

Official Transcript of Proceedings
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the
Disposal of Mine Waste at the United Nuclear
Corporation Mill Site: Public Meeting

Docket Number: 04008907

Location: teleconference

Date: Thursday, October 28, 2021

Work Order No.: NRC-1725

Pages 1-37

NEAL R. GROSS AND CO., INC.
Court Reporters and Transcribers
1716 14th Street, N.W., Suite 200
Washington, D.C. 20009
(202) 234-4433

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR THE
DISPOSAL OF MINE WASTE AT THE UNITED NUCLEAR
CORPORATION MILL SITE

+ + + + +

MEETING WITH LOCAL COMMUNITY - STANDING ROCK
CHAPTER OF NAVAJO NATION

+ + + + +

THURSDAY,

OCTOBER 28, 2021

+ + + + +

The meeting convened via Teleconference,
at 12:00 p.m. EDT.

NRC STAFF PRESENT:

CHRISTINE PINEDA, NMSS

PATRICK LAPLANTE, Contractor

JOANNA MANYGOATS, Navajo Interpreter (Contractor)

AMY MINOR, Contractor

JAMES SMITH, NMSS

SANDRA TALLEY, NMSS Tribal Liaison

ASHLEY WALDRON, NMSS

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

OTHER FEDERAL PARTICIPANTS:

JANET BROOKS, EPA

SARA JACOBS, EPA

BRANDON NICHALSON, EPA

PRISCILLA TOM, EPA

STANDING ROCK CHAPTER OFFICIALS:

CLINTON JIM

JOHNNY JOHNSON

JANICE PADILLA

PHYLLIS WILLETO-LANCER

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

	PAGE
Welcome and Introductions.....	4
Overview and Slide Presentation of Draft EIS.....	7
Questions.....	36
Adjourn.....	38

P R O C E E D I N G S

12:28 p.m.

MS. PINEDA: My name is Christine Pineda, and I'm an environmental project manager at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. And I will, I'll refer to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission as the NRC all throughout this presentation.

And we'd like to discuss today our draft Environmental Impact Statement, or draft EIS, for the proposed mine waste disposal at the United Nuclear Mill Site. The draft EIS has been out for public comment since November of 2020, and will be available until November 1st of this year.

We have a Navajo translator on the line, Joanna Manygoats. And our plan, unless you prefer that we do something different, is to have her translate our entire presentation.

We also have a court reporter on the line, Allegra Chilstrom, who will transcribe the meeting so we can capture any comments you might have. And in addition I'm getting a recording of the meeting so, as another way to capture your comments or questions.

Other staff and contractors from the NRC are on the line as well. And there's also staff from the Environmental Protection Agency. And so, I think

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

we, I'll turn it over to Joanna to translate that. And then we can do quick introductions of the people on the phone. Joanna.

MS. MANYGOATS: Yes. Can you hear me?

MS. PINEDA: Yes.

MS. MANYGOATS: Okay.

(Native language spoken)

MS. MANYGOATS: Back to you, Christine.

MS. PINEDA: Thank you, Joanna. So, I think now we can go to the rest of the people on the line, starting with the NRC staff and contractors. So, Ashley, do you want to start?

MS. WALDRON: Sure. I'll go first. Ashley Waldron. I work with Christine. I'm also an environmental project manager working on the Environmental Impact Statement for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

MR. SMITH: I'm James Smith. I'm the Senior Project Manager for the UNC Church Rock site. And I oversee the whole process, but specifically right now the safety evaluation report dealing with the UNC request.

MS. TALLEY: I'm Sandra Talley. I'm the Tribal Liaison with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. And I work with Ashley and Christine on outreach.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

MR. LAPLANTE: This is Patrick LaPlante. I'm an environmental scientist working for the NRC contractor that's providing technical support for the development of the EIS.

MS. MINOR: And this is Amy Minor. I am an environmental scientist, and I am also a contractor providing support for the development of the Environmental Impact Statement.

MS. PINEDA: I think that might be all of the NRC folks. So, we can move to EPA folks.

