



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
REGION IV  
1600 E. LAMAR BLVD  
ARLINGTON TX 76011-4511

September 2, 2016

John McCarthy, Manager  
Environmental, Health and Safety  
Uranerz Energy Corporation  
1701 East E Street, Suite 100  
Casper, WY 82601

SUBJECT: NRC INSPECTION REPORT 040-09067/2016-002

Dear Mr. McCarthy:

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) conducted an unannounced routine inspection at the Nichols Ranch In-situ Recovery (ISR) Project in Campbell and Johnson Counties, Wyoming, on August 2-4, 2016. The purpose of the inspection was to examine activities conducted under your license as they relate to public health and safety, and to confirm compliance with the Commission's rules and regulations and the conditions of your license. Within these areas, the inspection consisted of selected examination of procedures and representative records, observations of activities, tours of the uranium recovery facilities and the environmental monitoring locations, and interviews with site personnel.

At the conclusion of the inspection, the inspection results were discussed with you at the final exit meeting on August 4, 2016. The inspection results are documented in the enclosure to this inspection report. One minor violation was identified and documented in the subject inspection report. However, this violation is not subject to any enforcement action and therefore, no response to this letter is required.

In accordance with 10 CFR 2.290 of the NRC's "Agency Rules of Practice and Procedure," a copy of this letter, its enclosure and your response, if you choose to provide one, will be made electronically available for public inspection in the NRC Public Document Room or from the NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) accessible from the NRC Website at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. To the extent possible, your response should not include any personal privacy or proprietary information so that it can be made available to the public without redaction.

J. McCarthy

- 2 -

Should you have any questions concerning this inspection, please contact Ms. Bernadette Baca, Health Physicist at (817) 200-1235.

Sincerely,

/RA by RSBrowder Acting for/

Jack E. Whitten, Chief  
Fuel Cycle and Decommissioning Branch  
Division of Nuclear Materials Safety

Docket: 040-09067

License: SUA-1597

Enclosure:

Inspection Report 040-09067/2016-002

w/Attachment: Supplemental Information

cc:

C. Bilbrough, WDEQ

M. Rogaczewski, WDEQ

R. Schierman, WDEQ

S. Ramsay, Director, Wyoming Radiation Control Program

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
REGION IV

Docket: 040-09067

License: SUA-1597

Report: 040-09067/2016-002

Licensee: Uranerz Energy Corporation

Location: Nichols Ranch ISR Project. Nichols Ranch Unit  
Johnson and Campbell Counties, Wyoming

Dates: August 2-4, 2016

Inspectors: Bernadette Baca, Health Physicist  
Fuel Cycle and Decommissioning Branch  
Division of Nuclear Materials Safety

Marti Poston-Brown, Health Physicist  
Nuclear Materials Safety Branch – A  
Division of Nuclear Materials Safety

Accompanied by: Brandi O'Brien, Uranium Recovery Project Engineer  
State of Wyoming  
Department of Environmental Quality  
Land Quality Division

Alan Thompson, Uranium Recovery Project Geologist  
State of Wyoming  
Department of Environmental Quality  
Land Quality Division

Approved by: Jack E. Whitten, Chief  
Fuel Cycle and Decommissioning Branch  
Division of Nuclear Materials Safety

Enclosure

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### Uranerz Energy Corporation, In-Situ Recovery Facility NRC Inspection Report 04009067/2016-002

This inspection included observations of site activities, review of records, and interviews with site personnel. In summary, the license was conducting operations in accordance with regulatory and license requirements as described below.

