

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

Before Administrative Judges:

William J. Froehlich, Chairman  
Dr. Mark O. Barnett  
G. Paul Bollwerk, III

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

Docket No. 40-9075-MLA  
  
ASLBP No. 10-898-02-MLA-BD01  
  
February 08, 2018

ORDER

(Requesting Information for Fourth Telephonic Conference Call)

On January 24, 2018, the Licensing Board held its third conference call with the parties to this proceeding since the issuance of LBP-17-09<sup>1</sup> to discuss the NRC Staff's efforts to resolve Contention 1A.<sup>2</sup> Contention 1A is the sole remaining contention in this case, and pertains to the NRC Staff's National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) responsibility to adequately address Sioux tribal cultural, religious, and historic resources in the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (FSEIS).<sup>3</sup> In LBP-15-16, the Board previously found with respect to Contention 1A that to "fulfill the agency's NEPA . . . responsibilities to protect and preserve cultural, religious, and historical sites important to the Native American tribal cultures in the Powertech project area, the NRC Staff must conduct a study or survey of

---

<sup>1</sup> See LBP-17-09, 86 NRC \_\_ (Oct. 19, 2017).

<sup>2</sup> Tr. at 1260–310.

<sup>3</sup> See LBP-17-09, 86 NRC at \_\_ (slip op. at 1–2).

tribal cultural resources before granting a license,”<sup>4</sup> and that the FSEIS was deficient in this regard because the FSEIS did not “contain an analysis of the impacts of the project on the cultural, historical, and religious sites of the Oglala Sioux Tribe and the majority of the other consulting Native American tribes.”<sup>5</sup> In CLI-16-20, the Commission affirmed this Board decision on Contention 1A, concluding that the Board did not commit “clear error” in its factual determination that the NRC Staff’s consideration of Oglala Sioux Tribe and other Native American cultural resources failed to satisfy NEPA’s hard look standard.<sup>6</sup> Thus, the Commission affirmed that a deficiency exists in the FSEIS. Thereafter, in LBP-17-09, the Board denied the NRC Staff’s motion for summary disposition on Contention 1A, concluding that the FSEIS deficiencies remained because (1) the NRC Staff had yet to conduct a study or survey of the missing tribal cultural resources; and (2) there remained a factual dispute on whether the NRC Staff’s method of assessing the missing tribal cultural resources was reasonable.<sup>7</sup>

On December 6, 2017, the NRC Staff proposed in letters to the parties a newly developed approach to provide the information needed for the tribal cultural resources analysis missing in the FSEIS.<sup>8</sup> Six weeks later, on January 19, 2018, the parties provided written responses to the NRC Staff’s proposal.<sup>9</sup> The Board held a conference call on January 24,

---

<sup>4</sup> LBP-15-16, 81 NRC 618, 653 (2015), aff’d, CLI-16-20, 84 NRC 219 (2016).

<sup>5</sup> Id. at 655.

<sup>6</sup> CLI-16-20, 84 NRC at 247–48.

<sup>7</sup> See LBP-17-09, 86 NRC at \_\_\_ (slip op. at 31).

<sup>8</sup> See, e.g., Letter from Cinthya I. Román, Chief, Environmental Review Branch, Division of Fuel Cycle Safety, Safeguards & Environmental Review, NRC Office of Nuclear Material Safety & Safeguards (ERB/FCSE/NMSS), to Trina Lone Hill, Cultural Affairs & Historic Preservation Office, Oglala Sioux Tribe (Dec. 6, 2017) (ADAMS Accession No. ML17340B365) [hereinafter December 6 Proposal].

<sup>9</sup> Letter from Trina Lone Hill, Cultural Affairs & Historic Preservation Office, Oglala Sioux Tribe, to Cinthya I. Román, Chief, ERB/FCSE/NMSS (Jan. 19, 2018) (ADAMS Accession No.

2018 that was the first opportunity to discuss the parties' formal responses to the NRC Staff's December 6 proposal to resolve Contention 1A.

