1862, making it the second oldest producing field in the U.S. [<http://ghostdepot.com/rg/library/magazine/florence%20oil.htm>].
 47. The Pierre Formation exists in the Black Hills region and lies stratigraphically above the Inyan Kara Group, the target formations at D-B (Tourtelot, 1962; DSEIS p.3-14). Thus, it is likely that several of the geologic units in the D-B area can also transmit fluids via fracture pathways. This indicates that future computer simulations of D-B ground water flow and leach field performance should be be capable of modeling fracture flow characteristics.
 48. The aquifer testing already performed demonstrates leakage between the various formations / facies bounding the ore zone. However, it seems equally likely that longer-duration aquifer tests conducted at even higher pumping rates would demonstrate even more clearly the leaky nature of these site sediments.

Potential hydrogeologic pathways to nearby wells have not been adequately investigated and documented.

49. The discussion above presents ample evidence that the D-B area sediments contain numerous possible subsurface pathways for project leach fluids to

migrate vertically between water-bearing units and outside the project boundaries. Unfortunately, as noted above, Powertech has not adequately defined the baseline water levels or water quality conditions of neighboring wells within a 2-mile radius of the D-B project. In addition, the 2009 Application, TR pg. 2-180, states that no public data are available on the use of aquifers in Fall River or Custer counties. Such data should have been compiled by Powertech as part of the DSEIS and Application, and should be required before any licenses are given.

As further described in depth by Dr. Moran:

Hydrogeologic Performance of the Water-bearing and Other Geologic Units.

33. The DSEIS fails to provide detailed, site-specific information / data on the hydrogeologic characteristics of the relevant D-B water-bearing and other bounding geologic units, including the mineralized zones. Such data must be obtained by performing and interpreting long-term, aquifer test data. The DSEIS admits that such long-term, detailed testing will not be performed until after the NRC license is issued (e.g. DSEIS at 2-17, 7-11).

34. The hydrogeologic data presented in the DSEIS are inadequate to reliably portray and predict the following:
 - the baseline, detailed directions of ground water flow in the relevant water-bearing units;
 - the extent of long-term hydraulic connections between the various geologic units, both within the project area and outside;
 - the horizontal / regional extent of water level declines (and impacts on pumping rates) outside the project boundaries;
 - the degree to which ground water withdrawals may impact local surface waters;
 - the operator's ability to contain the migration of contaminants;
 - the operator's ability to restore aquifer water quality to baseline / acceptable conditions.

35. Such inadequate hydrogeologic data also mean that any ground water flow simulations based on these data are likely to provide highly imprecise and unreliable predictions (e.g. SEIS, P.2-16, L 30-37).
36. In addition, such inadequate hydrogeologic data, coupled with the lack of reliable baseline water quality data (see below), render the NRC staff predictions about impacts (both incremental and Cumulative) to water resources largely meaningless (e.g. the Executive Summary and Section 5.0). For example, despite failing to define the extent (areal, vertical) and specific, detailed chemical compositions of past contamination, the NRC staff predicts that Cumulative Impacts to Surface Waters and Wetlands will be MODERATE TO LARGE (p.5-17), but that the D-B project will have a SMALL incremental impact on surface waters and wetlands when added to all other past and present impacts (p. 5-30). Given the lack of detailed baseline data (hydrogeologic and water quality) such conclusions sound more public relations statements than science.

Based on this demonstration, the DSEIS fails to provide an adequate site characterization of geology and hydrogeology and as a result fails to adequately analyze the impacts associated with the proposed mine, particularly on groundwater resources.

DSEIS CONTENTION D: The DSEIS Fails to Adequately Analyze Ground Water Quantity Impacts

The DSEIS violates NEPA in its failure to provide an analysis of the ground water quantity impacts of the project. Further, the DSEIS presents conflicting information on ground water consumption such that the water consumption impacts of the project cannot be accurately evaluated. These failings violate 10 C.F.R. §§ 51.10, 51.70 and 51.71, and NEPA, and implementing regulations.

This contention is one of omission and thus need not be supported by an expert. However, the Supplemental Declaration of Dr. Robert E. Moran (attached as Exhibit 2) provides additional support for this contention.

10 C.F.R. §§ 51.10, 51.70 and 51.71, and the National Environmental Policy Act, and implementing regulations, require the agency to provide sufficient data for a scientifically-defensible review of the environmental impacts of the operation and for the Commission to conduct an independent analysis. The DSEIS as published fails to meet these requirements in that it does not provide reliable and accurate information as to the project's ground water consumption. Thus, the DSEIS has not met the requirements of NRC regulations and NEPA.

