

Brooke T. Paup, *Chairwoman*  
Bobby Janecka, *Commissioner*  
Catarina R. Gonzales, *Commissioner*  
Kelly Keel, *Executive Director*



## TEXAS COMMISSION ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

*Protecting Texas by Reducing and Preventing Pollution*

March 19, 2025

TO: All interested persons.

RE: Uranium Energy Corp.  
Class III Underground Injection Control Area Permit No. UR03075

### **Decision of the Executive Director.**

The executive director has made a decision that the above-referenced permit application meets the requirements of applicable law. **This decision does not authorize construction or operation of any proposed facilities.** This decision will be considered by the commissioners at a regularly scheduled public meeting before any action is taken on this application unless all requests for contested case hearing or reconsideration have been withdrawn before that meeting.

Enclosed with this letter are instructions to view the Executive Director's Response to Public Comment (RTC) on the Internet. Individuals who would prefer a mailed copy of the RTC or are having trouble accessing the RTC on the website, should contact the Office of the Chief Clerk, by phone at (512) 239-3300 or by email at [chiefclk@tceq.texas.gov](mailto:chiefclk@tceq.texas.gov). A complete copy of the RTC (including the mailing list), complete application, draft permit and related documents, including public comments, are available for review at the TCEQ Central Office. Additionally, a copy of the complete application, the draft permit, and executive director's preliminary decision are available for viewing and copying at the Goliad Public Library, 320 South Commercial, Goliad, Texas 77963.

If you disagree with the executive director's decision, and you believe you are an "affected person" as defined below, you may request a contested case hearing. In addition, anyone may request reconsideration of the executive director's decision. The procedures for the commission's evaluation of hearing requests/requests for reconsideration are located in 30 Texas Administrative Code Chapter 55, Subchapter F. A brief description of the procedures for these two requests follows.

### **How to Request a Contested Case Hearing.**

It is important that your request include all the information that supports your right to a contested case hearing. Your hearing request must demonstrate that you meet the applicable legal requirements to have your hearing request granted. The commission's consideration of your request will be based on the information you provide.

The request must include the following:

- (1) Your name, address, daytime telephone number, and, if possible, a fax number.

P.O. Box 13087 • Austin, Texas 78711-3087 • 512-239-1000 • [tceq.texas.gov](http://tceq.texas.gov)

- (2) The name of the applicant, the permit number and other numbers listed above so that your request may be processed properly.
- (3) A statement clearly expressing that you are requesting a contested case hearing. For example, the following statement would be sufficient: "I request a contested case hearing."
- (4) If the request is made by a group or association, the request must identify:
  - (A) one person by name, address, daytime telephone number, and, if possible, the fax number, of the person who will be responsible for receiving all communications and documents for the group;
  - (B) the comments on the application submitted by the group that are the basis of the hearing request; and
  - (C) by name and physical address one or more members of the group that would otherwise have standing to request a hearing in their own right. The interests the group seeks to protect must relate to the organization's purpose. Neither the claim asserted nor the relief requested must require the participation of the individual members in the case.

Additionally, your request must demonstrate that you are an **"affected person."** An affected person is one who has a personal justiciable interest related to a legal right, duty, privilege, power, or economic interest affected by the application. Your request must describe how and why you would be adversely affected by the proposed facility or activity in a manner not common to the general public. For example, to the extent your request is based on these concerns, you should describe the likely impact on your health, safety, or uses of your property which may be adversely affected by the proposed facility or activities. To demonstrate that you have a personal justiciable interest, you must state, as specifically as you are able, your location and the distance between your location and the proposed facility or activities.

Your request must raise disputed issues of fact that are relevant and material to the commission's decision on this application that were raised **by you** during the public comment period. The request cannot be based solely on issues raised in comments that you have withdrawn.

To facilitate the commission's determination of the number and scope of issues to be referred to hearing, you should: 1) specify any of the executive director's responses to **your** comments that you dispute; 2) the factual basis of the dispute; and 3) list any disputed issues of law.

### **How to Request Reconsideration of the Executive Director's Decision.**

Unlike a request for a contested case hearing, anyone may request reconsideration of the executive director's decision. A request for reconsideration should contain your name, address, daytime phone number, and, if possible, your fax number. The request must state that you are requesting reconsideration of the executive director's decision, and must explain why you believe the decision should be reconsidered.

### **Deadline for Submitting Requests.**

A request for a contested case hearing or reconsideration of the executive director's decision must be **received by** the Chief Clerk's office no later than **30 calendar days** after the date of this letter. You may submit your request electronically at [www.tceq.texas.gov/agency/decisions/cc/comments.html](http://www.tceq.texas.gov/agency/decisions/cc/comments.html) or by mail to the following address:

Laurie Gharis, Chief Clerk  
TCEQ, MC-105  
P.O. Box 13087  
Austin, Texas 78711-3087

### **Processing of Requests.**

Timely requests for a contested case hearing or for reconsideration of the executive director's decision will be referred to the TCEQ's Alternative Dispute Resolution Program and set on the agenda of one of the commission's regularly scheduled meetings. Additional instructions explaining these procedures will be sent to the attached mailing list when this meeting has been scheduled.

### **How to Obtain Additional Information.**

If you have any questions or need additional information about the procedures described in this letter, please call the Public Education Program, toll free, at 1-800-687-4040.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Laurie Gharis". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Laurie Gharis  
Chief Clerk

LG/erg

Enclosure

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENT**  
**for**  
**Uranium Energy Corp.**  
**Class III Underground Injection Control Area Permit No. UR03075**

The Executive Director has made the Response to Public Comment (RTC) for the application by Uranium Energy Corp. for Class III Underground Injection Control Area Permit No. UR03075 available for viewing on the Internet. You may view and print the document by visiting the TCEQ Commissioners' Integrated Database at the following link:

<https://www.tceq.texas.gov/goto/cid>

In order to view the RTC at the link above, enter the TCEQ ID Number for this application (UR03075) and click the "Search" button. The search results will display a link to the RTC.

Individuals who would prefer a mailed copy of the RTC or are having trouble accessing the RTC on the website, should contact the Office of the Chief Clerk, by phone at (512) 239-3300 or by email at [chiefclk@tceq.texas.gov](mailto:chiefclk@tceq.texas.gov).

**Additional Information**

For more information on the public participation process, you may contact the Office of the Public Interest Counsel at (512) 239-6363 or call the Public Education Program, toll free, at (800) 687-4040.

A complete copy of the RTC (including the mailing list), the complete application, the draft permit, and related documents, including comments, are available for review at the TCEQ Central Office in Austin, Texas. Additionally, a copy of the complete application, the draft permit, and executive director's preliminary decision are available for viewing and copying at the Goliad Public Library, 320 South Commercial, Goliad, Texas 77963.

MAILING LIST  
for  
Uranium Energy Corp.  
Class III Underground Injection Control Area Permit No. UR03075

FOR THE APPLICANT:

Craig Wall, V.P. EH&S  
Uranium Energy Corp.  
500 North Shoreline Boulevard, Suite 800N  
Corpus Christi, Texas 78401

INTERESTED PERSONS:

See attached list.

FOR THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR  
via electronic mail:

Ryan Vise, Deputy Director  
Texas Commission on Environmental  
Quality  
External Relations Division  
Public Education Program MC-108  
P.O. Box 13087  
Austin, Texas 78711-3087

Don Redmond, Staff Attorney  
Thomas Hopkins, Staff Attorney  
Texas Commission on Environmental  
Quality  
Environmental Law Division MC-173  
P.O. Box 13087  
Austin, Texas 78711-3087

Dan Hannah, Technical Staff  
Texas Commission on Environmental  
Quality  
Waste Permits Division  
UIC Permits Section MC-233  
P.O. Box 13087  
Austin, Texas 78711-3087

FOR PUBLIC INTEREST COUNSEL  
via electronic mail:

Garrett T. Arthur, Attorney  
Texas Commission on Environmental  
Quality  
Public Interest Counsel MC-103  
P.O. Box 13087  
Austin, Texas 78711-3087

FOR THE CHIEF CLERK  
via electronic mail:

Laurie Gharis, Chief Clerk  
Texas Commission on Environmental  
Quality  
Office of Chief Clerk MC-105  
P.O. Box 13087  
Austin, Texas 78711-3087

ABRAMEIT , ANDREW  
MCKAY & COFFEY LLP  
PO BOX 192  
CUERO TX 77954-0192

ABRAMEIT , GLEN  
6211 WIGTON DR  
HOUSTON TX 77096-4623

ABRAMEIT , MICHAEL  
6884 E FM 1961  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3401

ADICKES , JON  
1573 E FM 1961  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3414

ALANIZ , ROBIN  
PO BOX 1418  
GOLIAD TX 77963-1418

ALBRECHT , ALAN  
6000 DANFORTH RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3531

ALBRECHT , ALAN  
2061 HARDWICK WAY  
GRANITE BAY CA 95746-7131

ALBRECHT , CALLIE C  
699 GROLL LN  
VICTORIA TX 77905-3297

ALSTROM , CARA  
1305 N MOODY ST  
VICTORIA TX 77901-5142

ALSTROM , CATHERINE  
1305 N MOODY ST  
VICTORIA TX 77901-5142

BAACKE , RUTH  
1358 N SAN PATRICIO ST  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3922

BADE , ALDON  
147 FM 1961  
YORKTOWN TX 78164

BAMMERT , TATE DIRECTOR  
GOLIAD COUNTY GROUNDWATER CONSERVATION  
DISTRICT  
PO BOX 562  
GOLIAD TX 77963-0562

BANE , SAM  
1374 BEGO RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3695

BARNETT , DAVE  
463 ARNOLD RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3386

BARNHART , CLAIRE  
PO BOX 626  
BERCLAIR TX 78107-0626

BARNHILL , BILL    & ROBIN  
PO BOX 1226  
GOLIAD TX 77963-1226

BEARD , ELIZABETH HAUN  
1551 FOX CROSSING RD  
MEYERSVILLE TX 77974-4121

BENNETT , MIKE  
795 CLIP RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3234

BENNETT , R MIKE COUNTY JUDGE  
GOLIAD COUNTY TEXAS  
PO BOX 677  
GOLIAD TX 77963-0677

BETTGE , CATHERINE    & RICHARD  
306 BETTGE LN  
MEYERSVILLE TX 77974-4154

BETTGE , RICHARD  
306 BETTGE LN  
MEYERSVILLE TX 77974-4154

BLUNTZER , JIM S  
1260 BLUNTZER RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3403

BLUNTZER , OTTO    & RUTH  
585 BLUNTZER RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3530

BOKORNEY , JOE    & SHIRLEY  
3742 OLD GOLIAD RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3315

BONE , STEVEN  
1678 BEGO RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3604

BORGFELD , HARVEY T  
2973 E FM 884  
YORKTOWN TX 78164-5451

BRAQUET , SIDNEY J  
NO 1  
1324 CORTLANDT ST  
HOUSTON TX 77008-4290

BREEDEN , DORIS    & PAUL  
77 STIRRUP RD  
VICTORIA TX 77905-2623

BREEDEN , PAUL  
77 STIRRUP RD  
VICTORIA TX 77905-2623

BREWER , HARVEY   & KAREN KNEIP  
1885 FOX RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3416

BROWN , RETA  
UIAG  
468 FM 1961  
YORKTOWN TX 78164-5456

BRUEGGERHOFF , KIRSTEN  
2387 HORSESHOE BND  
GOLIAD TX 77963-4135

BRUMBY , KIRBY  
3600 POST OAK RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3347

BRUMBY , KIRBY COMMISSIONER PRECINCT 3  
GOLIAD COUNTY TEXAS  
123 W FM 884  
WEESATCHE TX 77993-9800

BRUNS , BEV   & CALVIN  
47 YORKTOWN SLICKFIELD RD  
YORKTOWN TX 78164-5232

BRUNS , BEV  
47 YORKTOWN SLICKFIELD RD  
YORKTOWN TX 78164-5232

BRUNS , DALIN   & M'LISS  
5329 STATE HIGHWAY 119 S  
YORKTOWN TX 78164-5365

BULLA , PAT  
7202 FOXTREE CV  
AUSTIN TX 78750-7932

BURNAM , LON  
APT 2503  
1600 TEXAS ST  
FORT WORTH TX 76102-3400

BYRD , DR. DAVID ARTHUR  
PÁJARO CATTLE COMPANY  
4020 FM 1351  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3738

CAMACHO , ANNALYSA  
GOLIAD COUNTY GROUNDWATER CONSERVATION  
DISTRICT  
PO BOX 562  
GOLIAD TX 77963-0562

CARAWAY , RACHEL  
5298 OLD GOLIAD RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3317

CARDOSA , CHAD  
APT 1602  
2930 GRAND OAKS LOOP  
CEDAR PARK TX 78613-4363

CARSON , BRAD  
2380 DANFORTH RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3406