MS. JACOBS: Hi. My name is Sara Jacobs. And I am the project manager for the Northeast Church Rock Mine site. I work for EPA in Region 9 out of San Francisco.

MR. NICHALSON: Hey, good morning. This is Brandon Nichalson. I'm the project manager for the Quivira Mine site.

MS. TOM: Good morning. This is Priscilla Tom. I'm the community involvement coordinator for the mine site.

MS. BROOKS: Good morning. This is Janet Brooks. I'm the remedial project manager of the United Nuclear Mill site. And I work out of the Dallas, Texas office. Thank you.

MS. PINEDA: Okay.

MR. JIM: Hello. Do I introduce myself?

MS. PINEDA: Yes, sir. Thank you.

MR. JIM: My name is Clinton Jim, Standing Rock Chapter Land Board.

MS. PINEDA: And is there anyone else on the line who would like to introduce themselves?

MR. JOHNSON: Hello. My name is Johnny Johnson. I'm Standing Rock Chapter President, as well as Eastern Navajo Agency Chair for 31 Chapters.

MS. PADILLA: Good morning. This is Janice Padilla. I'm with Tse'il'ahi' Chapter, community service coordinator.

MS. WILLETO-LANCER: Phyllis Willetto-Lancer, Tse'il'ahi' Chapter Vice President.

MS. PINEDA: I think we might have covered everyone. So, we'll continue now. If you can see the slides we'll go to the next slide, which is an overview of the presentation.

And the main topics that I'll be covering during the presentation today are, I will describe the proposal by United Nuclear to clean up and dispose of the uranium mine waste from the Northeast Church Rock Mine site.

And I'll then explain the NRC's role in this process, and describe the results of our

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

environmental review that are presented in our draft EIS.

Near the end of the presentation I'll describe the ways that you can provide comments on the draft EIS, besides any comments that you would like to make in this meeting.

And I will plan to hand it over to Joanna frequently. And check in to see if you have any questions or comments that you'd like to make as we move through the presentation. So, Joanna.

MS. MANYGOATS: Yes.

(Native language spoken)

MS. MANYGOATS: Go ahead, Christine.

MS. PINEDA: Thank you, Joanna. So, moving to the next slide, Slide 3 is a brief description of United Nuclear Corporation's request that the NRC approve its proposal for the mine waste. Could you advance -- Yes.

United Nuclear Corporation has a license from the NRC to manage the mill site, which is adjacent and across Route 566 from the Northeast Church Rock Mine site.

And United Nuclear has requested that the NRC grant an amendment to its current license that would allow the waste from the Northeast Church Rock

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

Mine site to be placed on the mill site according to a design that has been approved by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, or USEPA.

If the NRC decides to approve this amendment, United Nuclear would transfer for permanent disposal one million cubic yards of mine waste to a repository that would be constructed on top of the existing impoundment. Joanna.

MS. MANYGOATS: Thank you.

(Native language spoken)

MS. MANYGOATS: Back to you, Christine.

MS. PINEDA: Thank you, Joanna. Next I just want to point out a few things about --

MR. JOHNSON: Christine.

MS. PINEDA: Yes.

MR. JOHNSON: Christine, this is Johnny, Standing Rock Chapter.

MS. PINEDA: Hi.

MR. JOHNSON: I have a question about that. One million? Is it you're talking about one million pound? You talking about one million cubic yards? Or are you talking about one million acres of dirt, or waste?

MS. PINEDA: It's one million cubic yards.

MR. JOHNSON: Okay. Of dirt that's going

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

to be taken from the inner, what was it, UNC, which is on the west side of 566? It's going to be transported over to the east side of 566? Am I correct? Or is it vice versa?

MS. PINEDA: Yes. It's going to be, it's one million cubic yards of dirt, and rock, and debris taken from the mine site on the west side of 566, and moved across to the mill site.

So, the mine site is on, and I'll get into this. But the mine site is on Navajo Trust land. And then the mill site where it would be moved to is private land owned by United Nuclear.

MR. JOHNSON: Is that land site currently the General Electric, or something in that line of business that owns that private land?

