

## **5.0 Cumulative Impacts**

This chapter addresses the potential for cumulative environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the on-site or off-site disposal alternatives and other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions in the affected region.

Council on Environmental Quality regulations implementing the procedural provisions of NEPA require federal agencies to consider the cumulative impacts of a proposal (40 CFR 1508.25[c]). A cumulative impact on the environment is the impact that would result from the incremental impact of an action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions, regardless of what agency (federal or non-federal) or person undertakes such other actions (40 CFR 1508.7). This type of assessment is important because significant cumulative impacts can result from several smaller actions that by themselves do not have significant impacts.

The on-site and off-site alternative locations under consideration are located in rural areas with no major industrial or commercial centers nearby. No past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future actions are anticipated to result in cumulative impacts when considered with the proposed alternative. However, other present and reasonably foreseeable future actions could result in cumulative impacts to the other sites when considered together with the on-site or off-site disposal alternatives. These actions are

- Seasonal tourism in and around Moab
- Widening of US-191 between Moab and Crescent Junction
- Planned Williams Petroleum Products pipeline project
- Ongoing activities at the White Mesa Mill site

These actions, and the potential for creating cumulative impacts, are addressed below.

### **5.1 Seasonal Tourism**

Several national parks are in the vicinity of the Moab site and the off-site alternatives. Arches National Park is adjacent to the north border of the Moab site, and Canyonlands National Park is approximately 12 miles southwest of the site. In 2002, 765,000 visitor days were recorded at Arches National Park; 41,524 of that number included at least one overnight stay. Most of the land in the area is open to recreational uses, and tourism is an important part of the Moab economy. Favorable weather allows recreational access for hikers, bikers, and off-highway vehicle users and others in all seasons. The Colorado River adjacent to the Moab site is a source of extensive recreational use for spring and summer water sports. The land directly south of the Moab site is often used by campers and hikers throughout the summer. Activities at the Moab site, together with tourism, could have a cumulative impact on traffic congestion (e.g., increases in truck traffic as high as 186 percent; see Table 2–28) in central Moab.

## **5.2 Widening of US-191**

US-191 has been upgraded to four lanes between Moab and the intersection of US-191 and SR-313. The upgrades also include adding two turn lanes at the entrance to Arches National Park, at Gemini Bridges, and at SR-313; adding a 2-mile-long bicycle lane on the northeast side of US-191; and adding center divides along some stretches of the highway. Because these upgrades were completed in 2004, and no definitive plans for additional improvements are known, it is unlikely that this highway construction project and the transport of uranium mill tailings from the Moab site would result in cumulative impacts.

## **5.3 Williams Petroleum Products Pipeline Project**

The Williams Petroleum Products pipeline project is a recently approved project that would extend from Bloomfield, New Mexico, to Salt Lake City, Utah. The pipeline project would include (1) converting approximately 220 miles of an existing natural gas pipeline system to transport refined petroleum products from Bloomfield to Crescent Junction and (2) constructing approximately 260 miles of new refined petroleum product pipeline extending west from Crescent Junction to a terminal just north of Salt Lake City. The Williams pipeline project was approved by BLM in a ROD signed October 12, 2001; however, construction has not begun because of ongoing litigation (Mackiewicz 2003). This pipeline project would include aboveground and underground facilities near the proposed Crescent Junction disposal site. However, according to the company, as of May of 2005 there are no plans to implement the Crescent Junction aspects of this project in the foreseeable future, and the schedule for the other aspects of the propose actions is uncertain.

The purpose of the Williams pipeline project would be to transport refined petroleum products from northwest New Mexico to intermediate storage locations at Crescent Junction and Nephi, Utah, and ultimately to a terminal north of Salt Lake City, where the petroleum products could be distributed to markets in Utah and western Colorado. The pipeline project is being designed to transport up to 75,000 barrels per day of gasoline, diesel, and jet fuel (a barrel of petroleum contains 42 gallons). The project would involve

- Converting 220 miles of existing 10- and 12-inch-diameter natural-gas pipelines to transport refined petroleum products from Bloomfield to a proposed terminal east of Crescent Junction.
- Constructing a new 12-inch refined-petroleum pipeline on a 50-ft-wide right-of-way extending from the new Crescent Junction terminal to a terminal with existing refineries in the north Salt Lake City area.
- Constructing new product terminals consisting of storage tanks and truck-loading facilities at Crescent Junction and Nephi.

The portion of the project between Bloomfield and Crescent Junction is further outlined below because this segment of the pipeline project could lead to future interactions with the disposal of mill tailings at the Crescent Junction site alternative.

The 220-mile, 10- and 12-inch conversion segment would extend north from Williams Kutz Pump Station near Bloomfield to the proposed Crescent Junction terminal near the US-191/I-70

junction. The existing 10- and 12-inch pipelines currently carry natural-gas products. These pipeline segments would be retrofitted by installing 43 motor and manual valves that could be used to shut down the pipeline in the event of a large leak or failure. In addition, a new pump station would be built on approximately 4 acres near DOE's proposed Crescent Junction site. The existing pipeline segments to be converted would be used in their present condition once the valves, end piping, and pump stations are completed. Because these sections already comply with current pipeline safety requirements, they are not subject to hydrostatic testing or inspection in association with the proposed change in service (DOI 2001). The existing pipelines are situated within an existing utility corridor that includes several other utility lines, including natural gas pipelines and electric transmission lines.

The new 12-inch pipeline segment would extend from the proposed Crescent Junction terminal to an existing terminal north of Salt Lake City. Proceeding west from Crescent Junction, the first 98 miles of new pipeline would be installed within a new 75-foot-wide construction right-of-way generally running parallel to an existing utility corridor. The construction right-of-way would revert to a 50-foot-wide permanent right-of-way after surface rehabilitation. This section of new pipeline would cross the Green River once and the Price River twice. The remaining sections of new pipeline extending from Price to the Salt Lake City area would also lie within existing utility corridors. These pipeline sections are not discussed further because these areas are a considerable distance from the actions associated with the Moab project.

If implemented as conceived, the Crescent Junction terminal would be constructed on a 65-acre tract of BLM-administered land in Section 26, T. 22 S., R. 19 E. This site is adjacent to existing railroad lines and just east of the US-191/I-70 junction. The terminal facility would include petroleum product storage tanks, a truck-loading rack, vapor combustion system, electrical substation, offices, and warehouse buildings, all to be situated within a 50-acre fenced area served by a new access road connecting to US-191. The terminal offices would house control equipment and serve as an office for station operations. A technician shop and product-testing laboratory building would also be constructed at this terminal facility. The total terminal tank storage capacity would be approximately 190,000 barrels. Tanks would include three gasoline storage tanks; two fuel oil storage tanks; individual storage tanks for gasoline mix, fuel oil mix, and butane; and one relief tank. All tanks would be enclosed within an earthen berm of sufficient height to contain 110 percent of the total contents of the largest tank. Initial products planned for truck loading and shipment include regular and premium unleaded gasoline and low-sulfur No. 2 fuel oil. Vapors produced during truck loading would be collected into a positive, closed-loop system and disposed of by combustion. Average throughput for truck dispatch is estimated to be approximately 10,000 barrels per day. On the basis of use of single trucks that could load 180 barrels per load, the expected truck traffic visits would likely range from 50 to 60 trucks per day.

The new pipeline would be built in three different pipeline construction spreads. The Crescent Junction-to-Price pump station spread is considered a high-production spread that would require about 90 to 150 workers. The new pipeline construction would involve several sequences of construction, starting with clearing and grading and ending with placement of final erosion-control features and reclamation. After ground clearing and leveling, heavy equipment would be brought in to dig ditches. Ditches could be open several days until the pipe is placed and backfilled. Typical soil cover depth after placement would be approximately 3 ft or less in rocky terrain. Pump stations would be located adjacent to the right-of-way, and construction would involve the installation of pump equipment and piping. The pumps would be connected to the pipeline by lateral lines, and shutoff valves would be installed to isolate the pump stations from

the pipeline in the event of an emergency. Construction of the Crescent Junction pump station would follow the same general construction procedures for the Crescent Junction terminal except that no large tanks or truck racks would be constructed. Approximately 20 to 50 workers would be needed to construct the proposed Crescent Junction pump station. Construction of the Crescent Junction terminal would require a construction crew of 20 to 30 workers for initial site work and 40 to 60 workers for tank erection and installation of the mechanical and electrical facilities. The terminal would require an estimated 8 to 12 months to complete. Construction crews would consist of general contractors, heavy equipment operators, pipe welders, electricians, instrumentation specialists, millwrights, laborers, and quality assurance specialists.

The completed pipeline would be patrolled from the air every 3 weeks at a minimum and at least 26 times per year. Williams would employ a leak-detection system integrated with its SCADA monitoring system. To help prevent external corrosion leading to leaks, a protective coating would be applied to the exterior of the new pipeline segments, and cathodic protection would be used on all pipeline segments to help minimize corrosion.

The impacts of constructing and operating the Williams pipeline project, including increases in truck traffic and consequences of an accident, could result in cumulative impacts when considered together with the impacts of constructing a uranium mill tailings disposal cell at the Crescent Junction site alternative. Even if both DOE and Williams decide to implement these projects at the same time, the magnitude of potential traffic impacts would be small, as the extent of overlapping use of roadways within the Crescent Junction area would be a mile or less before Williams employees would merge onto I-70 and no longer compete with DOE traffic.

## **5.4 Ongoing Operations at White Mesa Mill**

The White Mesa Mill site is a 5,415-acre parcel that is privately owned by IUC. On-site facilities consist of a uranium mill, uranium-ore storage pad, and four lined uranium mill-tailings disposal cells. Since 1997, the mill has processed more than 100,000 tons of uranium ore. Although mill operations and disposal of tailings from the Moab site would occur on the White Mesa Mill site, the two operations are not expected to result in cumulative doses to the workforces for each operation because there would be sufficient distance between the two operations. This expectation is based on the assumption that there would be two separate groups of workers: one group that would work exclusively on the IUC areas of the White Mesa facility and one group that would work exclusively on the disposal cell for the Moab tailings. For each group of workers, the radon and gamma dose would be predominantly from the tailings in their immediate vicinity, not from tailings located at a distance. For example, the radon dose from tailings in a person's immediate vicinity is about 10 times greater than the radon dose from tailings located in an adjacent cell. For gamma doses, the dose from tailings in a person's immediate vicinity is more than 10 times greater than the gamma doses from tailings located in an adjacent cell.

If IUC decides to expand its operations at the White Mesa Mill site, this expansion would result in an increase in the disturbed area and a potential increase in the disturbance of cultural resources. Although expansion is unlikely given the foreseeable business climate and the available capacity in the existing disposal cells, an expansion of the facility, together with the potential use of approximately 346 acres for a disposal cell for the Moab tailings, could result in cumulative impacts to cultural resources.

## **5.5 References**

40 CFR 1500-1508. Council on Environmental Quality, “Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act.”

DOI (U.S. Department of the Interior), 2001. *Final Environmental Impact Statement, Questar, Williams, and Kern River Pipeline Project*, June.

Mackiewicz, M., 2003. Personal communication, M. Mackiewicz, BLM Realty Specialist, Price (Utah) Field Office, with G. Karriker, S.M. Stoller Corporation, July 25.

End of current text

## **6.0 Unavoidable Impacts, Short-Term Uses and Long-Term Productivity, and Irreversible or Irrecoverable Commitment of Resources**

In addition to a discussion of the environmental impacts of the proposed action and a discussion of alternatives, NEPA requires that an EIS contain information on any adverse environmental impacts that are unavoidable, on short-term uses and long-term productivity of the environment, and on any irreversible or irretrievable commitment of resources.

### **6.1 Unavoidable Adverse Impacts**

Under all action alternatives, there would be a very slight increase in radiation doses to the public and workers as a result of remediation and disposal activities, which could result in a very slight increase in excess cancer risk based on a 5-year remediation period and a 30-year post remediation exposure period. For these activities, the highest increased total risk of a latent cancer fatality for the maximally exposed member of the public in Moab for the duration of the activities would be  $3.9E-3$  under the on-site disposal alternative; the total risk of a latent cancer fatality for the maximally exposed member of the public in Moab for the duration of the activities under the off-site disposal alternatives would be  $8.8E-3$ . In addition, radon exposures at the off-site disposal sites would result in a latent cancer fatality risk to the maximally exposed member of the public of  $2.2E-5$  at Klondike Flats,  $9.4E-5$  at Crescent Junction, and  $9.7E-6$  at White Mesa Mill.

For the population around Moab, the total risk of a latent cancer fatality would be 0.26 for the on-site disposal alternative. The total risk of a latent cancer fatality for the population around Moab for the off-site disposal alternatives would be 1.0 if the truck or rail transportation options were used, or 0.74 latent cancer fatalities if the slurry pipeline option were used. In addition, radon exposures at the off-site disposal sites would result in a latent cancer fatality risk of 0.014 for the population around Klondike, 0.010 for the population around Crescent Junction, and 0.015 for the population around White Mesa.

Under the action alternatives, it is estimated that there would be 12 latent cancer fatalities in the population exposed at vicinity properties. If the vicinity properties were not remediated, it is estimated that there would be 26 latent cancer fatalities in the population exposed at vicinity properties. For the maximally exposed individual at the vicinity properties, the risk of a latent cancer fatality is estimated to be 0.029 for the action alternatives and 0.067 if the vicinity properties were not remediated.

Under the action alternatives, there would be an unavoidable increase in truck and other construction-related traffic and traffic due to commuting workers. This unavoidable adverse impact would occur 5 to 7 days a week, would last for the duration of Moab site surface remediation activities (up to 8 years), and would primarily but not exclusively impact US-191. Off-site transportation of tailings by truck would result in the greatest increase in traffic. The highest traffic impacts would occur if tailings were trucked to White Mesa Mill. Under this disposal alternative and transportation mode there would be an unavoidable impact (121 percent increase in truck traffic) on the already congested traffic situation in downtown Moab.

Additional traffic and noise associated with remediation activities would result in displacement and increased mortality of wildlife close to construction areas and transportation routes.

Under all off-site alternatives, projected annual withdrawals of Colorado River water would exceed the 100-acre-foot protective limit set by USF&WS. Maximum estimated annual requirements range from 235 to 730 acre-feet and would continue for 3 to 5 years, depending on work schedules and transportation modes. Pipeline transportation to Klondike Flats or Crescent Junction would require the greatest volume of Colorado River water; river water requirements for a pipeline to White Mesa Mill would be partially offset by the use of Recapture Reservoir for recycle water.

Unavoidable adverse impacts to cultural resources and traditional cultural properties would likely occur under all but the No Action alternative. Unavoidable impacts would be greatest under the White Mesa Mill alternative. The density, variety, and complexity of cultural resources that would be unavoidably and adversely affected would be so great under the White Mesa Mill alternative that mitigation would be extremely difficult. Although a similar potential for unavoidable adverse effects would occur under the other alternatives, the lower densities of known resources would allow mitigation measures to be more easily implemented.

## **6.2 Relationship Between Local Short-Term Uses of the Environment and Long-Term Productivity**

Implementation of the alternatives would create a conflict between the local short-term uses of the environment and long-term productivity. Under all alternatives, land required for the disposal cell would be unavailable for other uses in perpetuity. This conflict would be more significant for the on-site disposal alternative, given the proximity of the Moab site to the city of Moab and to heavily used recreation areas such as Arches National Park. Under the on-site alternative, at least the entire 130-acre pile would be unavailable for other uses in perpetuity. Moreover, under all alternatives, the area at the Moab site used for ground water treatment would be unavailable for at least 75 years. This area could be 40 acres or more if an evaporation technology were implemented. Also under any alternative, the final decisions on possible future release and uses of the approximately 309-acre off-pile area of the Moab site must be deferred pending a determination of the success of surface remediation.

Under the off-site alternatives, the 346- to 439-acre disposal cell areas would be unavailable in perpetuity. This conflict would be the least significant for the White Mesa Mill site alternative because that site already includes four uranium mill tailings disposal cells.

## **6.3 Irreversible or Irretrievable Commitment of Resources**

The irreversible or irretrievable commitment of resources that would occur if the on-site or off-site disposal alternatives were implemented are (1) the use of fossil fuels in the transport of tailings and borrow materials, (2) the use of borrow materials, (3) the use of steel if the slurry pipeline transport were chosen, and (4) the use of land for the disposal cell in perpetuity. All alternatives would require an irretrievable commitment of millions of gallons of diesel fuel. The estimated total diesel fuel consumption for the on-site disposal alternative would be 4 to 5 million gallons (see Section 2.1.5.4). The estimated total diesel fuel consumption for off-site disposal would range from 12 to 20 million gallons for truck transportation, from 10 to

11 million gallons for rail transportation, and from 7 to 9 million gallons for slurry pipeline transportation.

Implementation of any of the alternatives would also require the use of borrow materials to cap the tailings pile and for site reclamation. These materials would include cover soils, radon/infiltration barrier soils, sand and gravel, and riprap. DOE estimates that the total volume of irretrievably committed borrow material would be approximately 1.7 million yd<sup>3</sup> for the on-site disposal alternative and 2.2 million yd<sup>3</sup> for each of the off-site disposal alternatives. DOE estimates that the maximum area of land that would be disturbed to extract borrow materials would be 550 acres for the on-site disposal alternative, 690 acres for the Klondike Flats or the Crescent Junction off-site disposal alternatives, and 174 acres for the White Mesa Mill off-site disposal alternative. The estimated acres of disturbed land do not include disturbances associated with obtaining sand, gravel, or riprap from commercial vendors. DOE believes these estimates represent maximum areas of disturbance; however, the final acreage of disturbed land would depend on the selection of borrow areas and depths to which borrow soils would be extracted.

Pipeline transport of tailings for off-site disposal would use between 4,400 tons (for Klondike Flats) and 24,000 tons (for White Mesa Mill) of steel that may become sufficiently contaminated to require disposal in the cell.

Under any alternative, there would be an irreversible and irretrievable commitment of the land that would be dedicated to the disposal cell. These commitments are described in Section 6.2.

