



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

December 13, 1996

Distribution:

JTaylor  
JMilhoan  
HThompson  
JBlaha  
CPaperiello, NMSS  
MFliegel, NMSS  
RBangart, SP  
KCyr, OGC  
GT96727  
EDO r/f  
PDR

Dr. Dianne R. Nielson, Executive Director  
Department of Environmental Quality  
State of Utah  
168 North 1950 West  
Post Office Box 144810  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-4810

Dear Dr. Nielson:

I am responding to your September 16, 1996 letter describing recent discussions with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff regarding the elimination of dual regulation at uranium mill sites in Utah. The Commission appreciates your interest in simplifying the regulatory oversight of uranium mill and tailings facilities in Utah and in reconciling regulatory differences between the NRC and applicable Utah ground and surface water quality regulations. In retrospect, there seems to have been considerable misunderstanding on the part of both the NRC staff and the State of Utah. I have enclosed specific responses to the six areas of concern that you identified in your letter (Enclosure 1). Nevertheless, I believe it is important to clarify why NRC was not able to undertake all the actions the State of Utah believed were necessary for eliminating dual regulation and to suggest alternative approaches in addressing the concerns you have raised.

As you are aware, the standards contained in NRC regulations conform to standards promulgated by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Judicial reviews by a Federal Court found that the EPA standards met the Federal legislative mandate for protection of groundwater [American Mining Congress v. Thomas, 772 F.2nd 640 (10th Cir. 1985); American Mining Congress v. NRC, 902 F.2nd 781 (10th Cir. 1990)]. Because NRC's requirements conform to the EPA standards, the NRC requirements also meet the Federal legislative mandate and, therefore, provide adequate protection of public health and safety within the meaning of the Atomic Energy Act.

During the past year of interactions, it became apparent that the State of Utah wanted the NRC to impose State of Utah requirements on NRC licensees. As the NRC staff noted in the meetings between the State of Utah and the NRC, there are many aspects of the State of Utah requirements, such as surface water standards, where the NRC does not have statutory responsibility. In addition, there are many other areas of groundwater protection where the NRC may not need to implement requirements as restrictive as those imposed by the State of Utah to provide adequate protection of public health and safety. Although the NRC was willing to consider implementing some of the State of

240100

96/2230208 XA

[Originated By: M. Fliegel, NMSS]

WM-3  
409.45  
96-173 X 205  
NRC FILE CENTER COPY


Utah requests, it could do so only if it believed that taking the action was necessary to protect the public health and safety, and it could provide a sound technical and regulatory basis for such action.

One example of the difficulties encountered in trying to resolve the problems is the different approach that NRC and the State of Utah take to contaminated groundwater. In implementing its regulatory program, NRC takes into account the ultimate use of contaminated groundwater. In some cases, groundwater may not be drinking-water quality, and as such, NRC may exercise regulatory discretion regarding what cleanup actions licensees need to take to meet the regulations. The State of Utah, on the other hand, views all groundwater as potential drinking-water, and occasionally may require regulatory actions that go beyond NRC regulations. This different view of the ultimate use of groundwater is one of the major differences between NRC and State of Utah programs. The agreement being advocated by the State of Utah would have NRC implement all the State of Utah requirements. This approach would require NRC to revise its groundwater program, including changes to the NRC regulations. Because the present NRC program provides adequate protection of public health and safety, the staff informed the State of Utah that NRC did not plan to undertake any regulatory actions beyond those currently in the Federal program. NRC encouraged the State of Utah to review the requirements being implemented as part of the Federal program to see if the State could accept this program.

Nevertheless, there are alternative ways that we can work together to eliminate dual regulation. For example, the State of Utah could consider becoming an Agreement State for uranium recovery facilities. This would allow the State of Utah to implement the NRC program as well as any additional State authorized requirements it believed were necessary to regulate groundwater quality. We also have signed Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) with several States to facilitate interactions. Enclosure 2, for your consideration, is an MOU between NRC and the Utah Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) that we have drafted that would eliminate dual regulation in Utah. If you would like to pursue this approach, the NRC would be pleased to work with you to implement such an MOU. Another approach to help reduce dual regulation would have Utah licensees voluntarily commit to report on actions or standards satisfying Utah. The NRC could include those voluntary commitments to report in the license. The response to item 6 of your letter (see enclosure 1) discusses some of the considerations NRC uses to determine the appropriateness of including a commitment in the license. In order to include voluntary commitments, the license condition would have to be worded carefully to ensure that NRC would not enforce commitments that go beyond NRC regulatory authority. There also may be an additional issue relating to State reimbursement for NRC implementation of Utah requirements depending on the extent of our involvement relating to the reporting requirements and need for any direct NRC licensing review assistance. Under current Commission policy relating to fees and technical assistance to Agreement States, direct licensing review assistance would be subject to State reimbursement. The NRC staff could work with your staff if you want to pursue this approach.

In closing, I want to assure you that the NRC is committed to working with the State of Utah to resolve these issues. I hope I have clarified NRC's position on these matters and that you will consider one or more of the alternatives that I have proposed. If you have further questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,



Shirley Ann Jackson

Enclosures:

1. Response to State of Utah, dated 9/16/96
2. Memorandum of Understanding

cc: Don Ostler, UDWQ  
Larry Mize, UDWQ  
Bill Sinclair, UDRC  
Peter Heaney, Grand County Council

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION RESPONSE TO  
STATE OF UTAH CONCERNS IN SEPTEMBER 16, 1996,  
LETTER TO CHAIRMAN SHIRLEY JACKSON

Item 1: Narrow Definition of "Hazardous Constituent": Contaminant Detectability

There are actually two issues identified under this item.

1.a) NRC Criterion 5B(2) unduly restricts the definition of a "hazardous constituent."

Response:

The definition comes directly from U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) standards in 40 CFR Part 192.

1.b) The determination of whether a constituent meets the definition of "hazardous constituent" is made only once, early in a facility's life. Consequently, slow moving constituents, that may contaminate groundwater after the initial determination of "hazardous constituents," are not monitored and could, therefore, be unregulated.

Response:

All uranium mills with contaminated groundwater are currently under a corrective action program (CAP). These CAPs require that licensees monitor the groundwater for constituents that were identified as "hazardous constituents" when the programs were developed in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Requiring routine monitoring of constituents that were not identified as "hazardous constituents" when the CAPs were accepted is not necessary because the CAPs that are currently in place work to reduce groundwater contamination for all constituents that are present, not just those being monitored. Moreover, before terminating the license for a uranium mill site, the NRC staff will require licensees to demonstrate that all constituents found in the tailings are within standards in the groundwater.

Item 2: Missing Non-radiologic Contaminants in Criterion 13

NRC Criterion 13 does not include several non-radiological contaminants, including ammonia, copper, fluoride, manganese, nitrate, pH, total dissolved solids (TDS), vanadium, and zinc, which are regulated by the Utah Ground Water Quality Protection Regulations.

Response:

The NRC has the ability to regulate other constituents beyond those listed in Criterion 13. At the time NRC reviewed the groundwater CAPs, the staff concluded that there was no need to go beyond the list of constituents found in Criterion 13 and in the tailings liquid for most sites. To date, NRC does not have any reason to revisit those earlier decisions. However, as changes

are made to CAPs, or final monitoring is done at the time of license termination, the staff will consider, based on a sound technical and regulatory basis, what, if any, additional constituents should be included.

It should be noted that the State of Utah equates the elimination of dual regulation with its proposal to have NRC assume all responsibility for groundwater protection at uranium mills. During the June 1996 meeting, the staff tried to explain that concurrent jurisdiction is an area where both NRC and the State of Utah share regulation of the same nonradiological constituents. For those constituents regulated solely by the State of Utah, and not in NRC regulations or license conditions, there are no concurrent jurisdictional issues. The State of Utah is the sole regulatory authority. This is the case for constituents that are in the State of Utah standards, but are not in NRC regulations. The State of Utah proposal would do more than eliminate dual regulation. It also would shift the regulation of State of Utah groundwater standards to NRC, and remove the State of Utah from any review or enforcement of its own standards.

Item 3: Inclusion of Mill Site Facilities in Groundwater Monitoring, Characterization, and Corrective Action

The NRC does not have any standards for cleanup of groundwater contamination from sources other than the tailings.

