

**From:** Stephen Cohen  
**To:** Donna Wickers  
**Date:** 10/12/05 6:58AM  
**Subject:** Re: Resumption of Mining - *GoqEMA - Docket 40-8502*

Donna:

I agree that if all your doing is the same thing as before then simply requesting the original license conditions would probably be fine. However, if something were to change, then this would be the time to update the application.

Steve

>>> "Donna L. Wickers" <[dwickers@cogema-mining.com](mailto:dwickers@cogema-mining.com)> 10/11/05 6:13 PM >>>  
Hi Steve,

Thanks for your response. A question:

Why would we need to provide a revised or updated license application? At the time we requested a "possession only" license (approved in 2001), we were not due for a license renewal until June 30, 2008. We have no proposed changes in the life of mine application ... we simply plan to begin where we left off with the same plan and the same performance based license conditions. We will be doing nothing different process-wise, just continuing with our previous plan. We already send in revised replacement pages on an annual basis pursuant to our current performance based license. I would think that we could simply ask for reinstatement of certain license conditions, state that nothing else has changed except the mining schedule is now five years later, provide an updated surety estimate and go back to work.

Donna

At 10:46 AM 10/11/2005 -0400, you wrote:

>Donna:

>

>You would need to submit a license amendment request proposing the  
>amendments and providing a revised or updated license  
>application. Replacement pages may suffice instead of entirely new  
>license application, but that depends on the scale of the revisions. You  
>will also need to rebaseline your surety.

>

>I am investigating the need for an inspection prior to mining  
>resumption. Regarding schedule for approval, I can't begin to develop a  
>schedule until the end of this month.

>

>Steve

>

> >>> "Donna L. Wickers" <[dwickers@cogema-mining.com](mailto:dwickers@cogema-mining.com)> 10/05/05 2:13 PM >>>

>Hi Steve,

>

>We are currently involved in preparing a feasibility report for the  
>potential resumption of mining at Christensen Ranch. If you remember, one  
>of my questions for NRC in our May 2005 sidebar meeting at the NRC/NMA

**Mail Envelope Properties (434CEC5E.1EC : 13 : 8700)**

**Subject:** Re: Resumption of Mining  
**Creation Date:** 10/12/05 6:58AM  
**From:** Stephen Cohen  
**Created By:** SJC7@nrc.gov

**Recipients**  
cogema-mining.com  
dwichers (Donna Wichers)

**Post Office**

**Route**  
cogema-mining.com

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	5597	10/12/05 06:58AM

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**Reply Requested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

>conference was "what would it take to reinstate our previous performance  
>based license for production from the current reclamation only status  
>license we now have. " John Lusher's response to me a week or so later was  
>that we simply ask to add back to the license the production conditions  
>taken out ... he thought that a two month turn around for an amendment  
>approval would be reasonable. Well, now that John is gone, I need to  
>confirm with you that this is still the case, or is there something else I  
>should be aware of. I need to incorporate regulatory agency issues or  
>constraints into the feasibility report.  
>  
>Could you please give me your confirmation of this, and what exactly I need  
>to do, and what would the approval timing be?  
>  
>Thanks,  
>  
>Donna