CARTER , MARY W  
BLACKBURN CARTER PC  
4709 AUSTIN ST  
HOUSTON TX 77004-5004

CHAPMAN , DEBRA  
792 W FM 1961  
YORKTOWN TX 78164-5419

CHAPMAN , GREGORY C  
792 W FM 1961  
YORKTOWN TX 78164-5419

CHAPMAN , GREGORY C  
792 FM 196  
YORKTOWN TX 78164

CHEEK , DAVID  
14319 N US HIGHWAY 183  
YORKTOWN TX 78164-5663

CHRIST , LARRY  
29 GOLIAD N  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3447

CHRISTOPHER , PAMELA  
5300 OLD GOLIAD RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3317

CHRISTOPHER , W W  
5300 OLD GOLIAD RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3317

CHRISTOPHER , WILLIAM  
CHRISTOPHER LAND & LIVESTOCK CO  
5300 OLD GOLIAD RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3317

CLAPSADDLE , CARL  
8500 FM 622  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3792

CLAPSADDLE , CHARLES  
8497 FM 622  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3760

CLARK , H C  
GOLIAD COUNTY COMMISSIONERS  
2300 BOLSOVER ST  
HOUSTON TX 77005-2612

CLEMENTS , THURMAN  
VICTORIA GROUNDWATER CONSERVATION  
435 CONTI LN  
VICTORIA TX 77904-1207

COLLINS , CHRISTINE   & LAMAR M  
2848 WEBER RD  
VICTORIA TX 77905-3130

CONCERNED CITIZEN ,  
2387 HORSESHOE BND  
GOLIAD TX 77963-4135

COOK , GINGER  
3933 KILGORE RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3659

COREY , BILL  
63 DONDO LN  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3210

COWLEY , ALICIA  
4020 FM 1351  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3738

COWLEY , GARY  
4020 FM 1351  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3738

CROOM , CAROLYN  
2502 ALBATA AVE  
AUSTIN TX 78757-2103

CUSHING , LARA  
PO BOX 830706  
SAN ANTONIO TX 78283-0706

DAVIS , KEVIN  
3407 HALLEMANN RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3374

DE LAY , DON L  
PO BOX 1171  
GOLIAD TX 77963-1171

DE LUNA , JOE M  
135 CHERIE BROOK DR  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3903

DEFOREST , ALVIN  
4529 DANFORTH RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3540

DOHMANN , ALLEN  
2823 ENKE RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3365

DOHMANN , ART DIRECTOR  
GOLIAD COUNTY GROUNDWATER CONSERVATION  
DISTRICT  
PO BOX 562  
GOLIAD TX 77963-0562

DOHMANN , ARTHUR A  
PO BOX 117  
WEESATCHE TX 77993-0117

DORNBURG , BILLY L  
13613 N US HIGHWAY 183  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3472

DORNBURG , STUART  
PO BOX 218  
WEESATCHE TX 77993-0218

DREIER , JOHN H  
3692 FRANKE RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3232

DUDERSTADT , ASHLEY  
8915 FM 236  
CUERO TX 77954-5712

DUDERSTADT , WILBURN R "PETE"  
744 ARNOLD RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-4526

DUESER , JEROME C  
2844 AFFLERBACH RD  
YORKTOWN TX 78164-1964

DUKE , JOHN & WANDA  
2900 HENCERLING RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-4490

EDWARDS , KENNETH & PAT  
PO BOX 67  
FANNIN TX 77960-0067

EDWARDS , KENNETH COMMISSIONER PRECINCT  
1  
GOLIAD COUNTY TEXAS  
611 E END ST  
GOLIAD TX 77963-4233

EGGEMEYER , JACQUELINE  
341 LEUSCHNER RD  
VICTORIA TX 77905-3074

FAGG , KEVIN COMMISSIONER PRECINCT 4  
GOLIAD COUNTY TEXAS  
10101 E FM 1961  
GOLIAD TX 77963

FELS , HOWARD  
STE 700  
500 N SHORELINE BLVD  
CORPUS CHRISTI TX 78401-0399

FLORES , JULIAN  
GOLIAD COUNTY COMMISSIONER  
PO BOX 634  
GOLIAD TX 77963-0634

FOERSTER , DARWIN A  
508 DUNDEE ST  
VICTORIA TX 77904-2877

FOERSTER , HUBERT A  
510 DUNDEE ST  
VICTORIA TX 77904-2877

FOLKS , JOAN S  
PO BOX 324  
WEESATCHE TX 77993-0324

FRANKE , DARREN & RENEE  
1464 W FM 1961  
YORKTOWN TX 78164-5436

FUCHS , DONNA   & EDWARD S  
40 MESQUITE LN  
CUERO TX 77954-5107

FUCHS , KYLE   & TRACY  
1271 FOX RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-4374

GAMBLIN , DEBORAH  
PO BOX 768  
GOLIAD TX 77963-0768

GAYLE , BRIDGET  
PO BOX 1310  
GOLIAD TX 77963-1310

GAYLE , ROBERT B  
PO BOX 1310  
GOLIAD TX 77963-1310

GLOOR , GARLAND R  
2484 FM 622  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3745

GONZALES , ELIDA  
PO BOX 654  
YORKTOWN TX 78164-0654

GOSSLEE , SUSYBELLE L  
9511 FAIRCREST DR  
DALLAS TX 75238-1415

GRAHAM , PATRICIA LUX  
18645 STATE HIGHWAY 239 W  
KENEDY TX 78119-4739

GRAHAM , TERRELL VICE PRESIDENT  
GOLIAD COUNTY GROUNDWATER CONSERVATION  
DISTRICT  
PO BOX 562  
GOLIAD TX 77963-0562

GRAHAM , MR TERRELL LEE  
18645 STATE HIGHWAY 239 W  
KENEDY TX 78119-4739

GRAHMANN , DR. ERIC D  
3744 IRBY RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-4416

GRAHMANN , JOHNNY   & SUSAN  
610 MONTERREY DR  
VICTORIA TX 77904-2374

GREESON , MILTON  
PO BOX 2509  
VICTORIA TX 77902-2509

GRIEDER , FRED  
PO BOX 1058  
GOLIAD TX 77963-1058

GRIEDER , FRED  
GRIEDER RANCH LLC  
PO BOX 1058  
GOLIAD TX 77963-1058

GRIFFITH , GERALD A  
4335 DANFORTH RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3408

GUERRA , REFUGIO  
PO BOX 194  
WEESATCHE TX 77993-0194

GUTMANN , G A  
2432 COLOGNE RD  
VICTORIA TX 77905-4155

HADDEN , KAREN D  
605 CARISMATIC LN  
AUSTIN TX 78748-2923

HALPIN , BEKI  
302 S 7TH ST  
PFLUGERVILLE TX 78660-3909

HARRINGTON , DIANA  
PO BOX 1360  
GOLIAD TX 77963-1360

HASTINGS , PATRICIA A  
226 ELIOT RD  
MEYERSVILLE TX 77974-3976

HAUN , BRYAN  
112 NORTHWOOD CIR  
CUERO TX 77954-5005

HAUSMAN , ERNEST   & FRANCES M  
103 OXFORD DR  
SAN ANTONIO TX 78213-4062

HAVLIK , BEVERLY B  
CZEXAS RANCH  
3265 DANFORTH RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3537

HEARD , MYRA S  
PO BOX 85  
FANNIN TX 77960-0085

HEINE , ROY  
237 MIDWAY RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3397

HENSON , MARSHALL  
468 DANFORTH RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3405

HERWEEK , LINDA  
3230 W FM 884  
YORKTOWN TX 78164-5161

HIEBNER , DENISE  
1385 SEILER RD  
YORKTOWN TX 78164-5278

HILBRICH , MARK  
PO BOX 1056  
GOLIAD TX 77963-1056

HILL JR , WILLIAM V  
9036 ANTIETAM DR  
SAN ANTONIO TX 78239-3557

HOFFMAN , DONNA  
SIERRA CLUB - LONE STAR  
1202 SAN ANTONIO ST  
AUSTIN TX 78701-1834

HOFFMAN , DONNA L  
1500 GREGORY ST  
AUSTIN TX 78702-2732

HOLY , ROBIN M  
502 CLAY DR  
VICTORIA TX 77904-1382

HORNSTEIN , MR & MRS MARVIN  
1417 FM 622  
VICTORIA TX 77905-3110

HOWARD , VIVIAN  
110 WINNIPEG ST  
VICTORIA TX 77905-3676

HUGHES , PETER  
526 NOLL RD  
MEYERSVILLE TX 77974-3965

IRWIN , GEORGIA ANNE  
3148 W FM 884  
YORKTOWN TX 78164-5306

JACKSON , KATHLEEN  
PO BOX 1  
FANNIN TX 77960-0001

JACOB , BETTY & JOE  
312 N CHURCH ST  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3943

JACOB , DON H  
1701 VICTORIA STATION DR  
VICTORIA TX 77901-3027

JACOBS , WAYNE R  
2664 DANFORTH RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3534

JENKINS , CARL & DONNA L  
580 WHEELER LN  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3640

JENKINS , MS HEIKE  
14870 S US HIGHWAY 183  
YORKTOWN TX 78164-5426

JOHNSTON , MILDRED  
2904 KIPLING ST  
VICTORIA TX 77901-7621

JORDAN , BILLY  
307 N GONZALES ST  
CUERO TX 77954-2900

KERSEY , BETTY  
PO BOX 32  
GOLIAD TX 77963-0032

KERSEY , WILLIAM  
PO BOX 32  
GOLIAD TX 77963-0032

KEY , WAYNE  
1737 ALBRECHT RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3432

KIMBROUGH , ISAAC  
10147 FM 622  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3766

KLANEKA , MARYANN  
10790 FM 631  
TAFT TX 78390-4531

KLANIKA , KENNETH  
KUPAC LLC  
2078 COUNTY ROAD 460  
COUPLAND TX 78615-5126

KORTH JR , MR WILFRED  
BARNHART Q5 RANCH AND NATURE RETREAT  
PO BOX 626  
BERCLAIR TX 78107-0626

KORTH , WILFRED PRESIDENT  
GOLIAD COUNTY GROUNDWATER CONSERVATION  
DISTRICT  
PO BOX 562  
GOLIAD TX 77963-0562

KRATZIG , ELIZABETH  
PO BOX 560  
GOLIAD TX 77963-0560

LADNER , JAMES & MARY E  
5791 S SH 119  
YORKTOWN TX 78164

LANGE , LARRY  
107 LAUREL OAK CIR  
CUERO TX 77954-2147

LANGE , LARRY  
7483 N US HIGHWAY 183  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3522

LANGE , WILLIAM  
107 LAUREL OAK CIR  
CUERO TX 77954-2147

LANTZ , ANGELA  
6900 US HIGHWAY 59 S  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3276

LEMKE , J W  
1029 FM 1351  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3262

LINZER , J NAOMI  
J NAOMI LINZER INDEXING SERVICES  
422 STAGES DR  
CORPUS CHRISTI TX 78412-2810

LONG , TED COMMISSIONER PCT 4  
GOLIAD COUNTY  
358 E FM 1961  
GOLIAD TX 77963-4404

LOVETT , DENISE & PATRICK  
5170 DANFORTH RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3543

LUND , ANNA  
3744 IRBY RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-4416

MAMEROW , MRS AMANDA JO  
57 DIEBEL RD  
YORKTOWN TX 78164-5140

MANCIAZ , JESSE  
81 RAMIREZ RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3209

MANNING , JAN  
4791 STATE HIGHWAY 239 W  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3850

MCCULLOUGH , DELBERT  
3256 DANFORTH RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3537

MCKINNEY , BELITHA & MELVIN H  
962 LEE ALVES RD  
YORKTOWN TX 78164-5246

MCKINNEY , FRANCEY & RICIA  
107 TAMPA DR  
VICTORIA TX 77904-1654

MCKINNEY , RICKI  
107 TAMPA DR  
VICTORIA TX 77904-1654

MEYER , MARY  
1700 WILLOW DR  
RICHMOND TX 77469-4845

MICHAELSEN, DAVID & PINSKER,LINDA  
247 ABERDEEN AVE  
CORPUS CHRISTI TX 78411-1284

MICHAELSEN , DAVID  
247 ABERDEEN AVE  
CORPUS CHRISTI TX 78411-1284

MIGURA RADTKE , MRS KAREN  
2930 GRAND OAKS LOOP  
CEDAR PARK TX 78613-4363

MIGURA , MALCOLM  
133 COLONY DR  
VICTORIA TX 77905-3255

MIGURA , ROSALIE  
133 COLONY DR  
VICTORIA TX 77905-3255

MONTAGUE , WM  
3339 FM 622  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3748

MORELAND , GENE  
3840 E FM 1961  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3441

MORGENROTH , BOB  
PO BOX 2431  
VICTORIA TX 77902-2431

MORLAND , AMY  
3840 E FM 1961  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3441

MORRISON , THE HONORABLE GEANIE W STATE  
REPRESENTATIVE  
TEXAS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DISTRICT 30  
RM 1W.6  
PO BOX 2910  
AUSTIN TX 78768-2910