#### Management Control and Organization

The organizational structure and staffing levels maintained by the licensee during the inspection period met the requirements specified in the license and were sufficient for the work being performed. The licensee conducted audits and inspections as required by regulatory requirements and its license. (Section 1.2)

#### In-Situ Leach Facilities

The licensee conducted in-situ recovery and operations in accordance with the license and regulatory requirements. Plant parameters were within the limits specified in the license and license application. The licensee completed operator training associated with the elution and precipitation processes. The licensee had also received its slurry truck, is in the process of completing operator training on the slurry press and transfer process to the slurry trailer. Radiological controls, including signs and postings, were implemented in accordance with regulatory requirements. (Section 2.2)

#### Radiation Protection

The licensee implemented a radiation protection program that met the requirements of 10 CFR Part 20 and the license, with the exception of full adherence to licensee procedure RWPRAD-SOP-12, where a minor violation was identified. In addition, occupational doses were less than the annual regulatory limits. (Section 3.2)

#### Effluent Control and Environmental Protection and Maintaining Effluents from Materials Facilities As Low As Reasonably Achievable

The licensee conducted environmental, wellfield, and excursion monitoring in accordance with license requirements. Public doses were within regulatory requirements. (Section 4.2)

#### Inspection of Transportation Activities and Radioactive Waste Processing, Handling, Storage and Transportation.

Waste water treatment, transportation of slurry, disposal of byproduct material and management of 11e.(2) wastes were being conducted in accordance with license and regulatory requirements. (Section 5.2)

## REPORT DETAILS

### Site Status

At the time of inspection, Uranerz Energy Corporation (licensee) was conducting in-situ recovery (ISR) operations at the Nichols Ranch ISR Project, Nichols Ranch Unit. Uranium recovery operations were being conducted in Production Area (PA) Number 1 (PA-1). There were eight header houses in service at the time of the inspection. The uranium-bearing lixiviant from the wellfield was being pumped to the Nichols Ranch Unit central processing plant where uranium was extracted from the fluid using ion exchange columns. The barren solution was then refortified with chemicals prior to re-injection into the ore zone aquifer. The licensee is processing the uranium bearing resin through the elution and precipitation tanks to the filter press and then shipping the yellowcake slurry from the filter press to an out of state uranium mill for drying and packaging.

The licensee is authorized to construct a dryer and related support equipment at the Nichols Ranch Unit central processing plant. At the time of this inspection, the licensee had not started construction of the dryer. The licensee is authorized to conduct uranium operations in Production Area No. 2, this area is being developed but is not in operation. Finally, the licensee is authorized to construct a satellite facility at the Hank Unit, but the licensee has not started construction at this facility.

### 1 Management Organization and Control (88005)

#### 1.1 Inspection Scope

Ensure that the licensee has established an organization to administer the technical programs and to perform internal reviews, self-assessments and audits.

#### 1.2 Observations and Findings

##### a. Organizational Structure

The inspectors compared the licensee's organizational structure in effect at the time of the inspection to the NRC approved structure provided in the License Application Section 5.1.1 (ML15076A032). The licensee has a total of 38 full time employees, 2 long term contractors and 15 contractor drillers. Since the previous inspection, the organizational structure has remained unchanged other than movement of individuals from one job to another and a redistribution of responsibilities to address attrition of duplicate or administrative positions.

The Radiation Safety Officer (RSO) is supported by one staff member with RSO qualifications (Environmental Supervisor). These individuals share two safety technicians, one of which is in the process of obtaining qualification as a Health Physics Technician. At the time of the inspection, based on the licensee's staffing plan, the radiation safety technician duties were being shared between the RSO, Environmental Supervisor, and the Manager of Environmental, Health and Safety. As indicated above,

the licensee uses contractors for drilling work on an as-needed basis. The inspectors determined that the licensee had sufficient staff to implement the radiation protection, groundwater monitoring and environmental programs based on the current operating level.

b. Safety and Environmental Review Panel

License Condition 9.4 of the performance based license requires, in part, that the licensee establish a SERP process to evaluate if program changes, tests or experiments require an NRC license amendment prior to implementation. The inspectors reviewed the single SERP evaluation completed since the last inspection conducted in January 2016. The reviewed SERP was:

SERP-4-2016	Bacterial contamination of well has caused sampling parameters to be skewed. The contamination must be mitigated and chemical means are not possible. A method for mechanically removing the bacteria is necessary.
-------------	---