All alternatives would result in the irretrievable commitment of Colorado River water, although the usages would all be within the limits of DOE's Colorado River water usage rights. Much of the use would be irretrievable because the water would be used for on-site or off-site decontamination, other construction-related uses, or possibly slurry production and ultimately would evaporate in double-lined evaporation ponds. The estimated maximum annual consumption of nonpotable water is 130 to 235 acre-feet for the rail transportation option, 135 to 240 acre-feet for truck transportation, and 730 acre-feet for slurry pipeline transportation (see Table 2-24). This water would be drawn from the Colorado River for the Klondike Flats and Crescent Junction alternatives. For the White Mesa Mill alternative, part of the decontamination water and the slurry pipeline makeup water would be drawn from the Recapture Reservoir. These annual figures are conservative upper bounds for irretrievable commitments of nonpotable water.

End of current text

## 7.0 Regulatory Requirements

This chapter presents descriptions of federal, tribal, and state regulatory requirements that may be applicable to the on-site and off-site disposal alternatives.

For this EIS, regulatory requirements are the laws, regulations, executive orders, and regulatory guidance that are, or may be, applicable to the alternatives analyzed in this EIS and that are critical to the decision-making process. The discussion of regulatory requirements is divided into three categories: federal, Native American, and state.

### 7.1 Federal Regulatory Requirements

#### 7.1.1 National Environmental Policy Act, 42 *United States Code* (U.S.C.) §§ 4321 et seq.

NEPA requires that a federal agency evaluate the potential environmental effects of implementing a proposed action. The Council on Environmental Quality has promulgated regulations to implement the procedural provisions of NEPA. These regulations are binding on all federal agencies and are codified at 40 CFR 1500–1508. These regulations specify the content of an EIS and include requirements for cooperating agency and public involvement. In addition, DOE has promulgated its own NEPA-implementing regulations, which are codified at 10 CFR 1021. DOE has complied, or is complying, with these requirements in generating this EIS.

This EIS is also intended for use by the BLM and the NPS to meet NEPA requirements for decisions they may need to make with respect to the proposed remediation and disposal of the Moab uranium mill tailings pile. The *Bureau of Land Management Manual 1790* (BLM 1988a) and *National Environmental Policy Act Handbook* (BLM 1988b) implement BLM NEPA regulations. NPS NEPA regulations are implemented under Director's Order 12 *Conservation Planning and Environmental Impact Analysis and Decision-Making* (NPS 2001).

#### 7.1.2 Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 7901 et seq., as amended

In 1978, public concern about potential human health and environmental effects of uranium mill tailings led Congress to pass UMTRCA, which amended the Atomic Energy Act. In UMTRCA (Title I), Congress acknowledged the potentially harmful health effects associated with uranium mill tailings and identified 24 inactive uranium-ore processing sites that must be considered for remedial action. UMTRCA directs EPA, DOE, and NRC to undertake certain actions as described below.

Title I of UMTRCA provides the basis for

- EPA standards for the remediation of RRM-contaminated soils, buildings, and materials that ensure protection of human health and the environment.
- EPA standards and compliance options for RRM-contaminated ground water, including supplemental standards, ACLs, and institutional controls.
- EPA standards for remediation of vicinity properties.

- NRC review of completed site remediation for compliance with EPA standards.
- NRC licensing of the site, property transfers to states, or DOE long-term surveillance and maintenance.

In 1983, Congress amended UMTRCA, directing EPA to promulgate general environmental standards for the processing, possession, transfer, and disposal of uranium mill tailings. These standards, titled “Health and Environmental Protection Standards for Uranium and Thorium Mill Tailings” (codified at 40 CFR 192 [Subparts A, B, and C]), include exposure limits for surface contamination and concentration limits for ground water contamination. DOE is responsible for ensuring compliance with surface and ground water standards at Title I sites.

Title II of UMTRCA provides the basis for regulating active uranium-ore processing sites licensed by NRC. Although it is not applicable to the inactive Moab site, it is applicable to the currently operating White Mesa Mill.

The 40 CFR 192 Subpart A disposal standards for control of RRM are design based with specific performance requirements: ensure that a disposal cell will be reasonably effective for up to 1,000 years (and a minimum of 200 years); limit the release of radon-222 to the atmosphere; and provide ground water protection. Numerical standards are provided for radon-222 releases to the atmosphere and for ground water protection. Corrective actions are required within an 18-month period if contaminant concentrations in ground water at disposal sites exceed the ground water protection standards. Provisions in 40 CFR 192 also allow for the application of supplemental standards and ACLs for ground water contaminants based on site-specific circumstances.

Subpart B standards for cleanup provide numerical standards for cleanup that are based on concentrations of radium-226 in surface materials (e.g., soils) and for exposure to radiation in buildings. Ground water cleanup standards are the same as the protection standards specified in Subpart A. In addition to active remediation, natural flushing is an acceptable means of meeting the standards if they can be met within 100 years and if enforceable institutional controls can be put in place during this time.

Subpart C of 40 CFR 192 provides guidance for implementing Subparts A and B. Subpart C requires that standards be met on a site-specific basis using information gathered during site characterization and monitoring. A RAP is required to demonstrate how requirements of Subparts A and B are to be met. Criteria are also presented for determining the applicability of supplemental standards.

**Radon-222**

Radon is a naturally occurring inert radioactive gas found in soil, rock, and water throughout the United States. It has numerous isotopes, but radon-220 and radon-222 are the most common. Radon causes lung cancer and is a threat to human health because it tends to collect in homes, sometimes to very high concentrations. As a result, radon is the largest source of exposure to naturally occurring radiation.

Radon-222 is the decay product of radium-226. Radon-222 and its parent, radium-226, are part of the long decay chain for uranium-238. Because uranium is essentially ubiquitous in the Earth's crust, radium-226 and radon-222 are present in almost all rock, soil, and water.

Following a decision to remediate the Moab site, DOE would prepare a remedial action plan for the site. The plan would describe the site restoration activities that, when remedial action was completed, would result in compliance with applicable environmental standards. This plan would be reviewed by NRC, which must approve the plan.

UMTRCA Title I also requires that upon completion of remedial action, each designated disposal site must be monitored and maintained by a federal agency under the NRC general license at 10 CFR 40.27. To meet this requirement, DOE would prepare a long-term surveillance plan for the disposal site. The plan would specify how DOE would care for and operate the disposal site. Upon NRC concurrence in the plan, the disposal site would be accepted under the general license. The NRC license does not expire. Thus, DOE, or a successor federal or state agency, would have responsibility to care for the disposal site in perpetuity.

### **7.1.3 Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law No. 106-398)**

The Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act, enacted in October 2000, gave DOE responsibility for remediation of the Moab site and mandated that the site be remediated in accordance with Title I of UMTRCA. The act also directed that a Plan for Remediation be completed and that NAS provide assistance to DOE in evaluating costs, benefits, and risks associated with remediation alternatives.

### **7.1.4 Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.)**

The ESA provides for the protection of threatened and endangered species and designated critical habitat. Section 7 of the act requires federal agencies, having reason to believe that a prospective action may affect an endangered or threatened species or its critical habitat, to consult with USF&WS to ensure that the action does not jeopardize the continued existence of the species or destroy critical habitat. Endangered species and critical habitat exist in the vicinity of the Moab site.

### **7.1.5 Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 661 et seq.)**

The Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act promotes more effectual planning and cooperation between federal, state, public, and private agencies for the conservation and rehabilitation of the nation's fish and wildlife and authorizes the U.S. Department of the Interior to provide assistance. This act requires consultation with USF&WS on the possible effects on wildlife if there is construction, modification, or control of bodies of water in excess of 10 acres in surface area.

### **7.1.6 Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918, as amended (16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.)**

The Migratory Bird Treaty Act, as amended, is intended to protect birds that have common migration patterns between the United States and Canada, Mexico, Japan, and Russia. It regulates the harvest of migratory birds by specifying conditions such as the mode of harvest, hunting seasons, and bag limits. The act stipulates that it is unlawful to "take, possess, . . . any migratory bird," unless obtained under a permit. Migratory birds may be affected by one or more of the alternatives.

### **7.1.7 Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. §§ 1251 et seq.**

This act and its implementing regulations (40 CFR Parts 110–112, 122–125, 130–131, 230–231, and 404; and 33 CFR 322–330) regulate pollution prevention and discharges of point and non-point discharges, establish water quality standards, and regulate discharges of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States. Although mill tailings are exempt from the definition of a pollutant, discharges from wastewater treatment facilities (if required) may be subject to regulation under the Clean Water Act. Construction activities that disturb more than 1 acre of land require compliance with storm-water management and erosion-control regulations and require storm-water discharge permits. Dredging or filling activities of the Colorado River would also require a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Clean Water Act Section 404 permit.

### **7.1.8 Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899, Section 10, 33 U.S.C. 403**

This provision regulates the construction of any development or building that affects the “navigable capacity of any of the waters of the United States” and requires the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers’ approval of any action “to excavate or fill, or in any manner to alter or modify the course, location, condition, or capacity of, any port, roadstead, haven, harbor, canal, lake, harbor of refuge, or enclosure within the limits of any breakwater, or of the channel of any navigable water of the United States. . . .”

### **7.1.9 Floodplain Management and Protection of Wetlands, 10 CFR 1022**

DOE regulations codified at 10 CFR 1022 implement the requirements of Executive Orders 11988 (*Floodplain Management*) and 11990 (*Protection of Wetlands*) for actions that may affect these areas. Specifically, they require federal agencies to evaluate actions they may take to avoid, to the extent possible, adverse effects associated with direct and indirect development of a floodplain or a wetland. A portion of the Moab site falls within the 100-year floodplain of the Colorado River, and wetlands exist within and adjacent to the site; however, a formal wetlands delineation has not been conducted to date. A “Floodplain and Wetlands Assessment for Remedial Action at the Moab Site” and a Statement of Findings as required by the DOE regulations is attached as Appendix F to this EIS. Any wetland area disturbance during remediation and restoration must comply with the appropriate requirements. Wetland areas must be identified and delineated for the Moab site and any off-site project locations.

### **7.1.10 Safe Drinking Water Act, 42 U.S.C. 300f et seq.**

The primary objective of this act is to protect the quality of public water supplies. This law grants EPA the authority to protect the quality of public drinking water supplies by establishing national primary drinking water regulations. EPA has delegated authority for enforcement of drinking water standards to the states. EPA regulations (codified at 40 CFR Parts 123, 141, 145, 147, and 149) specify maximum contaminant levels, including those for radioactivity, in public water systems, which are generally defined as systems that serve at least 15 service connections or serve at least 25 year-round residents. The city of Moab derives most of its drinking water from a well field in the Glen Canyon aquifer near the northeast canyon wall of Spanish Valley. Two water-supply wells located near the entrance to Arches National Park are located in the Navajo Formation. The Colorado River is not currently used as a drinking water supply for the City of Moab.

#### **7.1.11 Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 7401 et seq., as amended**

This act and its implementing regulations regulate air emissions from treatment processes and construction equipment, fugitive dust, and radon emissions from the tailings pile. The National and Secondary Ambient Air Quality Standards (codified at 40 CFR Parts 50 and 53) address standards and monitoring requirements for PM<sub>10</sub> and for lead in ambient air. The National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) (40 CFR 61 Subpart T) requirements are applicable to control radon emissions from the disposal of uranium mill tailings and apply to the final tailings disposal location after long-term stabilization of the disposal site has been completed as described at 40 CFR 61.221(a) and 40 CFR 61.223(e). However, the NESHAP requirements for radon emissions do not apply during periods of active remediation.

#### **7.1.12 Archaeological Resources Protection Act, 16 U.S.C. §§ 470aa et seq., and National Historic Preservation Act, 16 U.S.C. §§ 470 et seq.**

Cultural and historic resources are protected by these acts and their implementing regulations and by Executive Orders 11593 (*Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment*) and 13007 (*Protection and Accommodation of Access to Indian Sacred Sites*). The regulations at 36 CFR 800 require federal agencies to take into account the effect of a proposed action on a structure or object that is included on or is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places and to establish procedures to identify and provide for preservation of historic and archeological data that might be destroyed through alteration of terrain as a result of a federal action. Cultural resources may be present in areas of the proposed alternatives.

#### **7.1.13 Antiquities Act, 16 U.S.C. 431 et seq.**

The Antiquities Act protects historic and prehistoric ruins, monuments, and objects of antiquity (including paleontological resources) on lands owned or controlled by the federal government. If historic or prehistoric ruins or objects were identified during the construction or operation of facilities, DOE would have to determine if adverse effects to these ruins or objects would occur. If so, the Secretary of the Interior would have to grant permission to proceed with the activity (36 CFR 296 and 43 CFR Parts 3 and 7).

#### **7.1.14 Federal Land Policy and Management Act, 43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.**

The Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA), Title V, governs rights-of-way and withdrawals on federal lands administered by BLM (U.S. Department of the Interior). This act requires an application, review, and study by the administering agency and decisions by the Secretary of the Interior on withdrawal of federal lands, including terms and conditions of withdrawals. Access to and use of public lands administered by BLM are primarily governed by regulations regarding rights-of-way (43 CFR 2800) and withdrawals of public domain land from public use (43 CFR 2300).

#### **7.1.15 Noise Control Act of 1972, 42 U.S.C. 4901 et seq., as amended**

Section 4 of the Noise Control Act of 1972, as amended, directs all federal agencies to carry out “to the fullest extent within their authority” programs within their jurisdictions in a manner that furthers a national policy of promoting an environment free from noise jeopardizing health and welfare.

#### **7.1.16 Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 6901 et seq., as amended**

RCRA gives EPA the authority to control hazardous waste from “cradle to grave,” including the generation, transportation, treatment, storage, and disposal of hazardous waste. RCRA also established a framework for the management of nonhazardous wastes. The 1986 amendments to RCRA enabled EPA to address environmental problems that could result from underground tanks storing petroleum and other hazardous substances. RCRA focuses only on active and future facilities and does not address abandoned or historical sites. However, based on historical practices at UMTRA sites, there is the potential for RCRA-regulated waste to be “commingled” with RRM at some vicinity properties. Regulations governing RCRA-regulated waste are in 40 CFR 260–273. This includes waste that may be subject to recycling provisions of the regulations. For the purpose of analysis in this EIS, DOE assumed that all commingled waste would ultimately be approved for management and disposal as RRM and would be disposed of in the selected disposal cell.

#### **7.1.17 Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, 49 U.S.C 1801 et seq.**

Transportation of hazardous and radioactive materials in commerce must be conducted in compliance with all applicable state and federal regulations as codified at 49 CFR 130–180. The DOT exemption at 40 CFR 761 may be applied to the bulk transportation of regulated radioactive mill tailings. This exemption provides relief from labeling, placarding, and manifesting requirements that are normally applicable to individual bulk shipments. Bulk transportation packaging requirements for haul trucks and rail cars (e.g., diapering tailgates on haul trucks, covering loads, reducing moisture content) would apply.

#### **7.1.18 Toxic Substances Control Act, 7 U.S.C. 136 et seq.**

Some of the provisions of the Toxic Substances Control Act regulate the management and disposal of asbestos and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) that may be present at the site. Although these materials would be managed as RRM on the site, regulations in 40 CFR 761 and 763 would be applicable as best management practices. Both asbestos and PCBs are eligible for disposal in UMTRA disposal cells.

#### **7.1.19 Executive Order 12898 (*Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations*, February 11, 1994)**

This executive order requires each federal agency to identify and address disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority and low-income populations.

## **7.2 Native American Regulatory Requirements**

### **7.2.1 American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978 (42 U.S.C. 1996)**

This act reaffirms Native American religious freedom under the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution and establishes policy to protect and preserve the inherent and constitutional right of Native Americans to believe, express, and exercise their traditional religions. This law ensures the protection of sacred locations and access of Native Americans to those sacred locations and traditional resources that are integral to the practice of their religions. Further, it establishes requirements that would apply to Native American sacred locations, traditional resources, or traditional religious practices potentially affected by construction and operation activities.

### **7.2.2 Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990 (25 U.S.C. 3001)**

The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act directs the Secretary of the Interior to guide the repatriation of federal archaeological collections and collections that are culturally affiliated with Native American tribes and held by museums that receive federal funding. Major actions to be taken under this law include (1) the establishment of a review committee with monitoring and policy-making responsibilities; (2) the development of regulations for repatriation, including procedures for identifying lineal descent or cultural affiliation needed for claims; (3) the oversight of museum programs designed to meet the inventory requirements and deadlines of this law; and (4) the development of procedures to handle unexpected discoveries of graves or grave goods during activities on federal or tribal land. The provisions of the act would be invoked if any excavations associated with construction or operation activities led to unexpected discoveries of Native American graves or grave artifacts.

### **7.2.3 Executive Order 13007, Indian Sacred Sites**

This order directs federal agencies, to the extent permitted by law and not inconsistent with agency missions, to avoid adverse effects to sacred sites and to provide access to those sites to Native Americans for religious practices. The order directs agencies to plan projects to provide protection of and access to sacred sites to the extent compatible with the project.

### **7.2.4 Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments**

This order directs federal agencies to establish regular and meaningful consultation and collaboration with tribal governments in the development of federal policies that have tribal implications, to strengthen U.S. government-to-government relationships with Indian tribes, and to reduce the imposition of unfunded mandates on tribal governments.

## **7.3 State Regulatory Requirements**

### **7.3.1 Clean Water Act Implementing Regulations**

*Utah Administrative Code* (U.A.C.) Section R317-2-13 (Water Quality Standards) classifies the Colorado River and its tributaries as

- 1C Protected as a raw water source for domestic purposes with prior treatment processes as required by the Utah Department of Health;
- 2B Protected for boating, water skiing, and similar uses, excluding swimming;
- 3B Protected for warmwater species of game fish and other warmwater aquatic life, including the necessary aquatic organisms in their food chain; and
- 4 Protected for agricultural uses, including irrigation of crops and stock watering.

Numeric criteria specific to each of these use designations are specified at U.A.C. Section R317-2-14.

### **7.3.2 State Water Appropriations**

Uses of surface water and ground water require compliance with water rights appropriations requirements that are administered by the Utah State Engineer's Office, Department of Natural Resources, Division of Water Rights. Ponding of ground water, construction dewatering of ground water, and use of surface water (i.e., Colorado River) for dust suppression and tailings compaction may be considered consumptive use.

