AUG 2 3 1982

DISTRIBUTION
Docket File 40-8380

PDR

WMUR r/f WMUR w/f

WM w/f NMSS r/f

NRC Region IV

KLKalman JJLinehan DEMartin

DEMartin HJPettengill

RAScarano REBrowning

JBMartin BFisher

MEMORANDUM FOR:

Docket No. 40-8380

Docket File No. 40-8380

FROM:

04008380140E

WMUR: KLK

Kenneth L. Kalman

Operating Facility Section I Uranium Recovery Licensing Branch

SUBJECT:

REVIEW OF ROCKY MOUNTAIN ENERGY COMPANY'S (RMEC'S) SURETY INSTRUMENT AND ENSUING AMENDMENT OF LICENSE CONDITION 37 OF SOURCE MATERIAL LICENSE SUA-1228,

AMENDMENT NO. 3.

In accordance with requirements of License Condition No. 37 of Source Material License SUA-1228, RMEC submitted a copy of the Reclamation Performance Bond posted with the Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality (WDEQ) along with an estimate of the reclamation costs for the Nine Mile Lake ISL Test Site. In a telephone conversation on May 25, 1982, RMEC's Michael Neumann provided revisions of these costs. These revisions are noted on the attachment to this memorandum entitled "1980 Estimate of Reclamation Costs, Nine Mile Lake ISL Test Site".

#### Surface Reclamation

RMEC's revised estimates of surface reclamation costs were compared to costs listed in the final Generic Environmental Impact Statement (FGEIS) and to estimates accepted by WDEQ for other in-situ facilities; Cleveland Cliffs Iron Company - Collins Draw, Uranerz - Ruth Project and Uranium Resources Incorporated - North Platte.

The revised estimates of surface reclamation and their comparisons with the FGEIS and other sources of cost estimates are discussed below:

1) Although the 1980 estimate covered the cost of reclaiming three evaporation ponds, the largest of these, a 27-acre pond was never constructed. Therefore, the revised estimate is based on reclaiming only 9 acres of land. This caused the reduction in costs 1 to 4 listed under surface reclamation of the evaporation ponds.

20077

9

DFC		WMUR		WMUR			40-8380/k1k,	/82/08/02/0
NAME	: 1	KLKalman:ag	:JJL	inehan				:
DATE	: {	8/ /82	:8/	/82	 :	 :	 	

- RMEC's estimate of \$0.85/yd³ for sludge excavation was in line with the FGEIS cost estimate of \$0.83/yd³, assuming the use of a scraper and drag line, and the Means 1982 Building Construction Cost Data estimate of \$0.82/yd³ using a front-end loader. On the other hand, RMEC did not include the cost of hauling the sludge 80 miles to the Bear Creek site for disposal. RMEC estimates 24,546 tons of sludge will have to be moved and estimates the cost of hauling it to be \$0.10/ton/mile which brings the total cost of excavating and hauling up to \$216,168.00. In comparison, the FGEIS shows the hauling cost to be \$0.22/ton/mile, but this is based on a shorter haul. However, RMEC's estimate is in line with the Wyoming State Highway Department and the Means 1982 Building Construction Cost Data estimates showing that a haul of this nature would cost \$0.09 \$0.10/ton/mile.
- No estimate was given for revegetating Pattern 1 because it has already been seeded twice and RMEC does not believe any further seeding to be necessary. RMEC estimates a revegetation cost of \$500 per acre for patterns 2, 3, and 4 which is in line with the NRC staff's estimate of \$450.00 per acre for a single seeding. The staff believes that a single seeding with an appropriate mixture of seed and soil conditioner should provide adequate revegetation.

Although the costs for revegetation of miscellaneous areas listed are not directly comparable, due to the way the costs are itemized and inherent differences between projects, general comparisons were made with other projects. For example, RMEC estimated the cost of revegetating miscellaneous sites such as roads and parking areas at a total cost of \$11,900.00 for a 24.8 acre area or an average cost of \$480.00 per acre. RMEC's estimate is generally in line with the Uranerz estimate, which for similar activities, averaged \$550.00 per acre. Based on comparisons of this nature the staff concluded that RMEC's estimates were generally within line of other cost estimates. In addition, this cost of \$480.00 per acre compares well with the staff's estimate of \$450.00 per acre.

4) These revisions cause the total affected area to drop to 43.9 acres and the cost of reclaiming the surface of this area to increase to \$231,718.00.