During the conference call, the Oglala Sioux Tribe and Consolidated Intervenors expressed general approval of the proposal, counsel for the Oglala Sioux Tribe specifically stating that "should the [S]taff propose to move forward as proposed, we would participate,"<sup>10</sup> and that the Tribe was committed to "soliciting . . . input and helping to coordinate and arrange the NRC [S]taff's engagement with . . . other tribes."<sup>11</sup> However, Powertech indicated that it was "unequivocal[ly]" rejecting the NRC Staff's proposal as it currently stands.<sup>12</sup> Nonetheless, the parties agreed to have a conference call among counsel on February 1, 2018 to determine if there was an approach to resolving Contention 1A upon which all parties could agree,<sup>13</sup> and that the parties would submit a joint Status Report summarizing the teleconference to the Board.<sup>14</sup> The parties provided the Status Report to the Board on February 6, 2018.<sup>15</sup>

The Status Report states Powertech's position that "the approach proposed by NRC Staff in December 2017 to resolve Contention 1A [is] cost-prohibitive" and indicates that counsel for Powertech "would need to discuss with the client as to whether the [licensee] could support any site survey proposal" and "whether there were any components of the NRC Staff-proposed

---

ML18019B267); Letter from John Mays, Chief Operating Officer, Powertech (USA) Inc., to Cinthya I. Román, Chief, ERB/FCSE/NMSS (Jan. 19, 2018) (ADAMS Accession No. ML18019B268); Email from David Frankel, Counsel, Consolidated Intervenors, to Emily Monteith, NRC Staff Counsel (Jan. 19, 2018) (ADAMS Accession No. ML18024A812).

<sup>10</sup> Tr. at 1273.

<sup>11</sup> Tr. at 1274.

<sup>12</sup> Tr. at 1292.

<sup>13</sup> Tr. at 1276–77, 1282, 1306.

<sup>14</sup> Tr. at 1307.

<sup>15</sup> Notice of Summary Report of Counsel Conference Call (Feb. 6, 2018) [hereinafter Status Report].

framework that would be acceptable . . . or any components that the licensee believes would need to be eliminated.”<sup>16</sup> The Oglala Sioux Tribe agreed to provide “a list of the other Tribes that it contemplated being part of any survey approach.”<sup>17</sup> The Oglala Sioux Tribe also reaffirmed its belief that a “physical site survey remains a fundamental requirement for resolution” of Contention 1A and that while a literature review could play a role in the NEPA impacts analysis, such a review “cannot substitute” for such a survey.<sup>18</sup>

While the continued willingness of the parties to engage with each other regarding the NRC Staff’s proposal is commendable, the Board is troubled that Powertech has not yet provided the NRC Staff with answers on what components of the NRC Staff’s proposal it would accept and what components it would not, and, likewise, that the Oglala Sioux Tribe has yet to prepare a list of other Tribes it contemplates being a part of a survey—let alone reached out to those Tribes to determine if they are willing to participate. It was the Board’s understanding that Powertech and the Oglala Sioux Tribe, based on statements made by counsel at the January 24, 2018 teleconference, would have this information to discuss with the NRC Staff during the February 1, 2018 conference call among counsel.<sup>19</sup> This stands in contrast to the actions by the

---

<sup>16</sup> Id., unnumbered attach. at unnumbered p. 1.

<sup>17</sup> Id.

<sup>18</sup> Id.

<sup>19</sup> During the January 24, 2018 teleconference, counsel for Powertech stated that it would answer “in short order,” and discuss with the other counsel during the February 1, 2018 teleconference whether it was unequivocally opposed to any site survey, or only unequivocally opposed to any site survey that included Tribes other than the Oglala Sioux Tribe. See Tr. at 1296. Yet, in the Status Report Powertech counsel stated that he “would need to discuss with the client as to whether the [licensee] could support any site survey proposal in the framework proposed by NRC Staff.” Status Report, unnumbered attach. at unnumbered p. 1. Likewise, the December 2017 proposal asked the Oglala Sioux Tribe for assistance with identifying Tribes that should be involved, December 6 Proposal at 4, and, during the January 24 teleconference, NRC Staff counsel again asked for that information. Tr. at 1298. Yet, in the Status Report counsel for the Oglala Sioux Tribe stated that it had yet to complete such a list. Status Report, unnumbered attach. at unnumbered p. 1.

NRC Staff. After the Board denied its motion for summary disposition,<sup>20</sup> the NRC Staff moved quickly and constructively to craft a new proposal and timeline to resolve the concerns raised by the intervenors and address the Board's determinations regarding the NEPA deficiency remaining in the FSEIS as identified in Contention 1A.