Response:

The Commission has established standards for the cleanup of groundwater contamination from byproduct material in the tailings impoundment. However, these standards are not applicable to the cleanup of groundwater contamination solely from other activities within the mill site, such as ore storage or yellowcake storage. Groundwater contamination resulting from sources other than the tailings impoundment can be addressed through 10 CFR Part 40, Appendix A, Criterion 5F. Under Criterion 5F, uranium mill licensees would be required to address seepage of contaminants into the groundwater from sources other than byproduct material. Further, Criterion 5F specifies that the cleanup standards for this contamination would be determined on a site-specific basis. The staff informed the State of Utah that it would use the standards in Criterion 5B to help ensure that all groundwater would be cleaned up to comparable standards. The staff has not identified any mill site where there is groundwater contamination that cannot be attributed to the tailings impoundment. Therefore, the staff currently is applying the standards in Criterion 5B to all groundwater cleanup.

Item 4: NRC Lack of Surface Water Quality Standards for Mill Tailings

The NRC does not have standards for the regulation of surface water.

Response:

Although the NRC does not have standards for the regulation of surface water potentially contaminated by leakage from the facility, NRC groundwater standards provide protection of surface water. Each constituent must meet one of three standards at the point of compliance in the groundwater: 1) background concentration; 2) the maximum concentration level established by EPA and identified in Criterion 5C; or 3) an alternate concentration limit

(ACL) established by NRC. If either one of the first two standards is met in the groundwater for a constituent, surface water will be protected. To establish an ACL for a constituent, NRC must consider nine factors relating to potential adverse effects on groundwater quality and nine factors relating to potential adverse effects on hydraulically connected surface water quality. Therefore, although it is technically correct to state that NRC does not have surface water standards, the regulatory framework in Criterion 5 is protective of surface water. Nevertheless, it should be noted that because NRC does not have standards for surface water, there is no concurrent jurisdiction in this area, and thus no dual regulation. The State of Utah is the sole regulator.

Planned discharges to surface waters are regulated under 10 CFR Part 20 for radiological hazards, but the NRC does not have the authority to regulate the chemical hazards of planned discharges to surface water. The State of Utah, through its National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit authority, would regulate planned surface water discharges with respect to chemical hazards.

Item 5: NRC Inability to Regulate and Cleanup Groundwater Pollution Pre-dating 1978.

If licensees can show that off-site groundwater contamination occurred prior to 1978, then the NRC does not have any regulatory authority over it.

Response:

The NRC did not have authority over byproduct material until the passage of the Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act of 1978. As such, licensees do not have to clean up off-site contamination if they can show that all the contamination occurred before 1978. However, if this demonstration cannot be made, and this is usually very difficult to show, NRC will continue to regulate the cleanup of contaminated groundwater beyond the mill site boundary. This is an important distinction that was made to the State of Utah during the June 19, 1996 meeting between NRC and Utah.

Item 6: NRC Refusal to Enforce Voluntary Commitments by a Licensee

The NRC staff refused to enforce voluntary commitments made by licensees.

Response:

Although licensees may propose many commitments in their groundwater CAPs, NRC may not want to include all these commitments in a license condition. Many considerations help determine what commitments should be placed in a license condition. Some of these considerations include: 1) a sound technical basis to include the commitments; 2) consistent and appropriate application of the regulatory program; 3) the ability to conduct effective inspections of the licensee commitment; and 4) the obligation to enforce license conditions, regardless of the basis for the condition.

NRC has further considered this item and concludes that it could include voluntary reporting commitments in a license. License conditions would have to be written carefully, taking into account the above considerations. Enforcement of commitments that have no basis in NRC regulations could present

problems; therefore, commitments that are needed for compliance with State of Utah standards would be the responsibility of the State to enforce. However, the staff is prepared to work with Utah in this area within the regulatory framework discussed above.

DRAFT

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING  
BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
AND THE STATE OF UTAH  
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

1. Purpose. This Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") is intended to provide a framework for voluntary cooperation between the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission ("NRC") and the State of Utah, Department of Environmental Quality (UDEQ) to minimize or eliminate the dual regulation of groundwater at uranium mills in the State of Utah.
2. Regulatory Authority. The NRC regulates radiological and non-radiological hazards of byproduct material as confined in Section 11e.(2) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 2011 et seq. The UDEQ administers and enforces Utah's environmental statutes over the radiological hazards of 11e.(2) byproduct material.
3. Designation of Site Coordinators. Within ninety (90) days after execution of this MOU, each agency will designate a site coordinator for each uranium recovery mill or 11e.(2) byproduct disposal site identified in Appendix A. Each agency shall notify the other, in writing, of the name, address, telephone and facsimile numbers of each site coordinator. Any changes in the designation of a coordinator will be communicated in writing to the other agency.
4. Meetings and Conference Calls between the Agencies. At the request of either agency, with reasonable notice, a meeting or conference call will be scheduled between the site coordinators and other agency representatives to discuss coordination of actions related to groundwater restoration work or 11e.(2) byproduct disposal at uranium mills covered by this agreement.
5. Technical and Regulatory Consultation. At the request of either agency, with reasonable notice, representatives of each will be made available to discuss technical or regulatory matters pertaining to groundwater restoration work at the sites covered under this agreement.
6. Meetings with the Public. Except in response to site emergencies, each agency will notify the other, at least two weeks in advance, of any public meeting related to groundwater restoration activities at sites covered by this agreement.
7. Meetings with Other Regulatory Entities. At its discretion, either agency may invite representatives of the other agency to attend meetings with other regulatory entities who share some responsibility for the groundwater restoration at sites covered under this MOU. At a minimum, both parties to this MOU will keep the other informed of such meetings and the results of those meetings. [It should be noted that the NRC has an Open Meeting policy which would require these meetings to be open to the public because they almost always would involve discussions concerning a specific licensee (Open Meeting Statement of NRC Staff Policy, 59 Federal Register 48340, 9/20/94)].

DRAFT

8. Notice of Site Inspections. Each agency will make a good faith effort to coordinate routine site inspections of groundwater restoration activities at sites covered under this agreement by providing two weeks advance notice (when possible) to the other agency.

9. Dissemination of Information to Other Agencies. As necessary to implement oversight of operations, remediation, and decommissioning of sites covered under this agreement effectively, the agencies will coordinate pertinent and appropriate dissemination of information to other Federal, State and local government agencies.

10. Exchange of Information Between Agencies.

A. The agencies will exchange information concerning groundwater restoration of uranium recovery mills and 11e.(2) byproduct disposal sites as follows:

i. Upon request, NRC will make available to UDEQ for review and copying any documents disclosable to the public under the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552, NRC regulations in 10 CFR Part 9, Public Records, and in 10 CFR Part 2.790, public inspections, exemptions, requests for withholding, and any other applicable Federal statute, regulation, or policy.

ii. Upon request, UDEQ will make available to the NRC for review and copying any documents disclosable to the public under the [insert appropriate state policy] UDEQ's public information policy, and any other applicable Utah statute, regulation, or policy.

B. All documents exchanged by the agencies will be addressed to the designated coordinator for the each site.

C. Nothing in this MOU shall be construed as compelling either agency to produce information or documents which the agency deems confidential or privileged.

11. Disclosure of Information to the Public. The right of access by the public to information under Federal and State law, regulation, or policy is not affected by this MOU.

12. Designation of Single Regulator for Groundwater Restoration.

A. It is agreed that the lead agency for developing a regulatory program for groundwater restoration at uranium mills shall be the NRC. The regulations and standards that NRC will use in its regulatory program will be those contained in 10 CFR Part 40, Appendix A.

B. The NRC will be the lead agency for setting standards other than those contained in 10 CFR Part 40, Appendix A. This could include standards for constituents not covered currently in 10 CFR Part 40, Appendix A, as well as background limits or alternate concentration limits for any constituent regulated by NRC under this agreement. It is agreed that the final determination of any limits for groundwater clean up rests with NRC. If the State of Utah does not agree with the NRC's final determination, it can choose to implement its own regulatory program. However, if the State of Utah does not notify NRC in writing within 60 days of the final NRC position, then the

DRAFT

State of Utah agrees that it will not require any additional clean up by the United States Department of Energy (DOE), if DOE is the long-term care custodian for the site.

C. The evaluation of any groundwater clean up program, or any modification to an already accepted program, will be the responsibility of the NRC. The NRC will be the lead agency for determining the acceptability of any program, or modification. If the State of Utah does not agree with the NRC's final determination, it can choose to implement its own regulatory program, and require additional groundwater corrective actions. However, if the State of Utah does not notify NRC in writing within 60 days of the final NRC position, that Utah plans to undertake its own regulatory program, then the NRC position will be accepted as final by both agencies.