MS. PINEDA: Yes. That's GE. General Electric owns United Nuclear Corporation. So it's, United Nuclear is a, well, GE is the parent company of United Nuclear.

MR. JOHNSON: Yes. Thank you.

MS. PINEDA: Sure. So, just to note a few things about our role. The NRC only has authority at the mill site. And our role is to approve or deny the license amendment request for the mill site.

We do not have authority at the Northeast

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

Church Rock Mine site. And the NRC also was not involved in the decisions regarding the mine waste cleanup.

USEPA's Region 9 office is overseeing cleanup at the Northeast Church Rock Mine site. And USEPA's Region 6 office and the NRC both have authority at the mill site to address the groundwater contamination that is being cleaned up now.

And before United Nuclear can proceed with implementing the cleanup of the mine site that USEPA Region 9 selected, the NRC needs to make a licensing decision for the mill site, that would allow the mill site to accept that waste. Joanna.

MS. MANYGOATS: Thank you.

(Native language spoken)

MS. MANYGOATS: Back to you, Christine.

MS. PINEDA: Thanks, Joanna. Next I will give a general overview of the NRC's process. As I mentioned, the NRC is performing an environmental review and a safety review for this action.

The NRC documented its safety findings in what's called a Safety Evaluation Report. And that report was issued in September of 2020. The safety evaluation looks at whether United Nuclear's proposal would meet NRC requirements at the mill site.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

And I believe that you have paper copies of the Safety Evaluation Report there at the Chapter House.

In addition, the NRC is required under the National Environmental Policy Act to evaluate and publish the environmental impacts of this proposal. And that evaluation is what is documented in our draft EIS that's out for comment until November 1st.

The NRC staff will evaluate all the public comments we have received on the draft EIS, and consider whether the EIS needs to be modified. And we will then publish a final EIS in May of next year.

The final EIS will include an appendix that summarizes and responds to all of the public comments that we've received on the draft EIS during the comment period. And then by June of next year the NRC will issue its decision of whether to grant United Nuclear's license amendment request. Joanna.

MS. MANYGOATS: Thank you.

(Native language spoken)

MS. MANYGOATS: Go ahead, Christine.

MS. PINEDA: Thank you, Joanna. The next slide is Slide 6, for those of you who might have copies in front of you. And this slide shows how the draft EIS is organized into chapters. And I'll run

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

through that.

Chapter 1 describes the NRC's regulatory process, and explains what aspect of the environment the EIS evaluates in detail. And this chapter also explains what topics are not included in the EIS and why. And we refer to these as issues that are outside the scope of the EIS.

Chapter 2 describes United Nuclear's proposal in detail. This chapter also describes alternatives to the proposal that the EIS evaluates so that we can compare the impacts of the proposal to other alternatives.

Essentially, these are the impacts of granting the request compared to the impacts of not granting the request, or what we call no action. And this chapter also explains why the NRC did not evaluate other alternatives for managing the waste that the USEPA previously looked at in detail.

Chapter 3 is the detailed description of the environment around the mine and mill sites that would be affected by the proposal. This chapter has a section for each area of the environment that we assessed, such as air quality, water resources, soils, vegetation, wildlife, and a number of other areas.

And then, Chapter 4 describes the impacts

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

that the proposed action would have on each of these areas that were described in Chapter 3.

Chapter 5 is an assessment of cumulative impacts. Now, what this means is that we looked at how the impacts of the proposal would add to the impacts from other activities in the area. For example, other mine cleanup activities, or from historic activities at the Northeast Church Rock Mine site and mill site.

So, this chapter is where the EIS talks about the history of these sites, and recognizes that past mining and milling activities had a very big effect on the local communities and the environment.

Chapter 6 describes what measures United Nuclear is proposing to take that would help to lessen the impacts. We refer to these as mitigation measures. This chapter also lists some mitigation measures identified by the NRC, and some that were proposed by Navajo Nation communities or Government.

And if we receive comments from Navajo communities or organizations suggesting additional mitigation measures, those might appear in the final EIS in that table as suggested measures.

Appendix A in the draft EIS is a table that lists all of the correspondence the NRC had with

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

Tribes or agencies under the National Historic Preservation Act, or under the Endangered Species Act.

