

Safety Evaluation Report

DATE: November 1, 2016

DOCKET: 040-09075

LICENSE NO. SUA-1600

LICENSEE: Powertech (USA) Inc.

SITE: Dewey-Burdock Project

PROJECT MANAGER: Ronald Burrows

TECHNICAL REVIEWER: Reginald Augustus, Ronald Burrows, Jose Valdes

Summary and Conclusions

The licensee submitted information required by License Conditions (LCs) 9.5 and 12.23 by providing information on its initial financial assurance estimate and a revised decommissioning, decontamination, and reclamation (D&D) plan. The licensee estimated the cost to decommission and decontaminate the Dewey-Burdock facility by an independent party at \$1,620,000.

As documented in this Safety Evaluation Report (SER), the NRC staff concludes that the initial surety estimate includes funds sufficient to cover the estimated D&D costs of the facility required in 10 CFR Part 40, Appendix A, Criterion 9, and is therefore acceptable. In addition, the NRC staff has determined that the licensee has sufficiently addressed all aspects of LC 12.23. As a result, LC 9.5 will be modified to incorporate the approved initial financial assurance estimate, and LC 12.23 will be deleted.

Safety Evaluation

License Condition 9.5

LC 9.5 states:

Financial Assurance. The licensee shall maintain an NRC-approved financial surety arrangement, consistent with 10 CFR Part 40, Appendix A, Criterion 9, to adequately cover the estimated costs of decommissioning and decontamination, if accomplished by a third party. This surety arrangement shall cover offsite disposal of radioactive solid process or evaporation pond residues, and groundwater restoration pursuant to 10 CFR Part 40, Appendix A Criterion 5B (5). The surety shall also include the costs associated with all soil and water sampling analyses necessary to confirm the accomplishment of decontamination.

Proposed annual updates to the financial assurance amount, consistent with 10 CFR Part 40, Appendix A, Criterion 9, shall be provided to the NRC 90 days prior to the anniversary date. The financial assurance anniversary date for the Dewey-Burdock Project will be the date on which the first surety instrument is approved by the NRC. If the NRC has not approved a proposed revision 30 days prior to the expiration date of

the existing financial assurance arrangement, the licensee shall extend the existing arrangement, prior to expiration, for 1 year. Along with each proposed revision or annual update of the financial assurance estimate, the licensee shall submit supporting documentation, showing a breakdown of the costs and the basis for the cost estimates with adjustments for inflation, maintenance of a minimum 15-percent contingency of the financial assurance estimate, changes in engineering plans, activities performed, and any other conditions affecting the estimated costs for site closure.

Within 90 days of NRC approval of a revised closure (decommissioning) plan and its cost estimate, the licensee shall submit, for NRC review and approval, a proposed revision to the financial assurance arrangement if estimated costs exceed the amount covered in the existing arrangement. The revised financial assurance instrument shall then be in effect within 30 days of written NRC approval of the documents.

At least 90 days prior to beginning construction associated with any planned expansion or operational change that was not included in the annual financial assurance update, the licensee shall provide, for NRC review and approval, an updated estimate to cover the expansion or change. The licensee shall also provide the NRC with copies of financial-assurance-related correspondence submitted to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, a copy of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's financial assurance review, and the final approved financial assurance arrangement. The licensee also must ensure that the financial assurance instrument, where authorized to be held by a State or other Federal agency, identifies the NRC-related portion of the instrument and covers the activities discussed earlier in this license condition. The basis for the cost estimate is the NRC-approved site decommissioning and reclamation plan and any NRC approved revisions to the plan. Reclamation and decommissioning cost estimates and annual updates should follow the outline in Appendix C, "Recommended Outline for Site-Specific In Situ Leach Facility Reclamation and Stabilization Cost Estimates," to NUREG-1569, "Standard Review Plan for In Situ Leach Uranium Extraction License Applications—Final Report."

The licensee shall continuously maintain an approved surety instrument for the Dewey-Burdock Project, in favor of the NRC except for plugging and abandoning of all Class III and Class V injection wells, which will be maintained in favor of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. The initial surety estimate shall be submitted for NRC staff review and approval within 90 days of license issuance, and the surety instrument shall be submitted for NRC staff review and approval 90 days prior to commencing operations. The initial surety estimate shall include a reasonable estimate for the duration of groundwater restoration based on current experiences at licensed ISR facilities. The licensee shall also calculate pore volumes based on the actual screen lengths of injection and production wells and not by ore zone thickness.