D. On occasion, and when the NRC determines there is a sound technical and regulatory basis to do so, NRC will implement the flexibility provided in 10 CFR Part 40, Appendix A, and will expand the list of constituents contained in 10 CFR Part 40, Appendix A, Criterion 13.

E. The State of Utah agrees that it will not petition to intervene or participate in any hearing on licensing matters before the NRC that are covered by paragraphs 12.B. and C. unless notice was given within 60 days of the NRC final position.

13. Modifications. Any modifications or changes to this MOU shall be effective only if agreed to by the parties and set forth in writing as an amendment of this MOU.

14. Reservation of Rights. Nothing in this MOU shall affect the rights, duties and authority of either agency under the law. The agencies reserve their respective authority and rights to take any enforcement action which they deem necessary to fulfill their duties and responsibilities under the law.

15. Non-binding Memorandum. This memorandum is not intended to and does not create any contractual rights or obligations with respect to the NRC, UDEQ, or any other parties.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Carl J. Paperiello, Director  
Office of Nuclear Material Safety  
and Safeguards  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D.C.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Diane R. Nielson, Executive Director  
Department of Environmental Quality  
State of Utah  
Salt Lake City, Utah

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

CHAIRMAN

Dr. Dianne Nielson, Executive Director  
Department of Environmental Quality  
State of Utah  
168 North 1950 West  
Post Office Box 144810  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-4810

Dear Dr. Nielson:

I am responding to your September 16, 1996, letter describing the recent efforts undertaken by the State of Utah and the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff to eliminate dual regulation at uranium mill sites in Utah. In particular, you were concerned that the staff was not taking the actions, regarding the six areas of concern identified in your letter, that the State of Utah believed were necessary to protect the public health and safety. Because of this, the State of Utah concluded that NRC was not committed to eliminating dual regulation. A response to the six individual areas of concern identified in your letter is included in Enclosure 1. In response to the general concerns you raised, I want to clarify the NRC regulatory mission, and explain why NRC was not able to undertake all the actions the State of Utah believed were necessary for eliminating dual regulation.

As has been explained to representatives of the State of Utah in the past, the standards contained in NRC regulations conform with the standards promulgated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Not only did EPA find that these standards protect the public health and safety, but judicial reviews by a Federal Court found that the EPA standards met the legislative mandate for protection of groundwater [American Mining Congress v. Thomas, 772 F.2d 640 (10th Cir. 1985); American Mining Congress v. NRC, 902 F.2d 781 (10th Cir. 1990)]. Because the NRC requirements conform to the EPA standards, the NRC requirements also protect the public health and safety. Undertaking the actions proposed by the State of Utah, such as imposing more restrictive standards, may not always be necessary to protect the public health and safety. For example, in implementing its regulatory program, NRC takes into account the ultimate use of contaminated groundwater. In some cases, groundwater may not be drinking-water quality, and as such, NRC may exercise regulatory discretion regarding what cleanup actions licensees need to take to meet the regulations. The State of Utah, on the other hand, views all groundwater as potential drinking-water, and may occasionally require regulatory actions that go beyond NRC regulations. This different view of the ultimate use of groundwater is one of the major differences between NRC and State of Utah programs.

When the staff and the State of Utah began discussions on how to eliminate dual regulation, the staff was aware of the more restrictive nature of the

State of Utah program, but did not fully recognize the different view of the ultimate use of groundwater. However, the staff continued discussions in an attempt to achieve a mutual agreement on standards that both agencies could conclude protect the public health and safety, without the need to impose the State of Utah standards. During the past year of interactions, it became apparent that the State of Utah wanted NRC to impose the State of Utah requirements on NRC licensees. As was properly noted in the meetings between the State of Utah and NRC, there are many aspects of the State of Utah requirements, such as surface water standards, where the NRC does not have statutory responsibility. In addition, there are many other areas of groundwater protection where the NRC may not find a need to implement requirements as restrictive as those imposed by the State of Utah. Although the NRC was willing to consider implementing some of the State of Utah requests, it would do so only if it believed that taking the action was necessary to protect the public health and safety, and it could provide a sound technical and regulatory basis for such action.

However, the agreement being advocated by the State of Utah would have NRC implement all the State of Utah requirements. This approach would require NRC to revise its groundwater program, including changes to the NRC regulations. Because the present NRC program protects the public health and safety, NRC informed the State of Utah that it did not plan to undertake any regulatory actions beyond those currently in the Federal program. NRC encouraged the State of Utah to review the requirements being implemented as part of the Federal program to see if the State could accept this program. As an alternative, the State of Utah could consider becoming an Agreement State for uranium recovery facilities. This would allow the State of Utah to implement the NRC program, and any additional State authorized requirements it believed were necessary to regulate groundwater quality.

There are ways we can work together to eliminate dual regulation if you still wish to do so. We have signed Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) with several States to facilitate interactions. Enclosure 2, for your consideration, is an MOU between NRC and the Utah DEQ that we have drafted that would eliminate dual regulation in Utah. If you would like to pursue this approach, my staff would be pleased to work with you to finalize an MOU. Another approach to help reduce dual regulation would have Utah licensees voluntarily commit to report on actions or standards satisfying Utah. NRC could include those voluntary commitments to report, in the license. My response (in Enclosure 1) to item 6 of your letter discusses some of the considerations NRC uses to determine the appropriateness of including a commitment in the license. In order to include voluntary commitments, the license condition would have to be carefully worded to ensure that NRC does not have to enforce commitments that go beyond NRC regulatory authority. There may also be an additional issue relating to State reimbursement for NRC implementation of Utah requirements depending on the extent of our involvement relating to the reporting requirements and need for any direct NRC licensing review assistance. Under current Commission policy relating to fees and technical assistance to Agreement States, direct licensing review assistance would be subject to State reimbursement. NRC staff could work with your staff if you want to pursue this approach.

In closing, I would like to note that although NRC and Utah may not always reach agreement on all issues, NRC has attempted to respond to concerns raised by the State. In addition, at the request of Mr. Bill Sinclair, the Director of the State of Utah Division of Radiation Control (DRC), the staff holds bimonthly calls with DRC to discuss the status of uranium recovery facilities in the State of Utah. NRC has also met with representatives from DRC to discuss issues of importance, and continues to work closely with DRC on significant issues such as the Atlas reclamation. I believe these NRC actions indicate that NRC is committed to working with the State of Utah. I trust that this reply responds to your concerns and clarifies NRC's position.

Sincerely,

Shirley Ann Jackson

Enclosures:

1. Response to State of Utah, dated 9/16/96
2. Memorandum of Understanding

cc: Don Ostler, UDWQ  
Larry Mize, UDWQ  
Bill Sinclair, UDRC  
Peter Heaney, Grand County Council

D. Nielson

3

in the State of Utah. NRC has also met with representatives from DRC to discuss issues of importance, and continues to work closely with DRC on significant issues such as the Atlas reclamation. I believe these NRC actions indicate that NRC is committed to working with the State of Utah. I trust that this reply responds to your concerns and clarifies NRC's position.

Sincerely,

Shirley Ann Jackson

Enclosures:

1. Response to State of Utah, dated 9/16/96
2. Draft MOU Between NRC and State of Utah

cc: Don Ostler, UDWQ  
Larry Mize, UDWQ  
Bill Sinclair, UDRC  
Peter Heaney, Grand County Council

TICKET #: EDO 96727

DISTRIBUTION: File Center PUBLIC NMSS r/f URB r/f CSeelig, PMDA  
MBell JSurmeier LHowell CCain DCorley, OC  
HThompson EDO r/f MWeber DWM r/f DWM t/f  
JAustin DGillen DIR r/f MBridgers, EDO RBangart, SP  
KCyr, OGC CPoland CNWRA

Path & File Name: S:\DWM\URB\MHF\STOFUT.RSP

\*SEE PREVIOUS CONCURRENCE

OFC	URB*		URB*		TECH*		DWM*		OGC*		OSP*		NMSS	
NAME	MFliegel		JHolonich		EKraus		JGreeves				RBangart		MKnapp	
DATE	10/10/96		10/10/96		10/09/96		10/16/96		10/15/96		10/15/96		10/ /96	

OFC	NMSS*		EDO		EDO		OCM							
NAME	CPaperiello		HThompson		JTaylor		SJackson							
DATE	10/16/96		10/21/96		10/21/96		10/ /96							

In small Box on "DATE:" line enter: M = E-Mail Distribution Copy H = Hard Copy  
OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

D. Nielson

3

indicate that NRC is committed to working with the State of Utah. I trust that this reply responds to your concerns and clarifies NRC's position.