In accordance with License Condition 9.4, the licensee is expected to submit a description of each change, including a summary of each safety and environmental evaluation to the NRC in the subsequent annual report. The inspectors concluded that the licensee correctly implemented the performance-based license, and the evaluation did not require prior NRC approval.

c. Audits and Inspections

The inspectors reviewed the audits and inspections generated by the licensee since the previous inspection, in accordance with the requirements of License Condition 9.7 and Regulatory Guide 8.30. The licensee was conducting and documenting a daily walk-through of all work and storage areas of the facility to ensure that good radiation practices were being followed. The Health Physics Technician, RSO, RSO-designee and trained and qualified operators performed and documented the daily walk-throughs. Per Licensed Condition 9.7, trained and qualified operators can perform the daily walk-throughs on days when radiation safety staff are not available, like weekends and holidays, and the RSO or RSO designee will review the walk-throughs upon return to the facility. A review of the daily walk-throughs conducted since the previous inspection revealed three examples of the RSO or RSO designee failing to perform the required review. The RSO performed the next available facility daily walk-throughs, reviewed conditions from the previous walk-throughs, and no safety significant issues were identified. The monthly reviews by the RSO were being conducted in a timely manner.

The licensee performed a review of its radiation protection program as required by 10 CFR 20.1101(c) and submitted it to the NRC as an ALARA Audit for the operating period April 2014 to August 2015 (ML 16004A034). The audit included occupational exposures, radiation survey results, training activities, and compliance with license and regulatory requirements. The data in the April 2014 – August 2015 report covers more than an annual timeframe. The inspectors interviewed the RSO and discussed concerns that negative trends may not be timely identified. The RSO indicated that the facility was in the process of moving towards an ALARA reporting timeline that ran from April 1<sup>st</sup> to

April 1<sup>st</sup>. The inspectors reviewed the available material and determined the licensee met the review requirements and consider this issue to be administrative in nature.

d. Additional Protocols

The inspectors verified that the licensee had provided the NRC with appropriate documentation to comply with 10 CFR 75.11 that related to the Agreement between the United States of America and the International Atomic Energy Agency for the Application of Safeguards in the U.S. The licensee provided four forms containing contact information, the estimated annual yellowcake production capacity, the current annual yellowcake production, and the current inventory of yellowcake at the facility. The licensee discussed how it determined these numbers, and the inspectors concluded the reports were accurate, complete, and consistent for the reports submitted for calendar year 2015.

1.3 Conclusions

The organizational structure and staffing levels maintained by the licensee during the inspection period met the requirements specified in the license and were sufficient for the work in progress. The licensee's safety and environmental reviews were performed in accordance with the license requirements. The licensee conducted audits and inspections as required by regulatory requirements and the license.

**2 In-Situ Leach Facilities (89001)**

2.1 Inspection Scope

Determine if in-situ recovery activities were being conducted in accordance with regulatory requirements and the license.

2.2 Observations and Findings

a. Uranium Recovery Operations

At the time of the inspection, uranium recovery operations were being performed at Nichols Ranch PA-1, with the start of development in the second production area (PA-2). Eight header houses were in operations in PA-1 with Header House (HH) number 8 (HH-8) going online on July 5, 2016. Approval for PA-2 has been received from Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality and construction for the header houses and production wells has started. The inspectors reviewed records of the lixiviant composition and concluded that the results were in compliance with License Condition 10.1 requirements.

The inspectors reviewed the injection, production and waste disposal rates from PA-1 based on information presented in the recent quarterly reports submitted by the licensee. At the time of the inspection, the average production flow was 330 gallons per minute per header house, for a total daily flow of 2640 gallons per minutes. This volume is

below the maximum rate of 3500 gallons per minute as specified in License Condition 10.2.

The inspectors reviewed the licensee's uranium production records and noted that the production rates for year to date in 2016, along with the projected production rates for the remainder of 2016, were below the annual limit specified in License Condition 10.2.