Staff Review and Analysis of LC 9.5

Regulatory Requirements

In accordance with LC 9.5 (NRC, 2014a), Powertech (USA) Inc. (Powertech, or the licensee) is required to "maintain an NRC-approved financial surety arrangement, consistent with 10 CFR Part 40, Appendix A, Criterion 9, to adequately cover the estimated costs of decommissioning and decontamination," by a third-party for its Dewey-Burdock Uranium Recovery facility located

in Fall River and Custer Counties, South Dakota. By letter dated July 3, 2014 (Powertech, 2014a), Powertech submitted to the NRC staff its initial surety estimate for review and approval.

The NRC staff reviewed Powertech's Dewey-Burdock surety estimate in accordance with requirements in 10 CFR Part 40, Appendix A, Criterion 9, "Financial Criteria" and LC 9.5 of Materials License SUA-1600 (NRC, 2014a). The NRC staff used NUREG-1569 (NRC, 2003), "Standard Review Plan for In Situ Leach Uranium Extraction License Applications" (SRP) as guidance in determining elements to be included in a surety review. Specifically, the NRC staff used the review procedures and acceptance criteria in Section 6.5, and guidance in Appendix C of the SRP (NRC, 2003). The NRC staff used Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality (WDEQ) Land Quality Division Guideline 12 "Standardized Reclamation Performance Bond Format and Cost Calculation Methods" (Guideline 12) (WDEQ, 2016) when applicable, to verify that reasonable unit costs were included in the surety calculations.

Sufficiency of the Cost Estimate

The financial assurance cost estimate includes costs for all D&D activities at the project site used in conjunction with the first year of license possession except for plugging and abandoning Class III injection wells and Class V deep disposal wells. In accordance with LC 9.5 (NRC, 2014a), a separate financial instrument will be maintained in favor of the Environmental Protection Agency for these specific activities. The NRC staff observes, however, that the cost estimate does include the costs for plugging and abandoning production and monitor wells. The costs for plugging and abandoning production and monitor wells will be included in the NRC portion of the financial instrument. The cost estimate also includes costs for access road reclamation that does not have a direct nexus to radiological safety. This type of item has been included based on the assumption that NRC and the South Dakota Department of Environment and Natural Resources (SD DENR) will enter into a memorandum of understanding agreement by which NRC will hold the state's portion of the financial instrument. The unit costs for D&D are consistent with vendor quotes, 2014 RSMeans cost data, regulatory guidance including Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality's Guideline 12 and other operating uranium in situ recovery and industrial facilities. The NRC staff observes that SD DENR reviewed Powertech's initial surety estimate and had no comments (DENR, 2015).

Powertech estimated the cost to decommission and decontaminate the Dewey-Burdock facility by an independent party at \$1,620,000. This estimate does not include costs for groundwater restoration because no lixiviant injection will occur during the initial financial assurance period or costs for radiological decontamination, radiological surveying, or disposal of 11e.(2) byproduct material when the facility will continue to be non-operational. Estimated costs for these items will be included in future updates when lixiviant injection is planned. The cost estimate is based on: year 2014 dollars, costs of a third party contractor, no credit for any salvage value, and a 15 percent contingency factor.

The NRC staff has completed its review of the initial surety estimate for Powertech's Dewey-Burdock Project and finds that the licensee has included in the estimate all activities listed in Sections 6.1-6.4 of the SRP (NRC, 2003) and to be conducted during the period covered by the surety. Staff finds the licensee has based the assumptions for the financial surety analysis on site conditions and generally accepted industry practices, and appropriate cost factors as described above. Therefore, the NRC staff finds that the licensee has established an acceptable financial assurance cost estimate based on the requirements in 10 CFR Part 40, Appendix A, Criterion 9.

Appropriateness of the Financial Instrument

Pursuant to 10 CFR Part 40, Appendix A, Criterion 9, “[f]inancial surety arrangements must be established by each mill operator before commencement of operations to assure that sufficient funds will be available to carry out the decontamination and decommissioning of the mill and site and for the reclamation of any tailings or waste disposal areas.” The financial assurance mechanism to be used by Powertech will be provided at least 90 days prior to commencing operations as required by LC 9.5. Powertech has committed to supplying a financial assurance mechanism in a form and in an amount approved by NRC staff in accordance with 10 CFR Part 40, Appendix A, Criterion 9.