MOSES , BRENDA & JASON  
PO BOX 1125  
GOLIAD TX 77963-1125

MOTAL , PAUL D  
3315 GALESBURG DR  
AUSTIN TX 78745-5811

MOYA , EMIKA  
PO BOX 392  
GOLIAD TX 77963-0392

MULLENIN , MARTHA  
CITY OF GOLIAD  
PO BOX 1  
GOLIAD TX 77963-0001

NEAL , DOROTHY  
13747 FM 622  
VICTORIA TX 77905-3030

NELSON , LINDA L  
166 OLD GOLIAD RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3390

NIEMANN , SHANA P  
REFUGIO GROUNDWATER CONSERVATION DIST  
PO BOX 116  
REFUGIO TX 78377-0116

NOLAND , ELAINE  
PO BOX 423  
GOLIAD TX 77963-0423

ORMAND , JAMES & ROSALIE  
PO BOX 239  
WEESATCHE TX 77993-0239

ORMAND , ROSALIE TETER  
PO BOX 239  
WEESATCHE TX 77993-0239

ORR , WELDON SCOTT  
1742 E FM 1961  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3368

ORTEGA , JESSE  
1938 FOX RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3356

ORTEGA , MISTY  
1938 FOX RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3356

OVERLANDER , MARY ANN  
3744 OLD GOLIAD RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3315

OVERLANDER , SHANNON  
3746 OLD GOLIAD RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3315

PACKARD , JOANNA  
1938 FOX RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3356

PACKARD , ROD  
1938 FOX RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3356

PACKARD , RODD  
1938 FOX RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3356

PARKINSON , DONNA  
1984 HALLEMANN RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3352

PARKINSON , ROBERT  
1984 HALLEMANN RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3352

PAULSGROVE , STEVEN G  
PO BOX 1234  
GOLIAD TX 77963-1234

PERALES , MARISA ATTORNEY  
PERALES ALLMON & ICE PC  
1206 SAN ANTONIO ST  
AUSTIN TX 78701-1834

PERDUE , LESLIE  
2932 N US HIGHWAY 183  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3633

PESEK , ROBIN  
553 PESEK LN  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3639

PETERS , KATHY  
345 E FRANKLIN ST  
GOLIAD TX 77963-4214

PINSKER , LINDA  
247 ABERDEEN AVE  
CORPUS CHRISTI TX 78411-1284

POST , JULIA & VIRGINIA  
407 WILHEM LN  
GOLIAD TX 77963-2104

POWER , NORMAN  
PO BOX 253  
GOLIAD TX 77963-0253

PRIMROSE , DEBRA SUE  
880000008844  
500 ATZENHOFFER RD  
YORKTOWN TX 78164-5414

QUILLIAN , JOANN  
1444 RUTHERFORD LN  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3336

RADER , JIMMIE D  
PO BOX 665  
GOLIAD TX 77963-0665

RADTKE , GREYSON  
941 HERMAN MIGURA RD  
YORKTOWN TX 78164-5470

RADTKE , LANCE  
941 HERMAN MIGURA RD  
YORKTOWN TX 78164-5470

REED , MARGIE  
1070 SCENIC LOOP DR  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3821

REICHERT-GARZA , STEPHANIE  
134 TILLEY LN  
VICTORIA TX 77905-3124

RIGGS , RANDY  
3163 N 183  
GOLIAD TX 77963

RITENOUR , KLAUS & TAMMY  
27 NOLL RD  
MEYERSVILLE TX 77974-3970

RODRIGUEZ , LISA  
2387 HORSESHOE BND  
GOLIAD TX 77963-4135

ROSS , ERIC & SHARON  
4466 E FM 1961  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3441

RUTHERFORD , MARGARET A  
1256 BLUNTZER RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3403

SAATHOFF , MARTHA  
PO BOX 1433  
GOLIAD TX 77963-1433

SAHADI , REAGAN  
4751 OCEAN DR  
CORPUS CHRISTI TX 78412-2675

SAHADI , REAGAN DIRECTOR  
GOLIAD COUNTY GROUNDWATER CONSERVATION  
DISTRICT  
PO BOX 562  
GOLIAD TX 77963-0562

SALYER , JIM  
PO BOX 3966  
VICTORIA TX 77903-3966

SAMFORD , MONA  
5222 KINGS HWY  
AUSTIN TX 78745-2862

SAUERMILCH , WILBERT  
PO BOX 826  
YORKTOWN TX 78164-0826

SAYLER , MONTE  
4595 FRANKE RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-4363

SCHAAR , TONI & TRAVIS  
564 NAGEL RD  
VICTORIA TX 77905-3132

SCHEURICH , VENICE  
COASTAL BEND SIERRA CLUB  
PO BOX 10101  
CORPUS CHRISTI TX 78460-0101

SCHLEY , TRAVIS  
240 E FM 1961  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3363

SCHNEIDER , LEROY H  
2437 ABRAMEIT RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3717

SCHRADE , BRIANNA  
9563 FM 622  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3764

SCHULTE , KALYN  
16 FAITH DR  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3328

SCHUSTEREIT , KENNETH D  
275 BAASS LN  
VICTORIA TX 77905-3606

SCHUSTEREIT , MICHAEL  
119 SABINE ST  
PORTLAND TX 78374-1453

SCOTT , DOUG  
5415 E FM 1961  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3652

SCOTT , JUDITH A  
5415 E FM 1961  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3652

SCOTT , KAREN  
4791 STATE HIGHWAY 239 W  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3850

SEAL , RUSSELL  
SIERRA CLUB ALAMO GROUP  
628 COUNTY ROAD 5711  
LA COSTE TX 78039-2301

SEILER , PHIL  
346 E FM 884  
YORKTOWN TX 78164-5446

SHARP , BETTY  
2181 DIEBEL RD  
WEESATCHE TX 77993

SHEARMAN , CODY  
9116 FM 743  
KENEDY TX 78119-4660

SHEARMAN , TINA  
9116 FM 743  
KENEDY TX 78119-4660

SHELTON , MICHALLA  
PO BOX 667  
GOLIAD TX 77963-0667

SHELTON , MICHELLE GENERAL MANAGER  
GOLIAD COUNTY GROUNDWATER CONSERVATION  
DISTRICT  
PO BOX 562  
GOLIAD TX 77963-0562

SIBLEY , JEFF  
414 MADISON  
SAN ANTONIO TX 78204-1412

SIMMONS , DEE ANN  
913 WHEELER LN  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3644

SIMMONS , WAYLAN A  
URAC  
913 WHEELER LN  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3644

SISSON , LARRY  
461 LASSMAN RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3774

SMITH , MS BARBARA DIRECTOR  
GOLIAD COUNTY GROUNDWATER CONSERVATION  
DISTRICT  
PO BOX 562  
GOLIAD TX 77963-0562

SMITH , BARBARA  
GOLIAD COUNTY GROUNDWATER CONS DIST  
376 GOLIAD N  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3446

SMITH , DIANE & KENNETH  
674 FM 1351  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3788

SMITH , MARGIE & WAYNE  
4 LOS ROBLES RD  
YORKTOWN TX 78164-5184

SMITH , MARGIE  
4 LOS ROBLES RD  
YORKTOWN TX 78164-5184

SMITH JR , WILLIAM G  
38 MAIN ST  
WEESATCHE TX 77993

SPEARS , STEPHANIE Y  
154 STIRRUP RD  
VICTORIA TX 77905-2622

SPEARS , STEPHANIE Y  
614 ALOE RD N  
VICTORIA TX 77905-4219

STANGE , CURTIS  
2506 COLETOVILLE RD S  
VICTORIA TX 77905-3044

STARR , RAYMOND  
PO BOX 957  
GOLIAD TX 77963-0957

STOCKTON , ADA SUE  
PO BOX 582  
BEEVILLE TX 78104-0582

STOCKTON , TOM E  
1367 HALL RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3671

STOCKTON , VICTORIA A  
1367 HALL RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3671

SUMPTER , HEATHER  
GOLIAD COUNTY GROUNDWATER CONSERVATION  
DISTRICT  
PO BOX 562  
GOLIAD TX 77963-0562

SUMPTER , HEATHER  
GOLIAD COUNTY GROUNDWATER CONSERVATION  
DISTRICT  
118 S MARKET ST  
GOLIAD TX 77963-4345

SUTER , PATRICIA  
COASTAL BEND SIERRA CLUB  
1002 CHAMBERLAIN ST  
CORPUS CHRISTI TX 78404-2607

SWANSON , M C  
2204 HUTCHINS LN  
EL CAMPO TX 77437-2110

SWICKHEIMER , GEORGIA LEE  
PO BOX 217  
FANNIN TX 77960-0217

TIBILETTI , JOE  
KTXN RADIO  
PO BOX 7286  
VICTORIA TX 77903-7286

TOERCK , KATHY & RUDY  
265 CHARCO ST  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3701

TSAI , TIM  
4526 AVENUE D  
AUSTIN TX 78751-3006

TUTTLE , WANDA  
401 JOSEPHINE RD  
VICTORIA TX 77905-3031

TYRNA , MRS RACHEL  
106 ABERDEEN ST  
VICTORIA TX 77904-2746

VOGEL , MACKEY  
2750 AFFLERBACH RD  
YORKTOWN TX 78164-2103

VONDOHLEN , JANIE  
248 HILL AVE  
GOLIAD TX 77963-4141

WALKER , DAVID  
PO BOX 1086  
GOLIAD TX 77963-1086

WARREN , CAROL  
1235 HALLEMANN RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3309

WARREN , CAROL & DAVID P  
1235 HALLEMANN RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3309

WARZECHA , CYNTHIA  
1742 E FM 1961  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3368

WARZECHA , N MICHAEL  
1742 E FM 1961  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3368

WEISE , GARY PAUL  
255 GARZA RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3508

WILD , KAY  
12121 FM 240  
WESTHOFF TX 77994-4131

WILLIAMS , COLT & KATY  
363 SANTA RITA BLVD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-4383

WILLIAMS , COLT SECRETARY  
GOLIAD COUNTY GROUNDWATER CONSERVATION  
DISTRICT  
PO BOX 562  
GOLIAD TX 77963-0562

WILLIAMS , MINA  
141 NAPLES ST  
CORPUS CHRISTI TX 78404-1828

WIMBERLEY , TREY  
239 E FM 1961  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3412

WITKOWSKI , STEPHANIE  
PO BOX 604  
GOLIAD TX 77963-0604

WOOD , ROBERT  
PO BOX 645  
GOLIAD TX 77963-0645

WRIGHT , DAVID A  
1372 FM 2443  
KENEDY TX 78119-4695

YANTA , BRIAN  
567 MCCAMPBELL RD  
GOLIAD TX 77963-4076

YOAST , BILL  
2932 N US HIGHWAY 183  
GOLIAD TX 77963-3633

YOUNG , DAVID COMMISSIONER PRECINCT 2  
GOLIAD COUNTY TEXAS  
16930 S HIGHWAY 59  
BERCLAIR TX 77963

ZENGERLE , CURTIS & TERILYNN  
88 ROYAL OAKS 1  
YORKTOWN TX 78164-5211

ZENGERLE , DENNIS  
1405 ROY CT  
PEARLAND TX 77581-6323

**UNDERGROUND INJECTION CONTROL  
PERMIT NO. UR03075**

<b>APPLICATION BY</b>	<b>§</b>	<b>BEFORE THE</b>
<b>URANIUM ENERGY CORP.</b>	<b>§</b>	
<b>FOR RENEWAL AND</b>	<b>§</b>	
<b>AMENDMENT OF CLASS III</b>	<b>§</b>	<b>TEXAS COMMISSION ON</b>
<b>INJECTION WELL AREA</b>	<b>§</b>	
<b>PERMIT NO. UR03075</b>	<b>§</b>	<b>ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY</b>

---

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS**

---

The Executive Director of the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (the Commission or TCEQ) files this Response to Public Comments (Response) on the application by Uranium Energy Corp. (Applicant or UEC) for a Class III injection well area permit renewal and amendment to authorize *in situ* uranium mining. Before an application is approved, Title 30 Texas Administrative Code (30 TAC) Section (§) 55.156 requires that the Executive Director prepare a response to all timely, relevant and material, or significant comments received.