Given the weather and other scheduling limitations recognized in the NRC Staff's proposal, it is incumbent upon Powertech and the intervenors to move expeditiously in response to the NRC Staff's substantial efforts. The NRC Staff's proposal was provided to the parties in early December, but, after two months, Powertech's and the intervenors' counsel still appear unable to answer basic questions regarding their clients' positions on key elements of the NRC Staff's suggested plan.<sup>21</sup> The Status Report states that Powertech and the Oglala Sioux Tribe are committed to furnishing answers to the NRC Staff's questions within seven days of the February 1, 2018 call,<sup>22</sup> and the Board requests that these responses be docketed with the Board by February 15, 2018.

Lastly, during the January 24, 2018 teleconference, the Board noted that after it received the Status Report it would "issue an order either scheduling another telephone status conference or other procedures going forward."<sup>23</sup> The Board anticipates holding the fourth teleconference between Tuesday, February 20 and Friday, February 23, 2018, and requests that one representative of the collective parties contact Board law clerk Sarah Ladin, at [sarah.ladin@nrc.gov](mailto:sarah.ladin@nrc.gov), no later than February 12, 2018, and provide dates and times (Eastern Time) of availability for such a session during the week of February 20, 2018. Although the Board anticipates discussing the responses docketed by the parties on February 15, 2018

---

<sup>20</sup> LBP-17-09, 86 NRC at \_\_\_ (slip op. at 31).

<sup>21</sup> Status Report, unnumbered attach. at unnumbered p. 1.

<sup>22</sup> Id.

<sup>23</sup> Tr. at 1307.

during the February teleconference, we also highly encourage the parties to contact one another to further discuss the docketed responses before the Board's February teleconference.

The Board further requests that by February 15, 2018 the NRC Staff submit to the Board documentation of the NRC's billings to Powertech from April 30, 2015,<sup>24</sup> to the present.<sup>25</sup> These billings should include, and distinguish between, any of Powertech's bills for general costs under the materials program, and any fees billable to Powertech for the resolution of Contentions 1A and 1B.<sup>26</sup> Having this cost estimate from the NRC Staff will provide the parties further clarity on

---

<sup>24</sup> This is the date the Board issued LBP-15-16 determining that a NEPA deficiency existed in the FSEIS for Powertech's license, thereby putting all parties on notice that action had to be taken to rectify the FSEIS's inadequacies.

<sup>25</sup> If NRC Staff considers this information sensitive, it should submit these documents non-publically via the agency's E-Filing system. While there is a Protective Order in place that governs this proceeding, Memorandum and Order (Protective Order Governing the Disclosure of Sensitive Unclassified Non-Safeguards Information (SUNSI)) (Mar. 5, 2010) (unpublished), if the NRC Staff believes that the Protective Order does not cover the information, in consultation with the other parties, the NRC Staff should submit a proposed amendment to the Protective Order by February 13, 2018, so the Board can act to ensure a timely submission of the financial information may still be made by February 15, 2018.

<sup>26</sup> For instance, we now know that had the NRC Staff implemented its original April 2017 proposal for addressing Contention 1A, fees billable to Powertech for resolving this contention would have been approximately \$619,200, according to the NRC Staff's estimate. See NRC Staff Response to January 9, 2018 Order (Scheduling Third Telephonic Conference Call) (Jan. 17, 2018) attach. 1 at 1. The requested figures should provide a baseline for determining fees actually billed to Powertech for general costs under the materials program and for fees billed to Powertech to resolve Contentions 1A and 1B after the Board's decision in LBP-15-16.

the expenses thus far incurred by Powertech in the resolution of Contentions 1A and 1B, which should facilitate further discussions of costs in resolving Contention 1A.

It is so ORDERED.

FOR THE ATOMIC SAFETY  
AND LICENSING BOARD

*/RA/*

---

William J. Froehlich, Chairman  
ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE

Rockville, Maryland  
February 08, 2018

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

In the Matter of )  
 )  
POWERTECH (USA) INC. ) Docket No. 40-9075-MLA  
(Dewey-Burdock In Situ Recovery Facility) )  
 )

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of the foregoing **ORDER (Requesting Information for Fourth Telephonic Conference Call)** have been served upon the following persons by Electronic Information Exchange, and by electronic mail as indicated by an asterisk.