Additionally, pursuant to the requirements in 10 CFR Part 40, Appendix A, Criterion 9, a Standby Trust Agreement (STA) must be in place unless a trust fund is used as the financial assurance mechanism. The regulation states that “if a trust is not used, then a standby trust fund must be set up to receive funds in the event the Commission or State regulatory agency exercises its right to collect the surety.” Powertech must provide an STA along with the financial surety mechanism prior to commencement of operations in order to meet the regulatory requirement.

Conclusion

At this time the facility remains non-operational. Therefore, the licensee is not yet required to have a financial assurance mechanism or STA in place. Prior to commencement of operations, the licensee is required to provide a financial assurance mechanism and STA for NRC staff review and approval in accordance with 10 CFR Part 40, Appendix A, Criterion 9. The NRC staff will review the financial assurance mechanism at that time.

LC 9.5 will be modified to read:

- 9.5 Financial Assurance. The licensee shall maintain an NRC-approved financial surety arrangement, consistent with 10 CFR Part 40, Appendix A, Criterion 9, to adequately cover the estimated costs of decommissioning and decontamination, if accomplished by a third party. This surety arrangement shall cover offsite disposal of radioactive solid process or evaporation pond residues, and groundwater restoration pursuant to 10 CFR Part 40, Appendix A Criterion 5B (5). The surety shall also include the costs associated with all soil and water sampling analyses necessary to confirm the accomplishment of decontamination.

Proposed annual updates to the financial assurance amount, consistent with 10 CFR Part 40, Appendix A, Criterion 9, shall be provided to the NRC 90 days prior to the anniversary date. The financial assurance anniversary date for the Dewey-Burdock Project will be the date on which the first surety instrument is approved by the NRC. If the NRC has not approved a proposed revision 30 days prior to the expiration date of the existing financial assurance arrangement, the licensee shall extend the existing arrangement, prior to expiration, for 1 year. Along with each proposed revision or annual update of the financial assurance estimate, the licensee shall submit supporting documentation, showing a breakdown of the costs and the basis for the cost estimates with adjustments for inflation, maintenance of a minimum 15-percent contingency of the financial assurance estimate, changes in engineering plans, activities performed, and any other conditions affecting the estimated costs for site closure. The licensee shall

calculate pore volumes based on the actual screen lengths of injection and production wells and not by ore zone thickness.

Within 90 days of NRC approval of a revised closure (decommissioning) plan and its cost estimate, the licensee shall submit, for NRC review and approval, a proposed revision to the financial assurance arrangement if estimated costs exceed the amount covered in the existing arrangement. The revised financial assurance instrument shall then be in effect within 30 days of written NRC approval of the documents.

At least 90 days prior to beginning construction associated with any planned expansion or operational change that was not included in the annual financial assurance update, the licensee shall provide, for NRC review and approval, an updated estimate to cover the expansion or change. The licensee shall also provide the NRC with copies of financial-assurance-related correspondence submitted to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, a copy of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's financial assurance review, and the final approved financial assurance arrangement. The licensee also must ensure that the financial assurance instrument, where authorized to be held by a State or other Federal agency, identifies the NRC-related portion of the instrument and covers the activities discussed earlier in this license condition. The basis for the cost estimate is the NRC-approved site decommissioning and reclamation plan and any NRC approved revisions to the plan. Reclamation and decommissioning cost estimates and annual updates should follow the outline in Appendix C, "Recommended Outline for Site-Specific In Situ Leach Facility Reclamation and Stabilization Cost Estimates," to NUREG-1569, "Standard Review Plan for In Situ Leach Uranium Extraction License Applications—Final Report."

The licensee shall continuously maintain an approved surety instrument for the Dewey-Burdock Project in the amount of no less than \$1,620,000, in favor of the NRC except for plugging and abandoning of all Class III and Class V injection wells, which will be maintained in favor of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

The surety instrument shall be submitted for NRC staff review and approval 90 days prior to commencing operations.