And last but not least, at the end of each chapter there's a list of references. And these are documents that were used and relied on, and cited in the development of each chapter. Joanna.

MS. MANYGOATS: Thank you.

(Native language spoken)

MS. MANYGOATS: Back to you, Christine.

MS. PINEDA: Thank you. The next slide is a map. And this map shows the proposed project area. And it is about 17 miles northeast of Gallup, New Mexico.

MR. JOHNSON: Christine, this is Johnny.

MS. PINEDA: Yes.

MR. JOHNSON: Just a quick question. All this that we're going over, you have slides and presentation on PowerPoint. And I --

MS. PINEDA: Yes. I didn't hear the end of that. But we do have slides. And the, if you're on, if anyone was able to connect using their computer we are projecting the slides. And then also, I emailed the slides. So, you might be able to pull them up from the email and follow that way.

MR. JOHNSON: But if I may ask, could you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

email it to my personal email?

MS. PINEDA: Oh, sure.

MR. JOHNSON: [personal information removed] Maybe I can open it there. I'm on the Navajo Nation Chapter.org. But I can't open.

MS. PINEDA: Okay. I'm sorry, can you, I have the email ready to go. Just tell me your address one more time.

MR. JOHNSON: [personal information removed]

MS. PINEDA: [personal information removed]

MR. JOHNSON: [personal information removed]

MS. PINEDA: Oh, okay. Okay. So, I'm forwarding you the email that I had already sent out before. So, you'll see the slides attached to that email. And here it comes.

MR. JOHNSON: Thank you.

MS. PINEDA: Sure.

MR. JOHNSON: I was hoping to get it here. Thank you. Let me see what happens. I'll let you know.

MS. PINEDA: Okay. And so, if you're able to pull it up, we are on the maps slide. And that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

relates to the questions you had before.

So, the Northeast Church Rock Mine is on, as I mentioned, it's on Navajo Nation Trust land. And then the mill site is on private land that's owned by General Electric/United Nuclear.

So, the area on the mine site is where the waste would be taken from. And it will be transferred and placed on the area of the mill site, which is shaded with black lines.

Also on this figure you'll note that there are four areas called borrow areas. And there's another area called the jetty area. And I'll discuss those in a few minutes.

MR. JOHNSON: (inaudible).

MS. PINEDA: Yes.

MR. JOHNSON: No. It's all right.
(inaudible).

MS. PINEDA: Okay. Joanna, do you want to translate that one?

MS. MANYGOATS: Sure.

(Native language spoken)

MS. MANYGOATS: Go ahead, Christine.

MS. PINEDA: Okay. Thank you. On the next slide, which is Slide 8, we have described the history of the United Nuclear mill site. Past milling

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

of the uranium ore that came from the Northeast Church Rock Mine produced waste materials called tailings. And these liquid tailings were placed on the mill site in an impoundment for permanent disposal.

And as you might know, in 1979 the tailings impoundment dam collapsed, and released, hold on one second. Someone's calling in. Released 94 million gallons of mill tailings liquids into the Pipeline Arroyo, which is an arroyo that runs along the mill site.

The EIS describes this event in the cleanup activities after that spill. Groundwater cleanup has also been going on at the mill site because of the liquid tailings that were previously stored there, and to some extent because of the spill.

And there are two evaporation ponds on the site that are still being used for these groundwater cleanup activities. And you can see those on the map that was on the previous slide.

And I just want to note that the conditions at the site now are not the same as they were at the time of the 1979 spill. There's no longer a liquid tailings dam. And the tailings now are soils and debris in a repository, which we sometimes refer to as the tailings impoundment. Joanna.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

MS. MANYGOATS: I'm here.

MS. PINEDA: You can --

(Native language spoken)

MS. MANYGOATS: Go ahead, Christine.

MS. PINEDA: Thank you. The next slide is the, it's Slide 9. And it is the proposed action in more detail. And again, this very detailed description of the proposed action can be found in Chapter 2 of the EIS.

