

COLORADO OFFICE  
10758 W. CENTENNIAL RD., STE. 200  
LITTLETON, CO 80127  
TEL: (866) 981-4588  
FAX: (720) 981-5643

WYOMING OFFICE  
5880 ENTERPRISE DR., STE. 200  
CASPER, WY 82609  
TEL: (307) 265-2373  
FAX: (307) 265-2801



April 8, 2015

Mr. John Saxton  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Submitted via Email to [john.saxton@nrc.gov](mailto:john.saxton@nrc.gov)

**RE: Comments on the April 6, 2015 Public Meeting Regarding Shirley Basin**

Dear Mr. Saxton,

On January 28, 2015, Ur-Energy submitted an email to our NRC Project Manager posing three specific questions regarding proposed methods for complying with the preoperational radiological monitoring program for surface soil described in Reg Guide 4.14. In response to the email, our Project Manager stated that we would have to hold a public meeting to discuss the questions. While we did not believe this matter rose to the level of requiring a public meeting, we willingly agreed to participate in hopes of receiving valuable input that would assist us in designing a quality baseline monitoring program that would ultimately be acceptable to the agency. The public meeting was held on April 6<sup>th</sup>, more than two months after the original questions were posed, and involved the NRC Project Manager and two NRC Health Physicists. Unfortunately, NRC staff was unwilling to answer our questions or provide guidance on what would constitute acceptable data collection methodologies. As I understand it, NRC staff's reason for declining to respond to the questions was that they could not provide a response until they received and reviewed the complete final application. Obviously, this approach causes extra costs, delays and frustration for applicants since NRC doesn't provide input until all data is collected. If this is NRC's position, then there is no reason for licensees to seek input from the agency, especially in light of how long it took to schedule this particular meeting.

Since we could not get answers to the baseline survey design questions, we will perform the expensive and time consuming data collection utilizing what we believe are reasonable techniques and hope that the NRC will find them acceptable.

Another related frustration is with regard to timing. Once NRC staff realized they couldn't or wouldn't answer our questions, the agency should have notified us and cancelled the public meeting. In this particular case, we squandered over two months of time waiting for a meeting that ultimately failed to answer any of our questions.

In conclusion, the NRC has strongly encouraged licensees to regularly communicate and coordinate with the agency in pre-licensing submittal activities to improve the quality of the applications. We agree with NRC's stated position in this regard and have attempted to comply. Unfortunately, the NRC has determined that it is inappropriate to respond to technical questions.

We respectfully encourage the NRC to revisit its apparent policy of declining to answer technical questions and find a way to work more proactively with licensees. A more proactive approach by the agency is especially important since much of the available guidance was written for conventional mining techniques instead of in situ mining and is therefore of marginal use to in situ licensees.

Regards,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "John W. Cash", is written over a horizontal line.

Mr. John W. Cash  
President

Cc: Mrs. Theresa Horne, Ur-Energy Littleton Office