**I. Public Comments Received**

The Office of Chief Clerk received timely comments from: Richard J. Abitz, Michael Abrameit, Callie C. Albrecht, Catherine Alstrom, Cara Alstrom, Aldon Bade, Tate Bammert, Dave Barnet, Claire Barnhart, Mike R. Bennett, Jim S. Bluntzer, Harvey G. Brewer, Karen Kneip Brewer, Kirsten Brueggerhoff, Kirby Brumby, Bev Bruns, Pat Bulla, David Arthur Byrd, Annalysa Camacho, Chad Cardoso, Brad Carson, Debra Chapman, Gregory C. Chapman, Pamela Christopher, William Christopher, H. C. Clark, Ginger Cook, Alicia Cowley, Gary Cowley, Carolyn Croom, Art Dohman, Stuart Dornburg, Jed East, Kenneth Edwards, Kevin Fagg, Darren Franke, Renee Franke, Garland R Gloor, Susybelle L. Gosslee, Patricia Lux Graham, Terrell Lee Graham, Eric D Grahmann, Fred Grieder, Gerald A. Griffith, Karen D. Hadden, Beki Halpin, Beverly Havlik, Donna L. Hoffman, Vivian Howard, Heike Jenkins, Wayne Jacobs, Isaac Kimbrough, Kenneth Klanika, Wilfred Korth, Angela Lantz, Ted Long, Anna Lund, Amanda Jo Mamerow, Jesse Manciaz, Delbert McCullough, David Michaelson, Malcolm Migura, Rosalie Migura, Amy Moreland, Gene Moreland, Elaine Noland, Jesse Ortega, Misty Ortega, Joanna Packard, Rod Packard, Linda Pinsker, Debra Sue Primrose, Leslie Purdue, Greyson Radtke, Karen Migura Radtke, Lance Radtke, Margie Reed, Reagan Sahadi, Travis Schley, Brianna Schrade, Kalyn Schulte, Cody Shearman, Tina Shearman, Michelle Shelton, Jeff Sibley, Barbara Smith, Raymond Starr, Heather Sumpter, Rachel Tyrna, Janie Vondohler, Carol C. Warren, David P. Warren, Cynthia Warzecha, N. Michael Warzecha, Gary Paul Weise, Colt Williams, Katy Williams, Robert Wood, David A. Wright, Bill Yoast, David Young, Dennis Zengerle, Goliad County Groundwater Conservation District (GCGCD), Billy Dornburg on behalf of the congregation of St. Peter's Lutheran Church of Ander, Lon Burnam representing Sierra Club, and Marisa Perales on behalf of Carrizo/Comecrudo Nation of Texas, Inc.

State Representative Geanie Morrison requested a public meeting. A public meeting was held on August 5, 2024, in Goliad, Texas.

## II. Background

### A. Facility Description

The facility, referred to herein as the Goliad Project, is located at 14869 North United States Highway 183, Yorktown, Goliad County, Texas 78164. The facility where the proposed activity would take place is located approximately 13 miles north of the city of Goliad, about 0.9 miles east of the intersection of State Highway 183 and Farm-to-Market Road 1961 in Goliad County, Texas. The area within the proposed permit boundary is approximately 994.9 contiguous acres, including a 100-foot buffer zone.

### B. Application Description

UEC has applied to the TCEQ for renewal and amendment of Class III underground injection control area permit No. UR03075 to authorize an *in situ* uranium mining operation. TCEQ originally issued permit No. UR03075 to UEC on April 29, 2011. The Commission approved the issuance of permit No. UR03075 after considering an administrative law judge's (ALJ) proposal for decision, evidence, and arguments conducted in a contested case hearing on the application for the Class III injection well permit, UEC's application for Production Area Authorization No. 1 (UR03075PAA1), and UEC's application to designate an exempted aquifer. TCEQ Docket Nos. 2008-1888-UIC and 2009-1319-UIC. The Commission's order with Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law was issued on March 7, 2011. The permit authorizes UEC to operate Class III injection and production wells for recovery of uranium from a certain portion of the Goliad Formation within the permit area. After UEC's submission of an application for a minor amendment, the permit was amended on September 17, 2017, to add the permit range table of pre-mining water quality values in accordance with Texas Water Code § 27.0513(a), to reduce the permit area from 1139.4 acres to 994.9 acres, and to incorporate a reference to the United States Environmental Protection Agency's final approval of the aquifer exemption. UEC has not yet operated injection wells for the recovery of uranium at the Goliad Project.

UEC proposes to mine uranium deposits in the sands of the Goliad Formation using the *in situ* leach recovery method. *In situ* mining is accomplished by use of Class III underground injection control wells operating for both the injection and production of fluids. Class III wells inject fluid (lixiviant) from the surface into underground deposits of uranium ore. The lixiviant oxidizes the uranium and makes it mobile. Class III wells functioning in a production mode lift the solution bearing the uranium to the surface where resin beads remove the uranium from the solution. Reverse osmosis treatment then reconditions the water for reuse as lixiviant for continued mining. Reverse osmosis treatment will also be used to restore water in the mine area after the mining operation ends.

This Response to Comments only addresses relevant and material comments submitted on the application for renewal and amendment of the Class III injection well permit UR03075. The issued Production Area Authorization UR03075PAA1 and the designation of the exempted aquifer are not subject to renewal applications. UEC applied for and obtained Class I injection well permits WDW423 and WDW424 for injection well disposal of wastewaters produced from the mining, operation, and restoration activities. The Commission approved the issuance of the renewal and amendment of the Class I injection well permits WDW423 and WDW424 in an order dated September 4, 2024, on TCEQ Docket No. 2022-1553-WDW. UEC has been licensed

to possess uranium and radioactive by-product under radioactive material license at the Goliad Project under TCEQ license R06064. Any of the additional authorizations UEC may require other than the Class III injection well permit UR03075 are not addressed in this response.

### ***C. Procedural Background***

The TCEQ received this application on December 22, 2020, and declared it administratively complete on April 12, 2021. The Notice of Receipt of Application and Intent to Obtain a Class III Injection Well Area Permit Renewal was published in English on April 29, 2021, in the *Goliad Advance-Guard*.

The TCEQ held a public meeting on the application on August 5, 2024, at 7:00 pm at Goliad Memorial Auditorium, 925 S. US HWY 183, Goliad, Texas 77963. Notice of the public meeting was issued on June 27, 2024, and published in English on August 1, 2024, in the *Goliad Advance-Guard*.

On August 12, 2024, UEC revised its application to request amendment of the permit range table by including water quality data from all baseline and monitor wells completed in the production zones within the mine area. UEC also requested that total dissolved solids (TDS) be removed from the permit as an excursion control parameter and replaced with alkalinity, while also listing sulfate and uranium as additional control parameters to be used as needed. The Executive Director completed the technical review of the application on October 17, 2024, and prepared a draft permit. The Combined Revised Notice of Application and Intent to Obtain Permit and Notice of Application and Preliminary Decision for Class III Injection Well Area Permit Renewal and Amendment was issued on October 17, 2024, and published in English on November 14, 2024, in the *Goliad Advance-Guard*. The public comment period ended on December 16, 2024.

The Application was declared administratively complete on or after September 1, 2015; therefore, the Application is subject to the procedural requirements adopted pursuant to House Bill 801, 76th Legislature (1999) and Senate Bill 709, 84<sup>th</sup> Legislature (2015), both implemented by the Commission in its rules in 30 TAC Chapters 39, 50, and 55.

### **III. Access to Rules, Laws, and Information**

- The Texas Secretary of State webpage is [sos.state.tx.us](https://sos.state.tx.us).
- TCEQ rules in Title 30 of the Texas Administrative Code are available at [sos.state.tx.us/tac/](https://sos.state.tx.us/tac/) by selecting “View the current Texas Administrative Code” on the right, and then selecting “Title 30 Environmental Quality.”
- Texas statutes are available at [statutes.capitol.texas.gov](https://statutes.capitol.texas.gov).
- Federal rules in Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations are available at the EPA’s public webpage at [epa.gov/laws-regulations/regulations](https://epa.gov/laws-regulations/regulations).
- Federal environmental laws are available at the EPA’s public webpage at [epa.gov/laws-regulations/laws-and-executive-orders](https://epa.gov/laws-regulations/laws-and-executive-orders).
- Information about this application and the underground injection control permitting process is available from the TCEQ Public Education Program at 1-800-687-4040.

- General information about TCEQ can be found at our website at [www.tceq.texas.gov](http://www.tceq.texas.gov).
- If you would like to receive a hard copy of this RTC, please contact the Office of the Chief Clerk at 512-239-3300.

The permit application is available for viewing and copying at Goliad Public Library, 320 South Commercial, Goliad, Texas 77963. The following link to an electronic map of the site or facility's general location is provided as a public courtesy and is not part of the application or notice (for exact location, refer to application): <https://tceq.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=db5bac44afbc468bbddd360f8168250f&marker=-97.356944%2C28.865555&level=12>.

Certain Commission records for this application and draft permit are available for viewing and copying in the Office of the Chief Clerk (OCC) at the TCEQ main office in Austin at 12100 Park 35 Circle, Building F, 1st Floor. Some documents located in OCC may also be viewed in the Commissioner's Integrated Database at: [www14.tceq.texas.gov/epic/eCID/](http://www14.tceq.texas.gov/epic/eCID/).

#### IV. Comments and Responses

##### Opposition

##### **Comment No. 1:**

The following persons expressed their opposition to issuance of the renewed and amended permit: Wilfred Korth, Terrell Lee Graham, Gregory C. Chapman, Kalyn Schulte, Colt Williams, David P. Warren, Carol C. Warren, Jeff Sibley, Jesse Manciaz, Ted Long, Stuart Dornburg, Angela Lantz, Raymond Starr, Bill Yoast, Leslie Purdue, Beverly Havlik, Donna L. Hoffman, Karen Migura Radtke, Fred Grieder, Rosalie Migura, Malcolm Migura, Gary Paul Weise, Callie C. Albrecht, Gene Moreland, Amy Moreland, Margie Reed, Elaine Noland, Brad Carson, Wayne Jacobs, Delbert McCullough, Greyson Radtke, Chad Cardosa, Lance Radtke, Isaac Kimbrough, Kirsten Brueggerhoff, Dave Barnet, Mike R. Bennett, Kirby Brumby, Kevin Fagg, Kenneth Edwards, David Young, Billy Dornburg on behalf of the congregation of St. Peter's Lutheran Church of Ander, Anna Lund, Tate Bammert, Reagan Sahadi, Barbara Smith, Art Dohman, Eric D. Grahmann, Catherine Alstrom, Lon Burnam representing Sierra Club, and Carrizo/Comecrudo Nation of Texas, Inc.

##### **Response No. 1:**

The Executive Director acknowledges the comments made in opposition to the application for renewal and amendment of Class III injection well permit UR03075.

##### Geology and Hydrology

##### **Comment No 2:**

The following commenters expressed concerns about the adequacy of the application in characterizing geology and hydrology, direction and rate of groundwater flow, the identification of faults, and assessing seismicity: GCGCD, Wilfred Korth, Dennis Zengerle, Terrell Lee Graham, Patricia Lux Graham, Garland R. Gloor, Michelle Shelton, Ginger Cook, Colt Williams, Jeff Sibley, Fred Grieder, Dave Barnet, Amanda Jo

Mamerow, H. C. Clark, Tate Bammert, Reagan Sahadi, Barbara Smith, Art Dohman, Eric D. Grahmann, Kenneth Klanika, and Carrizo/Comecrudo Nation of Texas, Inc.

## **Response No 2:**

The Executive Director reviewed the application and prepared the draft permit in consideration of the applicable rules under 30 TAC Chapter 331 and Section 331.122. The technical report in the application included: a map indicating the permit area and area of review with all of the features (Attachment D - Figure 1.3); tabulation of wells in the area of review penetrating the injection zone (Tables 5.E-1 and VIII.A.1); maps and cross-sections indicating the vertical and lateral limits of the aquifers in the area of review (Figures 5.15 - 5.25); maps and cross-sections detailing the geologic structure of the local area (Figures 5.26 - 5.33); maps and cross-sections illustrating the regional geologic setting (Figures 5.3 - 5.5); proposed operating data (Section VI.D); rates and volumes of fluid to be injected (Section VI.D.1.a); injection pressure (Section VI.D.9); source of injection fluids (Section VI.D.9); formation testing program (Section VI.D.1.b); operation and injection procedures (Section VI.D.1.b); engineering drawings, plans for monitoring requirements (Figures 6.1a, 6.1B, 6.2 and Appendix C); expected changes in pressure, native fluid displacement, and direction of movement of injection fluid (Section VI.D.1.b); contingency plans for shut-ins or well failures (Section VI.D.10); corrective action plan; and a permit range table (Section XII); proposed financial assurance for plugging and abandoning Class III wells (Section III - Attachment F); and the closure plan (Section VI.E). The Executive Director determined that the application adequately characterized the geology and hydrology of the permit area and area of review and adequately assessed faults and seismicity.

After considering the record of a contested case hearing on the original application to issue Class III injection well permit UR03075 with opportunity for parties to submit evidence on the matter, the Commission issued an order adjudicating the following findings of fact (FOF):

(FOF 94) The application adequately characterizes and describes the geology and hydrology in the Mine Permit Area, including fault lines, under the applicable rules.

(FOF 95) The [Class III injection well area permit] application contains: a narrative description of the hydrology in the proposed Mine Permit Area; a narrative description of the geology in the proposed Mine Permit Area; permit-area cross-sections (and a cross section index map); structure and isopach maps for each of the four sands (Sands A-D); and potentiometric surface maps—both within each sand and for the region—that show the direction of groundwater flow.

(FOF 97) Two faults exist within the proposed Mine Permit Area; the Northwest Fault and the Southeast Fault

(FOF 98) The Northwest Fault is the larger of the two and runs along the northwest portion of the proposed Mine Permit Area, near the perimeter of the proposed production areas A and C and very near the perimeter of proposed production area D.