[Applicable amendment: 1]

LC 12.23

LC 12.23 states:

Within 90 days of receipt of an NRC license, the licensee will submit to the NRC for review and approval a revised decommissioning, decontamination, and reclamation plan. The revised plan will include soil cleanup criteria for radionuclides other than radium based on the radium benchmark dose method, as well as procedures for monitoring beta-gamma contamination on equipment, structures, and material released for unrestricted use. The soil cleanup criteria, based on the radium benchmark dose methodology for U and other radionuclides, will demonstrate that residual radioactivity in soil meets the criteria in 10 CFR Part 40, Appendix A, Criterion 6(6). The revised plan

will also include procedures for restoring stream channels to their original geomorphology.

Staff review and Analysis of LC 12.23

Soil Cleanup Criteria

In Section 6.2.3 of the SER (NRC, 2014b) issued with Powertech's initial materials license, the NRC staff explained that a thorium-230 cleanup standard for soil was required. This requirement was incorporated into LC 12.23 (NRC, 2014a) as well as a requirement to demonstrate that residual radioactivity in soil meets the criteria in 10 CFR Part 40, Appendix A, Criterion 6(6).

By letter dated July 3, 2014 (Powertech, 2014a), the licensee responded to LC 12.23 by providing a revised decommissioning, decontamination, and reclamation plan (also referred to as the Restoration Action Plan, or RAP). The portions of the RAP addressing the thorium-230 cleanup standard for soil and the demonstration that residual radioactivity in soil meets the criteria in 10 CFR Part 40, Appendix A, Criterion 6(6) are found in Sections 3 and 5. By e-mail dated September 2, 2014 (NRC, 2014c), the NRC staff notified the licensee that the RAP was incomplete and provided technical deficiencies that needed to be addressed. The licensee addressed these deficiencies in an e-mail dated September 25, 2014 (Powertech, 2014b).

In Attachment RAP-5 (Powertech, 2014a), the licensee presented the results of its RESRAD model used to determine the amount of residual thorium-230 in soil based on the radium benchmark dose (refer to 10 CFR Part 40, Appendix A, Criterion 6(6)). The licensee calculated a maximum soil concentration of 165 picocuries/gram of thorium-230 (Powertech, 2014a). This value was calculated using the radium benchmark dose of 38.1 mrem per year from residual radium over a one thousand year time period (refer to Section 6.4.1.1 of Powertech, 2009). The NRC staff finds the licensee's calculation of the maximum thorium-230 soil concentration consistent with Acceptance Criterion 6.4.3(4) of NUREG-1569 (NRC, 2003) and therefore acceptable.

To address the deficiencies specified in NRC staff's e-mail dated September 2, 2014 (NRC, 2014c), the licensee revised Sections 3.2, 3.6, and 5 of the RAP (Powertech, 2014b). Through these revisions, the licensee made additional commitments for demonstrating that residual radioactivity in soil meets the criteria in 10 CFR Part 40, Appendix A, Criterion 6(6). As an example, the licensee replaced its reliance on soil gamma ray measurements with a commitment to rely on "definitive soil concentration" data from its soil sampling strategy that will be part of its Decommissioning Plan (Powertech, 2014b). In addition, the licensee committed to develop site-specific scan minimum detectable concentrations for measurements performed for soil cleanup activities (Powertech, 2014b). Lastly, the licensee committed to design a survey method for verification of soil cleanup that will provide 95 percent confidence that survey units will meet cleanup guidelines (Powertech, 2014b). The NRC staff finds these commitments consistent with Acceptance Criterion 6.4.3(5) of NUREG-1569 (NRC, 2003) and therefore acceptable.

Monitoring for Beta-Gamma Contamination

In addition to the changes to the RAP addressing the soil cleanup criteria, the licensee committed (Powertech, 2014a) to using a procedure derived from Sections 6.6 and 6.7 of NUREG-1575 (NRC, 2000) for the detection of beta-gamma contamination. Section 3.3 of the RAP was revised to include these sections of NUREG-1575 (NRC, 2000) for the calculation of minimum detectable concentrations of the survey equipment. The NRC staff finds this commitment consistent with Acceptance Criterion 6.3.3(4) of NUREG-1569 (NRC, 2003) and therefore acceptable.