Sincerely,

Shirley Ann Jackson

Enclosure:

Response to State of Utah, dated 9/16/96

cc: Don Ostler, UDWQ  
Larry Mize, UDWQ  
Bill Sinclair, UDRC  
Peter Heaney, Grand County Council

TICKET #: EDO 96727

DISTRIBUTION: File Center PUBLIC NMSS r/f URB r/f CSeelig, PMDA  
MBell JSurmeier LHowell CCain DCorley, OC  
HThompson EDO r/f MWeber DWM r/f DWM t/f  
JAustin DGillen DIR r/f MBridgers, EDO RBangart, SP  
KCyr, OGC CPoland

Path & File Name: S:\DWM\URB\MHF\STOFUT.RSP

\*SEE PREVIOUS CONCURRENCE

*Bel 10/11*

OFC	URB*	URB*	TECH*	DWM	OGC*	OSP	NMSS
NAME	MFliegel	JHolonich	EKraus	JGreaves	NLO /Fonner	RBangart	MKnapp
DATE	10/10/96	10/10/96	10/09/96	10/10/96	10/ /96	10/15/96	10/ /96

OFC	NMSS	EDO	EDO	OCM
NAME	CPaperiello	HThompson	JTaylor	SJackson
DATE	10/16/96	10/ /96	10/ /96	10/ /96

In small Box on "DATE:" line enter: M = E-Mail Distribution Copy H = Hard Copy  
OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

D. Nielson

3

indicate that NRC is committed to working with the State of Utah. I trust that this reply responds to your concerns and clarifies NRC's position.

Sincerely,

Shirley Ann Jackson

Enclosure:

Response to State of Utah, dated 9/16/96

cc: Don Ostler, UDWQ  
Larry Mize, UDWQ  
Bill Sinclair, UDRC  
Peter Heaney, Grand County Council

TICKET #: EDO 96727

DISTRIBUTION: File Center PUBLIC NMSS r/f URB r/f CSeelig, PMDA  
MBell JSurmeier LHowell CCain DCorley, OC  
HThompson EDO r/f MWeber DWM r/f DWM t/f  
JAustin DGillen DIR r/f MBridgers, EDO RBangart, SP  
KCyr, OGC CPoland

Path & File Name: S:\DWM\URB\MHF\STOFUT.RSP

\*SEE PREVIOUS CONCURRENCE

OFC	URB*	URB*	TECH*	DWM	OGC	OSP	NMSS
NAME	MFliegel	JHolonich	EKraus	JGreeves	Janner	RBangart	MKnapp
DATE	10/10/96	10/10/96	10/09/96	10/ /96	10/ /96	10/ /96	10/ /96

OFC	NMSS	EDO	EDO	OCM
NAME	CPaperiello	HThompson	JTaylor	SJackson
DATE	10/ /96	10/ /96	10/ /96	10/ /96

In small Box on "DATE:" line enter: M = E-Mail Distribution Copy H = Hard Copy  
OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

D. Nielson

4

In closing, I would like to note that although NRC and Utah may not always reach agreement on all issues, NRC has attempted to respond to concerns raised by the State. In addition, at the request of Mr. Bill Sinclair, the Director of the State of Utah Division of Radiation Control (DRC), the staff holds bimonthly calls with DRC to discuss the status of uranium recovery facilities in the State of Utah. NRC has also met with representatives from DRC to discuss issues of importance, and continues to work closely with DRC on significant issues such as the Atlas reclamation. I believe these NRC actions indicate that NRC is committed to working with the State of Utah. I trust that this reply responds to your concerns and clarifies NRC's position.

Sincerely,

Shirley Ann Jackson

Enclosure:

1. Response to State of Utah, dated 9/16/96
2. Memorandum of Understanding

cc: Don Ostler, UDWQ  
Larry Mize, UDWQ  
Bill Sinclair, UDRC  
Peter Heaney, Grand County Council

TICKET #: EDO 96727

DISTRIBUTION: File Center PUBLIC NMSS r/f URB r/f CSeelig, PMDA  
MBell JSurmeier LHowell CCain DCorley, OC  
HThompson EDO r/f MWeber DWM r/f DWM t/f  
JAustin DGillen DIR r/f MBridgers, EDO RBangart, SP  
KCyr, OGC CPoland CNWRA

Path & File Name: S:\DWM\URB\MHF\STOFUT.RSP

\*SEE PREVIOUS CONCURRENCE

OFC	URB*	URB*	TECH*	DWM*	OGC*	OSP*	NMSS
NAME	MFitegel	JHolonich	EKraus	JGreeves		RBangart	MKnapp
DATE	10/10/96	10/10/96	10/09/96	10/16/96	10/15/96	10/15/96	10/ /96

OFC	NMSS*	EDO	EDO	OCM
NAME	CPaperiello	HThompson	JTaylor	SJackson
DATE	10/16/96	10/ /96	10/ /96	10/ /96

In small Box on "DATE:" line enter: M = E-Mail Distribution Copy H = Hard Copy  
OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

D. Nielson

3

in the State of Utah. NRC has also met with representatives from DRC to discuss issues of importance, and continues to work closely with DRC on significant issues such as the Atlas reclamation. I believe these NRC actions indicate that NRC is committed to working with the State of Utah. I trust that this reply responds to your concerns and clarifies NRC's position.

Sincerely,

Shirley Ann Jackson

Enclosure:

1. Response to State of Utah, dated 9/16/96
2. Memorandum of Understanding

cc: Don Ostler, UDWQ  
Larry Mize, UDWQ  
Bill Sinclair, UDRC  
Peter Heaney, Grand County Council

TICKET #: EDO 96727

DISTRIBUTION: File Center PUBLIC NMSS r/f URB r/f CSeelig, PMDA  
MBell JSurmeier LHowell CCain DCorley, OC  
HThompson EDO r/f MWeber DWM r/f DWM t/f  
JAustin DGillen DIR r/f MBridgers, EDO RBangart, SP  
KCyr, OGC CPoland CNWRA

Path & File Name: S:\DWM\URB\MHF\STOFUT.RSP

\*SEE PREVIOUS CONCURRENCE

OFC	URB*	URB*	TECH*	DWM*	OGC*	OSP*	NMSS
NAME	MFliegel	JHolonich	EKraus	JGreeves		RBangart	MKnapp
DATE	10/10/96	10/10/96	10/09/96	10/16/96	10/15/96	10/15/96	10/ /96

OFC	NMSS*	EDO	EDO	OCM
NAME	UPaperiello	HThompson	JTaylor	SJackson
DATE	10/16/96	10/ /96	10/ /96	10/ /96

In small Box on "DATE:" line enter: M = E-Mail Distribution Copy H = Hard Copy  
OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

indicate that NRC is committed to working with the State of Utah. I trust that this reply responds to your concerns and clarifies NRC's position.

Sincerely,

Shirley Ann Jackson

Enclosure:

Response to State of Utah, dated 9/16/96

cc: Don Ostler, UDWQ  
Larry Mize, UDWQ  
Bill Sinclair, UDRC  
Peter Heaney, Grand County Council

TICKET #: EDO 96727

DISTRIBUTION: File Center PUBLIC NMSS r/f URB r/f CSeelig, PMDA  
MBel JSurmeier LHowell CCain DCorley, OC  
HThompson JTaylor EDO r/f MWeber DWM r/f  
JAustin DGillen DIR r/f MBridgers, EDO

Path & File Name: S:\DWM\URB\MHF\STOFUT.RSP

\*SEE PREVIOUS CONCURRENCE

OFC	URB*	URB*	TECH*	DWM	OGC	OSP	NMSS
NAME	MFlegel	JHolonich	EKraus	JGreeves		RBangart	MKnapp
DATE	10/10/96	10/10/96	10/09/96	10/ /96	10/ /96	10/ /96	10/ /96

OFC	NMSS	EDO	EDO	OCM
NAME	CPaperiello	HThompson	JTaylor	SJackson
DATE	10/ /96	10/ /96	10/ /96	10/ /96

In small Box on "DATE:" line enter: M = E-Mail Distribution Copy H = Hard Copy  
OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

D. Nielson

3

indicate that NRC is committed to working with the State of Utah. I trust that this reply responds to your concerns and clarifies NRC's position.