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board (ASLB)  
Mail Stop T-3F23  
Washington, DC 20555-0001

William J. Froehlich, Chair  
Administrative Judge  
[william.froehlich@nrc.gov](mailto:william.froehlich@nrc.gov)

Mark O. Barnett  
Administrative Judge  
[mark.barnett@nrc.gov](mailto:mark.barnett@nrc.gov)

G. Paul Bollwerk, III  
Administrative Judge  
[paul.bollwerk@nrc.gov](mailto:paul.bollwerk@nrc.gov)

Margaret J. Bupp, Esq., Chief Counsel  
[margaret.bupp@nrc.gov](mailto:margaret.bupp@nrc.gov)

Nicole Simmons, Law Clerk  
[Nicole.Simmons@nrc.gov](mailto:Nicole.Simmons@nrc.gov)

Sarah B. Ladin, Law Clerk  
[Sarah.Ladin@nrc.gov](mailto:Sarah.Ladin@nrc.gov)

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Office of Commission Appellate Adjudication  
Mail Stop O-16B33  
Washington, DC 20555-0001  
OCA Mail Center  
[ocaamail@nrc.gov](mailto:ocaamail@nrc.gov)

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Office of the Secretary of the Commission  
Rulemakings & Adjudications Staff  
Mail Stop O-16B33  
Washington, DC 20555-0001  
[hearingdocket@nrc.gov](mailto:hearingdocket@nrc.gov)

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Office of the General Counsel  
Mail Stop O-15 D21  
Washington, DC 20555-0001  
Mary Spencer, Esq.  
[mary.spencer@nrc.gov](mailto:mary.spencer@nrc.gov)  
Susan Vrahoretis, Esq.  
[Susan.Vrahoretis@nrc.gov](mailto:Susan.Vrahoretis@nrc.gov)  
Emily Monteith, Esq.  
[emily.monteith@nrc.gov](mailto:emily.monteith@nrc.gov)  
Sabrina Allen, Paralegal  
[sabrina.allen@nrc.gov](mailto:sabrina.allen@nrc.gov)  
David Cylkowski  
[David.Cylkowski@nrc.gov](mailto:David.Cylkowski@nrc.gov)  
OGC Mail Center:  
[OGCMailCenter@nrc.gov](mailto:OGCMailCenter@nrc.gov)



POWERTECH (USA) INC., DEWEY-BURDOCK IN SITU RECOVERY FACILITY  
DOCKET NO. 40-9075-MLA

**ORDER (Requesting Information for Fourth Telephonic Conference Call)**

Counsel for the Applicant (Powertech)  
Thompson & Pugsley, PLLC  
1225 19<sup>th</sup> Street, NW, Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20036  
Christopher S. Pugsley, Esq.  
[cpugsley@athompsonlaw.com](mailto:cpugsley@athompsonlaw.com)  
Cynthia L. Seaton, Paralegal  
[cseaton@athompsonlaw.com](mailto:cseaton@athompsonlaw.com)  
Anthony J. Thompson, Esq.  
[ajthompson@athompsonlaw.com](mailto:ajthompson@athompsonlaw.com)

Consultant to Applicant (Powertech)  
WWC Engineering  
1849 Terra Ave.  
Sheridan, WY 82801  
Jack Fritz  
[jfritz@wwcengineering.com](mailto:jfritz@wwcengineering.com)

Counsel for the Oglala Sioux Tribe  
Western Mining Action Project  
P. O. Box 349  
Lyons, CO 80540  
Jeffrey C. Parsons, Esq.  
[wmap@igc.org](mailto:wmap@igc.org)

Counsel for the Oglala Sioux Tribe  
Energy & Conservation Law  
1911 Main Avenue, Suite 238  
Durango, CO 81301  
Travis E. Stills, Esq.\*  
[stills@frontier.net](mailto:stills@frontier.net)

Counsel for Consolidated Intervenor  
Greenspoon Marder, LLP  
202 Providence Mine Road, Suite 107  
Nevada City, CA 95959  
David C. Frankel, Esq.  
E-mail: [arm.legal@gmail.com](mailto:arm.legal@gmail.com)

Counsel for Consolidated Intervenor  
(Susan Henderson and Dayton Hyde)  
Law Office of Bruce Ellison  
P.O. Box 2508  
Rapid City, SD 57709  
Bruce Ellison, Esq.\*  
[belli4law@aol.com](mailto:belli4law@aol.com)  
Roxanne Andre, Paralegal\*  
[roxanneandre@yahoo.com](mailto:roxanneandre@yahoo.com)

Counsel for Consolidated Intervenor  
(Dayton Hyde)  
Thomas J. Ballanco, Esq.\*  
945 Traval Street, #186  
San Francisco, CA 94116  
[harmonicengineering@gmail.com](mailto:harmonicengineering@gmail.com)

[Original signed by Clara Sola \_\_\_\_\_]  
Office of the Secretary of the Commission

Dated at Rockville, Maryland  
this 8<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2018