### **7.3.3 Clean Air Act Implementing Regulations**

Utah Air Conservation Rules (19 U.A.C. Section 19-2-101 et seq.) require that fugitive dust be minimized or that measures be taken to prevent its occurrence. Air emissions from a ground water treatment system could also potentially be regulated by these requirements and would require a permit. The Utah Administrative Code requires that ambient air quality be monitored during construction activities.

### **7.3.4 Radioactive Materials Licensing**

As authorized by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the State of Utah is an Agreement State under NRC's program for regulating uranium mills. The *Utah Administrative Code* (UAC) R313-24-4(1)(b) requires the White Mesa Mill site to comply with State requirements for ground water protection. In addition, NRC transferred authority for the regulation of the possession of by-product material by persons to the State of Utah in August 2004. The State's regulatory authority would not apply to DOE's actions at Moab, Klondike Flats, or Crescent Junction.

## **7.4 References**

- 10 CFR 40. U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, “Domestic Licensing of Source Material.”
- 10 CFR 1021. U.S. Department of Energy, “National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Implementing Procedures.”
- 10 CFR 1022. U.S. Department of Energy, “Compliance with Floodplain and Wetlands Environmental Review Requirements.”
- 33 CFR 322-330. U.S. Department of Defense, “Navigation and Navigable Waters.”
- 36 CFR 296. U.S. Department of Agriculture, “Protection of Archaeological Resources: Uniform Regulations.”
- 36 CFR 800. Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, “Protection of Historic Properties.”
- 40 CFR 50. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, “National Primary and Secondary Ambient Air Quality Standards.”
- 40 CFR 53. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, “Ambient Air Monitoring Reference and Equivalent Methods.”
- 40 CFR 61. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, “National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants.”
- 40 CFR 110-112, 122-125, 130-131, 230-231, and 404. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, “Protection of the Environment.”
- 40 CFR 192. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, “Health and Environmental Protection Standards for Uranium and Thorium Mill Tailings.”
- 40 CFR 260. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, “Hazardous Waste Management System: General.”
- 40 CFR 761. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, “Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) Manufacturing, Processing, Distribution in Commerce, and Use Prohibitions.”
- 40 CFR 763. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, “Asbestos.”
- 40 CFR 1500-1508. Council on Environmental Quality, “Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act.”
- 43 CFR 3. U.S. Department of the Interior, “Preservation of American Antiquities.”
- 43 CFR 7. U.S. Department of the Interior, “Protection of Archaeological Resources.”
- 43 CFR 2300. U.S. Department of the Interior, “Land Withdrawals.”

43 CFR 2800. U.S. Department of the Interior, “Rights-of-Way, Principles and Procedures.”

49 CFR 130. U.S. Department of Transportation, “Oil Spill Prevention and Response Plans.”

BLM (Bureau of Land Management), 1988a. *BLM Manual Section 1790, National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 MS 1790*, October 25.

BLM (Bureau of Land Management), 1988b. *National Environmental Policy Act Handbook*, BLM Handbook H-1790-1, October 25.

NPS (National Park Service), 2001. *Conservation Planning and Environmental Impact Analysis and Decision-Making*, NPS Director’s Order and Handbook 12, January 8.

## 8.0 List of Preparers and Disclosure Statements

This chapter identifies the individuals who were principal preparers of this document and provides the disclosure statement of all contractors participating in the preparation of this EIS.

<b>Thomas L. Anderson</b>	<i>Affiliation</i>	Battelle
	<i>Education</i>	B.S. Botany, Ohio State University
	<i>Technical Experience</i>	31 years of experience and senior-level project management on more than 100 NEPA documents involving all aspects of DOE's nuclear and non-nuclear missions.
	<i>EIS Responsibility</i>	Project Manager and text preparation
<b>Cheri I. Bahrke</b>	<i>Affiliation</i>	Battelle
	<i>Education</i>	B.A. Geology, Indiana University
	<i>Technical Experience</i>	11 years of experience in environmental restoration, 7 years of experience in preparing NEPA documents for all aspects of DOE environmental restoration projects.
	<i>EIS Responsibility</i>	Text preparation of Land Use and Institutional Controls chapter
<b>James M. Becker</b>	<i>Affiliation</i>	Battelle
	<i>Education</i>	M.S. Wildlife Ecology, University of Washington B.S. Range and Wildlife Science, Brigham Young University
	<i>Technical Experience</i>	10 years of experience in preparing ecological evaluations for NEPA documents, ecological risk assessments, and biological assessments for energy-related projects.
	<i>EIS Responsibility</i>	Terrestrial ecology; affected environment, environmental consequences, and biological assessment
<b>Sandra J. Beranich</b>	<i>Affiliation</i>	Subcontractor to S.M. Stoller Corporation
	<i>Education</i>	M.A. Geography, University of Oregon B.A. Geology, Southern Illinois University
	<i>Technical Experience</i>	20 years of diverse experience related to preparation of portions of or entire NEPA documents for federal agencies and general coordination and management of NEPA or related documents, including 8 years of experience working on NEPA reports and studies for the DOE UMTRA Project. Areas of expertise include land use and transportation.
	<i>EIS Responsibility</i>	General project coordination for Chapter 3.0, "Affected Environment"; preparation of transportation and traffic sections

<b>Joel Berwick</b>	<i>Affiliation</i>	U.S. Department of Energy
	<i>Education</i>	B.S. University of Wyoming
	<i>Technical Experience</i>	18 years of experience in managing and supporting remedial actions. His work on the Monticello project involved the construction oversight of a state-of-the-art water-balance repository cover.
	<i>EIS Responsibility</i>	DOE Project Engineer for Moab
<b>Robert W. Bleil</b>	<i>Affiliation</i>	Battelle
	<i>Education</i>	B.S. Natural Resources and Wildlife Management, Colorado State University A.S. Pre-Law, Champlain College Environmental Science – Berkshire Community College
	<i>Technical Experience</i>	26 years of experience managing and preparing NEPA documents for BLM, USF&WS, private industry, and DOE. Contractor NEPA Compliance Lead at the DOE office in Grand Junction since 1990.
	<i>EIS Responsibility</i>	EIS Deputy Manager; technical content for aquatic and terrestrial ecology, biological assessment, regulatory requirements, and overall document preparation
<b>Amoret L. Bunn</b>	<i>Affiliation</i>	Battelle
	<i>Education</i>	Ph.D. Engineering, University of New Hampshire M.S. Civil Engineering, University of New Hampshire B.S. Biology, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
	<i>Technical Experience</i>	10 years of experience in preparing ecological evaluations for NEPA documents and ecological risk assessment and biological assessments for energy-related projects.
	<i>EIS Responsibility</i>	Aquatic ecology; affected environment, environmental consequences, and biological assessment
<b>Clay Carpenter</b>	<i>Affiliation</i>	S.M. Stoller Corporation
	<i>Education</i>	M.B.A. George Washington University B.S. Chemical Engineering, University of Virginia
	<i>Technical Experience</i>	23 years of experience in risk assessment and project management.
	<i>EIS Responsibility</i>	Human health risk assessment, construction risks, and failure scenario evaluation
<b>James R. Christensen</b>	<i>Affiliation</i>	Subcontractor to S.M. Stoller Corporation
	<i>Education</i>	B.S. Anthropology, University of Idaho
	<i>Technical Experience</i>	Project Manager with SWCA Environmental Consultants, Historical Anthropology Program, Salt Lake City, Utah 11 years of experience in cultural resource management, specializing in historical archaeology, history, and prehistoric archaeology.
	<i>EIS Responsibility</i>	Evaluation of Moab Project site features for historical significance; supervision of Class III cultural resource survey on Moab Project site

<b>Laura E. Cummins</b>	<i>Affiliation</i> <i>Education</i>	S.M. Stoller Corporation Ph.D. Geology, Florida State University M.S. Geology, Bowling Green State University B.S. Geology, Bowling Green State University
	<i>Technical Experience</i>	15 years of technical and regulatory environmental experience, including the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA), NEPA, risk assessment (human health and ecological), and geochemistry. Experience with DOE CERCLA/RCRA/UMTRA sites, EPA Superfund hazardous waste sites, and underground storage tank sites.
	<i>EIS Responsibility</i>	Human health and ecological risk, water quality issues, and ground water compliance
<b>Dennis J. DuPont</b>	<i>Affiliation</i> <i>Education</i> <i>Technical Experience</i> <i>EIS Responsibility</i>	S.M. Stoller Corporation Certificate, Mesa State College 15 years of experience in document production. Document coordinator and word processor
<b>Linda M. Edwards</b>	<i>Affiliation</i> <i>Education</i> <i>Technical Experience</i> <i>EIS Responsibility</i>	S.M. Stoller Corporation B.S. Organizational Management, Colorado Christian University 8 years of experience in document production. Review document redlines and prepared .pdf files
<b>John E. Elmer</b>	<i>Affiliation</i> <i>Education</i> <i>Technical Experience</i> <i>EIS Responsibility</i>	S.M. Stoller Corporation M.B.A. Western State University B.S. Civil Engineering, Colorado State University 10 years of experience in managing civil and environmental remediation projects, including studies, design, and construction and 15 years of experience managing environmental remediation projects for DOE involving low-level radioactive waste. Lead for engineering and construction; text preparation
<b>William E. Fallon</b>	<i>Affiliation</i> <i>Education</i> <i>Technical Experience</i> <i>EIS Responsibility</i>	Battelle Ph.D. Pharmaceutical Sciences, University of Rhode Island 25 years of experience as manager of and technical contributor to large DOE and EPA programs. Chapter 2.0 text preparation, integration, and technical coordination; cross-chapter consistency review
<b>David S. Foster</b>	<i>Affiliation</i> <i>Education</i> <i>Technical Experience</i> <i>EIS Responsibility</i>	S.M. Stoller Corporation B.A. Philosophy, University of Colorado; additional coursework in chemistry, geology, and hydrology 25 years of experience: analyst, Union Carbide Corporation Environmental Laboratory; health physics technician, Oak Ridge Associated Universities; chemical sampling coordinator and technical writer/editor, Oak Ridge National Laboratory; technical writer/editor, S.M. Stoller Corporation Technical editor

<b>Brad Fritz</b>	<i>Affiliation</i>	Battelle
	<i>Education</i>	M.S. Environmental Engineering, Washington State University B.S. Physics, Eastern Oregon University
	<i>Technical Experience</i>	3 years of experience in data analysis.
	<i>EIS Responsibility</i>	Conducting and writing noise and vibration analyses
<b>John Fritz</b>	<i>Affiliation</i>	Subcontractor to S.M. Stoller Corporation
	<i>Education</i>	Ph.D. University of Utah B.S. Eastern New Mexico University
	<i>Technical Experience</i>	30 years of experience in cultural, archaeological, and traditional cultural property research and instruction.
	<i>EIS Responsibility</i>	Lead investigator for cultural archaeological and traditional cultural properties characterization
<b>Michael J. Gardner</b>	<i>Affiliation</i>	Battelle
	<i>Education</i>	M.A. Public Administration, University of Colorado B.S. Geological Engineering, Brigham Young University
	<i>Technical Experience</i>	16 years of environmental engineering and regulatory compliance experience associated with various DOE environmental restoration projects.
	<i>EIS Responsibility</i>	Collection of environmental monitoring data and text preparation
<b>Craig S. Goodknight</b>	<i>Affiliation</i>	S.M. Stoller Corporation
	<i>Education</i>	M.S. Geology, University of New Mexico B.S. Geology, University of Tulsa
	<i>Technical Experience</i>	30 years of experience in geology of western Colorado and eastern Utah, includes experience as BLM District Geologist in eastern Utah, National Uranium Resource Evaluation program, and UMTRA Title I and II sites.
	<i>EIS Responsibility</i>	Technical Lead for preparation of geology section of EIS
<b>Kenneth E. Karp</b>	<i>Affiliation</i>	MFG, Inc.
	<i>Education</i>	B.S. Geology, Mesa State College
	<i>Technical Experience</i>	15 years of experience in site investigations and feasibility and alternative evaluation studies; 10 years of experience managing environmental restoration and compliance projects related to CERCLA, RCRA, and UMTRA sites.
	<i>EIS Responsibility</i>	Lead for ground and surface water; text preparation

<b><i>Marilyn K. Kastens</i></b>	<i>Affiliation</i>	Battelle
	<i>Education</i>	M.S. Soil Science, Oregon State University B.A. Geography, Oklahoma University
	<i>Technical Experience</i>	20 years of experience in environmental compliance and NEPA issues with DOE and BLM.
	<i>EIS Responsibility</i>	Prepared cultural resource and visual resource sections of EIS
<b><i>N. Edward LaBonte</i></b>	<i>Affiliation</i>	S.M. Stoller Corporation
	<i>Education</i>	B.S. Computer Management Science, Metropolitan State College
	<i>Technical Experience</i>	18 years of experience in Geographic Information Systems (GIS).
	<i>EIS Responsibility</i>	EIS Figure Coordinator and GIS Data Manager
<b><i>Susan D. Lyon</i></b>	<i>Affiliation</i>	S.M. Stoller Corporation
	<i>Education</i>	Certificate, Mesa State College
	<i>Technical Experience</i>	20 years of experience in document production.
	<i>EIS Responsibility</i>	Word process document and review redlines
<b><i>Melvin W. Madril, P.E.</i></b>	<i>Affiliation</i>	S.M. Stoller Corporation
	<i>Education</i>	B.S. Civil Engineering, University of Southern Colorado
	<i>Technical Experience</i>	25 years of civil engineering experience in site development, infrastructure design, and project and construction management; the last 18 years in engineering design and project management for radioactive contaminated soils and ground water remediation at various DOE sites.
	<i>EIS Responsibility</i>	Transportation studies, infrastructure conceptual design, labor, and equipment and natural resources consumption estimates
<b><i>Steven J. Maheras</i></b>	<i>Affiliation</i>	Battelle
	<i>Education</i>	Ph.D. Health Physics, Colorado State University
	<i>Technical Experience</i>	15 years of experience in health physics, transportation risk assessment, and radiological assessment.
	<i>EIS Responsibility</i>	Transportation risk assessment, air quality analysis, human health and safety analysis
<b><i>Thomas I. McSweeney</i></b>	<i>Affiliation</i>	Battelle
	<i>Education</i>	Ph.D. Chemical Engineering, University of Michigan
	<i>Technical Experience</i>	32 years of experience in risk assessment and safety analysis.
	<i>EIS Responsibility</i>	Transportation risk assessment

<b>Donald R. Metzler, P.Hg.</b>	<i>Affiliation</i>	U.S. Department of Energy
	<i>Education</i>	M.S. Hydrogeology, San Diego State University Registered geologist in California and Arizona and certified professional hydrogeologist with the American Institute of Hydrology B.S. Agricultural Science, California Polytechnic State University
	<i>Technical Experience</i>	Project Manager of the UMTRA Ground Water Project and involved in the UMTRA Program for 14 years. Work with uranium mill tailings has involved characterization, disposal cell cover performance, compliance strategy development, remedial action, and project management.
	<i>EIS Responsibility</i>	DOE Federal Project Director for the Moab, Utah, Uranium Mill Tailings Remediation Project. Development of ground water remediation strategy and technical reviewer of ground water modeling and disposal cell cover design
<b>Judith D. Miller</b>	<i>Affiliation</i>	S.M. Stoller Corporation
	<i>Education</i>	B.A. Communications, Mesa State College
	<i>Technical Experience</i>	Graphics design.
	<i>EIS Responsibility</i>	Graphics preparation
<b>Duane A. Neitzel</b>	<i>Affiliation</i>	Battelle
	<i>Education</i>	M.S. Biological Sciences, Washington State University B.S. Zoology, University of Washington
	<i>Technical Experience</i>	30 years of experience in managing and preparing NEPA documents for DOE and NRC.
	<i>EIS Responsibility</i>	Aquatic ecology; affected environment, environmental consequences, and biological assessment
<b>Daniel W. Nordeen</b>	<i>Affiliation</i>	S.M. Stoller Corporation
	<i>Education</i>	B.S. Civil Engineering, Colorado State University
	<i>Technical Experience</i>	15 years of experience in civil engineering site design and cost estimating with all aspects of the DOE UMTRA Project and CERCLA projects for disposal of low-level nuclear waste.
	<i>EIS Responsibility</i>	Conceptual design of alternatives, cost estimates, and text preparation
<b>Douglas M. Osborn</b>	<i>Affiliation</i>	Battelle
	<i>Education</i>	B.S. Chemical Engineering, Ohio State University
	<i>Technical Experience</i>	6 years of experience operating nuclear reactors in the U.S. Navy; 3 years experience in managing and maintaining a mechanical engineering laboratory at Ohio State University; 3 months of experience as nuclear engineering research intern.
	<i>EIS Responsibility</i>	Technical support
<b>Desiree Padgett</b>	<i>Affiliation</i>	Battelle
	<i>Education</i>	B.A. Journalism, University of New Mexico
	<i>Technical Experience</i>	18 years of experience editing technical documents for the U.S. Department of Defense and DOE, including 8 years of experience editing NEPA documents.
	<i>EIS Responsibility</i>	Technical Editor