And the proposed action, as I mentioned, is to amend United Nuclear's license to allow the transfer and disposal of one million cubic yards of mine waste on top of the existing tailings impoundment, in a repository that United Nuclear has designed, that would be on top of the existing tailings impoundment.

And the repository design was previously approved by the USEPA, and was presented in United Nuclear's application to the NRC. The proposal is described in three phases. And these phases are construction, transfer, and enclosure.

During the construction phase United Nuclear would prepare both the mine and mill sites for the eventual transfer and placement of the soil, rock, and vegetation, and debris waste from the mine site.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

As soon as the waste is excavated from the mine site it would be transferred by truck on a newly built haul road that would cross 566, Route 566. And this is the transfer phase.

After all the material is brought on the mill site and placed in the repository, it would be covered with additional layers of soil. And then native vegetation would be planted on top to prevent erosion, and to reduce the amount of water that infiltrates into the repository.

The soil material for covering the waste would be obtained from four areas. Those are the borrow areas that were on the map a couple of slides ago, four areas around the mill site.

Also, as part of the measures to control water flowing around the site during and after rains, Pipeline Arroyo would be stabilized by putting in a rock chute that is designed to allow water to flow through without eroding the soils.

And the NRC staff evaluated the arroyo stabilization plans as part of its safety review that's described in the Safety Evaluation Report. Joanna.

MS. MANYGOATS: Okay.

(Native language spoken)

MS. MANYGOATS: Go ahead, Christine.

MS. PINEDA: Okay. Thank you.

MS. PINEDA: Okay, thank you. Before I move to talk about the alternatives on Slide 10, I just wanted to take a second to see if anyone has any questions so far?

Okay. So Slide 10 is about the alternatives that the NRC evaluated in the draft EIS.

The main alternatives to the proposed action that we evaluated is what we refer to as no action, which means that the NRC would not approve the license amendment and therefore would not allow United Nuclear to dispose of the waste at the mill site.

The EIS assumes, in this case, that the waste would remain at the site, at the mine site, for another ten years before the U.S. EPA is able to choose another solution.

In addition to this alternative, the EIS evaluates two options that we call secondary alternatives. And the reason why we call them that is because they are essentially the same as the proposed action, but they include changes to certain activities.

So the first secondary alternative is that the waste would be transferred using a covered

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

conveyor system instead of by truck.

Under the second secondary alternative, soils that would be used to cover the waste on the mill site would be obtained from the jetty area of the Pipeline Arroyo instead of the four borrow areas that are shown on the map. More information on the alternatives is provided in Chapter 2 of the draft EIS.

Joanna?

MS. MANYGOATS: I am here.

(Native language spoken.)

MS. MANYGOATS: Okay, Christine?

MS. PINEDA: Okay, thank you. And then the next slide, which is Slide 11, this talks about Chapter 3 which is the description of the site and its surroundings, what we call the affected environment. And this is the environment that would be affected by United Nuclear's proposal.

This chapter gives detailed descriptions of the surrounding land uses, transportation routes, water resources and quality, plants and wildlife, air quality, soils, economic conditions, and other aspects.

On this slide, there are some of the characteristics of the area that we have mentioned,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

that the mill site is on privately owned land, owned by United Nuclear. The mine site is on Navajo Trust land. New Mexico Highway 566 is a two-lane highway that provides the primary access to the sites. There are about 34 occupied homesites within two miles. And our surface waters, Pipeline Arroyo is a dry stream bed that fills with water after rain. So it's an intermittent stream.

So more details can be found in Chapter 3 of the draft EIS.

Joanna?

(Native language spoken.)

MS. MANYGOATS: Back to you, Christine.

MS. PINEDA: Thank you. Moving on to Chapter 4 of the draft EIS, as I've mentioned, for each of the areas described in Chapter 3 we then, in Chapter 4, assessed what the impacts would be on those areas from the proposed project. And these impact assessments are like the phases that I described of the proposal.

And the phases are the construction phase, when there would be surface disturbing activities such as excavation, and road construction, and other activities; the transfer phase, when there would be loading of trucks and transporting of the waste from

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

the mine site to the mill site; and the closure phase.