The license is required to demonstrate an inward hydraulic gradient in wellfields during all operations in accordance with License Condition 10.8. During this inspection, the inspectors did not review this portion of operations to verify compliance with the license application and conditions. This section will be reviewed in a subsequent inspection.

b. Central Processing Plant

Since the previous inspection, the licensee has received its slurry trailer for transporting yellowcake slurry to an out-of-state uranium mill for drying and packaging. The inspectors observed a transfer of yellowcake from the slurry press to the slurry trailer.

The inspectors reviewed the licensee's process and training for the slurry press and material transfer to the slurry trailer. Since the last inspection, two trained operators left the facility (one in April and one in July) leaving six operators in training. The inspectors interviewed the Operations Supervisor and sampled the training records. The six operators were found to be in various stages of training completion. The operators are provided training by the Operations Supervisor and the slurry press and transfer operations are performed under his direct supervision.

c. Site Tours

The inspectors conducted site tours to observe in-situ recovery operations in progress. Areas toured included the Nichols Ranch Unit central processing plant, PA-1, wellfield, several header houses (HH-2, HH-6, and HH-8) and selected environmental monitoring locations. The inspectors also reviewed the status of development in PA-2. The inspectors determined that the operators were conducting operations in accordance with the site procedures.

The inspectors observed that all entrances to the facility and wellfields were posted with "Any Area within this Facility May Contain Radioactive Materials" as required by License Condition 9.11. Security was being maintained by fences, gates, locked doors and cameras.

The inspectors conducted independent radiological surveys of the gamma exposure rates present in the central processing plant, header houses and wellfields. The surveys were conducted using a Ludlum Model 19 microRoentgen rate meter (NRC No. 015546, calibration due date of August 12, 2016, calibrated to Ra-226). The inspectors noted that the as-found gamma exposure rates were consistent with the licensee's measurements. The licensee had several areas posted as radiation areas. The highest exposure rate within the central processing plant that was not posted as a radiation area was measured between the resin tanks at 2.6 millirem per hour. No area was identified

that met the definition of a radiation area (5.0 millirem in one hour) that was not posted as a radiation area.

### 2.3 Conclusions

The licensee conducted in-situ recovery and operations in accordance with the license and regulatory requirements. Plant parameters were within the limits specified in the license and license application. The licensee conducted slurry transfers in accordance with the license and regulatory requirements. The licensee has started but not completed training for operators associated with slurry transfer. Radiological controls including signs and postings were implemented in accordance with license and regulatory requirements.

## 3 **Radiation Protection (83822)**

### 3.1 Inspection Scope

Determine whether the licensee's radiation protection program was being conducted in compliance with the license and 10 CFR Part 20 requirements.

### 3.2 Observations and Findings

#### a. Occupational Exposures

The inspectors reviewed the licensee's occupational exposure records for 4<sup>th</sup> quarter 2015 and 1<sup>st</sup> quarter 2016. The licensee had not received the 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter dosimetry data from the vendor at the time of the inspection. Approximately 25 employees were monitored for external exposure using optically stimulated luminescence dosimeters that were exchanged on a quarterly basis. Occupational monitored employees included plant and wellfield operators, health physics staff and maintenance workers. The highest deep dose equivalent exposure for the two quarters reviewed was 14 millirem (0.14 milliSievert). This dose was assigned to a plant operator. All doses were below the limits established in 10 CFR 20.1201. No bioassay results were above the action level for investigation.