<b>Ray Plieness</b>	<i>Affiliation</i>	U.S. Department of Energy
	<i>Education</i>	B.S. Civil Engineering, Montana State University
	<i>Technical Experience</i>	25 years of experience managing construction, hazardous waste, and nuclear remediation projects.
	<i>EIS Responsibility</i>	Contractor EIS Project Manager and text preparation
<b>Ted M. Poston</b>	<i>Affiliation</i>	Battelle
	<i>Education</i>	M.S. Fisheries, University of Washington
	<i>Technical Experience</i>	29 years of experience in ecological, environmental and toxicological research with 22 years of NEPA experience in community noise assessments and ecology.
	<i>EIS Responsibility</i>	Coordinated noise and ground vibration section and consulted on ecology sections
<b>Barbara Price</b>	<i>Affiliation</i>	S.M. Stoller Corporation
	<i>Education</i>	B.A. Sociology, Anthropology, Adams State College B.S. Computer Science, Math, Mesa State College
	<i>Technical Experience</i>	17 years of professional experience as a computer programmer and analyst. 14 years of supporting various areas of business administration for DOE contractors with an emphasis on financial software development and support.
	<i>EIS Responsibility</i>	Database developer/Administrator
<b>Phyllis Price</b>	<i>Affiliation</i>	S.M. Stoller Corporation
	<i>Education</i>	A.A.S. Ferris State University
	<i>Technical Experience</i>	28 years of experience in graphic design and illustration.
	<i>EIS Responsibility</i>	Graphics preparation
<b>Cynthia L. Rakowski</b>	<i>Affiliation</i>	Battelle
	<i>Education</i>	M.S. Watershed Science, Utah State University B.S. Physics, Montana State University
	<i>Technical Experience</i>	10 years of experience integrating geomorphology and habitat availability for endangered fishes.
	<i>EIS Responsibility</i>	Aquatic ecology
<b>Michael T. Rectanus</b>	<i>Affiliation</i>	Battelle
	<i>Education</i>	B.S. Chemical Engineering, Ohio University
	<i>Technical Experience</i>	6 years of experience conducting air quality impact assessments for EISs and PSD construction permit applications.
	<i>EIS Responsibility</i>	Air quality analysis
<b>Donna L. Riddle</b>	<i>Affiliation</i>	S.M. Stoller Corporation
	<i>Education</i>	B.S. Environmental Restoration, Mesa State College
	<i>Technical Experience</i>	20 years of experience in quality assurance program definition and implementation and monitoring for DOE contractors.
	<i>EIS Responsibility</i>	Contractor QA Manager; quality consultation on EIS

<b>Christine D. Ross</b>	<i>Affiliation</i>	Battelle
	<i>Education</i>	A.A. Microcomputer Management, Specializing in Multimedia, Albuquerque Technical Vocational Institute
	<i>Technical Experience</i>	9 years of experience in graphic and desktop publishing work, 4 years of experience in GIS software and technology.
	<i>EIS Responsibility</i>	Prepared population, low-income, and minority maps for Chapter 3.0.
<b>Wendee K. Ryan</b>	<i>Affiliation</i>	S.M. Stoller Corporation
	<i>Education</i>	B.A. Speech Communication, Colorado State University
	<i>Technical Experience</i>	7 years of experience in Public Affairs for DOE contractors.
	<i>EIS Responsibility</i>	Public relations
<b>Linda Sheader</b>	<i>Affiliation</i>	Battelle
	<i>Education</i>	M.A. Botany, University of California Berkeley B.A. Biology, Adams State College
	<i>Technical Experience</i>	6 years of experience in wetlands delineation, restoration designs and monitoring, reclamation, botany, and plant ecology.
	<i>EIS Responsibility</i>	Revise floodplains and wetlands assessment and related sections
<b>Gregory M. Smith</b>	<i>Affiliation</i>	S.M. Stoller Corporation
	<i>Education</i>	M.S. Civil (Geotechnical) Engineering, Colorado State University
	<i>Technical Experience</i>	20 years of experience designing and constructing low-level uranium waste disposal cells for DOE.
	<i>EIS Responsibility</i>	Wind rose diagrams and affected environment text
<b>J. Amanda Stegen</b>	<i>Affiliation</i>	Battelle
	<i>Education</i>	M.S. Biology, University of Washington B.S. Wildlife Biology, Washington State University
	<i>Technical Experience</i>	10 years of experience in preparing ecological evaluations for NEPA documents and ecological risk assessment and biological assessments for energy-related projects.
	<i>EIS Responsibility</i>	Aquatic ecology, affected environment, environmental consequences, and biological assessment
<b>Karen Sutton</b>	<i>Affiliation</i>	S.M. Stoller Corporation
	<i>Education</i>	Various business training courses
	<i>Technical Experience</i>	23 years; United Banks of Colorado; 16 years Training and Employee Safety; 4 years Records
	<i>EIS Responsibility</i>	Reproduction and assembly

<b><i>Lucinda Low Swartz</i></b>	<i>Affiliation</i> <i>Education</i>	Battelle J.D. Washington College of Law, The American University
	<i>Technical Experience</i>	B.A. Political Science and Administrative Studies (joint major), University of California at Riverside 23 years of experience in environmental law and regulation.
	<i>EIS Responsibility</i>	Summary; Chapters 1.0 and 5.0 through 7.0, environmental laws and regulations; and technical review
<b><i>Cathy Thomas</i></b>	<i>Affiliation</i> <i>Education</i>	S.M. Stoller Corporation M.L.S. Emporia State University
	<i>Technical Experience</i>	B.S. Education, Emporia State University 30 years of experience in educational, medical, and corporate libraries conducting research for educators and clients.
	<i>EIS Responsibility</i>	Assisted in preparation of bibliographies
<b><i>Carlos A. Ulibarri</i></b>	<i>Affiliation</i> <i>Education</i>	New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology and Battelle Ph.D. Economics, University of New Mexico
	<i>Technical Experience</i>	10 years of experience in evaluating socioeconomic impacts of DOE projects involving environmental, energy, and nuclear regulatory programs.
	<i>EIS Responsibility</i>	Technical lead for socioeconomic impact evaluation
<b><i>Gretchen Van Reyper</i></b>	<i>Affiliation</i> <i>Education</i>	HRL Compliance, independent subcontractor B.S. Environmental Studies/Biology, Minnesota State University-Mankato
	<i>Technical Experience</i>	10 years of wetland and botany experience in federal and private sectors; 3 years of NEPA document assistance.
	<i>EIS Responsibility</i>	Floodplain and wetland sections and sensitive plant species list
<b><i>Paul G. Wetherstein</i></b>	<i>Affiliation</i> <i>Education</i>	Battelle A.A.S. Environmental Restoration Technology, Mesa State College
	<i>Technical Experience</i>	16 years of experience in environmental remediation, including 10 years in hazardous waste management involving DOE's uranium mill tailings work.
	<i>EIS Responsibility</i>	Research waste management issues for each alternative site
<b><i>Toby Wright</i></b>	<i>Affiliation</i> <i>Education</i>	MFG, Inc M.S. Civil Engineering, Colorado State University
	<i>Technical Experience</i>	B.S. Geosciences, University of Arizona 17 years of experience in environmental characterization, restoration and remediation design and management of private and federal clients.
	<i>EIS Responsibility</i>	Contractor Project Manager

**Julio Zimbron**

*Affiliation*

MFG, Inc.

*Education*

Ph.D. Chemical Engineering, Colorado State University

M.Sc. Chemical Engineering, Colorado State University

B.S. Biochemical Engineering, Monterrey Institute of Technology, Mexico

*Technical Experience*

Engineering design of water and air pollution control systems, including bioremediation, chemical treatment, and solids separation technologies.

*EIS Responsibility*

Water treatment alternatives screening

**Subcontract Agreement #STLR-3730-002-CP  
NEPA DISCLOSURE STATEMENT FOR PREPARATION OF THE  
REMEDICATION OF THE MOAB URANIUM MILL TAILINGS SITE,  
GRAND COUNTY, UTAH  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

CEQ Regulations at 40 CFR 1506.5(c), which have been adopted by the DOE (10 CFR 1021), require a contractor who will prepare an EIS to execute a disclosure specifying that they have no financial or other interest in the outcome of the project. In accordance with these requirements, Battelle Memorial Institute hereby certifies that to the best of its knowledge it has no financial or other interest in the outcome of the referenced EIS project.

In accordance with these requirements, **Battelle Memorial Institute** hereby certifies as follows: check either (a) or (b).

(a)  To the best of **Battelle Memorial Institute's** knowledge, it has no financial or other interest in the outcome of the referenced EIS project.

(b)  Battelle Memorial Institute has the following financial or other interest in the outcome of the referenced EIS projects hereby agree to divest themselves of such interest prior to the start of the work.

Financial or Other Interest

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

Certified by:

Lorraine M. Stier  
Signature

for Ralph K. Henricks  
Name

Contracting Officer  
Title

02/18/2003  
Date

**NEPA DISCLOSURE STATEMENT FOR PREPARATION OF THE  
REMEDICATION OF THE MOAB MILL TAILINGS SITE IN GRAND  
COUNTY, UTAH  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

CEQ Regulations at 40 CFR 1506.5(c), which have been adopted by the DOE (10 CFR 1021), require a contractor who will prepare an EIS to execute a disclosure specifying that they have no financial or other interest in the outcome of the project. The term "financial or other interest in the outcome of the project" for purposes of this disclosure, is defined in the March 23, 1981, guidance "Forty Most Asked Questions Concerning CEQ's National Environmental Policy Act Regulations," 46 FR 18026-18038 at Questions 71a and b.

"Financial or other interest in the outcome of the project" includes "any financial benefit such as a promise of future construction or design work in the project, as well as indirect benefits the contractor is aware of (e.g., if the project would aid proposals sponsored by the firm's other clients)" 46 FR 18026-18038 at 18031.

In accordance with these requirements, Intera Incorporated hereby certifies as follows: check either (a) or (b).

(a)  Intera Incorporated has no financial or other interest in the outcome of the referenced EIS projects.

(b) \_\_\_\_\_ has the following financial or other interest in the outcome of the referenced EIS projects hereby agree to divest themselves of such interest prior to the start of the work.

Financial or Other Interest

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

Certified by:

Patrick F. Malone

Signature

Patrick F. MALONE

Name

Contracting Officer

Title

JANUARY 20, 2003

Date

**NEPA DISCLOSURE STATEMENT FOR PREPARATION OF THE  
REMEDICATION OF THE MOAB MILL TAILINGS SITE IN GRAND  
COUNTY, UTAH  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

CEQ Regulations at 40 CFR 1506.5(c), which have been adopted by the DOE (10 CFR 1021), require a contractor who will prepare an EIS to execute a disclosure specifying that they have no financial or other interest in the outcome of the project. The term "financial or other interest in the outcome of the project" for purposes of this disclosure, is defined in the March 23, 1981, guidance "Forty Most Asked Questions Concerning CEQ's National Environmental Policy Act Regulations," 46 FR 18026-18038 at Questions 71a and b.

"Financial or other interest in the outcome of the project" includes "any financial benefit such as a promise of future construction or design work in the project, as well as indirect benefits the contractor is aware of (e.g., if the project would aid proposals sponsored by the firm's other clients)" 46 FR 18026-18038 at 18031.

In accordance with these requirements, MFG hereby certifies as follows: check either (a) or (b).

- (a)  MFG has no financial or other interest in the outcome of the referenced EIS projects.
- (b) \_\_\_\_\_ has the following financial or other interest in the outcome of the referenced EIS projects hereby agree to divest themselves of such interest prior to the start of the work.

Financial or Other Interest

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

Certified by:

  
Signature

Craig A. Hamilton  
Name

President/COO  
Title

January 17, 2003

Date

**NEPA DISCLOSURE STATEMENT FOR PREPARATION OF THE  
REMEDICATION OF THE MOAB MILL TAILINGS SITE IN GRAND  
COUNTY, UTAH  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

CEQ Regulations at 40 CFR 1506.5(c), which have been adopted by the DOE (10 CFR 1021), require a contractor who will prepare an EIS to execute a disclosure specifying that they have no financial or other interest in the outcome of the project. The term "financial or other interest in the outcome of the project" for purposes of this disclosure, is defined in the March 23, 1981, guidance "Forty Most Asked Questions Concerning CEQ's National Environmental Policy Act Regulations," 46 FR 18026-18038 at Questions 71a and b.

"Financial or other interest in the outcome of the project" includes "any financial benefit such as a promise of future construction or design work in the project, as well as indirect benefits the contractor is aware of (e.g., if the project would aid proposals sponsored by the firm's other clients)" 46 FR 18026-18038 at 18031.


In accordance with these requirements, **S.M. Stoller Corporation** hereby certifies as follows: check either (a) or (b).

- (a)  **S.M. Stoller Corporation** has no financial or other interest in the outcome of the referenced EIS projects.
- (b) \_\_\_\_\_ has the following financial or other interest in the outcome of the referenced EIS projects hereby agree to divest themselves of such interest prior to the start of the work.

Financial or Other Interest

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

Certified by:

  
Signature

James K. Archibald  
Name

V.P. and General Manager  
Title

January 17, 2003  
Date

**NEPA DISCLOSURE STATEMENT FOR PREPARATION OF THE  
REMEDATION OF THE MOAB MILL TAILINGS SITE IN GRAND  
COUNTY, UTAH  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

CEQ Regulations at 40 CFR 1506.5(c), which have been adopted by the DOE (10 CFR 1021), require a contractor who will prepare an EIS to execute a disclosure specifying that they have no financial or other interest in the outcome of the project. The term "financial or other interest in the outcome of the project" for purposes of this disclosure, is defined in the March 23, 1981, guidance "Forty Most Asked Questions Concerning CEQ's National Environmental Policy Act Regulations," 46 FR 18026-18038 at Questions 71a and b.

"Financial or other interest in the outcome of the project" includes "any financial benefit such as a promise of future construction or design work in the project, as well as indirect benefits the contractor is aware of (e.g., if the project would aid proposals sponsored by the firm's other clients)" 46 FR 18026-18038 at 18031.

In accordance with these requirements, **Teledyne Brown Engineering, Inc.** hereby certifies as follows: check either (a) or (b).


(a)  **Teledyne Brown Engineering, Inc.** has no financial or other interest in the outcome of the referenced EIS projects.

(b) \_\_\_\_\_ has the following financial or other interest in the outcome of the referenced EIS projects hereby agree to divest themselves of such interest prior to the start of the work.

Financial or Other Interest

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

Certified by:



\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

Renee H. Varner

Name

Sr. Contract Administrator

Title

January 17, 2003

Date

End of current text

## **9.0 List of Agencies, Organizations, and Individuals Receiving Copies of the EIS**

### **Government Officials—Federal**

Mr. Frank Bain, Bureau of Land Management  
Mr. Matthew Blevins, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Mr. Jim Carter, Bureau of Land Management  
Mr. Tom Chart, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Mr. Jim Fairchild, U.S. Geological Survey  
Mr. Scott Flanders, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Mr. Myron Fliegel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Dr. Richard Graham, U.S. EPA Region 8  
Mr. Paul Henderson, Canyonlands National Park  
Mr. Norm Henderson, National Park Service  
Mr. Steven Hoffman, Office of the Regional Solicitor, U.S. Department of the Interior  
Ms. Cherie Hutchison, U.S. Department of Labor, Mine Safety and Health Administration  
Mr. Ken Jacobson, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
Mr. Sam Keith, Center for Disease Control  
Mr. Henry Maddux, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Ms. Camille Mittelholtz, U.S. Department of Transportation  
Ms. Anne Norton Miller, U.S. EPA Headquarters  
Mr. Peter Penoyer, National Park Service  
Mr. Robert E. Roberts, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Mr. Cordell Roy, National Park Service  
Mr. Dan Schultheisz, U.S. EPA  
Mr. Fred Skaer, Office of NEPA Facilitation (HEPE-1)  
Mr. Robert F. Stewart, U.S. Department of Interior  
Mr. Larry Svoboda, U.S. EPA Region 8  
Mr. Willie Taylor, U.S. Department of the Interior, Office of Environmental Policy  
and Compliance  
Mr. Gary Torres, Bureau of Land Management  
Mr. Daryl Trotter, Bureau of Land Management  
Ms. Mary von Koch, Bureau of Land Management  
Mr. Bruce Waddell, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Mr. Dave Wood, National Park Service  
Ms. Margaret Wyatt, Bureau of Land Management

### **Elected Officials and Staffers—Federal**

The Honorable Wayne Allard, United States Senate  
The Honorable Joe Baca, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Joe Barton, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Xavier Becerra, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Robert F. Bennett, United States Senate  
Mr. Mike Reberg, Office of Congressman James Matheson

The Honorable Shelley Berkley, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Howard L. Berman, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Marion Berry, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Jeff Bingaman, United States Senate  
The Honorable Rob Bishop, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Mary Bono, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Barbara Boxer, United States Senate  
The Honorable Robert C. Byrd, United States Senate  
The Honorable Ken Calvert, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Chris Cannon, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Lois Capps, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Thad Cochran, United States Senate  
The Honorable Jim Costa, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Christopher Cox, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Randy (Duke) Cunningham, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Susan Davis, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable John Dingell, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Pete Domenici, United States Senate  
The Honorable John Doolittle, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable David Dreier, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Chet Edwards, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Jo Ann Emerson, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable John Ensign, United States Senate  
The Honorable Terry Everett, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Diane Feinstein, United States Senate  
The Honorable Bob Filner, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Jeff Flake, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Trent Franks, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Elton Gallegly, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Jim Gibbons, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Raul Grijalva, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Jane Harman, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Orrin Hatch, United States Senate  
The Honorable J. D. Hayworth, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable David L. Hobson, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Duncan Hunter, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Darrell E. Issa, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Jim Kolbe, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Jon Kyl, United States Senate  
The Honorable Tom Latham, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Carl Levin, United States Senate  
The Honorable Jerry Lewis, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable James Matheson, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable John McCain, United States Senate  
The Honorable Howard P. McKeon, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Juanita Millender-McDonald, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Gary G. Miller, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Grace Napolitano, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Bill Nelson, United States Senate

The Honorable Devin Nunes, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable David R. Obey, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Ed Pastor, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable John E. Peterson, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Jon Porter, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Harry Reid, United States Senate  
The Honorable Rick Renzi, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Silvestre Reyes, U.S. House of Representatives  
Mr. Bruce Richeson, Office of Senator Robert F. Bennett  
The Honorable Dana Rohrabacher, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Lucille Roybal-Allard, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Edward R. Royce, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable John Salazar, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Ken Salazar, United States Senate  
The Honorable Linda Sanchez, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Loretta Sanchez, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Adam B. Schiff, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Jeff Sessions, United States Senate  
The Honorable John Shadegg, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Brad Sherman, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Ike Skelton, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Hilda L. Solis, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable William M. Thomas, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Peter J. Visclosky, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable John Warner, United State Senate  
The Honorable Maxine Waters, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Diane E. Watson, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Honorable Henry A. Waxman, U.S. House of Representatives