During this phase, disturbed areas would be reclaimed and revegetated. And this includes putting vegetative covers, a cover on top of the mine waste repository.

Joanna?

(Native language spoken.)

MS. MANYGOATS: Back to you.

MS. PINEDA: Okay, thank you. Moving on to Slide 13, this slide and Slide 14 are, we're staying with Chapter 4 now for a bit, and these slides show the impact conclusions for each of the resource areas that were described in Chapter 3. Then the conclusions are based on the detailed evaluations that are described in Chapter 4.

The environmental impact levels could be small, moderate, or medium, or large. And the definition of each of those impact levels is provided in the very beginning of Chapter 4.

For some of the areas on this slide, you'll see there's a range, for example surface waste shows small to moderate. This means that the impact levels would be different during different phases of the project.

So during the construction and transfer phases, for example, the transportation and surface

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

water impacts would be moderate. This means they would be noticeable. But during the closure phase, these impacts would only be small, because closure involves primarily revegetating the disturbed areas.

There are also certain aspects that would have --- of the resource area that would have different impact levels. So you can see, for ecology, depending on whether you're talking about wildlife or vegetation, the impact level would be different. So for wildlife, it would be small, but for vegetation, it would be small to moderate. And this is primarily because of excavation activities affecting the vegetation on the mine site.

I want to note also that these slides are showing the impacts of the proposal, as I mentioned, that are described in Chapter 4. And Chapter 5 of the EIS addresses the impacts of historic events such as the past mining and milling operations, and also the spill. And these are evaluated as cumulative impacts.

Joanna?

MS. MANYGOATS: Okay.

(Native language spoken.)

MS. MANYGOATS: Back to you, Christine.

MS. PINEDA: Okay, thank you. Slide 14 is a continuation showing the impact levels that were

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

determined for each area that was assessed. And I think a few people don't have, maybe don't have the slides in front of you, so I'll just list the areas that are shown on these tables. But this is also summarized in the beginning of, I believe, in the executive summary of the EIS. And then, of course, in Chapter 4, it's described in detail.

So these two slides, 13 and 14, list land use, transportation, geology and soils, surface water, ground water, ecology, air quality, noise, historic and cultural resources, visual and scenic resources, socioeconomic conditions, environmental justice, public and occupational health, and waste management.

And all of these are what was assessed in detail in the EIS.

And then in the next few slides, I will discuss some of these areas in a little more detail. But first, I'll turn it back over to Joanna.

(Native language spoken.)

MS. MANYGOATS: Go ahead, Christine.

MS. PINEDA: Thank you. Before I go on to the next slide, which is transportation impacts on Slide 15, I just want to take, like, a three minute break real quick. And then I'll continue. So just about three minutes, and I'll be right back. Thank

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

you.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 1:55 p.m. and resumed at 1:58 p.m.)

MS. PINEDA: Okay. Continuing on, Slide 15 is transportation impacts. And transportation impacts would occur primarily during the construction and transfer phases. That's when the excavation activities would be occurring. And that's when the waste would be being moved across from the mine site to the mill site.

During the construction phase, there would be increased traffic from trucks bringing in materials and from worker vehicles near the haul road crossing on 566. And this would increase the traffic by about 68 percent in that area of 566 where the haul road would cross.

During the transfer phase, when the waste would be taken to the mill site, there would be about 280 truck trips per day or 40 trips per hour during a seven-hour work day. Road closures would be limited to 15 minutes or less, and United Nuclear has stated that it would not delay school buses.

United Nuclear would also install a temporary traffic light system at the Highway 566 crossing.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

Joanna?

MS. MANYGOATS: Yes.

(Native language spoken.)

MS. MANYGOATS: Back to you, Christine.

MS. PINEDA: Thank you. Slide 16 is about noise impacts. There would be a noticeable difference in noise levels as a result of the project. And it would be specifically from the use of trucks, and construction equipment, and from excavation activities. Increased traffic would also contribute to increased noise levels.

The residents of the Red Water Pond Road community are considered sensitive noise receptors and are most likely to notice the increased noise levels from this project.

Joanna?

(Native language spoken.)