The licensee conducted air sampling, in part, for assessment of internal exposures. The inspectors reviewed the licensee's radon-222 air sampling records and the uranium particulate and worker breathing zone results for the first two quarters of calendar year 2016. The inspectors identified that internal exposures were below the limits established in 10 CFR Part 20. The inspectors confirmed that the licensee had conducted air sampling at the required intervals. Procedures associated with the air sampling and dose assessment programs were reviewed and a contradiction in the methodology for determining internal dose from air sampling results was identified. One procedure instructed the user to calculate the committed dose equivalent (CDE) and provided the formula to convert the air sampling results to the CDE. The other procedure instructed the user to calculate the committed effective dose equivalent (CEDE) and the result was over 1 rem, then instructed the user to calculate the CDE. Neither procedure provided direction on the calculation of the CEDE. The conflict between these procedures was

discussed with the RSO to determine if the internal doses were based on the CEDE or the CDE. The RSO demonstrated the use of an Excel spreadsheet that allows him to enter the air sampling data and the spreadsheet calculates both the CDE and the CEDE and also determines the derived air concentration-hours (DAC-hrs). The inspectors concluded that the appropriate exposures were calculated and recorded for each employee.

b. Respiratory Protection

The inspectors reviewed the licensee's respiratory protection program with regard to maintaining exposures ALARA. The inspectors reviewed the licensee's testing, use, restoration and maintenance of respiratory protection for workers. The inspectors concluded that the licensee was maintaining a respiratory protection program that was in compliance with the regulatory requirements of 10 CFR 20.1703.

c. Radiation Work Permits

Since the previous inspection, 34 radiation work permits (RWPs) had been issued. The inspectors reviewed a sampling of the permits and determined the permits included the necessary air sampling and protective equipment requirements for the work being performed. However, when radiation work permits entry logs were compared with breathing zone air monitoring results, the inspectors identified approximately 10 percent of the RWPs involved individuals who had not signed in under the RWP yet were being monitored for internal exposures. Licensee Procedure RWPRAD-SOP-12 "Radiation Work Permit Policy" Section 4.2 states, in part, "personnel working under the RWP shall read and sign the RWP entry control log form to signify that they have read, understand and shall comply with the RWP requirements." The failure for personnel working under the RWP to read and sign the RWP entry control log is considered a violation of minor significance in this case, because the individuals were being monitored for their exposures; therefore, this minor violation is not subject to enforcement action. However, it's important for personnel to read and understand the conditions in the RWP to ensure they comply with the radiological control requirements while working inside the restricted areas. Further, the inspectors identified that the RSO and Operations Supervisor failed to identify that some individuals had not signed the RWP entry control log forms, when they performed their review of the RWP for closure.

d. Free release surveys

License Condition 9.6 requires the licensee to follow the guidance provided in the NRC document, "Guidelines for Decontamination of Facilities and Equipment prior to Release for Unrestricted Use or Termination of Licenses for Byproduct, Source or Special Nuclear Material." During the previous inspection, the inspectors identified an issue associated with some release surveys being performed with instrument correction factors using a 2-pi source efficiency. The licensee has corrected this issue and all surveys reviewed during this inspection were based on a 4-pi source efficiency. The inspectors determined that the licensee is conducting free release surveys in accordance with the requirements of License Condition 9.6.

### 3.3 Conclusions

The licensee implemented a radiation protection program that met the requirements of 10 CFR Part 20 and the license, with the exception of full adherence to licensee procedure RWPRAD-SOP-12, where a minor violation was identified. In addition, occupational doses were less than the established limits.

## **4 Effluent Control and Environmental Protection and Maintaining Effluents from Material Facilities ALARA (87192 and 88045)**

### 4.1 Inspection Scope

Determine if the environmental and effluent monitoring programs are adequate to monitor the impacts of site activities on the local environment.

### 4.2 Observations and Findings

#### a. Environmental Monitoring

The semi-annual reports submitted by the licensee in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR 40.65 are currently being evaluated by NRC headquarters staff. The NRC's review of these documents will be provided to the licensee under separate correspondence.

The inspectors toured two (NA3, NA4) environmental monitoring stations, selected radon monitoring stations (NR3, NR4, NR5), selected soil and water sample locations (Cottonwood Creek, Red Spring), selected monitoring ring wells for PA-2, and the meteorological station. The sampling at the environmental sampling stations were conducted in accordance with regulatory and license requirements.

