

1 A RESOLUTION OPPOSING THE MINING OF
2 URANIUM IN THE COMMONWEALTH OF
3 VIRGINIA IN THE ABSENCE OF AN UNBIASED,
4 CONCLUSIVE STUDY ON THE POTENTIAL
5 EFFECTS THEREOF
6
7
8

9 WHEREAS, in 1983, in response to proposals to mine uranium in the
10 Commonwealth of Virginia, the General Assembly enacted a legislative moratorium on
11 the mining of uranium in Virginia, which remains in effect today; and
12

13 WHEREAS, present-day estimates of uranium ore in Pittsylvania County and the
14 price of uranium yellowcake indicate that uranium deposits in Pittsylvania County may
15 be worth as much as \$7 to \$10 billion, prompting proposals to study the consequences
16 of repealing the moratorium and developing a regulatory framework for uranium mining;
17 and
18

19 WHEREAS, a company known as Virginia Uranium, Inc. has proposed to
20 establish one of the largest uranium mining operations in North America in Pittsylvania
21 County; and
22

23 WHEREAS, uranium mining by the process likely to be used in Pittsylvania
24 County, if such mining is ultimately approved, results in the creation of huge volumes of
25 highly mobile, radioactive, sand and clay-like sediments known as mill tailings, which are
26 stored as slurries and sludge in ponds, and ultimately as dewatered tailings piles, where
27 they retain 85% of their original radioactivity for hundreds of thousands of years; and
28

29 WHEREAS, historically, tailings pile confinement structures have failed in the
30 United States and elsewhere, resulting in the release of radioactive particles and
31 sediments to downstream surface waters; and
32

33 WHEREAS, it is well-documented and generally agreed within the scientific
34 community that long-term exposure to the level of radiation that could result from a
35 failure of a tailings pile confinement structure, or even a less catastrophic release, are
36 highly deleterious to human health; and
37

38 WHEREAS, historically, many uranium mines have not been properly operated or
39 closed, or in many instances have been abandoned, resulting in radioactive
40 contamination of ground and surface waters, and in some cases leaving a legacy of
41 environmental and human tragedy; and
42

43 WHEREAS, all uranium mines in the United States have, to date, been located in
44 states with low rainfall and high evaporation rates, both of which are important factors in
45 managing water and minimizing flooding, whereas Virginia's climate includes frequent
46 tropical storms, hurricanes, and nor'easters, many of which have produced more rainfall

47 in a few hours than the total annual precipitation of the arid states where the nation's
48 uranium mines are located; and

49
50 WHEREAS, by contrast, Virginia's surface water hydrology has the capacity to
51 cause significant erosion and structural damage to tailings piles, dams, and caps while
52 simultaneously providing long-distance, transport and dispersal downstream of
53 radioactive sediments released as a consequence of such erosion and damage, and
54 many of the uranium mining catastrophes in arid states were caused by the inability to
55 properly manage water, even though water management in such states is much less
56 problematic than in Virginia; and

57
58 WHEREAS, these past environmental disasters were also attributable to serious
59 deficiencies in the practices of the uranium mining industry and inadequate federal
60 regulation, such that in the United States, the federal government was forced to
61 intervene to remediate the harm and damage, and after two and one-half decades of
62 remediation and billions of dollars of expenditures, those efforts are still underway; and

63
64 WHEREAS, Virginia Beach and Chesapeake own a raw water intake on Lake
65 Gaston, which is downstream of the proposed mining operation in Pittsylvania County,
66 and water from the Lake Gaston Project is intermixed throughout the water supplies of
67 Chesapeake, Norfolk, and Virginia Beach; and

68
69 WHEREAS, if a flood of the magnitude of that caused by Hurricane Camille in
70 1969 were to fragment one or more tailings piles and transport radioactive mill tailings
71 downstream into Kerr Reservoir and Lake Gaston, the Lake Gaston Project might be
72 rendered inoperable for an indefinite period of time; and