MS. PINEDA: Okay. Slide 17 talks about surface water and ground water impacts. The primary surface water feature at the proposed project is the Pipeline Arroyo which is a tributary to the Puerco River. Impacts on the surface waters could result from erosion run off, from spills and leaks of fuels and lubricants, and storm water runoff.

United Nuclear is proposing several measures

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

to reduce the chances that the impacts would occur and to lessen any impacts that do occur. For example, United Nuclear would prepare and implement a storm water and spill prevention and cleanup plans, and is proposing some activities such as minimizing grading, revegetating disturbed areas, using silt fencing, and improving drainage around the site.

And these measures that I referred to before as mitigation measures, are listed in Chapter 6 of the EIS. And they're also discussed in Chapter 4 under surface water and ground water.

Also, I will note again that the proposal involves stabilization work in the Pipeline Arroyo to address concerns about the potential for erosion near the existing impoundment.

Joanna?

(Native language spoken.)

MS. MANYGOATS: Back to you.

MS. PINEDA: Thank you. Air quality impacts on Slide 18 would come primarily from dust and from vehicle and construction equipment emissions. Dust would be generated from vehicle travel on unpaved roads and from excavation activities. And wind can also create airborne dust.

United Nuclear would develop a plan approved

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

by the U.S. EPA to control dust and monitor the air. Some proposed measures United Nuclear would take to control dust would include setting the maximum speed on the roads to 20 miles per hour, not allowing equipment and trucks to idle when not in use, suppressing dust by spraying water on haul roads, excavation areas, and placement areas, adding gravel to roads to suppress dust, and covering any stockpiles in truck beds.

Joanna?

MS. MANYGOATS: Okay.

(Native language spoken.)

MS. MANYGOATS: Go ahead.

MS. PINEDA: Thank you. Historic and cultural resources is another area, and this on Slide 19. These are sites, or sometimes called properties, on and around the mine and mill sites where there might be scattered artifacts, or signs of habitation, or other signs that indicate the site is of historic or cultural value.

And these sites were found through surveys and identified under the National Historic Preservation Act for possible listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

On the mine and mill properties, there are

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

five cultural sites that have been identified within the areas of disturbance. And these are recommended as eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

Impacts on these cultural and historic resources could be small to large, depending on the measures that are taken to protect them. To protect them, the NRC is working with the Environmental Protection Agency, the Navajo Nation, the New Mexico Historic Preservation Office, and United Nuclear to develop a document, called a programmatic agreement, that will describe the measures United Nuclear needs to take to protect the resources when ground is being disturbed during the project.

Joanna?

(Native language spoken.)

MS. MANYGOATS: Back to you, Christine.

MS. PINEDA: Thank you. Moving on to the next slide, this is a list of, short list of some documents and a website you can go to. And I'm not sure who has this electronically on the slide. If you do pull up the slides, you should be able to click on these links, and they will take you to the documents.

And the first document listed is the draft EIS which you also should have copies of there at the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

Chapter house. The second document is what we call the readers' guide. And that is a summary document of the EIS, and that might be a good place to start. If you haven't looked at the EIS yet, you might want to start with the readers' guide. It's a blue booklet that I think you also have copies of.

And then the third link is a link to our project website. And that's our general website where you can find our, excuse me, our safety report as well as the NRC schedule.

And then also on that page there's a link to our public meetings page for the EIS where you can find a whole lot more information from our past public meetings, the transcripts, the slides, audio recordings, and also links to our radio broadcasts that we played a few times throughout the summer on KTNN and KGAK. The links to those broadcasts on YouTube are also on that page.

So, Joanna?

(Native language spoken.)

MS. MANYGOATS: Back to you, Christine.

MS. PINEDA: Thank you. On Slide 21, the different --

MR. JOHNSON: Christine?

MS. PINEDA: Hello?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

MR. JOHNSON: Christine, this is Johnny.

MS. PINEDA: Yes?

MR. JOHNSON: I want to delegate my call to Phyllis Willeto-Lancer. I've got another conference call I need to jump on for a few minutes, and then I'll be back on.