#### b. Dose to Members of the Public

The licensee conducted annual assessments of public doses as required by 10 CFR Part 20. The maximum public dose for calendar year 2015 was 70.73 millirem total effective dose equivalent. The dose was calculated using data from optically stimulated luminescence dosimeters, radon track etch detectors, and particulate air samples. The assigned doses were primarily from radon-222 and its progeny. The maximum dose for 2015 was less than the annual limit (100 millirem per year) as specified in 10 CFR 20.1301(a)(1).

#### c. Wellfield and Excursion Monitoring

The inspectors examined the reportable and non-reportable spill reports. The inspectors reviewed the licensee's spill records and quarterly reports pursuant to the requirements of License Condition 11.1. According to the licensee's records, 24 spills occurred resulting in a total of 12,398 gallons of unrecovered fluids. Of the total unrecovered volume, 1,695 gallons (19 spills) of production fluid were released. The inspectors confirmed that none of these spills were reportable to the NRC.

License Condition 11.5 requires, in part, that the licensee monitor groundwater at the designated excursion monitoring wells at least twice a month. The inspectors reviewed logs indicating groundwater monitoring was occurring; however, did not review specific groundwater monitoring and excursion data at this time. The inspectors will review the mechanical integrity testing (MIT) documentation during a subsequent inspection.

#### 4.3 Conclusions

The licensee conducted environmental monitoring in accordance with license requirements. The licensee reported the results in semi-annual reports to the NRC. The annual dose to members of the public remained below regulatory limits. The licensee was conducting excursion sampling as specified in the license.

### **5 Inspection of Transportation Activities and Radioactive Waste Processing, Handling and Storage (86740 and 88035)**

#### 5.1 Inspection Scope

Determine if transportation and disposal activities were conducted in compliance with regulatory and license requirements.

#### 5.2 Observations and Findings

##### a. Inspection of Transportation Activities and Solid Byproduct Waste

The inspectors reviewed transportation activities from the January 1, 2016 through June 30, 2016. During this time period, the licensee made slurry shipments, resin shipments and 11e.(2) byproduct waste shipments. The inspectors reviewed the licensee's procedures associated with these shipment and the shipping documentation. The licensee performed the shipments in accordance with NRC and U.S. Department of Transportation regulations.

The inspectors observed that all 11e.(2) byproduct material waste storage bins were being staged within restricted areas with surrounding fences and locked entries. The inspectors performed an ambient gamma radiation survey of the central processing plant containers to confirm that the area was appropriately posted and controlled in accordance with 10 CFR Part 20 regulations.

##### b. Wastewater Treatment Activities

The licensee does not release liquids directly into the environment during routine operations. Liquid effluent is processed through reverse osmosis units, stored in storage tank(s), or disposed to a deep disposal well.

At the time of the inspection, the daily injection rate to the Deep Disposal Well #1 was approximately 5.33 gallons per minute with a max pressure of 1138.6 pounds per square inch. The licensee recorded an injection pressure spike of 1138.6 pounds per square inch on June 30, 2016, during a scheduled shutdown. The licensee investigated the

occurrence and forwarded information to a third party for review. The licensee's investigation determined a water hammer occurred due to valves shutting too quickly in the injection line. As a corrective action, the licensee extended the time the pumps are ramped down and decreased the high-high pressure valve setting at the injection tubing to allow for a pressure spike but be within permitted conditions. The inspectors did not observe any indications of well degradation. Deep Disposal Well #4 was approximately 5.99 gallons per minute with a max pressure of 1048.57 pounds per square inch. The licensee did not report any additional issues with disposal of the wastewater during the inspection period.

### 5.3 Conclusions

Transportation of resins and slurry, disposal of byproduct material and management of 11e.(2) wastes were being conducted in accordance with the license and regulatory requirements.