Restoring Stream Channels

In Section 2.4.3.1.3 of the SER (NRC, 2014b) issued with Powertech's initial materials license, the NRC staff explained that a commitment to restore stream channels to their original morphology was required. This requirement was incorporated into LC 12.23 (NRC, 2014a). By letter dated July 3, 2014 (Powertech, 2014a), the licensee responded to this requirement by providing a revised RAP that included a discussion on stream channel reclamation in Section 3.8.

By e-mail dated September 2, 2014 (NRC, 2014c), the NRC staff notified the licensee that Section 3.8 of the RAP was incomplete and provided technical deficiencies that needed to be addressed. The licensee addressed these deficiencies by providing a revision to Section 3.8 of the RAP in an e-mail dated September 25, 2014 (Powertech, 2014b). The NRC staff finds the licensee's revised discussion of stream channel reclamation consistent with Acceptance Criterion 6.2.3(4) of NUREG-1569 (NRC, 2003) and therefore acceptable.

Conclusion

The NRC staff has determined that the licensee has sufficiently addresses all aspects of LC 12.23 as discussed above. Therefore, the NRC staff will remove LC 12.23 from Materials License SUA-1600 and amend LC 9.2 to include the commitments, representations, and statements made by Powertech in the submissions dated July 3, 2014 (Powertech, 2014a), and September 25, 2014 (Powertech, 2014b).

License Condition 9.2

LC 9.2 states:

The licensee shall conduct operations in accordance with the commitments, representations, and statements contained in the license application dated February 28, 2009 (Accession No. ML091200014), which is supplemented by the submittals dated August 10, 2009 (Accession No. ML092870160); June 28, 2011 (Accession No. ML112071064); February 27, 2012 (Accession No. ML120620195); April 11, 2012 (Accession No. ML121030013); June 13, 2012 (Accession No. ML12173A038); June 27, 2012 (Accession No. ML12179A534); and October 19, 2012 (Accession No. ML12305A056). The approved application and supplements are, hereby, incorporated by reference, except where superseded by specific conditions in this license. The licensee must maintain at least one copy of its complete, updated, and approved license application at the licensed facility. Unless otherwise specified, all references to the "license application" refer to the current, updated application including updates made per License Condition (LC) 9.4.

Whenever the words "will" or "shall" are used in the above referenced documents, it shall

denote a requirement. The use of “verification” in this license with respect to a document submitted for NRC staff review means a written acknowledgement by U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff that the specified submitted material is consistent with commitments in the approved license application, or requirements in a license condition or regulation. A verification will not require a license amendment.

Staff Review and Analysis of LC 9.2

License Condition 9.2 is commonly referred to by the NRC staff as the “tie down” condition. Under this license condition, the NRC requires the licensee to conduct operations in accordance with the commitments, representations, and statements contained in the license application and other submissions as noted. Since the licensee has made additional commitments, representations, and statements in submissions to the NRC as discussed in prior sections of this Safety Evaluation Report, the NRC staff will amend this license condition to add references to those commitments, representations, and statements.

License Condition 9.2 will be modified to read:

- 9.2 The licensee shall conduct operations in accordance with the commitments, representations, and statements contained in the license application dated February 28, 2009 (Accession No. ML091200014), which is supplemented by the submittals dated August 10, 2009 (Accession No. ML092870160); June 28, 2011 (Accession No. ML112071064); February 27, 2012 (Accession No. ML120620195); April 11, 2012 (Accession No. ML121030013); June 13, 2012 (Accession No. ML12173A038); June 27, 2012 (Accession No. ML12179A534); October 19, 2012 (Accession No. ML12305A056); July 3, 2014 (Accession No. ML14191A034); and September 25, 2014 (Accession No. ML14295A299).

The approved application and supplements are, hereby, incorporated by reference, except where superseded by specific conditions in this license. The licensee must maintain at least one copy of its complete, updated, and approved license application at the licensed facility. Unless otherwise specified, all references to the “license application” refer to the current, updated application including updates made per License Condition (LC) 9.4.

Whenever the words “will” or “shall” are used in the above referenced documents, it shall denote a requirement. The use of “verification” in this license with respect to a document submitted for NRC staff review means a written acknowledgement by U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff that the specified submitted material is consistent with commitments in the approved license application, or requirements in a license condition or regulation. A verification will not require a license amendment.