(FOF 99) Further characterization of the Northwest Fault is not required for the Mine Permit. Where applicable, future PAA applications will include the results of hydrologic testing and an interpretation of those results with respect to any faults to determine the hydrologic connection both across the fault and vertically along the

fault.

(FOF 100) The Southeast Fault transects only a small part of the southeast corner of the proposed Mine Permit Area and touches none of the proposed production areas.

(FOF 101) The [Class III injection well area permit] application accurately and adequately describes all faults in the proposed Mine Permit Area.

(FOF 102) The [Class III injection well area permit] application meets all applicable criteria of 30 TAC § 331.122, related to required consideration by the Commission prior to issuing a Class III Injection Well Area Permit.

(FOF 108) For the most part, the hydraulic gradient with the Mine Permit Area is relatively flat, resulting in a slow rate of groundwater flow.

(FOF 109) Regionally, the direction of groundwater flow is typical of coastal plain aquifers, that is, coastward. Thus, groundwater flow in the Mine Permit Area is generally to the southeast.

After considering the record of a contested case hearing on the original application to issue Class III injection well permit UR03075 with opportunity for parties to submit evidence on the matter, the Commission issued an order adjudicating the following conclusions of law (COL):

(COL 264) Based on the findings of fact set forth in and/or incorporated in Section V.G. above [in the Commission's order], the [Class III injection well area permit] application adequately characterizes and describes the geology and hydrology in the proposed permit area, including fault lines, under the applicable rules.

(COL 265) Section 331.122(2)(A) requires a map showing "faults, if known or suspected. Only information of public record is required to be on this map...."

(COL 266) Based on the findings of fact set forth in and/or incorporated in Section V.H. above [in the Commission's order], the geologic and hydraulic properties of the proposed permit area indicate that the Applicant will be able to comply with rule requirements.

**Comment No. 3:**

GCGCD, Wilfred Korth, Terrell Lee Graham, Patricia Lux Graham, Garland R. Gloor, and Amanda Jo Mamerow expressed concerns about differing application representations in UEC's application for Class I and Class III injection well permits.

**Response No. 3:**

Class I injection wells are generally deep wells used for injection of large volumes for disposal of waste in formations situated below underground sources of drinking water. Class III injection wells inject fluids for the purpose of extracting minerals, such as uranium. UEC's applications for Class I and Class III injection well permits require different information as they focus on different injection zones, have different design and construction requirements, and have different operational requirements. Under 30 TAC § 305.49, applications for Class I injection well permits must address the information required in 30 TAC § 331.121 and applications for Class III injection well permits must address the information required in 30 TAC § 331.122.

Comments on the Class I injection well permit application are not relevant or

material to the Commission's or the Executive Director's consideration of the Class III injection well permit application.

**Comment No. 4:**

GCGCD, Wilfred Korth, and Amanda Jo Mamerow expressed concerns about conducting mining activities in an unconfined aquifer.

**Response No. 4:**

TCEQ rules do not contain a prohibition of *in situ* mining in an unconfined aquifer. UEC's application indicates that groundwater in the designated Sand A is unconfined, and the groundwater in Sands B, C, and D is under confined conditions. After considering the record of a contested case hearing on the original application to issue Class III injection well permit UR03075 with opportunity for parties to submit evidence on the matter, the Commission issued an order adjudicating the following findings of fact:

(FOF 103) The geologic and hydraulic properties of the proposed Mine Permit Area indicate that UEC will be able to comply with rule requirements.

(FOF 104) Sands B, C, and D in the Mine Permit Area are confined aquifers. They are saturated with groundwater.

(FOF 105) Sand A in the Mine Permit Area is hydraulically unconfined but still isolated from the deeper sands by a low permeability confining layer throughout the Mine Permit Area.

After considering the record of a contested case hearing on the original application to issue Class III injection well permit UR03075 with opportunity for parties to submit evidence on the matter, the Commission issued an order adjudicating the following conclusion of law:

(COL 293) There is no statutory or regulatory prohibition against conducting *in situ* uranium mining in an unconfined aquifer.

**Comment No. 5:**

GCGCD, Wilfred Korth, Amanda Jo Mamerow, Art Dohman, Robert Wood, and Eric D. Grahmann expressed concerns about reliance on groundwater quality data from the original application or assert that water quality has changed since the original application was submitted.

**Response No. 5:**

Pre-mining baseline groundwater quality data was collected and provided to TCEQ as part of the original mine area permit application. No mining activities have been conducted at the site. Although multiple monitor wells and baseline wells have been installed within the mine permit area, these are considered "passive" devices and will only be used for groundwater assessment. No injection has been, or will be, allowed into or through these devices. Additionally, no chemicals or other elements, such as oxygen or carbon dioxide, have actively been injected into or through these wells that could potentially result in changes to chemistry of the native groundwater (i.e., pH or dissolved oxygen changes that could potentially dissolve or mobilize certain elements).

According to hydrogeologic information provided in the permit renewal

application, the groundwater flow rate for the Goliad Sands in the mine area is approximately 6.7 feet/year toward the southeast. This would result in approximately 94 feet of displacement, or movement, during the 14 years since original permit issuance. Based upon information provided in the original and renewal permit applications, there do not appear to be any sources of potential groundwater contaminant introduction within or immediately adjacent to the mine area, and it is unlikely that groundwater movement of 94 feet would significantly change the water quality since the original application was submitted.

**Comment No. 6:**

Wilfred Korth, Terrell Lee Graham, Colt Williams, Tate Bammert, Reagan Sahadi, Barbara Smith, Art Dohman, Rod Packard, and Carrizo/Comecrudo Nation of Texas, Inc., expressed concerns that oil and gas wells in the area have not been adequately assessed.

**Response No. 6:**

The requirements for reviewing artificial penetrations in the area of review for Class I and Class III injection well permit applications differ. Class III injection wells have a ¼ mile area of review surrounding the permit area under 30 TAC § 331.42(a)(4). Because Class III injection involves lower pressure and volumes and the permittee is required to confine injected mining solutions within the production zone of a production area surrounded by production zone monitor wells, no off-site migration of injected fluids is expected. The Executive Director reviewed the application and description of artificial penetrations in the area of review and does not consider that any corrective action is necessary to address the condition of any particular oil and gas well in the area of review.

**Comment No. 7:**

Wilfred Korth, Terrell Lee Graham, David Michaelson, Linda Pinsker, Colt Williams, Tate Bammert, Reagan Sahadi, Barbara Smith, Art Dohman, and Kenneth Klanika expressed concerns that hydraulic testing or pump testing has not been conducted to determine transmissivity of faults.

**Response No. 7:**

The Executive Director reviewed the application and prepared the draft permit in consideration of the applicable rules under 30 TAC Chapter 331. TCEQ rules do not specifically require hydraulic testing of faults. Nevertheless, the Commission's previous order issuing Class III injection well permit UR03075 addresses hydraulic testing. After considering the record of a contested case hearing on the original application to issue Class III injection well permit UR03075 with opportunity for parties to submit evidence on the matter, the Commission issued an order adjudicating the following finding of fact:

(FOF 99) Further characterization of the Northwest Fault is not required for the Mine Permit. Where applicable, future PAA applications will include the results of hydrologic testing and an interpretation of those results with respect to any faults to determine the hydrologic connection both across the fault and vertically along the fault.

After considering the record of a contested case hearing on the original application to issue Class III injection well permit UR03075 with opportunity for

parties to submit evidence on the matter, the Commission issued an order adjudicating the following conclusions of law:

(COL 267) Hydrologic testing is not required for a Class III Underground Injection Control permit, although an applicant must provide a description of the proposed hydrologic testing program.

(COL 268) Prior to conducting any mining operations near the Northwest Fault, UEC will have to apply for, and the Commission will have to issue one or more PAAs in addition to the PAA for PA-1.

(COL 269) The results of the hydrologic testing program must be submitted with an application for a PAA, which is needed to mine an ore body within an area permit.

UEC has only applied for only one Production Area Authorization (PAA), UR03075PAA1. If UEC submits an application for a PAA for a production area in closer proximity to the Northwest Fault, further testing and characterization of the fault will be required.

**Comment No. 8:**

GCGCD, Wilfred Korth, and Amanda Jo Mamerow expressed concerns that the application mis-labeled wells RBLB-2 and RBLD-1.

**Response No. 8:**

The Executive Director is uncertain which figures, maps, diagrams, tables and/or pages of the application have mis-labeled wells. Without additional information, the Executive Director is unable to respond to the comment.

**Comment No. 9:**

Richard J. Abitz and Carrizo/Comecrudo Nation of Texas, Inc., expressed concerns that the application did not adequately establish baseline.

**Response No. 9:**

The Executive Director reviewed the application and prepared the draft permit in consideration of the applicable rules under 30 TAC Chapter 331 and determined that the applicant adequately addresses baseline requirements. Baseline is not required for the permit area. Under 30 TAC § 331.82(e)(7), the permit includes a range table of pre-mining low and high values of groundwater parameters for wells completed in the production zone. This was added by an amendment to the permit on September 17, 2017. Establishing baseline is a requirement for each PAA. UEC has been issued Production Area Authorization UR03075PAA1 for Production Area 1 and the authorization is not subject to a renewal requirement. After considering the record of a contested case hearing on the original application to issue Class III injection well permit UR03075 with opportunity for parties to submit evidence on the matter, the Commission issued an order adjudicating the following findings of fact:

(FOF 79) Local water quality was established by sampling all existing wells within the Mine Permit Area and by sampling nearly all the existing wells within 1 kilometer of the permit area boundary. In addition, UEC completed and sampled 20 baseline wells.

(FOF 80) The locations of the 20 baseline wells largely correspond to the area where UEC anticipates mining (i.e., areas of high uranium mineralization).

(FOF 81) The [Class III injection well permit] application contains the water quality results from the 20 baseline wells and the 47 area wells located inside the permit area boundary or with 1 kilometer of the permit area boundary.

(FOF 82) Groundwater quality data from the 20 baseline wells is remarkably similar to the data from the 47 wells for all constituents with the exception of uranium and radium-226, which are significantly higher in the baseline wells.

After considering the record of a contested case hearing on the original application to issue Class III injection well permit UR03075 with opportunity for parties to submit evidence on the matter, the Commission issued an order adjudicating the following conclusions of law:

(COL 254) Based on the findings of fact set forth in Section V.C. above [in the Commission's order], the [Class III injection well permit] application adequately and accurately describe the baseline conditions of the groundwater in the proposed Mine Permit Area under applicable requirements of 30 TAC Chapter 331.

(COL 255) There are no TCEQ rule requirements for establishing baseline conditions as part of the Class III application, but baseline quality is defined as "[t]he parameters and their concentrations that describe the local groundwater quality of an aquifer prior to the beginning of injection operations."

#### Operations and monitoring

##### **Comment No. 10:**

GCGCD, Wilfred Korth, Heike Jenkins, Dennis Zengerle, Michelle Shelton, Richard J. Abitz, Beki Halpin, Carolyn Croom, Susybell L. Gosslee, Colt William, Katy Williams, Jeff Sibley, Amanda Jo Mamerow, and Carrizo/Comecrudo Nation of Texas expressed concerns that the application does not provide adequate scope and frequency of groundwater monitoring.

##### **Response No. 10:**

The Executive Director reviewed the application and prepared the draft permit in consideration of the applicable rules under 30 TAC Chapter 331 and determined that the applicant adequately addresses monitoring requirements. The permittee must meet the monitoring requirements of 30 TAC § 331.84 and comply with the specific production area monitoring requirements of 30 TAC §§ 331.103 and 331.105. These include requirements for monitoring the confinement of mining solution to the production area. The layout and designation of monitor wells for Production Area 1 are established in UR03075PAA1 and are not subject to this renewal application. Once mining begins, production zone monitor wells must be sampled twice each calendar month, with sampling events taken between 10-20 days apart.

##### **Comment No. 11:**

Wilfred Korth, Terrell Lee Graham, Gregory C. Chapman, David Michaelson, Katy Williams, Tate Bammert, Reagan Sahadi, Barbara Smith and Art Dohman expressed concerns that the application and proposed amendment to remove TDS as control parameter is not adequate.

##### **Response No. 11:**

Although total dissolved solids (TDS) has been removed as a control parameter

in the draft permit, conductivity remains as a control parameter. The Executive Director determined that conductivity is an appropriate control parameter to detect excursions. Conductivity is directly proportional to TDS content in a specific water sample. TDS can be estimated using conductivity measurements by applying a conversion factor. Both TDS and conductivity are identified as control parameters in the current permit for use in excursion monitoring. Either one or the other is sufficient as a control parameter for determination of dissolved solids content in groundwater samples. Keeping both control parameters in the permit is unnecessary and redundant. Additionally, mining facility and compliance inspectors from TCEQ's Critical Infrastructure Division have indicated that measuring conductivity is a more efficient and practical method for determining TDS in a field environment.

**Comment No. 12:**

Wilfred Korth, Terrell Lee Graham, Katy Williams, Tate Bammert, Reagan Sahadi, Barbara Smith and Art Dohman expressed concerns that the application and proposed permit inappropriately rely on self-reported information.