### Decommissioning

RMEC's estimate of \$59,900.00 for decommissioning was generally within range of cost estimates independently developed by the NRC staff. For

OFC : WMUR	:	WMUR		40-8380/k1k/82/08/02/0
NAME :KLKalman:ag	:JJL			:
DATE :8/ /82	:8/	/82		 :

- 3 -

example, RMEC has allocated \$22,000.00 for equipment removal and decontamination of the area. The major cost of equipment removal would be incurred in the dismantling and removal of the process building and a small shed housing an electric generator. The staff, using the range of cost estimates in the FGEIS, estimate this activity to cost approximately \$8,000.00.

RMEC did not itemize the cost of decontamination surveys. However, the staff estimates the cost of appropriate surveys of the evaporation ponds, wellfield and process area could range from \$1,200.00 for a gamma survey to \$25,800.00 for a gamma survey and extensive soil surveys for radium and uranium. Assuming no unusually high areas of contamination, the decontamination surveys should cost around \$12,000.00. The staff has therefore concluded that RMEC is adequatley bonded with \$22,000.00 for equipment removal and decontamination. Finally, the staff evaluated RMEC's cost estimates for well abandonment. Based on the staff's estimate of an average cost of \$1.29 per foot for capping, sealing and/or plugging of an abandoned well in accordance with Wyoming specifications, the staff again found RMEC to be adequately bonded.

#### Aquifer Restoration

RMEC originally estimated a cost of \$158,230 for subsurface restoration of Patterns 3 and 4. This estimate included such costs as reverse osmosis equipment, water pre-treatment equipment, sample analysis, chemical reagents, labor, operation and overhead. This cost was in line with the restoration costs at the other facilities mentioned above. Comparisons were also made with restoration costs listed in the "Report of Groundwater Quality After In Situ Leaching" prepared by Ford, Bacon and Davis, Utah. It should be noted, however, that subsurface restoration costs were listed for Patterns 3 and 4 only and that no mention was made of Patterns 1 and 2. This was brought to the attention of Richard Chancellor, District IV Engineer, WDEQ in a telephone conversation on May 3, 1982. Chancellor noted that although Patterns 1 and 2 were not listed, they are included in the legal land descriptions used in the reclamation performance bond. Patterns 1, 2 and 3 have already undergone the initial phases of restoration and restoration appears completed, though not yet officially recognized at Pattern 4. The staff therefore concluded that RMEC's estimates were adequate.

However, Mr. Neumann indicated that in their revised cost figures, RMEC wants to eliminate the cost of restoration because it believes restoration is nearing completion at Patterns 3 and 4. On the other

OFC		WMUR					: 40-8380/k1k	/82/08/02/0
NAME		alman:ag			A COURT OF THE OWNER OWNER OF THE OWNER			:
DATE	:8/	/82	:8/	/82	:		:	:

- 4 -

hand, pursuant to WDEQ's disapproval of deducting the salvage value of the reverse osmosis equpiment RMEC has added the formerly deducted value of \$33,000.00 back into its estimate.

#### Conclusions and Recommendations

RMEC is currently bonded for \$498,660.00. Based on RMEC's cost revisions the total cost of reclamation would be \$291,618.00. Restoration of Patterns 3 and 4 has not yet been officially approved by WDEQ or the NRC, hence the \$158,230.00 cost of restoration should not yet be eliminated. This increases the total cost to \$449,848.00. On the other hand, since RMEC has already made the capital expenditure for reverse osmosis equipment (\$35,000.00) and the water pre-treatment equipment (\$10,000.00), \$45,000.00 can be deducted from the total cost which would then be reduced to \$404,848.00. Adding the customary 20% contingency (approximately \$81,000.00) the total cost would be \$485,848.00 which is below the bonded amount of \$498,660.00.

Based upon the above cited considerations, the staff has concluded that the amount bonded for the Nine Mile Lake ISL Test Site is adequate and recommends that RMEC's surety be accepted and that License Condition No. 37 be amended as follows:

37. The licensee shall maintain a surety to cover all groundwater restoration and all reclamation and decommissioning, including the cost of offsite disposal of radioactive solid process or evaporation pond residues and a decontamination survey. Surety arrangements covering the cost of restoration of the Nine Mile Lake ISL Test Site and the costs of decontamination, decommissioning, and reclamation of above-grade facilities shall be provided by Wyoming DEQ Bond No. 4330515. The licensee shall only conduct restoration and reclamation operations at the Nine Mile Lake ISL Test Site, unless otherwise authorized by prior amendment of this condition. At least ninety (90) days prior to the expiration date of existing Wyoming DEO Bond No. 4330515 or of any subsequent sureties, or any revision to existing surety arrangements, the licensee shall submit a copy of the proposed new surety or revision, and supporting documentation providing a detailed basis for the covered restoration, reclamation, and decommissioning costs, to the NRC Uranium Recovery Licensing Branch for review and approval. Surety arrangements shall be updated at least annually to account for inflation.