Dr. Robert E. Moran sets forth the primary concerns related to the DSEIS' lack of credible analysis of ground water quantity impacts, as follows:

20. The D-B project area is semi-arid, having an average yearly precipitation of about 12.4 inches, and the range of evaporation for the So. Dakota-WY-Nebraska uranium region is between 40 and 50 inches (NRC GEIS 2009). Thus evaporation is roughly 3 to 4 times the yearly precipitation (ER, pg. 3-176 and 177; Fig. 3.6-27). Because the project is presently expected to operate for between 7 and 20 years, it will require the use of tremendous volumes of local ground water, and will result in losses of significantly greater quantities of water via evaporation.
21. Unfortunately, the DSEIS fails to provide reliable estimates for the volumes and sources of water to be used (consumptive and non-consumptive uses) during all stages of the proposed operation. Actual, detailed data on amounts of water required for operations are not presented (e.g. ISL operations, human consumption, dust suppression, evaporation from disposal ponds, waste disposal, etc.). In mining hydrogeologic studies, such data would routinely be included in a detailed Water Balance.
22. No detailed Water Balance is provided in the DSEIS. Instead the DSEIS provides imprecise, conflicting information on the volumes of water to be used throughout the various sections of the DSEIS (e.g. p.2-15, 2-34, 4-57-59, etc.).
23. Powertech calculates that the sustainable pumping rate from the Inyan Kara Group / Aquifer is about 40 gpm for the life of the project

(DSEIS p. 4-59). However, the NRC / Powertech state that the operational requirements for the Burdock CPP alone would require a sustained pumping rate of 65 gpm (at DSEIS p. 4-59). Powertech has applied to the SDDENR permits to extract water from the Madison Aquifer. Thus, it is presently unclear which aquifer will be the source for long-term, operational phase water. If the permits for using Madison Aquifer waters are denied, additional sources (besides Inyan Kara) would be required.

24. The applicant estimates the wellfield production bleed would be approximately 0.5 to 3.0 percent of the production flow rate, yielding a wellfield production bleed rate between 20 gpm and 120 gpm (DSEIS, P. 2-34).
25. Powertech estimates that approximately 52.6 million gallons of ground water would be required for the Construction phase alone (DSEIS p.5-30). No data are provided for the volumes of ground water required for the other phases, throughout the life of the project.
26. Clearly, the DSEIS fails to reveal reliable long-term water use data for all phases of the entire project. Greater uncertainty is shown when one reads the water use data originally presented in the 2009 Powertech Application, ER pg. 8-2 (Table 8.1-1), which states that ground water consumption will be 320 gpm.
27. Because no Water Balance is presented, it is unclear how much of this volume is recycled, re-injected as waste in other formations, etc. In addition, one must assume that quality of much of the recycled and re-injected water would be degraded as compared to any reliable preoperational baseline data.
28. Aside from the obvious lack of consistency, the estimates (above) translate into massive amounts of ground water when considered over the full life of the project. Using two of the estimated ground water use rates stated above, total water consumption over the life of the project can be estimated as follows:

65 gpm = 34.2 Million gpy (gals / yr).
 After 7 yrs = 239,148,000 gallons, or 239.15 Million gallons.
 After 17 yrs = 580,788,000 gals or 580.8 Million gallons.

320 gpm = 168.2 Million gpy (gals. / yr).
 After 7 yrs = 1,177,344,000 = 1.2 Billion gallons
 After 17 years = 2,859,264,000 gallons = 2.86 Billion gallons.

29. Clearly, this range of estimates indicates that vast quantities of ground water will be extracted from these aquifers over the long-term. At a minimum, Powertech should be required to construct a credible project water balance and to more seriously investigate the potential that such large-volume water use might impact local / regional ground water levels.

30. At present, I see no evidence that the Application contains a reliable compilation of baseline water level and pumping-rate data for the surrounding domestic and stock wells (see discussion below). Without such reliable, summarized data, there will be no viable method to demonstrate that ground water levels (and related pumping costs) have not been impacted by project- related activities.

31. The public must assume that Powertech will pay no cost for the actual water (the commodity) used during operations---while numerous other users do. The specifics of this issue should be addressed by Powertech in writing.

32. Despite the central role of water in the operation of the project, water use, availability, depletion, and consumption are not seriously analyzed through a water balance investigation, or other similar technique. This analysis is critical to understanding the anticipated impacts during project review and for monitoring actual water impacts should this project actually begin using and consuming groundwater.

The foregoing demonstrates that the DSEIS fails to adequately and clearly

[REMAINDER OF THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.]

describe the quantity of water to be used, in violation of the above-referenced regulations and laws.

III. CONCLUSION

For all the foregoing reasons, the Board should find that these new contentions are admissible.

Dated this 25th day of January, 2013.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ - electronically signed by

David Frankel, Counsel for Consolidated Intervenors
POB 3014
Pine Ridge, SD 57770
Tel: 605-515-0956
E-mail: arm.legal@gmail.com

POWERTECH (USA) INC.,)
)
(Dewey-Burdock In Situ Uranium Recovery)
Facility))

Docket No. 40-9075-MLA

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of the foregoing CONSOLIDATED INTERVENORS' NEW CONTENTIONS BASED ON DSEIS in the captioned proceeding were served via the Electronic Information Exchange ("EIE") on the 25th day of January 2013, which to the best of my knowledge resulted in transmittal of same to those on the EIE Service List for the captioned proceeding.

/s/ signed electronically by _____

David Frankel
Attorney for Consolidated Intervenors
P. O. Box 3014
Pine Ridge, SD 57770
605-515-0956
E-mail: arm.legal@gmail.com