Sincerely,

Shirley Ann Jackson

Enclosure:

Response to State of Utah, dated 9/16/96

cc: Don Ostler, UDWQ  
Larry Mize, UDWQ  
Bill Sinclair, UDRC  
Peter Heaney, Grand County Council

TICKET #: EDO 96727

DISTRIBUTION: File Center PUBLIC NMSS r/f URB r/f CSeelig, PMDA  
MBel JSurmeier LHJwell CCain DCorley, OC  
HThompson JTaylor EDO r/f MWeber DWM r/f  
JAustin DGillen DIR r/f MBridgers, EDO

Path & File Name: S:\DWM\URB\MHF\STOFUT.RSP

\*SEE PREVIOUS CONCURRENCE

OFC	URB	URB	TECH*	DWM	OGC	NMSS	NMSS
NAME	MFliegel	JHolovich	EKraus	JGreeves		MKnapp	CPaperiello
DATE	10/ /96	10/ /96	10/09/96	10/ /96	10/ /96	10/ /96	10/ /96

OFC	EDO	EDO	OCM
NAME	HThompson	JTaylor	SJackson
DATE	10/ /96	10/ /96	10/ /96

In small Box on "DATE:" line enter: M = E-Mail Distribution Copy H = Hard Copy  
OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

the NRC was willing to consider implementing some of the State of Utah requests, it would only do so if the NRC believed taking the action was necessary to protect public health and safety, and the NRC could provide a sound technical and regulatory basis for the action.

However, the agreement being advocated by the State of Utah would have NRC implement all of the State of Utah requirements. This approach would require NRC to revise its groundwater program, including changes to the NRC regulations. Because the current NRC program is protective of public health and safety, the NRC informed the State of Utah that it did not plan to undertake any regulatory actions beyond those currently in the Federal program. The NRC encouraged the State of Utah to review the requirements being implemented as part of the Federal program, and see if the State could reduce its regulatory oversight. As an alternative, the State of Utah could consider becoming an Agreement State for uranium recovery facilities. This would allow the State of Utah to implement any program it believed was necessary to regulate groundwater quality.

In closing, I would like to note that although the NRC and Utah may not always reach agreement on all issues, NRC has attempted to respond to concerns raised by the State. In addition, at the request of Mr. Bill Sinclair, the Director of the State of Utah Division of Radiation Control (DRC), the NRC staff holds bimonthly calls with DRC to discuss the status of uranium recovery facilities in the State of Utah. The NRC has also met with representatives from DRC to discuss issues of importance, and continues to work closely with DRC on significant issues such as the Atlas reclamation. I think these actions on the part of the NRC indicate that we are committed to working with the State of Utah. I trust that this reply responds to your concerns and clarifies NRC's position.

Sincerely,

Shirley Ann Jackson

Enclosure: Response to State of Utah, dated 9/16/96

cc: Don Ostler, UDWQ  
Larry Mize, UDWQ  
Bill Sinclair, UDRC  
Peter Heaney, Grand County Council

TICKET #: EDO 96727

DISTRIBUTION: File Center PUBLIC NMSS r/f URB r/f CSeelig, PMDA  
NBel JSurmeier LHowell CCain DCorley, OC  
HThompson JTaylor SDO r/f MWeber DWM r/f  
JAustin DGillen DIR r/f MBridgers, EDO

Path & File Name: S:\DWM\URB\PMF\STOFUT.RSP

OPC	URB	TECH	DWM	NMSS	NMSS	NMSS	EDO
NAME	JHolonich	EKris	MFederline	JGreeves	MKnapp	CPaperiello	HThompson
DATE	10/ /96	10/ /96	10/ /96	10/ /96	10/ /96	10/ /96	10/ /96
OPC	EDO	OCM					
NAME	JTaylor	SJackson					
DATE	10/09/96	10/09/96					

In small box on "DATE:" line enter: M = E-Mail Distribution Copy H = Hard Copy  
OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

URANIUM RECOVERY BRANCH  
Routing and Transmittal Slip

Date:

NAME:	INITIALS	DATE
1. Myron Fliegel	MF	10/19/96
2. Joseph Holonich		10/19/96
3. Ellen Kraus		10/09/96
4. John Greeves	JG	10/11/96
5. OGC		10/ /96
6. Richard Bangart	RLB	10/15/96
7. Malcom Knapp		10/ /96
8. Carl Paperiello		10/ /96
9. Hugh Thompson		10/ /96
10. James Taylor		10/ /96
11. Shirley Jackson		10/ /96
SUBJECT: RESPONSE TO SEPTEMBER 16, 1996, LETTER ON URANIUM RECOVERY		
Originator: Myron Fliegel		Location: T-7 Room J9
Secretary: Sophia Gilchrist		Phone: 415-7238
DOCUMENT NAME: S:\DWM\URB\MHF\STOFUT.RSP		

TICKET #: EDO 96727

Due to the EDO 10/18/97

Due to NMSS 10/15/97

nmss due date extended  
to 10/16 (noon)

# ACTION

## EDO Principal Correspondence Control

FROM: Dianne R. Nielson  
Utah Department of Environmental Quality

DUE: 10/08/96

EDO CONTROL: GT96727  
DOC DT: 09/16/96  
FINAL REPLY:

TO:

Chairman Jackson

FOR SIGNATURE OF :

\*\* GRN \*\*

CRC NO: 96-1018

Chairman Jackson

DESC:

NRC URANIUM RECOVERY PROGRAM

ROUTING:

Taylor  
Milhoan  
Thompson  
Blaha  
Bangart, SP  
Cyr, OGC

DATE: 09/25/96

ASSIGNED TO:

CONTACT:

NMSS

Paperiello

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS OR REMARKS:

*1 wk extension  
due to C.P.  
10/10/96  
EDO - 10/15*

DWM Action	
Due to NMSS	Director's Office
By	10/3/96
Rec'd	9/25/96

ACTION: GILLEN

Due to DWM

Director's Office: 10/2/96

CC: FEDERLINE  
HOLONICH  
DAVIS

9/26

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
CORRESPONDENCE CONTROL TICKET

PAPER NUMBER: CRC-96-1018                      LOGGING DATE: Sep 25 96  
ACTION OFFICE: EDO  
AUTHOR: DIANNE NIELSON  
AFFILIATION: UTAH  
ADDRESSEE: CHAIRMAN JACKSON  
LETTER DATE: Sep 16 96                      FILE CODE: MHS-11  
SUBJECT: JULY 29, 1996 COMMISSION BRIEFING ON THE URANIUM  
RECOVERY PROGRAM: STATE OF UTAH REPLY  
ACTION: Signature of Chairman  
DISTRIBUTION: CHAIRMAN, COMRS, RF  
SPECIAL HANDLING: SECY TO ACK  
CONSTITUENT:  
NOTES: OCM #5370  
DATE DUE: Oct 9 96  
SIGNATURE: .                      DATE SIGNED:  
AFFILIATION:

EDO -- GT96727



DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY  
OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Michael O. Leavitt  
Governor

Dianne R. Nielson, Ph.D.  
Executive Director

Brent C. Bradford  
Deputy Director

168 North 1950 West  
P.O. Box 144810  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-4810  
(801) 536-4400 Voice  
(801) 536-0061 Fax  
(801) 536-4414 T.D.D.

September 16, 1996

Dr. Shirley Jackson, Chairman  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001

Re: July 29, 1996 Commission Briefing on the Uranium Recovery Program: **State of Utah Reply.**

Dear Dr. Jackson:

We have reviewed certain comments made by NRC staff before the Commission during a briefing of July 29, 1996 regarding the NRC Uranium Recovery Program (August 19, 1996 NRC transcripts). Some of these statements referred to the State of Utah's Radiation Control Program, and appear to be out of context. Consequently, we would like to share with you our views and experience on these matters.

The transcripts of that meeting state that:

*"... In Utah, we have been working with Utah on mainly the Atlas site. We haven't had as much success there. The state would like us to take over regulation of all the groundwater, including implementation of its groundwater standards, the state groundwater standards and state surface water standards. We couldn't do that.*

*The state didn't feel comfortable, then, with having a double regulator there. We have been continuing to work with the state, continuing a dialogue with the state. We have not had as much success."*

Our purpose from the beginning has been to avoid a dual regulatory situation for the Atlas and other uranium mill tailings facilities in Utah. We believe this is in the best interest of both the uranium industry and the Utah public, providing certain regulatory issues and differences could be resolved.