## **Tribal**

Vice Chairman Smiley Arrowchis, The Ute Tribe  
Ms. Elayne Atcitty, White Mesa Ute Indian Tribe  
Mr. Neil Cloud, Southern Ute Indian Tribe  
Mr. Daniel Eddy, Jr., Colorado River Indian Tribes  
Mr. Robert Holden, National Congress of American Indians  
Mr. O. Roland McCook, The Ute Tribe  
Ms. Nora McDowell, Fort Mojave Indian Tribe  
Chairwoman Maxine Natchees, The Ute Tribe  
Governor Arlen P. Quetawki, Sr., Pueblo of Zuni  
Mr. Tom Rice, Ute Mountain Ute Tribe  
Mr. Edward D. "Tito" Smith, Chemehuevi Indian Tribe  
Mr. Arvin Trujillo, Navajo Nation Division of Natural Resources  
Ms. Mary Jane Yazzie, White Mesa Ute Council

## **Government Officials—State**

Ms. Sheila Brown, Governor's Office of Planning and Research  
Ms. LaVonne Garrison, State of Utah School & Institutional Trust Lands Administration  
Mr. Hugh Kirkham, Utah Department of Transportation  
Mr. Leroy Mead, Utah Division of Wildlife Resources  
Mr. Loren Morton, Utah Department of Environmental Quality  
Mr. Fred Nelson, Utah State Attorney General's Office  
Dr. Dianne Nielson, Utah Department of Environmental Quality  
Mr. Stephen A. Owens, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality  
Mr. Mark Page, State of Utah, Division of Water Rights  
Mr. Daren Rasmussen, Utah Department of Natural Resources Division of Water Rights  
Ms. Terry Roberts, Governor's Office of Planning and Research  
Mr. Bill Sinclair, Utah Department of Environmental Quality  
Mr. Joseph C. Strolin, Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects  
Mr. Reese Tietje, State of Nevada  
Mr. William Werner, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality  
Ms. Carolyn Wright, Utah Department of Natural Resources Center for Policy  
and Planning

## **Elected Officials—State**

The Honorable Kenny C. Guinn, Governor of Nevada  
The Honorable Jon Huntsman Jr., Governor of Utah  
The Honorable Janet Napolitano, Governor of Arizona  
The Honorable Bill Owens, Governor of Colorado  
The Honorable Arnold Schwarzenegger, Governor of California

## **Interest Groups**

Sierra Club  
Greenaction Indigenous Lands Project  
Mr. Bradley Angel, GreenAction for Health and Environmental Justice  
Ms. Sue Bellagamba, The Nature Conservancy, Moab Project Office  
Ms. Ashley Benton, John Burroughs School  
Ms. Eleanor Bliss, Grand Canyon Trust, Moab Office  
Ms. Danielle Brian, Project on Government Oversight  
Mr. Jim Bridgman, Alliance for Nuclear Accountability  
Mr. Dan Brook, University of California at Berkeley  
Mr. David Brunner, National Fish and Wildlife Foundation  
Mr. Jay Chen, Colorado River Board of California  
Mr. Tom Clements, Greenpeace International  
Dr. Thomas B. Cochran, Natural Resources Defense Council  
Ms. Jana Cranmer, Point Loma Nazarene University  
Mr. James H. Davenport, Colorado River Commission of Nevada  
Ms. Libby Fayad, National Parks Conservation Association  
Ms. Susan Gordon, Alliance for Nuclear Accountability

Ms. Jeannie Gregory, San Diego Natural History Museum  
Mr. Jason Groenewold, Healthy Environment Alliance of Utah  
Mr. John Hadder, Citizen Alert  
Dr. Jack Hamilton, University of Utah  
Mr. David Harper, Mohave Cultural Preservation Program  
Mr. Bill Hedden, Grand Canyon Trust, Moab Office  
Ms. Peggy Maze Johnson, Citizen Alert  
Ms. Laura Kamala, Grand Canyon Trust  
Mr. Fred Krupp, Environmental Defense  
Mr. Lawson LeGate, Sierra Club  
Mr. David Livermore, The Nature Conservancy  
Mr. Bill Love, Sierra Club  
Mr. William B. Mackie, Western Governors' Association  
Ms. Danielle Mentzer, Point Loma Nazarene University  
Dr. Michael Mooring, Point Loma Nazarene University  
Mr. Nadejda Murahovscaia, Point Loma Nazarene University  
Ms. Denise Oblak, Utah Guides & Outfitters Assn.  
Ms. Cynthia Ovando-Knutson, Point Loma Nazarene University  
Dr. Keith Pedersen, Point Loma Nazarene University  
Mr. Carl Pope, Sierra Club  
Ms. Dianne Rabello, Point Loma Nazarene University  
Ms. Pandora Rose, Mountain Defense League  
Mr. Richard J. Sawicki, The Wilderness Society  
Ms. Indra Serrano, Point Loma Nazarene University  
Ms. Stacey Street, Point Loma Nazarene University  
Mr. David A. Thompson, Kearny High Educational Center  
Ms. Karla VanderZanden, Canyonlands Field Institute  
Mr. Ivan Weber, U.S. Green Building Council-Utah  
Mr. John Weisheit, Living Rivers and Colorado Riverkeepers  
Ms. Jane Williams, California Communities Against Toxics  
Ms. Ellen Wohl, Department of Earth Resources Colorado State University  
Mr. Gerald R. Zimmerman, Colorado River Board of California

## **Local Officials**

Grand County Council  
Grand County Library  
San Juan County  
Mr. Rick Bailey, San Juan County Commission  
Ms. Judy Bane, Grand County  
Ms. Audrey Graham, Grand County Council  
Mr. Bart Koch, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California  
Ms. Joette Langianese, Grand County Council  
Mr. Jim Lewis, Grand County Council  
Ms. Lila Martinez, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California  
Mr. Patrick McDermott, Bluff Service Area Board of Trustees  
Mr. Al McLeod, Grand County Council  
Mr. Jerry McNeely, Grand County Council

Mr. Edward C. Morgan, Town of Carefree  
Ms. Gloria A. Rivera, Imperial Irrigation District  
Mayor Dave Sakrison, City of Moab  
Mr. Darrell H. Smith, Salt Lake County Council of Governments  
Ms. Maureen A. Stapleton, San Diego County Water Authority  
Mr. Rex Tanner, Grand County  
Town Council, Town of Castle Valley  
Mr. Dennis Underwood, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California  
Mr. Chris Webb, City of Blanding  
Thompson Springs

### **Media—Print, Radio, and Television**

Ms. Caroline Bleakley, KLAS-TV  
Mr. Gary Harmon, The Daily Sentinel  
Mr. Tom Harvey, The Salt Lake Tribune  
Mr. David Hasemyer, San Diego Union Tribune  
Ms. Nancy Lofholm, The Denver Post  
Mr. Phil Mueller, KCYN, 97.1 FM  
Mr. Alan Stahler, KZMR Radio  
Ms. Christy Williams, KZMU  
Times Independent

### **Private Citizens**

Breckenridge Communications  
Mr. Kevin Aarestad  
Ms. Theresa Acerro  
Mr. Frank A. Ackerman  
Ms. Beverly Ackerman  
Ms. Lani J. Adams  
Ms. Elizabeth Adkins  
Ms. Sherry Agnew  
Ms. Barbara Aguado  
Mr. Felix Aguilar  
Ms. Patricia Aguirre  
Mr. Evan Albright  
Mr. Bob Alexander  
Mr. & Ms. James P. and Pamela G. Alexander  
Mr. Duncan Allen  
Ms. Aimee Allen  
Ms. Adel Alsup  
Laura, Jeff, Brett Ambrose  
Mr. Scott H. Amey, POGO  
Mr. Tim Ampe  
Mr. Wayne Anderson  
Ms. Corina Anderson

Ms. Ellen Anderson  
Mr. Russ Anderson  
Ms. Jane Anderson  
Ms. Darla Anelli  
Mr. & Ms. Dean and Phyllis Angelico  
Ms. Linda R. Anthony  
Ms. Peggy Armour  
Mr. Dean Armstrong  
Mr. Chris Arnold  
Ms. Lani Asay  
Mr. Gary August  
Ms. Janina Austin  
Ms. Yolanda Badback  
Ms. Ellen Bailey  
Mr. & Mrs. Kyle & Carrie Bailey  
Mr. Bob Baird, URS Corporation  
Mr. Bruce Baizel  
Mr. Raghbir Bajwa  
Mr. & Mrs. Quentin & Pam Baker  
Ms. Tanya Baker  
Ms. Connie Baker  
Mr. Rob Baldwin  
Ms. Jennifer Banoczy  
Mr. Ron Barca  
Mr. Dominic Barile  
Mr. James Barker  
Ms. Helen Barker  
Ms. Michele L. Barnard  
Mr. Joel Barnes  
Mr. Lee Basnar  
Ms. Anne Bassett  
Ms. Mijanou Bauchau  
Ms. & Mr. Clara & Enduit Bauchau  
Ms. Gwynne Bauer  
Ms. Jamie Baughman  
Mr. Isaac Beardmord  
Mr. Dudley Beck  
Mr. Daniel Beeman  
Ms. Barbara Belcher, Century 21 Carole Realty  
Mr. Ray Bell  
Mr. Mark Belles  
Dr. Jean Bennett  
Ms. Jean M. Bennett  
Mr. James Bennett  
Mr. Richard Benson  
Ms. Silvia Berglas  
Ms. Barbie Bergman  
Ms. Diane Berliner  
Mr. & Ms. Irwin and Lila Berman

Ms. & Mr. Lila and Irv Berman  
Ms. Nancy Berman  
Ms. Carol Bernacchi  
Mr. & Ms. Bob and Linda Bernstein  
Mr. Thomas Bertetta  
Mr. Chad Beyer  
Ms. Bettina Bickel  
Ms. Danielle Bifulci  
Mr. and Mrs. Mike & Jean Binyon  
Ms. & Mr. Louise & Donn Bishop  
Mr. Steve Black  
Ms. Randi Blackwell  
Mr. Russell Blalack  
Mr. Norman Bloom, Williams Environmental Services, Inc.  
Ms. Jenny Blue  
Mr. Donald Blume  
Mr. David Bodner  
Mr. Evert Boer  
Mr. Lee A. Bogear  
Mr. William C. Boling  
Ms. Patricia Bolt  
Ms. Barbara Bolton  
Mr. Paul Bookidis  
Mr. Michael Bordenave  
Mr. Wayne Bostic  
Ms. Karen Bowden  
Mr. & Ms. Philip and Sharon Bowles  
Ms. Nan Singh Bowman  
Ms. Margaret Bowman  
Ms. Cleal Bradford  
Ms. Victoria Brandon  
Mr. Richard H. Brant  
Mr. Carl Brasow, Coastal Caverns  
Dr. Joseph Braun  
Ms. Joan Breiding  
Ms. Susan Breisch  
Ms. Marlene Bremner  
Mr. Matt Brennan  
Mr. William Bretz  
Mr. Jeff Bright  
Mr. Dennis Brittenbach  
Mr. B.A. Broughton  
Ms. Virginia Brown  
Mr. Frederick Brown  
Ms. Keri Brown  
Ms. Darcey Brown  
Ms. Lynn Brown  
Ms. Phyllis Brown  
Ms. Myrna Brown

Mr. Robert Browne  
Ms. Sarah Brownrigg  
Mr. Scott M. Bruner  
Ms. Jean-Marie Bruno, Park Water Company  
Ms. Debbie Brush  
Mr. Gary Bryant  
Mr. Richard Bryant  
Ms. Amy Brzeczek  
Ms. Heidi Buech  
Ms. Amoret L Bunn, Battelle/Pacific Northwest Laboratory  
Mr. Scott Burbridge  
Ms. Bitsa Burger  
Ms. Jessica Burgett  
Ms. Eleanor Burian-Mohr  
Mr. Mack Burke  
Mr. G. Burton  
Ms. Martha Bushnell  
Ms. Jennie Buss  
Ms. Barbara Busse  
Mr. Tom Cahill  
Mr. Anthony Caico  
Ms. Barbara G. Campbell Weir  
Mr. Chase Cantrell  
Ms. & Mr. Sandra and Richard Capano  
Ms. Sylvia Cardella  
Mr. & Mrs. Jim & Ginny Carlson  
Ms. Cathleen A. Carlson  
Ms. Virginia Carlson  
Ms. Jan Carmichael  
Ms. Andrea Carpenter  
Dr. Donna Carr  
Ms. & Mr. Gaile & Bob Carr  
Ms. Claire Carren  
Ms. Barbara Caton  
Ms. Sharon Cavallo  
Ms. Sherry Celine  
Ms. Audrey Celine  
Mr. Robert M Cerello  
Ms. Jessie Chambliss  
Mr. Victor Chan  
Ms. Kai Chan  
Ms. Maureen Chase  
Ms. Lisa Chase  
Mr. Kerry Chavez  
Mr. R. L. Christie  
Ms. Cathy Cirina  
Mr. David P. Clark  
Ms. Pamela Clark  
Mr. Brad Clark

Mr. Dustin Clark  
Mr. Dustin Clark  
Ms. Frances Clark  
Ms. Monette Clark  
Mr. Hereen Claudio  
Mr. Bruce Coburn  
Ms. Stacy Coleman  
Mr. Brian Collins  
Ms. Sandra Collins  
Mr. Joe Colosimo  
Ms. Vira Confectioner  
Ms. Sara Conklin  
Mr. Thomas Conroy  
Mr. Clay Conway, Gaeaorama, Inc.  
Ms. Erin Cooney  
Ms. Lisa Copeland  
Ms. Betty Coram  
Mr. Dave Cozzens  
Ms. Amy Crews  
Mr. & Ms. Dale and Janice Cross  
Mr. Sam Crowell  
Mr. Lawrence Crowley  
Mr. Ken Cuddeback  
Mr. Jonathan Cupp  
Ms. Patricia L. Curley  
Ms. Laurel Dailey-White  
Ms. Susan Dameron  
Ms. Patricia Daniels  
Mr. John Francis Darke  
Ms. Ena DaSilva  
Mr. Jon Davidson  
Mr. Juan de Greiff  
Mr David De Morelli  
Ms. Melanie DeBo/Stauffer  
Mr. A. Declario  
Ms. Diana Dee  
Ms. Jennifer Delker  
Mr. Larry Dennis  
Ms. Rachael Denny  
Mr. Kinjal Desai  
Ms. Eileen Deutsch  
Ms. Jessica Dicamillo  
Ms. Karen Dickerman  
Ms. Marina Diehl  
Ms. Deb Dillon  
Dr. John C. Dohrenwend, Southwest Satellite Imaging  
Mr. Matthew Donatoni  
Ms. Jennifer Doob  
Ms. Liza Doran

Ms. Virginia Dotson  
Ms. Mona Dougherty  
Ms. Anna Dowling  
Ms. Cindi Drake  
Ms. Mercy Drake  
Ms. Alice Drogin  
Mr. Ken Drogin  
Ms. Lisa Du  
Ms. Roseann Dudrick  
Mr. John Dukes  
Ms. Barbara Dunn  
Mr. Louis Dunn  
Mr. Eddy Dunn  
Ms. Collette DuPont  
Ms. Christine Dupre  
Ms. Claire Dye  
Ms. Susan Dzienius  
Mr. Scott Edmonson  
Ms. Sue Eininger  
Mr. Rob Elliott, Arizona Raft Adventures, Inc.  
Mr. David Ellis  
Ms. Stephanie Embrey  
Ms. Connie Emerine  
Mr. Michael Emery  
Mr. Todd Enders  
Mr. David Enevoldsen  
Ms. Rebecca English  
Ms. Karen Erickson  
Mr. Joseph Espanol  
Mr. Douglas Estes  
Mr. Michael W. Evans  
Ms. Lauren Evans  
Ms. Laura Evans  
Ms. Nancy Evans  
Mr. David Everist  
Ms. Janice Fahey  
Ms. Maureen Fahlberg  
Mr. Ron Faich  
Mr. Bill Fallon, Battelle Memorial Institute  
Ms. Beverly Falor  
Ms. Janeen Faulk  
Mr. Bruce Fayman  
Mr. Roger Featherstone, Earthworks  
Ms. Justina Fedorchuk  
Mr. Tom Ferguson  
Ms. Heather Feuer  
Mr. Lynn Fielder  
Ms. Sarah Fields  
Mr. David Firshein

Mr. John Fischer  
Mr. & Ms. Steve and Amanda Fisher  
Ms. Mary Beth Fitzburgh  
Ms. Lorel Foletta  
Ms. Gretel Follingstad  
Ms. Susan Folsom  
Ms. Janice Foss  
Mr. Anthony Foster  
Ms. Catherine France  
Mr. Lee Frank  
Ms. Anne Frazier  
Ms. Anna M Frazier, DINECARE  
Ms. Elizabeth Sloan Freel  
Mr. John Fritz  
Ms. Cyndi Fritzler  
Ms. Victoria Fugit  
Ms. Michelle Fuller  
Mr. Joel Futral  
Ms. Marnie Gaede  
Mr. Keith Gagomiros  
Ms. Dina Galassini  
Ms. Jennifer Gale  
Mr. Pat Galello  
Ms. Jeanette Galloway  
Ms. Shiela Ganz  
Mr. Jeffery A. Garcia  
Ms. Shayna Gardiner  
Mr. Frank Gardner, Bhate Associates  
Mr. Wayne Garland  
Ms. Katherine Garrett  
Mr. Jamie Gates  
Ms. Catherine Gauthier-Campbell  
Mr. John Geddie  
Mr. John Geiger  
Ms. Sheryl Lynn Gerety  
Mr. James Giannini  
Mr. Delamar Gibbons  
Mr. Jim Gibson  
Ms. Patty Giffin  
Mr. Kenneth John Gilmour  
Mr. Steve Glazer  
Mr. & Ms. Bill & Donna Gleason  
Mr. Mark Gleason  
Ms. Monica Goddard  
Mr. Alan Goggins  
Mr. Ernest Goitein  
Mr. Richard Goldman  
Ms. Judith Goldstein  
Mr. David Gomez

