

Uranium Watch

76 South Main Street, # 7 | P.O. Box 344
Moab, Utah 84532
435-260-8384

June 10, 2014

via electronic mail

Mr. Reid Rosnick
Radiation Protection Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Headquarters
Ariel Rios Building
Mail Code: 6608J
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D.C. 20460
rosnick.reid@epa.gov

Re: Request for Extension of Comment Period and Request for Hearing: Docket ID No. EPA-HQ- OAR-2008-0218. Comments on Proposed Rule: Revisions to National Emission Standards for Radon Emissions From Operating Mill Tailings (40 C.F.R. Part 61 Subpart W). 79 Fed. Reg. 25388, May 2, 2014.

Dear Mr. Rosnick:

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO SUBMIT COMMENTS

Uranium Watch requests a 60-day extension of the time period to submit comments on the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA's) Proposed Revisions to National Emission Standards for Radon Emissions From Operating Mill Tailings, 49 C.F.R. Part 61 Subpart W, Docket ID No. EPA-HQ- OAR-2008-0218. 79 Fed. Reg. 25388, May 2, 2014.

The request for a 60-day extension of time is based on the following.

Proposed Subpart W Factual Bases: One of the EPA's primary reasons for the proposed elimination of the requirement for radon monitoring and reporting at "existing" mill tailings impoundments (as defined in 40 C.F.R. § 61.251(d)) is the claim that the existing tailings impoundment at the Shootaring Canyon Mill (Garfield County, Utah) has a "synthetic liner." This claim is not supported by a citation in the proposed rule or

documentation in the Rulemaking Docket. The fact is that the tailings impoundment for the Shootaring Canyon Mill has a clay liner, not a synthetic liner.¹ This reality means that the EPA has a very shaky factual basis for its determination that, soon, any “existing” conventional tailings impoundments will all meet the standard in 10 C.F.R. § 61.252(b) (1), and, therefore, it is appropriate to eliminate any requirement for radon monitoring at “existing” tailings impoundments.

This incorrect factual claim regarding the Shootaring Canyon Mill and other misinformation, misleading information, incomplete information, and outdated information require a commenter to carefully review the proposed rule and supporting documents. Also, the EPA has asked for commenters’ thoughts on various aspects of the proposed rule. These lengthy and detailed research and comment preparations require additional time in order to frame informed comments.

REQUEST FOR HEARING

I would also request a hearing on Subpart W rulemaking at White Mesa, San Juan County. I will be out of state from mid-June until the week of July 27, so request a hearing at White Mesa after July 27, 2014. Therefore, additional time for comments and hearings are necessary.

Thank you for consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

Sarah Fields
sarah@uraniumwatch.org

¹ http://www.radiationcontrol.utah.gov/Uranium_Mills/uraniumone/docs/2012/March/DRC-2012-001447.pdf