We first brought our concerns to the attention of the NRC staff in a request for a meeting dated March 22, 1995. Later, this meeting was held in Salt Lake City on June 12, 1995. In attendance were Messrs. Joe Holonich, Mike Layton, and Mike Fliegel of the NRC, and staff of the Utah Divisions of Radiation Control (DRC) and Water Quality (DWQ). During this meeting State concerns related to groundwater quality protection and uranium mills were presented to the NRC staff. Central to the discussion were certain regulatory gaps or differences between the State and NRC groundwater requirements, which the State hoped could be filled, resolved, or reconciled; and thereby avoid the need for dual jurisdiction over uranium mill sites. At the conclusion of this meeting, it was our understanding that the NRC staff would evaluate our concerns, confer with legal counsel, and respond to us in a timely manner.



9610100196 GPP

After nearly a year had passed without feedback from the NRC, Messrs. Holonich and Fliegel were invited to return to Salt Lake City and update us on any progress they had made regarding our earlier concerns. This meeting was held in Salt Lake City on June 4, 1996, in conjunction with a meeting with Atlas Corporation regarding the State's comments on the recent NRC Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Draft Technical Evaluation Report. During this meeting we discovered that our original concerns were largely unsatisfied by the NRC staff. In addition, the NRC staff elaborated on other short-comings of the NRC regulations, which expanded the number of State issues and concerns held. The major State issues identified during the course of both of these meetings with your staff are summarized below.

1. Narrow Definition of "Hazardous Constituent": Contaminant Detectability - NRC Criterion 5B(2) unduly restricts the definition of a "hazardous constituent" by requiring that a uranium mill tailings contaminant:
  - A. Be reasonably expected in the waste, and
  - B. Have been already detected in groundwater at the facility, and
  - C. Be listed in NRC Criterion 13.

Our concern here is that many mill tailings contaminants are retarded during groundwater flow and transport processes. Consequently, if the determination of the presence of a contaminant in groundwater is undertaken only once, early in a facility's life, and then only in monitoring wells at the perimeter of a facility; retarded contaminants could later be released by the facility which would go unregulated by the NRC. Such unregulated and unmonitored release has the potential of causing adverse impact to human health and the environment.

Contrary to the NRC's approach, the State Ground Water Quality Protection Regulations require the facility to define all contaminants in the waste form which could potentially be leached and discharged to groundwater. Thereafter, periodic monitoring of the full suite of tailings contaminants, including retarded species, can be required for the protection of human health and the environment.

During a June 4, 1996 meeting, Mr. Holonich of your staff informed us that this issue would soon be brought to your attention. We anticipate that this issue could easily be resolved by periodic groundwater monitoring for a complete suite of uranium mill tailings contaminants and addition of detected contaminants via license amendment, as necessary. We encourage the Commission to carefully consider and resolve this issue relative to the NRC uranium mill tailings regulations.

2. Missing Non-radiologic Contaminants in NRC Criterion 13 - As described above, the NRC does not regulate groundwater contaminants at uranium mill sites unless they are listed in 10 CFR 40, Appendix A, Criterion 13.

Currently NRC Criterion 13 does not include several non-radiological contaminants of human health concern at uranium mill tailings, which are regulated by the Utah Ground Water Quality Protection (GWQP) Regulations (Utah Administrative Code [UAC], R317-6), including, but not limited to: ammonia, copper, fluoride, manganese, nitrate, nitrite, pH, total dissolved solids

(TDS), vanadium, and zinc. Most of these contaminants are regulated under the State GWQP Regulations by direct groundwater quality standards (copper, nitrate, nitrite, pH, TDS, and zinc, see UAC R317-6-2). State GWQP Regulations also allow the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) to set groundwater protection criteria for other contaminants where human health or other environmental criteria are available (ammonia, manganese, and vanadium, see UAC R317-6-2.2). The NRC lack of discrete groundwater protection standards for these non-radiological contaminants appears to be an important missing element in the NRC regulations.

During our June 12, 1995 meeting, Mr. Mike Layton of your staff informed us that Criterion 13 provides flexibility for the Commission to determine other "hazardous constituents", as follows (10 CFR 40 Appendix A, Criterion 13 preamble):

*"... The Commission does not consider the following list imposed by 40 CFR Part 192 to be exhaustive and may determine other constituents to be hazardous on a case-by-case basis, independent of those specified by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency in Part 192."*

However, after compilation of the minutes from our June 12, 1995, the NRC staff made no commitment to the State to evaluate or include the additional non-radiological mill tailings contaminants of interest (see Utah DEQ/NRC June 12, 1995 Meeting Minutes, p.4). This position was reinforced during our June 4, 1996 meeting, wherein Mr. Holonich informed us that the NRC would not evaluate our concerns in this matter; and reiterated that the burden to substantiate any cause for our concerns rested with the State of Utah.

This position appears recalcitrant, inflexible, and feeble in that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has already established human health and environmental protection standards and criteria for all of these non-radiologic contaminants of concern thru regulations promulgated under the Clean Water and Safe Drinking Water Acts. Furthermore, State surface and ground water quality protection standards and criteria for these contaminants have been derived in large part from existing and applicable EPA standards and requirements. As a result, State ground and surface water quality protection standards are protective of human health and the environment.

3. Inclusion of Mill Site Facilities in Groundwater Monitoring, Characterization, and Corrective Action - State Groundwater Quality Protection Regulations allow regulation of a broad range and types of discharges to groundwater, including areas wherein effluent or leachate has been stored, applied, disposed of, or discharged (UAC R317-6-1.28). This approach to groundwater pollution control allows regulation of both uranium mill tailings embankments and mill site related facilities. Examples of such mill related facilities include: raffinate ponds; ore stockpiles; reagent storage tanks, facilities, and related conveyances; and storm water retention ponds which may receive effluents or reagent spills.

Common sense dictates that these related sources of potential groundwater pollution must also be managed and controlled at uranium mill sites in order to prevent groundwater contamination. Furthermore, in the event of mill closure these related facilities must also be evaluated to assess any adverse impact to groundwater quality possibly caused by historical releases.

During our June 12, 1995 meeting with your staff, Mr. Holonich agreed to consult with NRC General Counsel to investigate the agency's authority to regulate such related mill site facilities. Later, in our June 4, 1996 meeting Mr. Holonich informed us that these related mill facilities could only be included under a NRC cleanup action if they were located immediately above the groundwater flow path of tailings embankment contaminants.

Mr. Holonich also alluded that NRC Criterion 5F could allow investigation of potential groundwater contamination in and around an existing uranium mill site; but that groundwater cleanup standards could not be mandated under the NRC regulations for these related facilities. Mr. Holonich also added that the NRC could look to the requirements of Criterion 5B to address such issues. However, our review of this requirement shows Criterion 5B focuses only on uranium tailings impoundments.

Consequently, we have concluded that the NRC regulations are essentially mute on the issue of groundwater pollution around mill site related facilities; particularly if these potential discharge points are located beyond the influence of the tailings embankment. Based on this situation and information from NRC staff, it appears that State regulation of groundwater under mill site facilities may be necessary to protect State groundwater and surface water resources.

4. NRC Lack of Surface Water Quality Standards for Mill Tailings - During our June 4, 1996 meeting, Mr. Holonich made it clear that the NRC regulations for uranium mill tailings have no water quality standards for the protection of the State's surface water. Our review of the NRC rules found in 10 CFR 40, Appendix A has confirmed this statement. Consequently, it appears that a NRC radioactive materials license cannot impose surface water quality standards for a uranium mill or tailings facility.

In contrast, Utah DEQ is a primacy state under the EPA National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). Consequently, primary authority for protection of Utah's surface water quality lies with DEQ. Implied in our primacy status is EPA's determination that Utah's surface water quality protection regulations are equivalent to EPA standards and criteria and protective of human health and the environment.

After consideration of the proximity of the Atlas Minerals uranium mill tailings site to the Colorado River, the lack of NRC surface water quality authority and regulations, and the State's primacy status and authority in this area further reinforces the need and obligation for the State to impose its regulations in order to protect human health and the environment.

5. NRC Inability to Regulate and Cleanup Groundwater Pollution Pre-dating 1978 - During our June 4, 1996 meeting, Mr. Holonich informed us that the NRC cannot regulate polluted groundwater at uranium mill tailings embankment, if the licensee can demonstrate this pollution was caused by the disposal facilities or operations prior to 1978, i.e., promulgation of the Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act (UMTRCA).

At the time UMTRCA was promulgated in 1978, the Atlas Minerals facility near Moab, Utah had been in operation for nearly 22 years. Consequently, there is a significant possibility that ground and surface water pollution exists at the Atlas facility which may have been caused by tailings

leachates discharged to groundwater before 1978. In such a case, the NRC would have no authority to require cleanup of such pre-existing ground and surface water pollution. This apparent NRC impotence further reinforces the need for the State to impose its authority at uranium mill tailings facilities that predated UMTRCA.