Mr. Michael Gonzalez  
Ms. Autumn Gonzalez  
Ms. Margaret Goodman  
Mr. Joe Gordon, S.M. Stoller Corporation  
Ms. Audrey Graham  
Ms. Kimberley Graham  
Ms. Ariel Graham  
Mr. Alvin Grancell  
Ms. Sandra Granich  
Mr. Jerald Grantham  
Mr. Robert Greenburg  
Mr. Jack Greene  
Mr. Tony Greiner  
Mr. Fred Griest  
Ms. Dian Griffith  
Ms. Bonnie Gross  
Mr. Paul B Grossman  
Ms. Robin Gustus  
Ms. Pam Hackley  
Ms. Melena Hagen  
Ms. Pamela Hahler  
Dr. Dee Hahn  
Ms. Sarah Jane Hall  
Ms. & Mr. Brook & Linda Hall  
Mr. Bob Hamel  
Ms. Karla Hancock  
Ms. Kim Hanks  
Mr. Jim Hanley  
Mr. Chong Hao  
Mr. Mark Harper  
Ms. Laura Harper  
Ms. Susie Harrington  
Mr. Chris Harrington  
Mr. Kelly Harris  
Mr. Bruce Harrison  
Ms. Katherine Harrod  
Ms. Linda Harroun  
Mr. Andrew Harsig  
Ms. Torie Hartge  
Mr. Doug Hartung  
Ms. Nora Lee Hastings  
Mr. Bob Haugen  
Ms. Sara Hayes  
Mr. Gary Hazen  
Mr. Slim Heilpern  
Mr. Christian Heinold  
Mr. G. Heinrichsdorff  
Mr. Chris Heintzelman  
Ms. Meckenzie Helmandollar

Ms. Marilyn Hempel  
Ms. Bonnie Hendricks, EDAW, Inc.  
Ms. Christine Henze  
Ms. Kathy Herman  
Ms. Julie Hernandez  
Mr. Rex Herron  
Mr. John R. Hess  
Mr. Lance Hetherington  
Mr. Brost Hety  
Mr. David Hicks  
Ms. Lucy Bastida Hilliard  
Mr. Don Hinds  
Mr. Daniel Hirsch, Committee to Bridge the Gap  
Mr. Ron Hochstein, International Uranium Corporation  
Mr. Christian Holenstein  
Mr. Frank Holgate  
Mr. Richard Hollister  
Ms. Jennifer Holmes  
Ms. Linda Holmes  
Mr. Ronald Holmes  
Mr. Carl Honecker  
Mr. Gary L. Honeyman, Union Pacific Railroad  
Mr. John Hotchkiss  
Mr. Jack Houghton  
Ms. Gail Houston  
Ms. Jennifer Hoyt  
Ms. Tamara Huddleston, Environmental Enforcement Section  
Ms. Linda Hudek  
Mr. & Ms. Tom and Lois Hughes  
Ms. Shannon Hughes  
Mr. Curt Hull, S.M. Stoller Corporation  
Mr. Eumy Hung  
Ms. Tamara Hurley  
Mr. Verne Huser  
Ms. Nancy Inaba  
Mr. Lantz M. Indergard, RG  
Mr. Timothy Indermuehle  
Ms. Eleanor Inskip  
Mr. Keith G. Irwin  
Mr. Craig Irwin  
Mr. Chris Isensee  
Mr. Brandon Ives  
Mr. David Januzelli  
Ms. Marilyn Jempel  
Mr. Jon Jenkins  
Mr. Basil Jenkins  
Ms. Kim Johnson  
Mr. William Johnson  
Mr. Ferd Johnson

Mr. Kim Johnson  
Mr. John Johnson  
Mr. Bob Johnston  
Mr. Irwin Jones  
Ms. Patricia Jones  
Ms. Penni Jones  
Mr. Allan B. Jones  
Ms. Kalen Jones  
Mr. James Jones, Tidewater Oil and Gas Company, LLC  
Ms. Lou Ann Joyal  
Ms. Kate Juenger  
Mr. Lee Juskalian  
Mr. Periel Kaczmarek  
Mr. Max Kaehn  
Ms. Karen Kain  
Ms. Angela T. Kantola  
Mr. Morris Kaplan  
Mr. Samuel Karcher  
Mr. Lynn Karsh  
Ms. Joni Kay  
Mr. D Kearns  
Mr. Riley Keating  
Ms. Nina Keefer  
Ms. Sharon Keeney  
Mr. Jason Keith, The Access Fun  
Ms. Alice Kelly  
Mr. Shahido Kempter  
Mr. Bill Kennedy  
Mr. Dan Kent  
Mr. Rob Kerchen  
Mr. Lonnie Key  
Ms. Lynda Key  
Mr. Mha Atma Khalsa  
Mr. Nezer Khan  
Mr. Donald Kiffmeyer  
Ms. Jayne L King  
Ms. Karen Kirschling  
Ms. Millie Kitchin  
Ms. Karen Kite  
Ms. Raechel Kjonaas  
Ms. Julie Kleinert  
Ms. Antonia Klohr  
Mr. Carmen Kluscor  
Ms. Charlotte Kollmeyer  
Ms. Rebecca Koo  
Ms. Shirley Kosek  
Ms. Katherine Kosmeya-Dodge  
Mr. Roy Kranz  
Mr. David B. Kuhlman

Ms. Rochelle La Frinere  
Ms. Juanita E. LaBlond  
Mr. David Lacy  
Ms. & Mr. Dorothy & Ken Lamm  
Ms. Suzanne Landa  
Mr. D. Landau  
Ms. Mireya Landin  
Ms. Amanda Landis-Hanna  
Ms. Sheryl Landrum  
Ms. Nancy Laplaca  
Ms. Audrey Lareau  
Ms. Laura Larkin  
Mr. Zach Latham  
Ms. Leona L Lauder  
Ms. Vicki Lawrence  
Ms. Melissa Lazaro  
Ms. Debra Lee  
Mr. Casey Leeboy  
Ms. Kathleen Leenerts  
Ms. Suzanne Leichtling  
Ms. Sue Lemontre  
Ms. Susie Leon  
Mr. John P. Leonard  
Mr. Don Leske  
Mr. Robert Levin  
Mr. Mark Levy  
Mr. & Ms. Stephen and Mary Lewis  
Ms. Donna Lewis  
Ms. Gail Lewis  
Mr. David Lien  
Mr. Dave Lill  
Ms. Virginia Lippert  
Mr. Robert Lippman  
Mr. Julius Lisi  
Ms. Carol Loar  
Mr. Peter Loeff  
Ms. Cecila Lovell  
Ms. Megan Loyko  
Ms. Alison J. Luedecke  
Ms. Anne Lyman  
Mr. Robert Lynch, Esq. Robert S. Lynch & Associates  
Ms. Sheree Lynn  
Ms. Kelly Lyon  
Mr. Jay Lyon  
Mr. Crawford Maccallum  
Mr. B. C. Macdonald  
Mr. Melvyn Maddox  
Mr. Steve Maheras, Battelle Memorial Institute  
Ms. Maia Maia

Ms. Sonja Malmuth  
Mr. William Manewal  
Ms. Alexis Manning  
Mr. Jonathan Manto  
Ms. Mary Markus  
Mr. Jim Marrs, Jim Marrs & Associates, Inc.  
Ms. Marie Marsh  
Ms. Victoria Marshall  
Mr. Sandy Marshall  
Ms. Rebecca Martin  
Ms. Cynthia Marugg  
Ms. Myrna May  
Ms. Susanne Mayberry  
Ms. Suzanne McCain  
Mr. Dan McCarn  
Mr. and Mrs. Jeff & Wren McCleary  
Ms. Catherine McClintock  
Ms. LaRue McDaniel  
Ms. Nora Jane McDonough  
Ms. Michele McDougal, McDougal & Associates  
Ms. Marjorie Larock McEwen  
Mr. Bob McFarland  
Ms. Anne S. McGrath  
Ms. Blair McLaughlin  
Ms. Laurie McLaughlin  
Ms. Sarah Mclean  
Mr. Erik McMillan  
Mr. James Mecke  
Mr. Jay Meierdierck  
Mr. Ronnie Melin  
Ms. Rachele Melious  
Ms. Ann E. Smith Mercandetti  
Mr. Gary Meunier  
Mr. Jessica Michals  
Ms. Joanna Mickle  
Mr. Gary Mierau  
Mr. Paul Miller  
Ms. Nancy Miller  
Ms. Lisa Miller  
Ms. Candice Millhollen  
Ms. Cynthia Milner  
Ms. Cynthia Minde  
Mr. David F. Mishiwiec, Sr.  
Ms. Roxanne Molina  
Ms. Sara Monterroso  
Mr. Tom Moody, Natural Channel Design, Inc.  
Ms. Judy Moore  
Ms. Estella Moore  
Ms. Jackie Moore

Ms. Lynne Moore  
Ms. Kristie Moore  
Ms. Mary Moran  
Mr. Billy Morander  
Mr. Rick Morgal  
Mr. Jacob Morgan  
Ms. Ivy Morrow  
Mr. Jeffery Morton  
Ms. Alicia Moser  
Mr. Grant Moskowitz  
Ms. Audrey Muller  
Ms. Terri Mungle  
Mr. David Munk  
Mr. Rich Munroe  
Ms. Donna Murico  
Mr. Jeff Nabas  
Ms. Marni Nacheff  
Mr. Fred Nadelman  
Mr. Robert E. Natkin, Jr.  
Ms. Paloma Navarrete  
Mr. Charles Nelson  
Ms. Teresa Nemeth  
Ms. Alice Neuhauser  
Mr. David Newcomer  
Mr. Peter Newton  
Mr. Gregg Nickel, Envirocon, Inc.  
Mr. Jaime Nicolaisen  
Mr. David Nicponski, Moab Reclamation, LLC  
Ms. Roma Niel  
Ms. M. Gail Nielsen  
Dr. Linda Nolte  
Mr. Thomas Norris  
Mr. Asiel Norton  
Mr. Jay Norwood, Pipeline Systems, Inc.  
Mr. Kirt Noyes  
Mr. Dean Nyffeler  
Ms. Beth Oden  
Ms. Jane Odin  
Mr. Kelly O'Donnell  
Ms. Addie Olazabal, EDAW, Inc.  
Mr. Nelson Olivas  
Ms. Ruth Olson  
Ms. Lora J. Oravec  
Mr. Gerald Orcholski  
Ms. Nancy Orr  
Mr. Ken Osborne  
Mr. Desmond O'Shea  
Ms. Kristen Osman  
Ms. Delores A. Oster

Mr. Jim Ostler  
Ms. Jan Overstreet  
Mr. Randy Padilla  
Ms. Beryl Pagan  
Ms. Jan Paley  
Ms. Mara Palmer  
Mr. John Pamperin  
Ms. Pinky Jain Pan  
Mr. Richard Pangren  
Ms. Nicole Parisi-Smith  
Ms. Jean Parkinson  
Mr. Kealan Partlow  
Mr. Richard Pasichnyk  
Ms. Shela Patrickson  
Mr. Robert S. Pattison  
Mr. Ken Paulsen  
Ms. Candee Pearson  
Ms. Kelle Peeplez  
Mr. Kevin Peer  
Ms. Debbie Pena  
Ms. Joann Perryman  
Ms. Tara Peterson  
Ms. Kimberly Peterson  
Mr. Bill Peterson, P & A Engineers  
Mr. Jason C. Petrig  
Mr. Todd Petrowski  
Mr. Bob Phillips  
Ms. Sally Phillips  
Ms. Mauricette Phillips  
Ms. Deborah Pierce  
Ms. Leslie Pierpont  
Mr. Lloyd M. Pierson  
Ms. Laura Pilewski  
Ms. Diana Piloyan  
Mr. David Piper  
Ms. Gayle Piper  
Ms. Christine Plotkin  
Ms. Karen Pluth  
Mr. Mel Podell  
Ms. Ann Pogue  
Mr. Don Policaro  
Mr. Jason Pollard  
Ms. Jeri Pollock  
Ms. Roberta Price  
Ms. Hedy Price  
Mr. James Provenzano  
Mr. & Ms. Tom and Mary Psychogios  
Mr. Steve Pucillo  
Ms. Jill Quilici

Ms. April Quinn  
Ms. Shyla Raghav  
Ms. Holly Randall  
Ms. Jill Ransom  
Mr. G. Harry Ransom  
Ms. Rosa Rashall  
Mr. Steve Rauzi  
Ms. Lisa Rayner  
Mr. St Raynis  
Mr. John Redhouse  
Mr. John Redhouse, DINECARE  
Ms. Mary Reed  
Mr. Ron Regehr  
Mr. Andrew Reich  
Mr. Andy Reimers  
Mr. Frank Reinhard  
Dr. David Repp  
Ms. Fran Reyes  
Ms. Debra Reynolds  
Ms. Susan Richards  
Mr. Matthew Richardson  
Mr. John Riddell  
Mr. Ross Ridder, Direct Marketing Resources, Inc.  
Ms. Emily Rieber  
Ms. Deborah Cloven Riley  
Mr. Raymond Riley  
Mr. Jeff Rippy, Rippy's Utility Location Services  
Mr. Kenneth Roach  
Mr. Kevin Roache  
Mr. Keegan Roberson  
Mr. Harold Roberts, International Uranium Corp.  
Ms. Donna Robi Robins  
Mr. Barth Robinson  
Ms. Karen Robinson  
Ms. Anne Robison  
Ms. Carol Rocker  
Ms. Beth Rodda  
Ms. Vonda Rodeheaver  
Ms. Tessa Roden  
Ms. Lila Rogers  
Dr. Alan Rogers  
Ms. Terri Rolland  
Ms. Monika Romero  
Ms. Charlene Root  
Mr. Scott Rosevear, Snell & Wilmer  
Ms. Aimee Ross  
Mr. Clay Rosson SAIC  
Ms. Diane Rounkles  
Mr. Patrick Roussetot

Ms. Julia Rouvier  
Mr. Manuela Rubalcava  
Ms. Ana Rudolph  
Ms. Leona Ruegg  
Mr. Steve Russell  
Ms. Barbara Rutledge  
Ms. Bela Ryan  
Mr. John Sakacs  
Mr. Diego Salgado  
Mr. Barry Saltzman  
Mr. James Sams  
Mr. Harold A Samuels  
Mr. Gary Sanders  
Mr. and Mrs. Sam & Polly Sanderson  
Mr. Gerardo Sandoval  
Ms. Julie Sanford  
Ms. Diana Sankey  
Mr. Gabe Schaffer  
Mr. Jack Schaps  
Ms. Ellen Schauer  
Ms. & Mr. Ann & John Schechter  
Mr. David Schein  
Ms. Roxane Scherek  
Ms. Mary Schilder  
Mr. Kurt Schlomberg  
Ms. Marilyn Schneider  
Ms. Ann Schoeller  
Ms. Gabriele Schubert  
Dr. Jane Carney Schulze  
Ms. Hilde Schweitzer  
Ms. Maria Scianna  
Mr. John Scott  
Mr. Sidney Ramsden Scott  
Ms. Lia Sculpt  
Mr. Franklin Seal  
Mr. Joseph Sebastian  
Ms. Linda Segall-Anable  
Mr. Chuck Seidler  
Mr. Charlie R. Sellers  
Mr. Robert Seltzer  
Mr. Michael Shaw  
Mr. Kevin Sheets  
Mr. Brand Shelton  
Mr. Kelly Shively  
Mr. Mark Shockley  
Mr. Larry Siglin  
Ms. Chandra Sigmund  
Ms. Karen Signorile  
Ms. Susan Silberberg-Peirce, Canyonlights Slides/Photography

Mr. Dennis Silva  
Ms. Catherine Silvers  
Ms. Kay Singer  
Ms. Camly Slawson  
Mr. Ken Sleight, Pack Creek Ranch  
Ms. Mindy A Smeal  
Mr. Hector Smith  
Ms. Cynthia Smith  
Mr. Philip Snyder  
Ms. Sandra Sobanski  
Mr. Johan Soderlind  
Mr. Conor Soraghan  
Mr. Michael Souza  
Ms. Jann Spallina  
Ms. Kirsten Speer  
Ms. Gayle Spencer  
Ms. Gail Spensley  
Mr. Duane Spicer  
Mr. Richard Spotts  
Mr. Richard A. Stafford  
Mr. John Stark  
Ms. Jennifer Stefanow  
Ms. Rochelle Stern  
Mr. Gene M. Stevenson  
Mr. Richard Stewart  
Mr. Rodney Stimmel  
Mr. David Stoker  
Ms. Debra Stokes  
Mr. Jim Stone  
Mr. S. J. Stratford  
Mr. Charles R. Straus  
Ms. Lori Strawn  
MCL Studio  
Ms. Kathleen G Stutz  
Mr. & Ms. Michael K. and Mary Suarez  
Mr. Jim Suhy  
Ms. Serena Suplee  
Ms. Madelaine Sutphin  
Ms. Lucy Swartz, Battelle Memorial Institute  
Mr. & Ms. GR and Verla Swasey  
Ms. Jeanne Sweig  
Mr. Richard Swisshelm  
Mr. Michael Tabib  
Mr. Lenn Tamminen  
Ms. Irene Taparauskas  
Ms. LaVerne Tate  
Ms. Joanne A. Taylor  
Mr. Steven Taylor  
Ms. Jennifer Terhune

Ms. Susan Thing  
Ms. Kim Thomas  
Mr. Kevin Thomas  
Ms. Lori Thomas  
Mr. Stephen Thompson  
Mr. Jim Thuesen  
Mr. Arthur J. Tielens, A.J. Tielens and Associates  
Mr. Jantrue Ting  
Mr. William Tiwald  
Mr. Steve Tobarrio  
Ms. Janette Tom  
Ms. Mary Ann Tomasko Perry  
Mr. Roger Townsend  
Ms. Kayta Tracey  
Mr. Kirk Treece, ECDC Environmental L.C.  
Mr. Howard Trenholme  
Ms. Tia Triplett  
Ms. Rebecca Trujillo  
Mr. Reed Tsosie Nielsons, Skanska Inc.  
Mr. Roy Tuckman  
Mr. & Ms. Patricia and Frank Turkot  
Ms. R-Laurraine Tutihasi  
Mr. Thomas B. Urani  
Ms. Andrea Valenzuela  
Mr. Jay Vance, Envirocare of Utah, Inc.  
Ms. Leta Vaughn  
Mr. Vladimir Vega  
Mr. James Verry  
Mr. Gerald Vertrees  
Mr. Peter Viglia  
Ms. Barbara Voss  
Mr. Matthew Waclawik  
Mr. Steve Wagner  
Ms. Joanne L. Wagner  
Mr. G. Blu Wagner  
Ms. Robyn Wagoner  
Ms. Mare Wahose  
Ms. Jeannine Wait  
Ms. Lois Waldref  
Ms. Mary Ann Wallner  
Mr. David Walworth  
Ms. Dawn Waring  
Mr. Don Wates  
Ms. Erica Wayne  
Mr. Jerry Wayne  
Ms. Rita Webber  
Mr. Majill-Lee Weber  
Mr. Ivan Weber, Weber Sustainability Consulting  
Mr. & Ms. Geoffrey and Elizabeth Weiler