[Applicable amendment: 1]

Categorical Exclusions and Consultations

The NRC staff has determined that issuance of an amendment to a license to change surety does not affect the scope or nature of the licensed activity nor does it alter the environmental impact of the licensed activity. Amending LC 9.5 to reflect the initial surety estimate is a licensing action that meets the categorical exclusion provision for surety changes in 10 CFR Part 51.22(c)(10)(i). Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this action.

In addition, in accordance with 10 CFR 51.22(b), the NRC staff has determined that an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement is not required for modifying LC 9.2 and deleting LC 12.23. Specifically, these amendments are administrative and procedural in nature because they modify or remove specific license conditions noted above from NRC Materials License SUA-1600 as a result of the NRC staff's review and approval of the information provided by the licensee in satisfaction of the specified license conditions. Therefore, as administrative and procedural amendments, these actions are categorically excluded under 10 CFR 51.22(c)(11) from the requirement to prepare an environmental assessment or environmental impact statement, based on the following NRC staff findings:

- that the modification and removal of the LCs discussed above will not result in a significant change in the types or significant increase in the amounts of any effluents that may be released offsite;
- that there will be no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure as a result of the modification and removal of the LCs discussed above;
- that the modification and removal of the LCs discussed above will not result in a significant construction impact; and
- that there is no significant increase in the potential for or consequences from radiological accidents as a result of the modification and removal of the LCs discussed above.

Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (Act) [16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.] outlines the procedures for Federal interagency cooperation to conserve Federally listed species and designated critical habitats. Section 7(a)(2) states that each Federal agency shall, in consultation with the Secretary, insure that any action they authorize, fund, or carry out is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of a listed species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of designated critical habitat. The NRC staff has determined that a Section 7 consultation is not required because the proposed actions are administrative/procedural in nature and will not affect listed species or critical habitat. The NRC staff has also determined that the proposed actions are not a type of activity that has potential to cause effects on historic properties because they are administrative/procedural actions. Therefore, no additional consultation is required under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

References

DENR, 2015. E-mail from E. Holm, South Dakota Department of Environment and Natural Resources, to R. Burrows, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, February 12, 2015, ADAMS Accession No. ML15044A055.

NRC, 2014a. U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Materials License SUA-1600, April 8, 2014, ADAMS Accession No. ML14043A392.

NRC, 2014b. U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Dewey-Burdock Final Safety Evaluation (Revised), April 2014, ADAMS Accession No. ML14043A347.

NRC, 2014c. E-mail from R. Burrows, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, to R. Blubaugh, Powertech (USA) Inc., Acknowledgment of Receipt, Status, and TAC Numbers to Track Reviews: Dewey-Burdock Project Licensing Activities LC 9.5 and LC 12.23, September 2, 2014, ADAMS Accession No. ML14247A184.

NRC, 2003. NUREG–1569, “Standard Review Plan for In Situ Leach Uranium Extraction License Applications—Final Report.” June.

NRC, 2000. NUREG-1575, Revision 1, Multi-Agency Radiation Survey and Site Investigation Manual (MARSSIM), August 2000.

Powertech, 2014a. Letter from R. Blubaugh, Powertech (USA) Inc., to U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Request to Amend License SUA-1600, Dewey-Burdock Project, License Conditions 9.5 and 12.23, Docket 40-9075, July 3, 2014, ADAMS Accession No. ML14191A034.

Powertech, 2014b. E-mail from R. Blubaugh, Powertech (USA) Inc., to R. Burrows, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Responses to Restoration Action Plan Completeness Review Comments, September 25, 2014, ADAMS Accession No. ML14295A299.

Powertech, 2009. Letter from R. Blubaugh, Powertech (USA) Inc., to C. Miller, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Powertech (USA), Inc.'s - Submission of Application for a Nuclear Regulatory Commission Uranium Recovery License for its Proposed Dewey-Burdock In Situ Leach Uranium Recovery Facility in the State of South Dakota., February 25, 2009, ADAMS Accession No. ML091200014.

WDEQ, 2016. Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality, Land Quality Division, Guideline No.12, “Standardized Reclamation Performance Bond Format and Cost Calculation Methods”, Revised May 2016,
[http://deq.wyoming.gov/media/attachments/Land%20Quality/Guidelines/Guideline_12_\(5_2016\).pdf](http://deq.wyoming.gov/media/attachments/Land%20Quality/Guidelines/Guideline_12_(5_2016).pdf), accessed July 19, 2016.