6. NRC Refusal to Enforce Voluntary Commitments by a Licensee - During our June 4, 1996 meeting we explored all possible avenues available to the State to avoid dual regulation of the Atlas Minerals facility. One option discussed was a State determination of measures necessary to protect ground and surface water resources near the Atlas facility; followed by an Atlas proposal to the NRC for a license amendment to include all the State determined measures. Thereafter, the NRC would enforce these voluntary commitments during normal administration of the license.

However, after lengthy discussion of this option, Mr. Holonich stated that the NRC would refuse to enforce voluntary license commitments that required licensee activity outside the requirements of 10 CFR 40, Appendix A. Furthermore, Mr. Holonich added that if the licensee, at a later date, proposed revoking any part of their previous voluntary commitments to the State, that the NRC would be obliged to approve such proposals.

This inability of the NRC to incorporate and enforce extra-ordinary licensing measures that could avoid the need for dual State/NRC regulation of this site, further reinforces our determination that State regulation of the Atlas facility is necessary.


Based on our previous meetings and discussions with your staff there appears to be little hope of satisfactory reconciliation of regulatory differences between the NRC and applicable State ground and surface water quality regulations for uranium mill and tailings facilities. As a consequence, DEQ will require three uranium mill facilities in Utah to secure State permits, including Atlas Minerals tailings near Moab, Utah; Energy Fuels Nuclear mill near Blanding, Utah, and the U.S. Energy Corporation mill near Tropic, Utah.

We hope that the above presentation regarding the basis and history of our ground and surface water quality concerns will show that Utah DEQ has made great efforts to avoid dual regulation of the uranium mill industry and establish a regulatory partnership with the NRC. Any suggestion that Utah DEQ has not sought to establish common regulatory efforts with NRC, or to look for innovative regulatory solutions to protect human health and the environment, is without merit or foundation.

Dr. Shirley Jackson, Chairman  
September 16, 1996  
Page 6

If you have any questions or comments regarding our ground or surface water quality concerns, or our experience in these matters, please call Mr. Bill Sinclair at the Utah Division of Radiation Control at (801) 536-4250.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Dianne R. Nielson".

Dianne R. Nielson, Ph.D.  
Executive Director

cc: Commissioner Rogers, NRC  
Commissioner Dicus, NRC  
Don Ostler, UDWQ  
Larry Mize, UDWQ  
John Greeves, NRC  
Joe Holonich, NRC  
Richard Bangart, NRC OSP  
Bill Sinclair, UDRC  
Peter Heaney, Grand County Council

F:\NRC\GW\nrccom.ltr

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION RESPONSE TO  
STATE OF UTAH CONCERNS IN SEPTEMBER 16, 1996,  
LETTER TO CHAIRMAN SHIRLEY JACKSON

Item 1: Narrow Definition of "Hazardous Constituent": Contaminant Detectability

There are actually two issues identified under this item.

1.a) NRC Criterion 5B(2) unduly restricts the definition of a "hazardous constituent."

Response:

The definition comes directly from U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) standards in 40 CFR Part 192.

1.b) The determination of whether a constituent meets the definition of "hazardous constituent" is made only once, early in a facility's life. Consequently, slow moving constituents, that may contaminate groundwater after the initial determination of "hazardous constituents," are not monitored and could, therefore, be unregulated.

Response:

All uranium mills with contaminated groundwater are currently under a corrective action program (CAP). These CAPs require that licensees monitor the groundwater for constituents that were identified as "hazardous constituents" when the programs were developed in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Requiring routine monitoring of constituents that were not identified as "hazardous constituents" when the CAPs were accepted is not necessary for three reasons. First, the CAPs that are currently in place work to reduce groundwater contamination for all constituents that are present, not just those being monitored. Second, before terminating the license for a uranium mill site, the staff will require licensees to demonstrate that all constituents found in the tailings are within standards in the groundwater. Finally, requiring monitoring of additional constituents does not directly result in additional protection of public health and safety. All the monitoring does is confirm what the amount of any constituent is in the groundwater. It is the CAP that reduces the amount of contamination in the groundwater, and thus helps protect the public health and safety.

Item 2: Missing Non-radiologic Contaminants in Criterion 13

NRC Criterion 13 does not include several non-radiological contaminants, including ammonia, copper, fluoride, manganese, nitrate, pH, total dissolved solids (TDS), vanadium, and zinc, which are regulated by the Utah Ground Water Quality Protection Regulations.

Response:

As was correctly noted in the State of Utah letter, the NRC has the ability to regulate other constituents beyond those listed in Criterion 13. At the time NRC reviewed the groundwater CAPs, the staff concluded that there was no need to go beyond the list of constituents found in Criterion 13 and in the tailings liquid, for most sites. To date, NRC does not have any reason to revisit those earlier decisions. However, as changes are made to CAPs, or final monitoring is done at the time of license termination, the staff will consider, based on a sound technical and regulatory basis, what, if any, additional constituents should be included.

It should be noted that the State of Utah equates the elimination of dual regulation with its proposal to have NRC pick up all responsibility for groundwater protection at uranium mills. During the June 1996 meeting, the staff tried to explain that concurrent jurisdiction is an area where both NRC and the State of Utah share regulation of the same nonradiological constituents. For those constituents regulated solely by the State of Utah, and not in NRC regulations or license conditions, there are no concurrent jurisdictional issues. The State of Utah is the sole regulatory authority. This is the case for constituents that are in the State of Utah standards, but are not in NRC regulations. The State of Utah proposal would do more than eliminate dual regulation. It would also shift the regulation of State of Utah groundwater standards to NRC, and remove the State of Utah from any review or enforcement of its own standards.

Item 3: Inclusion of Mill Site Facilities in Groundwater Monitoring, Characterization, and Corrective Action

The NRC does not have any standards for cleanup of groundwater contamination from sources other than the tailings.

Response:

The State of Utah letter does not accurately portray the NRC regulatory authority over groundwater contamination from sources other than the tailings. In past meetings with the State of Utah, the staff explained that the Commission has established standards for the cleanup of groundwater contamination from byproduct material in the tailings impoundment. However, these standards are not applicable to the cleanup of groundwater contamination solely from other activities within the mill site, such as ore storage or yellowcake storage. Groundwater contamination resulting from sources other than the tailings impoundment can be addressed through 10 CFR Part 40, Appendix A, Criterion 5(F). Under Criterion 5(F), uranium mill licensees would be required to address seepage of contaminants into the groundwater from sources other than byproduct material. Further, Criterion 5(F) specifies that the cleanup standards for this contamination would be determined on a site-specific basis. The staff informed the State of Utah that it would use the standards in Criterion 5(B) to help ensure that all groundwater would be cleaned up to comparable standards. The staff has not identified any mill site where there is groundwater contamination that cannot be attributed to the tailings impoundment. Because of the close proximity of the mill buildings to the tailings impoundments, the staff concludes that there would not be separate contamination plumes from the mill buildings. As such, the staff is currently applying the standards in Criterion 5(B) to all groundwater cleanup.

Item 4: NRC Lack of Surface Water Quality Standards for Mill Tailings

The NRC does not have standards for the regulation of surface water.

Response:

The State of Utah correctly notes that the NRC does not have standards for the regulation of surface water potentially contaminated by leakage from the facility. Therefore, the State of Utah states that it will impose its own regulatory program. However, NRC groundwater standards provide protection of surface water. Each constituent must meet one of three standards at the point of compliance in the groundwater: 1) background concentration; 2) the maximum concentration level established by EPA and identified in Criterion 5C; or 3) an alternate concentration limit (ACL) established by NRC. If either one of the first two standards is met in the groundwater, for a constituent, surface water will be protected. To establish an ACL for a constituent, NRC must consider nine factors relating to potential adverse effects on groundwater quality and nine factors relating to potential adverse effects on hydraulically connected surface water quality. Therefore, although it is technically correct to state that NRC does not have surface water standards, the regulatory framework in Criterion 5 is protective of surface water. It should be noted that because NRC does not have standards for surface water, there is no concurrent jurisdiction in this area, and thus no dual regulation. The State of Utah is the sole regulator.

Planned discharges to surface waters are regulated under 10 CFR Part 20 for radiological hazards. The State of Utah is correct that NRC does not have the authority to regulate the chemical hazards of planned discharges to surface water. The State of Utah, through its National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit authority, would regulate planned surface water discharges with respect to chemical hazards.