Ms. Margaret Weimer  
Mr. Ben Weinbaum  
Mr. Maury Weiner  
Mr. Robert Weinhold  
Mr. John Weisheit  
Mr. Russel Weisz  
Mr. Ross Weller  
Mr. Kimball Wells  
Mr. M. W. Wenner  
Ms. Kirstyn Werner  
Mr. Douglass Weymouth  
Ms. Thelma Whiskers  
Ms. Paulette Whitcomb  
Mr. Matthew S Whitcomb  
Ms. Sharlene White  
Ms. Claudia Whitnah  
Mr. Francis X. Wiget Ii  
Mr. Douglas Wilber  
Mr. Bryan H. Wildenthal  
Mr. James Wilk  
Mr. Charles Williams  
Ms. Janet Williams  
Ms. Susan Williams  
Mr. Bob Williams  
Ms. Seanna Williams  
Ms. Jennifer Wilson  
Mr. Ted Winterer  
Mr. Steven J. Wiser  
Mr. Barry Wolf  
Ms. Rachel Wolf  
Mr. John Wolfe  
Mr. Mel Wolters  
Mr. Jeffrey Womble  
Ms. Teresa Wong  
Mr. Howard Woo  
Ms. Patty Woodard  
Ms. Joan Woodard  
Ms. Victoria Woodard  
Ms. Angela Woodcock  
Mr. John Wu  
Ms. Michelle Wurth  
Ms. Tina Wynn  
Mr. William B. Yancey  
Ms. Ruby Young  
Ms. Jennifer Young  
Mr. Chad Young  
Ms. Mary Young  
Mr. Joe Yuskin  
Mr. Guy Zahller

Ms. Delilah Zamora  
Mr. Paul Zarchin  
Ms. Chandra Zeissler  
Ms. Sandy Zeldas  
Ms. JoAnne Zlevor  
Ms. Abigail Zoline

## **Resources**

DOE Grand Junction Public Reading Room  
Blanding Branch Library  
Grand County Library  
White Mesa Ute Administrative Building  
Ms. Amy Brunvand, University of Utah Marriott Library  
Ms. Judy Smith, Colorado State University Library

End of current text

## 10.0 Glossary

<i>active remediation</i>	The use of active ground water remediation methods such as gradient manipulation, ground water extraction and treatment, or in situ ground water treatment to restore ground water quality to acceptable levels.
<i>acute concentration</i>	The concentration of a contaminant in a medium (air, water, and soil) that would produce an acute exposure. Acute exposure is a single, short-term exposure (usually a day or less) to radiation, a toxic substance, or other stressors that may result in severe biological harm or death.
<i>alluvium</i>	Sediments generally composed of clay, silt, sand, gravel, or similar unconsolidated material deposited by flowing rivers and streams.
<i>ammonia</i>	A nitrogen-based compound that exists in either the un-ionized form (NH <sub>3</sub> ) or as the ammonium ion (NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> ).
<i>aquifer</i>	A geologic unit (rock or sediment) that can store and transmit water at rates sufficient to supply reasonable amounts of water to wells and springs.
<i>aquitard</i>	A layer of low-permeability formation immediately above or below an aquifer that retards but does not prevent the flow of ground water to or from the aquifer. It does not readily yield water to wells and springs but may serve as a storage unit for ground water.
<i>background ground water quality</i>	The composition of ground water in areas near the millsite that are geologically similar to the millsite and were not affected by ore-processing activities.
<i>benchmark</i>	An established criterion, known point, or metric used to compare measured or estimated values of chemicals in the environment. Benchmarks generally represent concentrations for a particular medium (e.g., air, soil, water, food) that are acceptable for given receptors (e.g., humans, animals).
<i>benthos</i>	The plants and animals living on the river bottom.
<i>biota</i>	Living organisms.
<i>borrow material</i>	Rock, soil, or other earth materials that are excavated from one location and transported for use at another location, generally for construction purposes (e.g., as fill material).
<i>brine</i>	The USGS classification of water with a TDS concentration of more than 35,000 mg/L. In the EIS, briny water in the basin fill aquifer beneath the Moab site is salty ground water, which became salty mostly from dissolution of evaporite minerals in the Paradox Formation.

<i>chronic concentration</i>	Concentration of a contaminant in an environmental medium (air, soil, and water) that would produce a chronic exposure. A chronic exposure is a continuous or intermittent exposure of an organism to a stressor (e.g., a toxic substance or ionizing radiation) over an extended period of time or significant fraction (often 10 percent or more) of the life span of the organism. Generally, chronic exposure is considered to produce only effects that can be observed some time following initial exposure. These may include impaired reproduction or growth, genetic effects, and other effects such as cancer, precancerous lesions, benign tumors, cataracts, skin changes, and congenital defects.
<i>cultural resources</i>	Historic properties, archaeological resources, and cultural items, such as (1) archaeological materials (e.g., artifacts) and sites that date to the prehistoric, historic, and ethnohistoric periods that are currently located on, or are buried beneath, the ground surface; (2) standing structures and/or their component parts that are more than 50 years of age or are important because they represent a major historical theme or era (e.g., Manhattan Project, Cold War); (3) structures that have an important technological, architectural, or local significance; (4) cultural and natural places, selected natural resources, and sacred objects that have importance for Native Americans; and (5) American folklife traditions and arts.
<i>decreaser grasses</i>	The grasses most eagerly sought after by grazing animals—they tend to decrease as grazing pressure increases. Most grasses are defined as being pasture increasers or decreasers.
<i>distribution coefficient (<math>K_d</math> and <math>R_d</math>)</i>	A ratio of the concentration of a chemical in soil to the concentration in water under equilibrium conditions (i.e., concentration in soil divided by the concentration in water).
<i>floodplain (including 100 and 500 year)</i>	The surface or strip of relatively smooth land adjacent to a river channel, constructed by the present river, and covered with water when the river overflows its banks. The floodplain is built of alluvium carried by the river during floods and deposited in the sluggish water beyond the influence of the swiftest current. A 100-year floodplain is the area of land that has a 1.0 percent or greater chance of being flooded in any given year. A 500-year floodplain is the area of land that has a 0.2 percent chance of being flooded in any given year.
<i>flow-and-transport modeling</i>	Use of computer software to try to simulate subsurface movement of water and chemicals to predict future conditions in an aquifer.

<i>fresh water</i>	The USGS classification of water based on the following concentration ranges of TDS: fresh water has less than 1,000 mg/L TDS, slightly saline water has 1,000 to 3,000 mg/L TDS, moderately saline water has 3,000 to 10,000 mg/L TDS, very saline water has 10,000 to 35,000 mg/L TDS, and brine has more than 35,000 mg/L TDS. In the EIS, fresh water in the basin fill aquifer beneath the Moab site is referred to as the upper portion of the aquifer that overlies the deeper briny ground water.
<i>fugitive dust</i>	(1) Dust emitted that does not pass through a stack, vent, chimney, or similar opening where it could be captured by a control device. (2) Any dust emitted other than from a stack.
<i>increaser grasses</i>	Grasses that become better established as grazing pressure increases because they are less palatable—they tend to increase as more favored species are grazed out. Most grasses are defined as being pasture increasers or decreasers.
<i>institutional controls</i>	Used to limit or eliminate access to, or uses of, land, facilities, and other real and personal property to prevent inadvertent human and environmental exposure to residual contamination and other hazards. These controls maintain the safety and security of human health and the environment and of the site itself. Institutional controls may include legal controls such as zoning restrictions and deed annotations and physical barriers such as fences and markers. Also included are methods to preserve information and data and to inform current and future generations of the hazards and risks.
<i>kilovolt amperes (kVA)</i>	A unit of electric measurement equal to the product of a kilovolt and an ampere. For direct current, it is a measure of power and is the same as a kilowatt; for alternating current, it is a measure of apparent power.
<i>legacy plume</i>	Site-related ground water contamination that is found in the freshwater layer of the ground water system and that would still be present even if no further contamination of the ground water takes place.
<i>long-term surveillance and maintenance</i>	A task performed by the DOE Office of Legacy Management through the DOE in Grand Junction, Colorado. The Office of Legacy Management provides expertise and resources necessary to manage low-level radioactive material disposal and impoundment sites after remedial action is complete.
<i>macrophytes</i>	Large aquatic plants.
<i>maximally exposed individual</i>	A hypothetical individual whose location and habits result in the highest total radiological or chemical exposure (and thus dose) from a particular source for all exposure routes (e.g., inhalation, ingestion, direct exposure).
<i>millirem (mrem)</i>	One thousandth of a rem (0.001 rem); see <i>rem</i> .

<i>mixing zone</i>	A limited portion of a body of water, contiguous to a discharge, where dilution is in progress but has not yet resulted in a concentration that will meet certain standards for all pollutants (from State of Utah surface water regulation R317-2-13).
<i>natural flushing</i>	Allowing the natural ground water movement and geochemical processes to decrease contaminant concentrations.
<i>PEIS</i>	<i>Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for the Uranium Mill Tailings Remedial Action Ground Water Project</i> , prepared by DOE in 1996 for the UMTRA Ground Water Project. The PEIS is intended to serve as a programmatic planning document that provides an objective basis for determining site-specific ground water compliance strategies at the UMTRA Project sites.
<i>pH</i>	A measure of the relative acidity or alkalinity of a solution, expressed in a scale of 0 to 14, with a neutral point at 7. Acid solutions have pH values lower than 7, and basic (i.e., alkaline) solutions have pH values higher than 7. Because pH is the negative logarithm of the hydrogen ion ( $H^+$ ) concentration, each unit increase in pH expresses a change in state of a factor of 10. For example, pH 5 is 10 times more acidic than pH 6, and pH 9 is 10 times more alkaline than pH 8.
<i>plant community</i>	A group of interacting plant species that share a common habitat, including incoming solar radiation, soil water, and nutrients, that recycle nutrients from the soil to living tissue and back again and that alternate with each other in time and space. Plant community is a general term that can be applied to vegetation types of almost any size or longevity. A plant association is a particular type of community that has been described sufficiently and repeatedly in several locations.
<i>PM<sub>10</sub></i>	Particulate matter in air small enough to move easily into the lower respiratory tract, defined as particles less than 10 micrometers in aerodynamic diameter.
<i>phytoremediation</i>	Use of plants to remove contaminants from ground water through root uptake. At the Moab site, tamarisk roots take in nitrogen compounds (e.g., ammonia and nitrate) from ground water.
<i>phreatophyte</i>	Deep-rooted plants that obtain water directly from the water table or a permanent ground water source.
<i>picocurie</i>	A unit of radioactivity equal to one trillionth ( $10^{-12}$ ) of a curie. A curie is a unit of radioactivity equal to 37 billion nuclear disintegrations per second.
<i>plume</i>	The volume of contaminated ground water originating at a contaminant source such as the tailings pile at the Moab site and migrating downgradient.

<i>probable maximum flood</i>	The hypothetical flood that is considered to be the most severe reasonably possible flood, based on the comprehensive application of maximum precipitation and other hydrological factors favorable for maximum flood runoff (e.g., sequential storms and snowmelts). It is usually several times larger than the maximum recorded flood.
<i>radium-226</i>	A radioactive metallic element in the decay chain that begins with uranium-238 and ends with lead-206, a stable isotope. Radium-226 has a half-life of about 1,600 years and decays to radon-222, an inert gas.
<i>radon-222</i>	A radioactive inert gas in the decay chain that begins with uranium-238 and ends with lead-206, a stable isotope. Radon has a half-life of about 3.8 days and decays into polonium-218, a metallic ion.
<i>reasonable maximum exposure</i>	The highest exposure that is reasonably expected to occur at a site (EPA risk assessment guidance) (exposure is defined as the contact of an organism with a chemical or physical agent).
<i>recharge areas</i>	Areas in which water on the ground surface (e.g., precipitation or a water body) infiltrates downward and replenishes an aquifer.
<i>rem</i>	A unit of radioactive dose equivalent, equal to the absorbed dose in tissue multiplied by an appropriate quality factor and possibly other modifying factors. Derived from “roentgen equivalent man,” referring to the dose of ionizing radiation that will cause the same biological effect as one roentgen of X-ray or gamma ray exposure.
<i>record of decision (ROD)</i>	A public document that records a federal agency’s decisions concerning a proposed action for which the agency has prepared an EIS. The ROD is prepared in accordance with the requirements of the Council on Environmental Quality NEPA regulations (40 CFR 1505.2). A ROD identifies the alternatives considered in reaching the decision, the environmentally preferable alternatives, factors balanced by the agency in making the decision, whether all practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental harm have been adopted, and, if not, why they were not.
<i>rim syncline</i>	A local depression that develops between salt diapirs resulting from movement of underlying salt toward the diapir structure.
<i>river incision</i>	The geologic process by which the Colorado River cuts down through the bedrock sandstone outcroppings located upstream and downstream of the Moab site.
<i>river mile</i>	The distance of a point on a river measured in miles from the river’s mouth along the low-water channel.

<i>saline</i>	The USGS classification of water based on the following concentration ranges of TDS: fresh water has less than 1,000 mg/L TDS, slightly saline water has 1,000 to 3,000 mg/L TDS, moderately saline water has 3,000 to 10,000 mg/L TDS, very saline water has 10,000 to 35,000 mg/L TDS, and brine has more than 35,000 mg/L TDS. In the EIS, saline water in the basin fill aquifer beneath the Moab site is referred to as salty ground water, which is salty mostly from dissolution of evaporite minerals in the Paradox Formation.
<i>salt-cored anticline</i>	An anticline in which salt (from evaporating seawater, including other materials such as silt and clay) has flowed upward and formed the core of the anticline.
<i>salt diapir</i>	A dome or elongate anticlinal fold in which the overlying rocks have been ruptured or pierced by the squeezing out of low-density salt deposits and their resulting upward movement.
<i>settling</i>	The gradual compacting and lowering of the height of a tailings pile. It is caused by the weight of the pile squeezing liquids from slimes downward and out of the pile.
<i>slimes</i>	The fine-grained fraction of the mill tailings that consists of clay- and silt-sized grains; defined as material that will pass through a 200-mesh Tyler-equivalent sieve.
<i>steady-state conditions</i>	Conditions that exist when a system is in equilibrium and that do not change significantly over time (e.g., ground water constituent concentrations that remain essentially constant).
<i>subsidence</i>	The geologic process that is lowering the entire tailings pile at the Moab site because of ground water dissolving the Paradox Formation salt deposits that underlie the Moab-Spanish Valley.
<i>supplemental standards</i>	A narrative exemption from remediating ground water to prescriptive numeric standards (background concentrations, maximum concentration limits [MCLs], or alternate concentration limits [ACLs]), if one or more of the eight criteria in 40 CFR 192.21 are met. At the Moab site, the applicable criterion is limited-use ground water, (40 CFR 192.21[g]), which means that ground water has naturally occurring total dissolved solids (TDS) concentrations greater than 10,000 milligrams per liter (mg/L), and widespread TDS contamination is not related to past milling activities at the site. The PEIS (DOE 1996) also discusses supplemental standards within the context of “no ground water remediation.” However, guidance in 40 CFR 192.22 directs that where the designation of limited-use ground water applies, remediation shall “assure, at a minimum, protection of human health and the environment.”
<i>tailings pore fluids</i>	Water in the pore spaces between the mineral grains that make up the tailings pile at the Moab site. Fluids can be remnants of fluids disposed of in the former tailings ponds or precipitation that seeped into the pile.

<i>total dissolved solids (TDS)</i>	A measurement of the nonvolatile constituents dissolved in water. TDS is measured by filtering a water sample through a glass fiber filter having an average pore size of 1 micrometer, evaporating a measured volume of the filtered water to dryness at 105 degrees Celsius (°C), then drying the residue to a constant weight at 180 °C. The result is expressed in milligrams of residue per liter of water sample. Water with more than 2,000 to 3,000 mg/L TDS is generally too salty to drink. TDS concentration of seawater is about 35,000 mg/L.
<i>traditional cultural property (TCP)</i>	A significant place or object associated with historical and cultural practices or beliefs of a living community that is rooted in that community's history and is important in maintaining the continuing cultural identity of the community.
<i>UMTRA Project</i>	Uranium Mill Tailings Remedial Action Project that was approved by Congress in 1978 and gave DOE authority to clean up inactive uranium-ore processing sites and vicinity properties, including ground water.
<i>uranium</i>	A radioactive, metallic element that is the heaviest of the naturally occurring elements. Uranium has 14 known isotopes, of which uranium-238 (half-life of about 4.5 billion years) is the most abundant. Uranium-235 (half-life of about 700 million years) is used as a fuel for nuclear fission.
<i>vicinity properties</i>	Properties, either public or private in the vicinity of designated uranium-ore processing sites, that are believed to be contaminated with RRM and may be eligible for characterization and cleanup under the UMTRA Project.
<i>wetland</i>	Areas that are inundated or saturated by surface water or ground water at a frequency and duration sufficient to support vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions. Wetlands generally include swamps, marshes, bogs, and similar areas.
<i>working level</i>	A measure of radon daughter concentration, consisting of any combination of short-lived radon-222 decay products in 1 liter of air that result in the ultimate emission of alpha particle energy of $1.5 \times 10^5$ million electron volts.
<i>young-of-the-year</i>	Juvenile fish less than 1 year old.
<i>zooplankton</i>	The animal constituent of the small plants and animals that float or drift in fresh water, mainly insects or fish.