## **6 Exit Meeting Summary**

The NRC inspectors presented the inspection results to the licensee's representatives at the conclusion of the onsite inspection on August 4, 2016. During the inspection, the licensee did not identify any information reviewed by the NRC as proprietary that was included in this report.

**SUPPLEMENTAL INSPECTION INFORMATION**

**PARTIAL LIST OF PERSONS CONTACTED**

Licensee

Kode Ames, Safety Officer  
Hilton Ballinger, Operations Supervisor  
Bernard Bonifas, Mine Manager  
Tracy Hanna, Regulatory Assistant  
Aaron Linard, Radiation Safety Officer  
John McCarthy, Environmental, Health and Safety Manager  
Chuck Patterson, Laboratory Supervisor  
Royal Pond, Environmental Supervisor  
Christine Schlagenhauser, Operations Manager

Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality

Brandi O'Brien, Project Engineer  
Alan Thompson, Project Geologist

**INSPECTION PROCEDURES USED**

IP88005	Management Organization and Control
IP89001	In-situ Leach Operations
IP83822	Radiation Protection
IP88045	Effluent Control and Environmental Protection
IP87102	Maintaining Effluents from Materials Facilities ALARA
IP86740	Inspection of Transportation Activities
IP88035	Radioactive Waste Processing, Handling, Storage and Transportation

**ITEMS OPENED, CLOSED AND DISCUSSED**

Opened

None

Closed

None

Discussed

None

## **LIST OF ACRONYMS**

ADAMS	Agencywide Documents Access and Management System
ALARA	As Low As Reasonably Achievable
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
IP	NRC Inspection Procedure
ISR	In-Situ Recovery
NRC	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
RSO	Radiation Safety Officer
RWP	Radiation Work Permit
SERP	Safety and Environmental Panel Review

J. McCarthy

- 2 -

Should you have any questions concerning this inspection, please contact Ms. Bernadette Baca, Health Physicist at (817) 200-1235.

Sincerely,

/RA by RSBrowder Acting for/

Jack E. Whitten, Chief  
Fuel Cycle and Decommissioning Branch  
Division of Nuclear Materials Safety

Docket: 040-09067  
License: SUA-1597

Enclosure:  
Inspection Report 040-09067/2016-002

cc:  
C. Bilbrough, WDEQ  
M. Rogaczewski, WDEQ  
R. Schierman, WDEQ  
S. Ramsay, Director, Wyoming Radiation Control Program

Distribution  
See next page

ADAMS ACCESSION NUMBER: ML16243A143

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SUNSI Review By: BDB	ADAMS: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non-Sensitive <input type="checkbox"/> Sensitive	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Publicly Available <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Publicly Available	Keyword: NRC-002
OFFICE	NMSB-A	FCDB	C:FCDB	
NAME	MPoston	BBaca	JEWhitten	
SIGNATURE	/RA/ e-mail	/RA/ e-mail	/RA by RSBrowder Acting for/	
DATE	8/31/16	9/2/16	9/2/16	

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Letter to John McCarthy from Jack Whitten dated September 2, 2016

SUBJECT: NRC INSPECTION REPORT 040-09067/2016-002,

Distribution:

K. Kennedy, RA  
S. Morris, DRA  
M. Shaffer, D:DNMS  
L. Howell, DD:DNMS  
J. Whitten, C:FCDB  
R. Kellar, C:NMSB-B  
V. Campbell, C:NMSB-A  
B. Baca, FCDB  
M. Poston-Brown, NMSB-A  
R. Evans, FCDB  
L. Gersey, FCDB  
R. Browder, FCDB  
R4DNMS\_RSFS  
R4DNMS\_DIV\_ADMIN  
B. VonTill, NMSS/DUWP/URLB  
R. Linton, NMSS/DUWP/URLB  
M. Herrera, DRMA/FRMT

carol.bilbrough@wyo.gov  
mark.rogaczewski@wyo.gov  
ryan.schierman@wyo.gov  
scott.ramsay@wyo.gov