Item 5: NRC Inability to Regulate and Cleanup Groundwater Pollution Pre-dating 1978.

If licensees can show that off-site groundwater contamination occurred prior to 1978, then the NRC does not have any regulatory authority over it.

Response:

The State of Utah letter does not accurately state the NRC position on this matter. It is correct that NRC did not have authority over byproduct material until the passage of the Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act of 1978. As such, licensees do not have to clean up off-site contamination if they can show that all the contamination occurred before 1978. However, if this demonstration cannot be made, and this is usually very difficult to show, NRC will continue to regulate the cleanup of contaminated groundwater beyond the mill site boundary. The State of Utah does not acknowledge this important distinction.

Item 6: NRC Refusal to Enforce Voluntary Commitments by a Licensee

The NRC staff refused to enforce voluntary commitments made by licensees.

Response:

The State of Utah portrayal of this situation is not an accurate description of the NRC position. NRC staff explained to the State of Utah during the June 4, 1996, meeting, that although licensees may propose many commitments in their groundwater CAPs, NRC may not want to include all these commitments in a license condition. Many considerations help determine what commitments should be placed in a license condition. Some of these considerations include: 1) a sound technical basis to include the commitments; 2) consistent and appropriate application of the regulatory program; 3) inspectability of the licensee commitment; and 4) the obligation of enforcing license conditions, regardless of the basis for the condition.

NRC has further considered this item and concludes that it could include voluntary reporting commitments in a license. License conditions would have to be carefully written, taking into account the considerations identified above. Enforcement of commitments that have no basis in NRC regulations could present problems; therefore, commitments that are needed for compliance with State of Utah standards would be the responsibility of the State to enforce. However, the staff is prepared to work with Utah in this area.

As noted in the response to Item 1, including all constituents that the State of Utah believes should be covered by a groundwater CAP may not be necessary to protect the public health and safety. Current actions NRC requires under its groundwater regulations do in fact, protect the public health and safety. Adding more constituents to an ongoing licensee program may not be justified when the cost to satisfy the requirement is compared to a potential, small benefit from the level of added protection of the public health and safety. In addition, as also noted in the response to Item 1, having NRC take on the burden of imposing all the State of Utah groundwater requirements does more than eliminate dual regulation. It would also shift the regulation of State of Utah groundwater standards to NRC.

**DRAFT**

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING  
BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
AND THE STATE OF UTAH  
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

1. Purpose. This Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") is intended to provide a framework for voluntary cooperation between the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission ("NRC") and the State of Utah, Department of Environmental Quality (UDEQ) to minimize or eliminate the dual regulation of groundwater at uranium mills in the State of Utah.
2. Regulatory Authority. The NRC regulates radiological and non-radiological hazards of byproduct material as confined in Section 11e.(2) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 2011 et seq. The UDEQ administers and enforces Utah's environmental statutes over the radiological hazards of 11e.(2) byproduct material.
3. Designation of Site Coordinators. Within ninety (90) days after execution of this MOU, each agency will designate a site coordinator for each uranium recovery mill or 11e.(2) byproduct disposal site identified in Appendix A. Each agency shall notify the other, in writing, of the name, address, telephone and facsimile numbers of each site coordinator. Any changes in the designation of a coordinator will be communicated in writing to the other agency.
4. Meetings and Conference Calls between the Agencies. At the request of either agency, with reasonable notice, a meeting or conference call will be scheduled between the site coordinators and other agency representatives to discuss coordination of actions related to groundwater restoration work or 11e.(2) byproduct disposal at uranium mills covered by this agreement.
5. Technical and Regulatory Consultation. At the request of either agency, with reasonable notice, representatives of each will be made available to discuss technical or regulatory matters pertaining to groundwater restoration work at the sites covered under this agreement.
6. Meetings with the Public. Except in response to site emergencies, each agency will notify the other, at least two weeks in advance, of any public meeting related to groundwater restoration activities at sites covered by this agreement.
7. Meetings with Other Regulatory Entities. At its discretion, either agency may invite representatives of the other agency to attend meetings with other regulatory entities who share some responsibility for the groundwater restoration at sites covered under this MOU. At a minimum, both parties of this MOU will keep the other informed of such meetings and the results of those meetings. [It should be noted that the NRC has an Open Meeting policy which would require these meetings to be open to the public because they would almost always involve discussions concerning a specific licensee (Open Meeting Statement of NRC Staff Policy, 59 Federal Register 48340, 9/20/94)].
8. Notice of Site Inspections. Each agency will make a good faith effort to coordinate routine site inspections of groundwater restoration activities at sites covered under this agreement by providing two weeks

**DRAFT**

Enclosure 2

DRAFT

advance notice (when possible) to the other agency.

9. Dissemination of Information to Other Agencies. As necessary to effectively implement oversight of operations, remediation, and decommissioning of sites covered under this agreement, the agencies will coordinate pertinent and appropriate dissemination of information to other Federal, State and local government agencies.

10. Exchange of Information Between Agencies.

A. The agencies will exchange information concerning groundwater restoration of uranium recovery mills and 11e.(2) byproduct disposal sites as follow:

i. Upon request, NRC will make available to UDEQ for review and copying any documents disclosable to the public under the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552, NRC regulations in 10 CFR Part 9, Public Records, and in 10 CFR Part 2.790, public inspections, exemptions, requests for withholding, and any other applicable Federal statute, regulation, or policy.

ii. Upon request, UDEQ will make available to the NRC for review and copying any documents disclosable to the public under the [insert appropriate state policy] UDEQ's public information policy, and any other applicable Utah statute, regulation, or policy.

B. All documents exchanged by the agencies will be addressed to the designated coordinator for the each site.

C. Nothing in this MOU shall be construed as compelling either agency to produce information or documents which the agency deems confidential or privileged.

11. Disclosure of Information to the Public. The right of access by the public to information under Federal and State law, regulation, or policy is not affected by this MOU.

12. Designation of Single Regulator for Groundwater Restoration.

A. It is agreed that the lead agency for developing a regulatory program for groundwater restoration at uranium mills shall be the NRC. The regulations and standards that NRC will use in its regulatory program will be those contained in 10 CFR Part 40, Appendix A.

B. The NRC will be the lead agency for setting standards other than those contained in 10 CFR Part 40, Appendix A. This could include standards for constituents not currently covered in 10 CFR Part 40, Appendix A, as well as background limits or alternate concentration limits for any constituent regulated by NRC under this agreement. It is agreed that the final determination of any limits for groundwater clean up rest with NRC. If the State of Utah does not agree with the NRC's final determination, it can choose to implement its own regulatory program. However, if the State of Utah does not notify NRC in writing within 60 days of the final NRC position, then the State of Utah agrees that it will not require any additional clean up by the United States Department of Energy (DOE), if DOE is the long-term care custodian for the site.

C. The evaluation of any groundwater clean up program, or any

DRAFT

DRAFT

modification to an already accepted program, will be the responsibility of the NRC. The NRC will be the lead agency for determining the acceptability of any program, or modification. If the State of Utah does not agree with the NRC's final determination, it can choose to implement its own regulatory program, and require additional groundwater corrective actions. However, if the State of Utah does not notify NRC in writing within 60 days of the final NRC position, that Utah plans to undertake its own regulatory program, then the NRC position will be accepted as final by both agencies.

D. On occasion, and when the NRC determines there is a sound technical and regulatory basis to do so, NRC will implement the flexibility provided in 10 CFR Part 40, Appendix A, and will expand the list of constituents contained in 10 CFR Part 40, Appendix A, Criterion 13.

E. The State of Utah agrees that it will not petition to intervene or participate in any hearing on licensing matters before the NRC that are covered by this MOU.

13. Modifications. Any modifications or changes to this MOU shall only be effective if agreed to by the parties and set forth in writing as an amendment of this MOU.

14. Reservation of Rights. Nothing in this MOU shall affect the rights, duties and authority of either agency under the law. The agencies reserve their respective authority and rights to take any enforcement action which they deem necessary to fulfill their duties and responsibilities under the law.

15. Non-binding Memorandum. This memorandum is not intended to and does not create any contractual rights or obligations with respect to the NRC, UDEQ, or any other parties.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Carl J. Paperiello, Director  
Office of Nuclear Material Safety  
and Safeguards  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D.C.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Diane Nielson, Executive Director  
Department of Environmental Quality  
State of Utah  
Salt Lake City, Utah

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

DRAFT