73
74 WHEREAS, a worst-case scenario would include abandonment of the lake
75 Gaston Project, termination of the water services contract with Norfolk (requiring the
76 payment to Norfolk of its stranded capital costs), and the construction of a seawater
77 desalination plant to replace the abandoned water supply at a direct cost to Virginia
78 Beach in excess of \$500 million; and

79
80 WHEREAS proponents of uranium mining do not dispute the environmental
81 consequences of past uranium mining practices in the United States or elsewhere, but
82 instead maintain that much more stringent regulations and improved uranium tailings
83 confinement technology will prevent any significant release of radioactive substances
84 downstream; and

85
86 WHEREAS, no mines or uranium tailings confinement cells have ever been
87 constructed in locations, such as Virginia, that are subject to frequent tropical storms,
88 hurricanes, nor'easters, and other storms that can and have produced precipitation
89 approaching the Probable Maximum Precipitation (PMP), as defined by the National
90 Weather Service, such that there can be no reasonable assurance under the present
91 state of knowledge of the subject that uranium mining can be performed safely in
92 Virginia; and

93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138

WHEREAS, on November 6, 2008, the Virginia Coal and Energy Commission (VCEC) adopted a resolution urging the Virginia Center for Coal and Energy Research (VCCER) to enter into an agreement with the National Academy of Sciences, or other comparable scientific or academic institution independent of the Center, to conduct a wide-ranging study of the impact of uranium mining in the Commonwealth of Virginia; and

WHEREAS, the City of Virginia Beach does not oppose an unbiased, scientific study of the potential impacts of uranium mining in Virginia by an independent entity such as the National Academy of Sciences.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF VIRGINIA BEACH, VIRGINIA:

That unless and until it can be demonstrated a reasonable degree of scientific certainty that there will be no significant release of radioactive sediments downstream under any circumstances, including, but not limited to, a direct hit on the mining facilities by a Probable Maximum Precipitation (PMP) storm event, the City of Virginia Beach is opposed to: (1) uranium mining in Virginia, including the proposed Virginia Uranium operation; (2) the elimination of the existing legislative moratorium on uranium mining, and (3) any attempt to develop a regulatory framework for uranium mining.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF VIRGINIA BEACH, VIRGINIA:

That any study commissioned by or used by the Commonwealth of Virginia to determine the feasibility of uranium mining in Virginia must include the following criteria:

- (1) The study must thoroughly evaluate the risks, including those resulting from a worst-case scenario as previously described, to the citizens of Virginia and assess whether uranium mining and milling in Virginia can be undertaken in a manner that will completely safeguard the Commonwealth's environment, natural and historic resources, agricultural lands, and the health and well-being of its citizens;
- (2) The entire study process must be open to the public and the press;
- (3) The City of Virginia Beach and other potentially impacted jurisdictions must be included as active participants in the study process;
- (4) The study must be conducted, and the conclusions of such study shall be determined, by a group of qualified and impartial experts, such as the National Academy of Sciences, who are completely

139 independent of the uranium mining industry, the nuclear power
140 industry, and any state commission that has assumed or been
141 charged with the responsibility for providing such a study;

142
143 (5) A peer review group that is independent of the VCEC and the
144 VCCER and includes adequate representation from environmental,
145 public health, water supply and water resource agencies, including
146 the Army Corps of Engineers, is established to monitor and critique
147 the study; and

148
149 (6) That the study must be adequately funded and under no deadline
150 for the completion of the study.

151
152

153 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF VIRGINIA
154 BEACH, VIRGINIA:

155
156 That the City Clerk is hereby directed to transmit a certified copy of this
157 Resolution to each member and member-elect of the City's Congressional and General
158 Assembly Delegations.

Adopted by the City Council of the City of Virginia Beach on the ____ day of _____
_____, 2008.

CA-10907
R-4
November 18, 2008