OFC	:	WMUR	:	WMUR			40-8380/k1k/82/08/02/0
NAME	: KLK	alman:ag	:JJL	inehan			:
DATE	:8/	/82	:8/	/82	:	 	

This amendment has been discussed with RMEC's Michael Neumann, who was in accord.

Kenneth L. Kalman Operating Facility Section I Uranium Recovery Licensing Branch Division of Waste Management

151

Approved By:

John J. Linehan, Section Leader Operating Facility Section I Uranium Recovery Licensing Branch

Enclosure:

Case Closed: 04008380140E

 OFC
 WMUR
 : WMUR
 : 40-8380/k1k/82/08/02/0

 NAME
 :KLKa1man:ag
 :JJMnahar
 :

 DATE
 :8/20/82
 :8/20/82
 :

#### 1980 ESTIMATE OF RECLAMATION COSTS NINE MILE LAKE ISL TEST SITE

## I. Surface Reclamation - Disturbed Areas

		Cost/Acre	Acres	Total Cost
A.	Evaporation Ponds1			
	<ol> <li>Backfill &amp; contouring</li> <li>Ripping &amp; chiseling</li> <li>Topsoil replacement</li> <li>Revegetation</li> </ol>	1430 ± 30 240	936	\$51400.00 12870. \$51400.00 12870. 270. 900.00 8640.00 2160.
	(mulching, seeding fertilizing)  5. Sludge Haulage (incl.)  10 1/501/mile to mo Total Affected Area	500	36 1	18000.00 4500.
в.	Wollfields - Revegetat	ion		240,
	1. Pattern II 2. Pattern III 3. Pattern IV	500 500 500	1.3 3.0 3.0	650.00 1500.00 1500.00
	Total Affected Area		10.1	3650.00
c.	Miscellaneous - Revege	tation		
	<ol> <li>Plant site</li> <li>Roads, parking are</li> <li>Office site</li> <li>Topsoil stockpiles</li> <li>Borrow &amp; disturbed areas</li> </ol>	500 500	0.3 4.0 0.5 15.0 5.0	150.00 1500.00 250.00 7500.00 2500.00
	Total Affected Area		24.8	11900.00
		TOTAL	76.9	197420.00 231,718,0

Includes old evaporation pond (six acres), new treated water reservoir (three acres), proposed cell of commercial evaporation reservoir (27-acres)

# II. Subsurface Restoration - Pattern III<sup>2</sup>

				Total Cost	
	A. B. C. D. E.	Reverse Osmosis (R.O.) Equip Water Pre-Treatment Equipment Sample Analysis - \$315/samp Chemical Reagents Labor, Operating, Overhead	le x 36 samples	\$35000.00 10000.00 11340.00 3300.00 57500.00	
			Subtotal	117140.00	
III.	Su	bsurface Restoration - Patte	rn IV <sup>3</sup>		
	Α.	Sample Analysis Chemical Reagents		11340.00 1000.00 28750.00	
			Subtotal	41090.00	
IV.	Dec	ommissioning Costs -	TOTAL  RMEC wanted  to eliminate thi	158230.00	
	А.	Equipment Removal, Decontam Well Abandonment	ination	22000.00	
		1. Pattern wells - 66 @ \$5 2. Baseline wells - 16 @ \$ 3. Pond monitor wells - 18	ells - 16 @ \$250/well		
			Subtotal	59900.00	
	c.	Salvage Value			
		1. R.O. circuit 2. Process equipment	DEQ didn't allow salvage value Subtotal	(30000.00)	
			Subtotal	_(38000-00)	
			TOTAL	<del>21900-00</del> 59900.00	
	2 <sub>As</sub>	sumes 6-month restoration pe			
	3 <sub>As</sub>	ssumes 3-month restoration pe	eriod		
17	mo.t	-al Peclamation Costs			

V. Total Reclamation Costs

A. Surface Reclamation

B. Subsurface Restoration

C. Decommissioning

23/7/8.00 197420.00 0.00 158230.00 599.00.00 21900.00 GRAND TOTAL 91,6/8.00 \$377550.00