**Response No. 12:**

The Executive Director reviewed the application and prepared the draft permit in consideration of the applicable rules under 30 TAC Chapter 331 and determined that self-reported information is appropriate. Self-reporting is an aspect of all TCEQ programs. It is not practical or financially feasible for TCEQ to physically collect samples and analyze them for every regulated facility with the frequency required for many of the programs under the agency's jurisdiction. However, there are several safeguards in place to help ensure the validity of information that is self-reported. First, all analytical data submitted to the TCEQ by a regulated entity must be certified as true and correct; falsification of any data constitutes fraud and may subject the permittee to enforcement or criminal prosecution. Second, analytical data submitted to the TCEQ must be from laboratories that meet the accreditation requirements of 30 TAC Chapter 25. Third, all data submitted is reviewed by TCEQ and any apparent inconsistencies or violations would be investigated further. Fourth, TCEQ may periodically collect its own samples and compare to self-reported information. And finally, all reported information is a public record available to anyone under the requirements of the Texas Public Information Act.

These comments are not relevant or material to the Commission's or the Executive Director's consideration of the application.

*Post-mining requirements*

**Comment No. 13:**

Rachel Tyrna, Karen D. Hadden, Beki Halpin, Jeff Sibley, Cara Alstrom, Janie Vondohler, and Fred Grieder expressed concerns that proposed groundwater restoration is not adequate.

**Response No. 13:**

The Executive Director reviewed the application and prepared the draft permit in consideration of the applicable rules under 30 TAC Chapter 331 and determined that the proposed groundwater restoration is adequate. Under 30 TAC § 331.107(a), groundwater in the production zone within the production area must be restored when

mining is complete. UEC proposes to use reverse osmosis treatment as the main restoration technique. Reverse osmosis treatment circulates cleaned water through the production zone, removes contaminants through reverse osmosis filtration, dispose the contaminants in the deep waste disposal well, and then re-circulates the filtered water through the production zone.

After considering the record of a contested case hearing on the original application to issue Class III injection well permit UR03075 with opportunity for parties to submit evidence on the matter, the Commission issued an order adjudicating the following findings of fact:

(FOF 131) UEC's proposal for restoration of groundwater to baseline levels as contained in the [Class III injection well permit] application is reasonable and adequate.

(FOF 132) The [Class III injection well permit] application contains a description of UEC's proposed restoration procedures, plans for a restoration demonstration and report to TCEQ regarding the demonstration.

(FOF 133) UEC's restoration proposal incorporates improvements as compared to past restoration efforts in Texas. These include: 1) the use of reverse osmosis on a commercial scale during mining to provide a jump start on restoration; 2) the initiation of restoration as soon as mining ends in a production area; and 3) the continued use of the ion exchange (IX) columns to remove residual uranium during restoration instead of only during mining.

(FOF 134) In addition, UEC's restoration efforts will benefit from technological advancements. The membranes that are used in the reverse osmosis process are now specifically designed to function with a longer life span and higher performance in the particular water quality in which they will be used.

(FOF 136) Within 18 months after initiation of mining in the first production area, UEC will conduct a restoration demonstration. If the results of that demonstration indicated that the assumed number of pore volumes required for aquifer restoration is inadequate, the ED will require the amount of financial assurance for aquifer restoration to be adjusted accordingly.

After considering the record of a contested case hearing on the original application to issue Class III injection well permit UR03075 with opportunity for parties to submit evidence on the matter, the Commission issued an order adjudicating the following conclusion of law:

(COL 285) Based on the findings of fact set forth in Section V.L. above [in the Commission's order], UEC's proposal for restoration of groundwater to baseline levels as contained in the permit application is reasonable and adequate.

**Comment No. 14:**

Cara Alstrom expressed concerns that the application and proposed permitted activities are not adequate for decommissioning the surface and facilities after mining.

**Response No. 14:**

Decommissioning of the surface is not addressed under TCEQ's underground injection control program rules in 30 TAC Chapter 331 or in the application for renewal and amendment of Class III injection well area permit UR03075.

Decommissioning is a requirement under the Radioactive Materials License R06064 issued to UEC. Under this license, UEC must implement a decommissioning plan in accordance with 30 TAC § 336.1115 to close the site, structures, and outdoor areas so that the property may be released for unrestricted use by the property owner.

This comment is not relevant or material to the Commission's or the Executive Director's consideration of the application.

### Financial Assurance

#### **Comment No. 15:**

Carrizo/Comecrudo Nation of Texas, Inc. expressed concerns that the proposed financial assurance is inadequate.

#### **Response No. 15:**

The Executive Director reviewed the application and prepared the draft permit in consideration of the applicable rules under 30 TAC Chapter 331 and determined that the financial assurance is adequate. Under permit provision VII. A. of the draft permit, the permittee must secure and maintain in full force and effect at all times an acceptable financial assurance mechanism, following 30 TAC §§331.109(b) and 331.142-331.144 to provide for plugging and abandonment of the permitted Class III wells, baseline wells, and monitoring wells. UEC has provided a cost estimate of \$468,464 for plugging and abandonment of these wells. The draft permit does not authorize injection of fluids until the financial assurance mechanism in the amount of the current cost estimate is established and effective. Additional financial assurance for plugging and abandonment will be required as additional wells are installed. While cost estimates for groundwater restoration are required for each production area, the financial assurance for groundwater restoration is included as part of the financial assurance required for closure under the radioactive materials license.

### Environmental and Natural Resources Protection

#### **Comment No. 16:**

The following commenters expressed their concerns about UEC's operation having a negative impact on groundwater quality, including contamination of groundwater from mining activities: Heather Sumpter, GCGCD, Wilfred Korth, Heike Jenkins, Darren Franke, Renee Franke, Dennis Zengerle, Aldon Bade, David Arthur Byrd, Terrell Lee Graham, Patricia Lux Graham, Alicia Cowley, Garland R Gloor, Gary Cowley, Michelle Shelton, Debra Sue Primrose, Richard J. Abitz, Harvey G. Brewer, Karen Kneip Brewer, Misty Ortega, Jesse Ortega, William Christopher, N. Michael Warzecha, Cynthia Warzecha, Pamela Christopher, David A. Wright, Tina Shearman, Joanna Packard, Cody Shearman, Claire Barnhart, Gregory C. Chapman, David Michaelsen, Linda Pinsker, Debra Chapman, Ginger Cook, Rachel Tyrna, Karen D. Hadden, Beki Halpin, Carolyn Croom, Pat Bulla, Travis Schley, Brianna Schrade, Susybelle L. Gosslee, Colt Williams, Katy Williams, Jeff Sibley, Cara Alstrom, Jesse Manciaz, Janie Vondohler, Angela Lantz, Raymond Starr, Beverly Havlik, Donna L. Hoffman, Karen Migura Radtke, Fred Grieder, Rosalie Migura, Malcolm Migura, Gary Paul Weise, Callie C. Albrecht, Greyson Radtke, Chad Cardosa, Lance Radtke, Kirsten Brueggerhoff, Dave Barnet, Gerald A. Griffith, Mike R. Bennett, Kirby Brumby, Kevin Fagg, Kenneth Edwards, David Young, Jim S. Bluntzer, Billy Dornburg on behalf of congregation of St. Peter's Lutheran Church of

Ander, Anna Lund, Amanda Jo Mamerow, Tate Bammert, Reagan Sahadi, Barbara Smith, Art Dohman, Rod Packard, Lon Burnam representing Sierra Club, Kenneth Klanika, Robert Wood, Eric D. Grahmann, and Carrizo/Comecrudo Nation of Texas, Inc.

**Response No. 16:**

The Executive Director reviewed the application and prepared the draft permit in consideration of the applicable rules under 30 TAC Chapter 331 and determined that groundwater will be adequately protected from mining activities and permitted injection activities. The focus of the TCEQ Underground Injection Control program and the rules of 30 TAC Chapter 331 is to protect underground sources of drinking water and fresh water from pollution. Mining activity will occur in an exempted aquifer. The *in situ* mining process involves injecting a mining fluid (lixiviant) into a mineralized zone, circulating this fluid through the zone to dissolve uranium minerals from the aquifer material, and then pumping the mining fluid to the surface where it can be processed to recover the uranium. In addition to uranium other constituents may also be dissolved from the aquifer material into the mining fluid. This results in an increase in the concentration of certain constituents in the groundwater within the mineralized zone and the area being mined. To provide protection of groundwater outside of the zone and area being mined using *in situ* techniques, the permittee must confine the mining solutions to the production zone within the area of designated production zone monitor wells under 30 TAC § 331.102. During mining operations, the permittee will be required to maintain a cone of depression in the production zone to confine mining solutions within the production area. To ensure protection of the areas outside of the mining zone, the permittee must:

- Identify existing wells that could serve as a conduit for mining solutions to move outside of the production area (30 TAC § 331.42);
- Construct wells in accordance with construction requirements (30 TAC § 331.82);
- Maintain mechanical integrity of all Class III wells (30 TAC § 331.4);
- Implement corrective action to prevent or correct pollution of an underground source of drinking water (30 TAC § 331.44);
- Obtain Executive Director approval of construction and completion of wells (30 TAC § 331.45)
- Operate the wells in accordance with operation requirements (30 TAC § 331.83);
- Monitor operations in accordance with monitoring requirements (30 TAC § 331.84);
- Submit reports in accordance with the reporting requirements (30 TAC § 331.85);
- Restore groundwater in the production zone within the production areas when mining is complete (30 TAC § 331.107); and
- Close wells in accordance with a plugging and abandonment plan in a manner which will not allow the movement of fluids through the well, out of the injection zone, or to the land surface. (30 TAC §§ 331.46 and 331.86)

After considering the record of a contested case hearing on the original application to issue Class III injection well permit UR03075 with opportunity for parties to submit evidence on the matter, the Commission issued an order adjudicating the following findings of fact:

(FOF 91) Data from the [Class III injection well permit] application shows that mining fluids will not migrate vertically or horizontally and contaminate an USDW (underground source of drinking water.)....

(FOF 92) UEC's proposal for restoration of groundwater to baseline levels as contained in the [Class III injection well permit] application is reasonable and adequate....

(FOF 93) The [Class III injection well permit] application is sufficiently protective of groundwater quality.

(FOF 110) Mining fluids will not migrate vertically or horizontally and contaminate an USDW (underground source of drinking water)....

(FOF 141) Groundwater is adequately protected from pollution....

(FOF 161) Maintaining a cone of depression during mining operations prevents the horizontal migration of mining fluids.

(FOF 172) Data in the [Class III injection well permit] application shows that USDWs within Goliad County will not be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed *in situ* uranium operations.

(FOF 235) Based on the above findings of fact [in the Commission's order], both groundwater and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution with proper safeguards. The draft [Class III injection well] Permit and draft PAA-1 [UR03075PAA1] impose terms and conditions reasonably necessary to protect fresh water from pollution.

After considering the record of a contested case hearing on the original application to issue Class III injection well permit UR03075 with opportunity for parties to submit evidence on the matter, the Commission issued an order adjudicating the following conclusions of law:

(COL 263) Based on the findings of fact set forth in and/or incorporate into Section V.F. above [of the Commission's order], the [Class III injection well permit] application is sufficiently protective of groundwater quality.

(COL 294) Based on the findings of fact set forth in and/or incorporated into Section V.R. above [of the Commission's order], mining fluids will not migrate vertically or horizontally and contaminate an USDW.

(COL 298) Based of the findings of fact set for in and/or incorporated into Section V.T. above [of the Commission's order] no USDWs within Goliad County will be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed *in situ* uranium operations.

(COL 340) Based on the findings of fact set forth herein [in the Commission's order], both groundwater and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution with proper safeguards.... The draft [Class III injection well] Permit and draft PAA-1 [UR03075PAA1] impose terms and conditions reasonably necessary to protect fresh water from pollution.

#### **Comment No. 17:**

The following commenters expressed concerns about the availability and use of groundwater supplies from the proposed mining activities: Heather Sumpter, GCGCD, Wilfred Korth, Dennis Zengerle, Terrell Lee Graham, Michelle Shelton, Richard J. Abitz,

Harvey G. Brewer, Karen Kneip Brewer, Misty Ortega, Jesse Ortega, William Christopher, N. Michael Warzecha, Cynthia Warzecha, Pamela Christopher, David A. Wright, Tina Shearman, Joanna Packard, Cody Shearman, Claire Barnhart, Gregory C. Chapman, David Michaelson, Linda Pinsker, Debra Chapman, Carolyn Croom, Colt Williams, Angela Lantz, Beverly Havlik, Karen Migura Radtke, Rosalie Migura, Lance Radtke, Mike R. Bennett, Kirby Brumby, Kevin Fagg, Kenneth Edwards, David Young, Jim S. Bluntzer, Billy Dornburg on behalf of congregation of St. Peter's Lutheran Church of Ander, Tate Bammert, Reagan Sahadi, Barbara Smith, and Art Dohman.