End of current text

## 11.0 Index

### A

#### affected environment

- borrow areas (Section 3.5)
- Crescent Junction site (off-site disposal) (Section 3.3)
- Klondike Flats site (off-site disposal) (Section 3.2)
- Moab site (on-site disposal) (Section 3.1)
- proposed pipeline corridors (Sections 3.2.18, 3.3.19, 3.4.19)
- White Mesa Mill site (off-site disposal) (Section 3.4)

#### air quality

- affected environment (Sections 3.1.4, 3.2 )
- Class I and Class II areas (Table 3–4, Section 3.1.4)
- conformity review (Section 3.1.4)
- impacts under the action alternatives (Table 2–32, Sections 4.1.2, 4.2.2, 4.3.2, 4.4.2)
- impacts under the No Action alternative (Table 2–32, Section 4.6.2)
- National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) (Table 3–4, Section 3.1.4)
- prevention of significant deterioration (PSD) (Table 3–4, Section 3.1.4)

#### alternatives (Section 1.4)

- comparison of (Table 2–32, Sections 2.6, 2.7.3)
- considered but not analyzed (Section 2.5)
- ground water remediation (Sections 1.4.3, 2.3)
- impacts of, *see* environmental consequences
- off-site disposal, description of (Sections 1.4.2, 2.2)
- on-site disposal, description of (Sections 1.4.1, 2.1)
- No Action, description of (Sections 1.4.4, 2.4)

#### aquatic ecology

- affected environment (Section 3.1.10)
- impacts under the action alternatives (Table 2–32, Section 4.1.6, 4.2.6, 4.3.6, 4.4.6)
- impacts under the No Action alternative (Table 2–32, Section 4.6.6)
- threatened and endangered, other special status species (Section 3.1.10.1, Appendix A1)

#### Arches National Park (search for term “Arches”)

- noise and vibration impacts (Sections 4.1.10, 4.2.10, 4.3.10)
- light impacts (Section 4.7.9)
- visitor numbers (Section 5.1)

### B

#### biological assessment (Appendix A1)

#### biological opinion (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service) (Appendix A3)

#### borrow areas (Section 3.5)

- construction and operations, *see* construction and operation activities, borrow areas
- environmental consequences associated with (Section 4.5)
- locations of (Sections 2.1.3, 3.5)

#### borrow materials (Section 2.1.3)

- excavation and transport (Section 2.1.3.2)
- standards and requirements (Section 2.1.3.1)

## C

- Cane Creek Branch rail line (Sections 1.4.2, 2.2.4, 3.17, 4.2.12)
- climate and meteorology (Sections 3.1.5, 3.2.3, 3.3.4, 3.4.4)
- Colorado River
  - incision (Sections 2.6.1, 3.1.1, 4.1.1)
  - migration (Sections 1.5.2, 2.1.1, 2.1.4, 2.7.1, 3.2, 4.1.1, Table 2–33)
  - water withdrawals (Table 2–32)
- construction and operation activities
  - borrow areas (Sections 2.1.3, 2.2.3)
  - Crescent Junction site (Section 2.2.5)
  - ground water remediation (Section 4.1.3)
  - Klondike Flats site (Section 2.2.5)
  - Moab site (Sections 2.1.1, 2.2.1)
  - White Mesa Mill site (Section 2.2.5.2)
- contaminants
  - risk assessment of (Appendix A2)
- contamination at the Moab millsite, *see* tailings and other contaminated materials
- cooperating agencies (Section 1.6)
- Crescent Junction site
  - affected environment at (Section 3.3)
  - construction and operations at, *see* construction and operation activities, Crescent Junction site
  - description of (Section 3.3)
  - environmental consequences associated with (Section 4.3)
- cultural resources
  - affected environment (Sections 3.1.13, 3.2.10, 3.3.11, 3.4.11)
  - Class I inventories (Sections 3.1.13, 3.2.10, 3.3.11, 3.4.11, 3.4.19, 3.5.9, 3.5.10)
  - Class III surveys (Sections 3.1.13, 3.2.10, 3.3.11, 3.4.11, 3.4.19, 3.5.9, 3.5.10)
  - consultations (Section 3.1.13)
  - impacts under the action alternatives (Table 2–32, Sections 4.1.9, 4.2.9, 4.3.9, 4.4.9)
  - impacts under the No Action alternative (Table 2–32, Section 4.6.9)
  - National Register of Historic Places (Sections 2.6.1, 3.1.13, 3.2.10, 3.2.18, 3.3.11, 3.3.19, 3.4.19, 3.5.9, 3.5.10, 4.1.9, 4.2.9, 4.3.9, 4.4.9, 4.7.7, 7.1.12, Table 3–48)
  - traditional cultural properties (Sections 2.6.1, 2.7.1, 3.1.13, 3.2.10, 3.2.18, 3.3.11, 3.3.19, 3.4.11, 3.4.19, 3.5.1, 3.5.2, 3.5.3, 3.5.5, 3.5.6, 3.5.10, 4.1.9, 4.2.9, 4.3.9, 4.4.9, 4.4.18, 6.1, Tables 2–32, 2–33, 4–52)
  - White Mesa Ute Community (Sections 3.1.13, 3.2.10.)
- cumulative impacts (Chapter 5.0)

## D

- decision-making process (U.S. Department of Energy) (Section 1.4.6)
  - cost comparisons of alternatives (Section 2.7.3)
  - National Academy of Sciences review (Section 2.7.2)
- disclosure statements (Chapter 8.0)

disposal cell

- at Crescent Junction (Section 2.2.5.1)
- at Klondike Flats (Section 2.2.5.1)
- at Moab site (Section 2.1.1.3)
- at White Mesa Mill (Section 2.2.5.2)
- cover conceptual design and construction (Appendix B)
- failure under the action alternatives (Table 2–32, Sections 4.1.17, 4.2.17, 4.3.17, 4.4.17)
- failure under the No Action alternative (Table 2–32, Section 4.6.17)
- reference cell (Section 2.2.5.1, Appendix B)

## **E**

environmental consequences

- borrow areas (Section 4.5)
- No Action alternative (Section 4.6)
- Crescent Junction off-site disposal alternative (Section 4.3)
- Klondike Flats off-site disposal alternative (Section 4.2)
- Moab on-site disposal alternative (Section 4.1)
- summary and comparison of (Section 2.6, Table 2–32)
- White Mesa Mill off-site disposal alternative (Section 4.4)

environmental impact statement

- contents of (Section 1.7)
- list of agencies, organizations, and individuals receiving copies of (Chapter 9.0)

environmental justice

- affected environment (Sections 3.1.20, 3.2.17, 3.3.18, 3.4.18)
- impacts under the action alternatives (Table 2–32, Sections 4.1.18, 4.2.18, 4.3.18, 4.4.18)
- impacts under the No Action alternative (Table 2–32, Section 4.6.18)
- populations, minority (Sections, 2.6.1, 7.1.19, Tables 2–32, 3–22)
- populations, low-income (Sections, 2.6.1, 7.1.19, Tables 2–32, 3–22)

## **F**

fish species, *see* aquatic ecology

floodplains and wetlands

- 100- and 500-year floods (Sections 2.6.1, Tables 2–32, 2–33)
- assessment for remedial action at Moab site (Appendix F)
- affected environment (Sections 3.1.8, 3.1.9, 3.2.6, 3.2.7, 3.3.7, 3.3.8, 3.4.7, 3.4.8)
- impacts under the action alternatives (Table 2–32, Sections 4.1.5, 4.2.5, 4.3.5, 4.4.5)
- impacts under the No Action alternative (Table 2–32, Section 4.6.5)

Floyd D. Spence Act (Sections 1.1, 1.5, 2.7.2, 7.1.3)

## **G**

geology

- affected environment (Sections 3.1.1, 3.2.1, 3.3.1, 3.4.1)
- impacts under the action alternatives (Table 2–32, Sections 4.1.1, 4.2.1, 4.3.1, 4.4.1)
- impacts under the No Action alternative (Table 2–32, Section 4.6.1)

glossary (Chapter 10.0)

ground water

- affected environment (Sections 3.1.6, 3.2.4, 3.3.5, 3.4.5)
- compliance strategy (Section 2.3.2.3)
- compliance uncertainties (Section 2.3.2.1)
- contaminants of potential concern (Section 2.3.1.2)
- EPA standards (Section 2.3.1.1)
- impacts under the action alternatives (Table 2–32, Sections 4.1.3, 4.2.3, 4.3.3, 4.4.3)
- impacts under the No Action alternative (Table 2–32, Section 4.6.3)
- limited-use aquifer (Section 2.3.1, Table 2–33)
- remediation objectives (Section 2.3.2.1)
- remediation schedules (Section 2.3.2)
- remediation technologies (Section 2.3.3)
- supplemental standards (Section 1.4.3)

## H

human health

- current risk (Sections 3.1.19, 3.2.16, 3.3.17, 3.4.17)
- construction risks (Appendix D)
- existing occupational risks (Section 3.1.19.3)
- future potential risks at Moab site (Appendix E)
- impacts under the action alternatives (Table 2–32, Sections 4.1.15, 4.2.15, 4.3.15, 4.4.15)
- impacts under the No Action alternative (Table 2–32, Section 4.6.15)
- natural radiation environment (Section 3.1.19.1)
- radiation and human health (Appendix D)
- radon emissions (Sections 2.1.1, 2.6.1, 3.4.3, 4.2.15, 4.3.15, 4.4.15, 7.1.11)

## I

impacts, *see also* environmental consequences

- cumulative (Chapter 5.0)
- unavoidable (Chapter 6.0)

infrastructure

- affected environment (Sections 3.1.16, 3.2.13, 3.3.14, 3.4.14)
- impacts under the action alternatives (Table 2–32, Sections 4.1.12, 4.2.12, 4.3.12, 4.4.12)
- impacts under the No Action alternative (Table 2–32, Section 4.6.12)

International Uranium (USA) Corporation (IUC) (Sections 1.4.2, 1.5, 2.2.5, 3.4, 3.4.5, Table 2–32, 2–33)

irreversible or irretrievable commitment of resources (Chapter 6.0)

## J

No entries

## K

### Klondike Flats site

- affected environment at (Section 3.2)
- construction and operations at, *see* construction and operation activities, Klondike Flats site
- description of (Section 3.2)
- environmental consequences associated with (Section 4.2)

## L

### land use

- affected environment (Sections 3.1.12, 3.2.9, 3.3.10, 3.4.10)
- impacts under the action alternatives (Table 2–32, Sections 4.1.8, 4.2.8, 4.3.8, 4.4.8)
- impacts under the No Action alternative (Table 2–32, Section 4.6.8)

### legacy chemicals (Section 1.2.1)

### list of preparers (Chapter 8.0)

## M

### Matheson Wetlands Preserve

- pipeline crossing (Appendix F)
- shallow ground water impacts (Table 2–33)

### mitigation (Section 4.7)

### Moab site

- affected environment at (Section 3.1)
  - closure of (under the off-site disposal alternative) (Section 2.2.1.3)
  - construction and operations at, *see* construction and operation activities, Moab site
  - contamination at, *see* tailings and other contaminated materials
  - current status of (Section 1.2.2)
  - description of (Section 3.1)
  - environmental consequences associated with (Section 4.1)
  - ground water remediation, *see* ground water
  - history of (Section 1.2.1)
  - monitoring and maintenance of (under the on-site disposal alternative) (Section 2.1.4)
- Moab Wash (Sections 3.1.6, 3.1.7, 3.1.8, 3.1.10, 3.2.18, 4.1.3, 4.1.4, 4.1.5, 4.1.6, 4.1.17, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.6.1, 4.6.5)
- realignment (Sections 4.1.4, 4.1.5, 4.2.5)

## N

### National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), *see* air quality

### National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (Section 1.0, 2.0, 2.1.1, 2.3.1, 2.4, 2.6.3, 4.0, 4.1.18, 4.7, 5.0, 6.0, Table 2–35)

### No Action alternative

- see* alternatives, No Action

noise and vibration

affected environment (Sections 3.1.14, 3.2.11, 3.3.12, 3.4.12)

impacts under the action alternatives (Table 2–32, Sections 4.1.10, 4.2.10, 4.3.10, 4.4.10)

impacts under the No Action alternative (Table 2–32, Section 4.6.10)

Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) (Sections 1.0, 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.3, 2.1.4, 2.2.5, 2.2.6, 2.3.2, 2.5.2, 3.4.3, 3.4.6, 4.0, 4.1, Table 2–33)

## O

off-site disposal alternative

*see* alternatives, off-site disposal

on-site disposal alternative

*see* alternatives, on-site disposal

## P

pipeline corridors, *see* slurry pipeline, corridor route maps

preferred alternative (Section 1.4.6)

prevention of significant deterioration (PSD), *see* air quality

public and agency involvement (Section 1.5)

purpose and need for agency action (Section 1.3)

## Q

No entries

## R

rail transportation

*see* transportation options, rail

Record of Decision (ROD) (Sections 1.4.3, 1.4.4, 2.1, 2.1.1, 2.2, 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.7.1, 4.7, 5.3, Table 2–33)

regulatory drivers (Chapter 7.0)

regulatory requirements (Section 1.1)

residual radioactive material (RRM)

at vicinity properties (Sections 2.1.2, 2.6.1)

resource requirements

off-site disposal (Section 2.2.7)

on-site disposal (Section 2.1.5)

responsible opposing views (Section 2.6.4)

## S

scoping (Section 1.5.1)

issues/concerns raised (Section 1.5.2)

short-term uses and long-term productivity, relationship between (Chapter 6.0)

- slurry pipeline, *see also* transportation options, slurry pipeline
  - corridor route maps (Appendix C)
  - system specifications (Section 2.2.4)
- socioeconomics
  - affected environment (Sections 3.1.18, 3.2.15, 3.3.16, 3.4.16)
  - impacts under the action alternatives (Table 2–32, Sections 4.1.14, 4.2.14, 4.3.14, 4.4.14)
  - impacts under the No Action alternative (Table 2–32, Section 4.6.14)
  - Regional Input-Output Modeling System II (RIMS II) (Sections 4.1.14, 4.2.14)
- soils
  - affected environment (Sections 3.1.2, 3.2.2, 3.3.2, 3.4.2)
  - impacts under the action alternatives (Table 2–32, Sections 4.1.1, 4.2.1, 4.3.1, 4.4.1)
  - impacts under the No Action alternative (Table 2–32, Section 4.6.1)
- surface water
  - affected environment (Sections 3.1.7, 3.2.5, 3.3.6, 3.4.6)
  - compliance standards (Table 2–33)
  - impacts under the action alternatives (Table 2–32, Sections 4.1.4, 4.2.4, 4.3.4, 4.4.4)
  - impacts under the No Action alternative (Table 2–32, Section 4.6.4)

## **T**

- tailings and other contaminated materials (Sections 1.2.2, 3.1.3)
  - ammonia salt layer (Sections 2.5.1, 2.6.1, 3.1.3, 4.1.3, 4.2.3, Tables 2–32, 2–33)
  - excavation and preparation of (under the off-site disposal alternative) (Section 2.2.1.2)
  - transportation of (under the off-site disposal alternative) (Section 2.2.4)
- terrestrial ecology (wildlife and vegetation)
  - affected environment (Sections 3.1.11, 3.2.8, 3.3.9, 3.4.9)
  - impacts under the action alternatives (Table 2–32, Sections 4.1.7, 4.2.7, 4.3.7, 4.4.7)
  - impacts under the No Action alternative (Table 2–32, Section 4.6.7)
  - migratory birds (Sections 3.1.11, 3.2.8, 3.4.9, 4.1.7, 4.2.7, 4.3.7, 4.4.7, 4.7.6, Tables 2–32, 3–35, 3–54)
  - tamarisk (Sections 1.5, 2.1.1, 3.1.3, 3.1.6, 3.1.8, 3.1.9, 4.1.3, 4.1.4)
  - threatened and endangered, other special status species (Appendix A1)
- traffic, vehicular
  - affected environment (Sections 3.1.17.1, 3.2.14, 3.3.15, 3.4.15)
  - Average Annual Daily Traffic counts (Sections 3.1.17, 3.2.14, 3.3.15, 4.1.16, 4.2.16, 4.3.16, Table 2–32)
  - impacts under the action alternatives (Table 2–32, Sections 4.1.16, 4.2.16, 4.3.16, 4.4.16)
  - impacts under the No Action alternative (Table 2–32, Section 4.6.16)
- transportation
  - affected environment (Section 3.1.17, 3.2.14, 3.3.15, 3.4.15)
  - impact analysis (Appendix H)
  - of borrow materials (Section 2.1.3.2)
  - of tailings and other contaminated materials (Section 2.2.4)
- transportation options (under the off-site disposal alternative)
  - rail (Section 2.2.4.2)
  - slurry pipeline (Section 2.2.4.3)
  - truck (Section 2.2.4.1)

truck transportation

*see* transportation options, truck

## U

unavoidable impacts, *see* impacts

uncertainties and their consequences (Section 2.6.2, Table 2–33)

Union Pacific Railroad (Sections 1.2, 1.4, 2.2.4, 3.1.13, 3.1.17, 3.2.9, 3.2.11, 3.2.18, 3.3.10, 3.3.11, 4.2.12, 4.7.11)

Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act (UMTRCA) (Sections 1.0, 1.1, 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.4, 2.2.1, 2.2.5, 2.3.1, 3.1.3, Table 3–7)

## V

vegetation, *see* terrestrial ecology

vicinity properties

applicable regulations (Section 2.1.2.4)

characterization and remediation of (Section 2.1.2)

inclusion survey area (Section 2.1.2)

Remedial Action Agreement (Section 2.1.2)

visual resources

affected environment (Sections 3.1.15, 3.2.12, 3.3.13, 3.4.13)

impacts under the action alternatives (Table 2–32, Sections 4.1.11, 4.2.11, 4.3.11, 4.4.11)

impacts under the No Action alternative (Table 2–32, Section 4.6.11)

## W

waste management

affected environment (Sections 3.1.16.1, 3.2.13, 3.3.14, 3.4.14.1)

impacts under the action alternatives (Table 2–32, Sections 4.1.13, 4.2.13, 4.3.13, 4.4.13)

impacts under the No Action alternative (Table 2–32, Section 4.6.13)

White Mesa Mill site

affected environment at (Section 3.4)

construction and operations at, *see* construction and operation activities, White Mesa Mill site

description of (Section 3.4)

environmental consequences associated with (Section 4.4)

current operations (Appendix G)

wildlife, *see* terrestrial ecology

## X, Y, Z

No entries