MS. PINEDA: Okay, I'm getting to the end of the presentation. So just let Phyllis know or something if you need us to --- if you have questions and you want us to wait for you. Does that sound good?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes, okay.

MS. PINEDA: Okay, thank you.

MR. JOHNSON: I think she's on the line (inaudible).

MS. PINEDA: I think she is on the line. Phyllis? I think she is?

MR. JOHNSON: Phyllis, are you there?

MS WILLETO-LANCER: Yes, I'm here.

MR. JOHNSON: Okay. I'm going to jump off and get on the water line project.

MS WILLETO-LANCER: Okay.

MR. JOHNSON: Can you go ahead and retain the ---

MS WILLETO-LANCER: Yes, I'll be glad to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

stay on.

MR. JOHNSON: Okay, thank you.

MS WILLETO-LANCER: Okay.

MS. PINEDA: And thank you.

MR. JOHNSON: Thank you.

MS. PINEDA: So there are several ways you can submit comments. You can make a comment in this meeting if you want.

You can also email comments to this email address. It's UNC-ChurchRockEIS@nrc.gov. We have a phone number set up, a toll-free phone number where you can leave a voice mail, and you can either -- there's an option to -- you can leave it in English or you can go to -- there's a Navajo line too.

And you can go to the federal rulemaking website which is www.regulations.gov. And you have to input this docket identification number in order to find the project to submit your comment up on that website. Or you can mail your comments to the address that is listed on the slide.

And if anyone has any questions about leaving a comment, they can feel free to contact us, and we will help you.

And I think I'll go to the next slide, and then just turn it over to Joanna after that.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

The next slide is the project contacts. So this is how you can contact either Ashley or me. And then if you have a question about our safety review, that's Jim Smith. And that's his information.

Joanna?

MS. MANYGOATS: Yes.

(Native language spoken.)

MS. MANYGOATS: Back to you.

MS. PINEDA: So that's the end of the presentation, so if anyone has any questions, or comments, we can try to respond to those. Of if not, then I'm not sure if we should --- I'm not sure if Mr. Johnson plans to get back on the line at some point.

Any questions?

MS WILLETO-LANCER: This is Phyllis, I don't have any questions. I can let Johnny know that he didn't miss anything. It was the conclusion.

MS. PINEDA: Okay. And I think there was another person on from the land use --

MS WILLETO-LANCER: Oh, that was Mr. Clinton Jim --

MS. PINEDA: See if he has --

MS WILLETO-LANCER: -- from our land board.

MS. PINEDA: -- any questions.

MS WILLETO-LANCER: I don't know if he's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

still on.

MS. PINEDA: Okay. Well, it sounds like ---

MS WILLET-LANCER: Well, thank you very much for your presentation. And if we have any questions, we'll go ahead and do a response to you before the first.

MS. PINEDA: Okay, thank you, appreciate it.

MS WILLETO-LANCER: If not, the meeting was very good and well understood.

MS. PINEDA: Okay, great. Well, thanks for your time. And yes, please give us a call if you have any questions.

MS. PADILLA: Christine?

MS. PINEDA: Yes?

MS. PADILLA: This is Janice.

MS. PINEDA: Hi.

MS. PADILLA: I was following along and the electric went out and kicked me off and everything else. Yes, the power went off for awhile. So I had to call back in too. So anyway, I thought I'd just let you know. But I listened to the presentation.

MS. PINEDA: Okay.

MS. PADILLA: I'm multitasking, so I'm listening and doing other stuff here.

MS. PINEDA: Okay. Did you have any

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

questions?

MS. PADILLA: No, I don't.

MS. PINEDA: Okay.

MS. PADILLA: And if Phyllis can -- give me a call in the chapter, Phyllis.

MS WILLET-LANCER: Okay.

MS. PADILLA: Thanks, Christine. It was a good presentation.

MS. PINEDA: Okay. Thank you. And thanks to everyone on the line who are available today. And I guess that concludes our meeting then.

MS WILLET-LANCER: Okay, well thank you. Have a good day.

MS. PINEDA: You too, have a good day.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 2:29 p.m.)

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