**Response No. 17:**

The applicable statutes and rules for the application and issuance of a Class III injection well area permit for *in situ* uranium mining do not regulate the volume of fresh water used by a permittee to conduct mining operations. After considering the record of a contested case hearing on the original application to issue Class III injection well permit UR03075 with opportunity for parties to submit evidence on the matter, the Commission issued an order adjudicating the following findings of fact:

(FOF 69) UEC's projected water consumption is between 133 and 206 acre-feet per year.

(FOF 70) The [Goliad County Groundwater Conservation] District's Management Plan anticipated the need to plan for groundwater usage for uranium mining purposes. The Plan projects 800 acre-feet per year of groundwater usage for such purposes, which is almost four times the amount that UEC projects it will use on an annual basis.

(FOF 71) UEC's estimated water use over the life of the project and projected maximum monthly water use are also projected to fall within the limits of the District's current water usage rule.

(FOF 72) UEC's mining operation and restoration activities will not unreasonably reduce the amount of groundwater available for permitting by the District.

After considering the record of a contested case hearing on the original application to issue Class III injection well permit UR03075 with opportunity for parties to submit evidence on the matter, the Commission issued an order adjudicating the following conclusion of law:

(COL 248) The Class III injection well requirements that apply to *in situ* mining do not regulate the volume of fresh water used by a permittee.

These comments are not relevant or material to the Commission's or the Executive Director's consideration of the application.

**Comment No. 18:**

GCGCD, Wilfred Korth, Rachel Tyrna, Cara Alstrom, Amanda Jo Mamerow, and Eric D. Grahmann expressed concerns that the application and proposed permitted activities are not adequately protective of surface waters.

**Response No. 18:**

The Executive Director reviewed the application and prepared the draft permit in consideration of the applicable rules under 30 TAC Chapter 331 and determined that surface waters will be adequately protected from mining activities and permitted injection activities. The draft permit prohibits the discharge of fluids into or adjacent

to any water in the State (Sec. V. C. 5.) Requirements for containment of spilled fluids from mining activities are addressed in the radioactive materials license and are not part of this injection well permit. After considering the record of a contested case hearing on the original application to issue Class III injection well permit UR03075 with opportunity for parties to submit evidence on the matter, the Commission issued an order adjudicating the following findings of fact:

(FOF 118) Class III area permit applications address protection of surface water only in a general sense. The specific regulatory requirements for containment of surface fluids are included in a radioactive material license ("RML"). An *in situ* uranium mine operator is required to have an RML.

(FOF 119) UEC's [Class III injection well permit] application contains operational measures to comply with the Draft [Class III injection well] Permit's prohibition against discharge of fluids into surface waters.

(FOF 120) No impact to wetlands are anticipated as a result of UEC's proposed operations.

(FOF 121) The [Class III injection well permit] application describes design features related to the management of flooding and runoff. These features will prevent and/or minimize contact of mining fluids with the ground surface.

(FOF 122) With proper construction practices, mining activities will not impact the quality of runoff caused by flooding.

(FOF 123) Accidental spills at the plant, in the field, and at the Class I waste disposal well areas will be minimized by automated monitoring equipment, daily visual inspections and reporting, and by UEC's corrective action program.

(FOF 126) The [Class III injection well permit] application is sufficiently protective of surface water quality.

After considering the record of a contested case hearing on the original application to issue Class III injection well permit UR03075 with opportunity for parties to submit evidence on the matter, the Commission issued an order adjudicating the following conclusion of law:

(COL 279) Based on the findings of fact set forth in Section V.J. above [in the Commission's order] the [Class III injection well permit] application is sufficiently protective of surface water quality.

**Comment No. 19:**

GCGCD, Wilfred Korth, Aldon Bade, Debra Sue Primrose, Briana Schrade, Susybelle L. Gosslee, Colt Williams, Katy Williams, Jesse Manciaz, Donna L. Hoffman, expressed concerns that the application and proposed permitted activities are not adequately protective of livestock or wildlife.

**Response No. 19:**

The Executive Director reviewed the application and prepared the draft permit in consideration of the applicable rules under 30 TAC Chapter 331 and determined that livestock and wildlife will be adequately protected from mining activities and permitted injection activities. Impact to livestock and wildlife will be minimized by the protections to groundwater, surface water, soil and air contamination. After

considering the record of a contested case hearing on the original application to issue Class III injection well permit UR03075 with opportunity for parties to submit evidence on the matter, the Commission issued an order adjudicating the following findings of fact:

(FOF 138) The proposed uranium mining activities will not negatively impact livestock and wildlife, including endangered species.

(FOF 139) If there is no contamination of the air, soil, surface water or groundwater outside the production area, then animals are not impacted. The [Class III injection well permit] application complies with rules designed to eliminate these possible pathways for contamination of animals.

After considering the record of a contested case hearing on the original application to issue Class III injection well permit UR03075 with opportunity for parties to submit evidence on the matter, the Commission issued an order adjudicating the following conclusions of law:

(COL 286) Based on the findings of fact set forth in and/or incorporated into Section V.M. above [of the Commission's order], the Applicant's proposed activities will not negatively impact livestock and wildlife, including endangered species.

(COL 287) Applicants for an RML must examine levels of radiological exposure to facility workers and members of the public via pathways such as air, soils, surface water, and food chain (crops, cattle, etc.) 30 TAC §§ 336.301-336.368.

**Comment No. 20:**

GCGCD, Wilfred Korth, Aldon Bade, Debra Sue Primrose, Gregory C. Chapman, Carolyn Croom, Pat Bulla, Jeff Sibley, Angela Lantz, Donna L. Hoffman, Callie C. Albrecht, Anna Lund, Amanda Jo Mamerow, Vivian Howard, and Eric D. Grahmann expressed concerns that the application and proposed permitted activities are not adequate to protect health and welfare.

**Response No. 20:**

The Executive Director reviewed the application and prepared the draft permit in consideration of the applicable rules under 30 TAC Chapter 331 and determined that health and welfare will be adequately protected from mining activities and permitted injection activities. Impact to health and welfare will be minimized by the protections to groundwater, surface water, soil and air contamination. After considering the record of a contested case hearing on the original application to issue Class III injection well permit UR03075 with opportunity for parties to submit evidence on the matter, the Commission issued an order adjudicating the following finding of fact:

(FOF 147) UEC's proposed activities will not adversely affect public health and welfare.

After considering the record of a contested case hearing on the original application to issue Class III injection well permit UR03075 with opportunity for parties to submit evidence on the matter, the Commission issued an order adjudicating the following conclusion of law:

(COL 291) Based on the findings of fact set forth in and/or incorporated into Section V.O. above [in the Commission's order], the Applicant's proposed activities will

not adversely affect public health and welfare.

**Comment No. 21:**

Pamela Christopher and Pat Bulla expressed concerns that the application and proposed permitted activities are not adequate to protect soil and land from contamination.

**Response No. 21:**

The Executive Director reviewed the application and prepared the draft permit in consideration of the applicable rules under 30 TAC Chapter 331 and determined that soil and land will be adequately protected from mining activities and permitted injection activities. Requirements for responding to spills and contamination of soils and land are not addressed in the application for the Class III injection well permit. Requirements for responding to spills and soil and surface contamination are addressed in the radioactive material license. After considering the record of a contested case hearing on the original application to issue Class III injection well permit UR03075 with opportunity for parties to submit evidence on the matter, the Commission issued an order adjudicating the following finding of fact:

(FOF 145) UEC has demonstrated its compliance with the TCEQ regulatory scheme governing *in situ* uranium mining. Fresh water and air are adequately and sufficiently protected from pollution, soil and vegetation are adequately and sufficiently protected from contamination, and UEC's proposed activities will not negatively impact livestock and wildlife, including endangered species.

(FOF 149) Fresh water and air are adequately and sufficiently protected from pollution; soil and vegetation are adequately protected from contamination; and UEC's proposed activities will not negatively impact livestock and wildlife, including endangered species....

*Air Emissions*

**Comment No. 22:**

Pat Bulla, Greyson Radtke, Chad Cardosa, and Lance Radtke expressed concerns that the application and proposed permitted activities are not adequate to protect the air from pollution.

**Response No. 22:**

The Executive Director reviewed the application and prepared the draft permit in consideration of the applicable rules under 30 TAC Chapter 331 and determined that the air will be adequately protected from mining activities and permitted injection activities. The Injection Well Permit UR03075 does not authorize air emissions. The rules and statutes under which the subject application is reviewed do not include consideration of emissions of air pollutants or radiation. Worker and public exposure to radiation are addressed in the radioactive materials license. Emission of air pollutants are subject to the applicable requirements of the Texas Clean Air Act. After considering the record of a contested case hearing on the original application to issue Class III injection well permit UR03075 with opportunity for parties to submit evidence on the matter, the Commission issued an order adjudicating the following finding of fact:

(FOF 145) UEC has demonstrated its compliance with the TCEQ regulatory scheme governing *in situ* uranium mining. Fresh water and air are adequately and sufficiently protected from pollution, soil and vegetation are adequately and sufficiently protected from contamination, and UEC's proposed activities will not negatively impact livestock and wildlife, including endangered species.

After considering the record of a contested case hearing on the original application to issue Class III injection well permit UR03075 with opportunity for parties to submit evidence on the matter, the Commission issued an order adjudicating the following conclusion of law:

(COL 287) Applicants for an RML must examine levels of radiological exposure to facility workers and members of the public via pathways such as air, soils, surface water, and food chain (crops, cattle, etc.) 30 TAC §§ 336.301-336.368.

These comments are not relevant or material to the Commission's or the Executive Director's consideration of the application.

**Comment No. 23:**

Rachel Tyrna and Angela Lantz expressed concerns that the application and proposed permitted activities are not adequate to protect from radiation.

**Response No. 23:**

The rules and statutes under which the subject application is reviewed do not include consideration of emissions of air pollutants or radiation. Worker and public exposure to radiation are addressed in the radioactive materials license. Requirements for protection against radiation are addressed under the requirements of the Texas Radiation Control Act and the rules of the Commission in 30 TAC Chapter 336. These requirements include radiation protection standards and radiation monitoring. After considering the record of a contested case hearing on the original application to issue Class III injection well permit UR03075 with opportunity for parties to submit evidence on the matter, the Commission issued an order adjudicating the following finding of fact:

(FOF 142) UEC has adopted an Operational Monitoring Program, which is set forth in its [Radioactive Material License] Application. Pursuant to the RML, UEC will be required to conduct regular sampling of air, vegetation (including a grazing crop), soil, sediment, surface water and groundwater at pre-determined locations on a quarterly and annual basis throughout its operations. This monitoring will enable UEC to detect any potential breach of the controls required by the RML.

After considering the record of a contested case hearing on the original application to issue Class III injection well permit UR03075 with opportunity for parties to submit evidence on the matter, the Commission issued an order adjudicating the following conclusion of law:

(COL 287) Applicants for an RML must examine levels of radiological exposure to facility workers and members of the public via pathways such as air, soils, surface water, and food chain (crops, cattle, etc.) 30 TAC §§ 336.301-336.368.

## Public Concerns

### **Comment No. 24:**

GCGCD, Wilfred Korth, and Amanda Jo Mamerow expressed concerns that the application is not in the public interest.

### **Response No. 24:**

The Executive Director reviewed the application and prepared the draft permit in consideration of the applicable rules under 30 TAC Chapter 331 and the Texas Injection Well Act in Texas Water Code Chapter 27 and determined that the use and installation of the proposed injection wells is in the public interest. After considering the record of a contested case hearing on the original application to issue Class III injection well permit UR03075 with opportunity for parties to submit evidence on the matter, the Commission issued an order adjudicating the following findings of fact:

(FOF 63) UEC's proposed installation and use of Class III injection wells for *in situ* mining of uranium are in the public interest in accordance with the criteria in Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a).

(FOF 64) Uranium, in contrast with oil and gas, is a very scarce natural resource that exists in commercially mineable concentrations in only a few areas of the United States, including Goliad County, Texas.

(FOF 65) It is in the public interest for this natural resource to be produced to meet the energy needs of the United States, for the mineral owners to realize the economic benefits of uranium production on their property.

(FOF 66) A review of the ED's RTC [filed October 31, 2008] regarding [the original Class III injection well permit] application shows that the ED considered a wide range of issues regarding public interest, including: economic impacts and quality of life, health and welfare, groundwater quality, geology/hydrology of the aquifer, monitoring, control of migration of mining fluids, aquifer restoration, financial assurance and compliance history.

(FOF 67) The ED undertook a balancing approach and considered potential and negative impacts in making a determination of public interest.

(FOF 68) The ED also reviewed the [Class III injection well permit] Application to ensure that UEC would meet all regulatory requirements.

(FOF 73) UEC's compliance history does not show that granting the [Class III injection well permit] application would be against the public interest....

(FOF 74) UEC's ability to meet applicable financial assurance requirements does not show that granting the [Class III injection well permit] application would be against the public interest....

(FOF 75) UEC's restoration proposal and past groundwater restoration efforts by other operators do not show that granting the [Class III injection well permit] application would be against the public interest....

After considering the record of a contested case hearing on the original application to issue Class III injection well permit UR03075 with opportunity for parties to submit evidence on the matter, the Commission issued an order adjudicating the following conclusion of law:

(COL 244) Based on the findings of fact set forth in and incorporated into Section V.A. above [in the Commission's order], UEC's [Class III injection well permit] application is in the public interest consistent with the policy of the state as defined by the Legislature under Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a).

(COL 245) TCEQ rules require TCEQ to implement Chapter 27 of the Texas Water Code in a manner consistent with the policy of this state to: maintain the quality of fresh water in the state to the extent consistent with the public health and welfare and the operation of existing industries, taking into consideration the economic development of the state, prevent underground injection that may pollute fresh water; and require the use of all reasonable methods to implement this policy.

(COL 246) The scope of the public interest consideration must be appropriately limited so that it does not conflict with other law.

**Comment No. 25:**

Wilfred Korth, Terrell Lee Graham, Colt Williams, Tate Bammert, Reagan Sahadi, Barbara Smith, Art Dohman, and Lon Burnam representing Sierra Club expressed concerns that the application has not demonstrated a public need.

**Response No. 25:**

An applicant is not specifically required to demonstrate a public need to obtain a Class III injection well permit. The Executive Director reviewed the application and prepared the draft permit in consideration of the applicable rules under 30 TAC Chapter 331 and the Texas Injection Well Act in Texas Water Code Chapter 27 and determined that there is not a practical, economic and feasible alternative to injection wells reasonably available. After considering the record of a contested case hearing on the original application to issue Class III injection well permit UR03075 with opportunity for parties to submit evidence on the matter, the Commission issued an order adjudicating the following findings of fact:

(FOF 176) There are no practical, economic and feasible alternatives to the use of injection wells for uranium in the Mine Permit Area.

(FOF 177) The available alternative methods for recovering uranium are underground and open pit (surface) mining, both of which involve de-watering the production zone sands, removing huge quantities of surface and subsurface material (i.e., the overburden), and creating substantial amounts of solid waste (i.e., tailings).

(FOF 178) The *in situ* mining process is more environmentally-protective means of uranium mining. As compared to the available alternatives, *in situ* uranium mining greatly minimizes the physical damage to the land and subsurface and results in much less solid waste.

After considering the record of a contested case hearing on the original application to issue Class III injection well permit UR03075 with opportunity for parties to submit evidence on the matter, the Commission issued an order adjudicating the following conclusions of law:

(COL 300) Based on the findings of fact set forth in Section V.U. above [in the Commission's order], there is no "practical economic, and feasible alternative to an injection well reasonably available" within the meaning of that term as set forth in Tex. Water Code § 27.051(d)(2).

(COL 301) Section 27.051(d) of the Texas Water Code provides that in determining if the use or installation of an injection well is in the public interest, the Commission must consider whether there is an alternative to “an injection well,” not whether there is an alternative to the proposed injection well location.

**Comment No. 26:**

Michelle Shelton, Mike R. Bennett, Kirby Brumby, Kevin Fagg, Kenneth Edwards, David Young, and Billy Dornburg on behalf of congregation of St. Peter's Lutheran Church of Ander expressed concerns that the application and proposed permitted activities are not beneficial to the local economy.

**Response No. 26:**

The Executive Director reviewed the application and prepared the draft permit in consideration of the applicable rules under 30 TAC Chapter 331 and the Texas Injection Well Act in Texas Water Code Chapter 27 and determined that the use and installation of the proposed injection wells is in the public interest. However, an application for a Class III injection well permit is not specifically required to demonstrate a benefit to the local economy.

Local roadways Ingress/Egress

**Comment No. 27:**

Bev Bruns expressed concerns that the application and proposed permitted activities do not adequately consider transportation routes to the proposed permit area.

**Response No. 27:**

An application for a Class III injection well permit is not specifically required to demonstrate adequate transportation routes to the proposed permit area. The TCEQ does not regulate motor vehicle use or the routing of transportation for Class III injection activities. After considering the record of a contested case hearing on the original application to issue Class III injection well permit UR03075 with opportunity for parties to submit evidence on the matter, the Commission issued an order adjudicating the following findings of fact:

(FOF 127) Local roadways are sufficient to handle traffic to and from the proposed facility.

(FOF 128) UEC's site access plan provides that UEC construct a new road so that the main entrance to the proposed site will be directly onto US Highway 183.

(FOF 129) US Highway 183 is designed for higher volume traffic and larger vehicles than local county roadways.

(FOF 130) The local roadways will not be adversely affected by the traffic created by the proposed *in situ* uranium mining operation.

After considering the record of a contested case hearing on the original application to issue Class III injection well permit UR03075 with opportunity for parties to submit evidence on the matter, the Commission issued an order adjudicating the following conclusion of law:

(COL 284) Based on the findings of fact set forth in Section V.K. above [in the

Commission's order], local roadways are sufficient to handle traffic to and from the proposed facility.

These comments are not relevant or material to the Commission's or the Executive Director's consideration of the application.

### Bankruptcy Contingency

#### **Comment No. 28:**

Dennis Zengerle and Dave Barnet expressed concerns that application and proposed permitted activities do not appropriately consider the applicant's bankruptcy. Dennis Zengerle, Pamela Christopher, Catherine Alstrom, Cara Alstrom and Angela Lantz expressed concerns that the application and proposed permitted activities inappropriately impose long term liability on the state and taxpayers.

#### **Response No. 28:**

Financial assurance provides a contingency mechanism to assure that a permittee's obligations are performed even if the permittee is unable to do so because of a bankruptcy or other situation. Financial assurance provides a source of funds secured by a third party to the benefit of TCEQ to perform activities like closure or corrective action, if necessary, so that state money is not used. Under 30 TAC § 305.125(22), which is incorporated by reference into the draft permit, the permittee is required to notify the Executive Director immediately following the filing of a petition for bankruptcy by the permittee or affiliate of the permittee. Financial assurance for plugging and abandonment (closure) of the Class III wells is required under the permit. In addition, financial assurance for decommissioning and groundwater restoration is required under UEC's radioactive materials license. In event of the permittee's bankruptcy and failure to close wells or complete decommissioning, funds from the financial assurance would be available to TCEQ.

### Uranium Mining Generally

#### **Comment No. 29:**

Jeff Sibley, Gerald A. Griffith and Lon Burnam representing Sierra Club expressed concerns that the application and proposed permitted activities should not be approved because of the poor history of uranium mining.

#### **Response No. 29:**

The Executive Director's review of an application for a Class III injection well permit does not consider the perceived success or failures of other uranium mining activities. Injection well area permits are specifically established by the legislature in Tex. Water Code § 27.0513, and applications for such permits are considered under the applicable statutes and rules of the Commission. The Executive Director reviewed UEC's application for renewal and amendment of the Class III injection well permit and determined that the application meets all applicable requirements. Surface mining and underground mining are alternative methods historically used for recovering uranium. The *in situ* method using injection and production wells causes less physical destruction of the production zone aquifer and overlying land because it does not use heavy machinery and minimizes generation of waste because it does not require the removal of overburden.

These comments are not relevant or material to the Commission's or the Executive Director's consideration of the application.

### Property Rights

#### **Comment No. 30:**

Gregory C. Chapman expressed concerns that granting the application and issuing the proposed permit would constitute a taking of private property.

#### **Response No. 30:**

The Executive Director disagrees that approving an application and issuing an injection well permit constitutes a taking of private property. UEC must possess all property rights to conduct its permitted activities. TCEQ does not acquire any property, confer any property right to UEC, or convey any property to UEC. Under 30 TAC § 305.122(c), an injection well permit does not convey any property rights of any sort, nor any exclusive privilege, and does not become a vested right in the permittee. Under 30 TAC § 305.122(d), a permit does not authorize any injury to persons or property or an invasion of other property rights, or any infringement of state or local law or regulations. Under Tex. Water Code § 27.104, the fact that a person has a permit issued under the Injection Well Act does not relieve him from any civil liability. If a person believes that a well operator's actions are infringing upon a protected property right, the person should seek redress in a civil court.

### Application Review

#### **Comment No. 31:**

GCGCD, Wilfred Korth, and Amanda Jo Mamerow expressed concerns that all application requirements have not been met.

#### **Response No. 31:**

The Executive Director reviewed the application and prepared the draft permit in consideration of the applicable rules under 30 TAC Chapter 331 and the Texas Injection Well Act in Texas Water Code Chapter 27 and determined that the application met all requirements.

#### **Comment No. 32:**

Dennis Zengerle and Jeff Sibley expressed concerns that the application requires review by an independent third party.

#### **Response No. 32:**

The Executive Director is assigned the responsibility by statute and rules of the Commission to review an application for a Class III injection well permit. The Executive Director reviews applications under applicable laws with independence and without prejudice. The application is subject to public notice with opportunity for the public to review the application and submit comments. There is no requirement or authority to obtain the review by some other entity.

These comments are not relevant or material to the Commission's or the Executive Director's consideration of the application.

**Comment No. 33:**

Wilfred Korth, Terrell Lee Graham, Katy Williams, Tate Bammert, Reagan Sahadi, Barbara Smith, and Art Dohman expressed concerns that the application was subject to too many notices of deficiency.

**Response No. 33:**

The notice of deficiency process is an integral part of the Executive Director's technical review of an application. The Executive Director issues notices of deficiency during technical review of an application to inform an applicant of additional information required before the Executive Director declares an application to be technically complete. The application was subject to one administrative notice of deficiency and four technical notices of deficiency. After submission of all application revisions, the Executive Director determined that the application is complete.

These comments are not relevant or material to the Commission's or the Executive Director's consideration of the application.

**Property Values****Comment No. 34:**

GCGCD, Wilfred Korth, Aldon Bade, David Arthur Byrd, Terrell Lee Graham, Patricia Lux Graham, Garland R. Gloor, Gregory C. Chapman, and Amanda Jo Mamerow expressed concerns that the application and proposed permitted activities are not adequate to protect the value and use of property.

**Response No. 34:**

The TCEQ's jurisdiction is established by the legislature and is limited to the issues and subjects forth in statute. Accordingly, the TCEQ does not have jurisdiction to consider the effects on property values when determining to approve or deny a permit application. In addition, the draft permit does not convey any property rights of any sort and does not authorize any injury to persons or property or an invasion of other property rights (Sec. VIII. E and F.) After considering the record of a contested case hearing on the original application to issue Class III injection well permit UR03075 with opportunity for parties to submit evidence on the matter, the Commission issued an order adjudicating the following findings of fact:

(FOF 143) UEC's proposed activities will not negatively impact the use of property.

(FOF 144) Existing land uses adjacent to the Mine Permit Area include low density, scattered rural residential, cattle ranching, cropland, and oil and gas production.

(FOF 145) UEC has demonstrated its compliance with the TCEQ regulatory scheme governing *in situ* uranium mining. Fresh water and air are adequately and sufficiently protected from pollution, soil and vegetation are adequately and sufficiently protected from contamination, and UEC's proposed activities will not negatively impact livestock and wildlife, including endangered species....

After considering the record of a contested case hearing on the original application to issue Class III injection well permit UR03075 with opportunity for

parties to submit evidence on the matter, the Commission issued an order adjudicating the following conclusions of law:

(COL 288) Based on the findings of fact set forth in and/or incorporated into Section V.N. above [in the Commission's order], the Applicant's proposed activities will not negatively impact the use of property.

(COL 289) TCEQ does not have jurisdiction to consider effects on property values when determining whether to approve or deny a Class III injection well [permit] application.

(COL 290) The issuance of an injection well permit "does not convey any property rights of any sort" and "does not authorize any injury to persons or property or an invasion of other property rights, or any infringement of state or local law or regulations." 30 TAC § 305.122 (b)-(c); *see also id.* § 305.125(16) (providing that all injection well permits must include a condition stating that it "does not convey any property rights of any sort, or any exclusive privilege").

## **V. Conclusion**

The Executive Director has reviewed the application and preliminarily determined that it meets all relevant regulatory and statutory requirements.

**VI. Changes Made to the Draft Permits in Response to Comments**

No changes were made to the draft permits in response to public comments received.

Respectfully submitted,

Texas Commission on Environmental Quality

Kelly Keel  
Executive Director

Phillip Ledbetter, Director  
Office of Legal Services

Charmaine Backens, Deputy Director  
Environmental Law Division



---

Don Redmond, Staff Attorney  
Environmental Law Division  
State Bar No. 24010336  
P.O. Box 13087, MC 173  
Austin, Texas 78711-3087  
Phone: (512) 239-0612  
Fax: (512) 239-0606



---

Thomas Hopkins, Staff Attorney  
Environmental Law Division  
State Bar No. 24143022  
P.O. Box 13087, MC 173  
Austin, Texas 78711-3087  
Phone: (512) 239-5427  
Fax: (512) 239-0606

REPRESENTING THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR  
OF THE TEXAS COMMISSION ON  
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on March 11, 2025, that the Executive Director's Response to Public Comments for Renewal and Amendment of Class III Injection Well Area Permit No. UR03075 was filed with the TCEQ's Office of the Chief Clerk.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Don Redmond". The signature is written in a cursive style with a horizontal line underneath it.

Don Redmond, Staff Attorney  
Environmental Law Division